

JCU ePrints

This file is part of the following reference:

Cheers, Brian Harvey (1992) *Social support in small remote towns in Far North and north-west Queensland, Australia: implications for human services*. PhD thesis, James Cook University.

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/15216>

CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION

LIMITATIONS

This investigation had nine limitations.

First, results cannot be generalised to similar respondents living in similar towns in similar regions elsewhere. However, the fact that results were very similar for each town implies that they can be treated as clear working hypotheses for researchers, practitioners, service planners and policy formulators serving similar people in other similar Australian towns.

Second, the study did not include people living in fully Aboriginal families. Clearly, results cannot be generalised to these.

Third, deprived, disadvantaged, or low income families were not specifically investigated. For the most part, the study was of people in the middle income range.

Fourth, we can only discuss and develop implications for the needs investigated.

Fifth, for methodological reasons discussed in Chapter 5, respondents were presented with hypothetical situations. There is no way of knowing what they would do when actually confronted with the given need. However, generally high reliability coefficients and data obtained from respondents who had actually sought help in the situations presented strengthen the evidence. Moreover, as we saw in Chapter 4, there is some evidence to suggest that perceived support can reduce stress to a greater extent than actual support.

Sixth, responses from young children should be treated cautiously because they were made by parents, most often mothers.

Seventh, we have no way of knowing from this investigation whether respondents would use relevant formal services if they were provided locally. For many of these needs, however, it is unlikely that relevant formal services would be provided locally to remote Australian towns of this size in the foreseeable future. Given this, the important question concerns how we can provide resources to residents which are relevant to their needs and appropriate to their living situations even though we cannot provide locally based formal services.

Eighth, because of resource and time limitations comparable data from urban and other settlements were not obtained. Clearly, precise comparisons between the towns investigated and other kinds of settlements cannot be made, though results can be compared with those obtained from similar studies of other kinds of settlements. However, the aims and design of this investigation mean that precisely comparable data cannot be found in the literature. While this clearly remains a limitation, for three reasons no apology is offered. First, the descriptive nature of the study and its design have been justified. Second, results can be meaningfully discussed and useful service implications developed without comparable data. Third, the lack of comparable rural data has not significantly retarded the development of knowledge about urban areas. Clearly, though, there is a need to compare these results with those for a comparable urban population.

Finally, for the most part, differences and associations were only moderate. This was possibly a result of the design. Further investigation of these results is called for.

It is possible that the study design and the minimum levels of association and difference chosen to report results in Chapter 6 meant that some results may have occurred purely by chance. For the most part, then, discussion in this chapter focusses on results for which plausible explanations can be found, those which are consistent with re-occurring patterns in the data, and those which have implications for providing human services to these towns.

ALL NEEDS

Unless otherwise indicated discussion in this section refers to childrearsers' support-seeking.

DISTANCE AND EXTENT OF SUPPORT

Overall, these residents either had access to supports who they believed could provide useful assistance or were confident that they could resolve these problems themselves. Only a few could not find a source or chose one which they believed was unlikely to be of much help, and then only for isolated needs.

The fact that supports generally received high ratings partly reflects the definition of social support presented in Chapter 4. However, it also demonstrates the extent to which respondents felt secure in the knowledge that, overall, they could find adequate support for a wide range of needs. This, of course, accords with literature and research reported in Chapter 3 indicating that rural residents' formal and non-formal supports are effective (Bates, Clarke and Bertsche, 1980, p.200; Vallance and D'Augelli, 1982; Young, Giles Jr. and Plantz, 1982; Kelley and Kelley, 1985; Patterson, Germain, Brennan and Memmott, 1988).

When distance was an issue, it was for temporary residents rather than their more permanent neighbours. It was they who were most likely to report that their preferred supports were too far away to be useful and that they had no acceptable local alternatives.

This is similar to Jones' results (1978 and 1980), indicating that recent arrivals in rural communities, especially those who had left intimate social networks behind, had the greatest difficulties in establishing new social networks. It is also similar to Cotterell's (1984) findings that, when compared with women in traditional Australian country service towns, their more temporary counterparts in mining towns had smaller support networks, and fewer kin and more neighbours in their support networks (p.105). Cotterell went on to suggest that because they were so far away from their preferred natural supports, women in mining towns were forced to develop supportive ties with other local women with whom they had more superficial relationships.

In most cases respondents failed to identify a support because they simply preferred to handle the problem themselves rather than because of the unavailability or inaccessibility of their preferred source or because they were pessimistic about anyone being able to help. The fact that respondents rated self-help a little higher than help obtained from other sources also indicates that this was a positive choice rather than something they were forced to accept because of the lack of alternatives.

Three results suggest that respondents were generally prepared to seek assistance from distant sources and that the help they anticipated receiving from these would be adequate.

First, as many non-local as local sources were chosen, and this was the case for both named and unnamed sources. This challenges suggestions that people living in rural areas obtain most of their assistance from local supports.

Second, whether the source was local or not, or even how far they were from town, had no effect on the extent to which respondents believed they would contribute to resolving their problems. This held for both named and unnamed sources and for analyses across all needs and for each need.

Third, permanent residents were more self-reliant than others. If distance from supports did create problems, we would expect it do so for **temporary** residents, most of whom were relatively recent arrivals, and that it would be they who would be forced to rely more on their own resources.

Thus, overall, the fact that these people were living in a remote town, isolated from formal services and, for many, from some important natural supports did not leave them unable to manage the problems included in this investigation either through their own efforts and/or with assistance from others. Nor did it mean that the help they anticipated receiving would not be useful.

However, being remote from their preferred supports did affect who these people chose to seek help from. One in four local selections were made because respondents believed their preferred sources were too far away to help. Ideally, they would have preferred to go to other sources of assistance, but distance made this difficult or unreasonable given the need. This was especially the case for needs such as occasional child care and household assistance where local sources were in the best position to help anyway, for needs such as temporary incapacity and temporary constant child care where the demands on the

source would not be great and where respondents would not be placed in a position of high dependency, and for less personally embarrassing situations.

Geographic constraints also forced some respondents to choose local rather than non-local sources for representation concerning essential services. If they could do so reasonably easily and cheaply they probably would have opted to go direct to organisations such as The Far North Queensland Electricity Board with complaints about services. Instead, they chose local organisations such as local government or, for Capeville residents, their citizens organisation to represent their interests with the authorities.

Clearly, though, distance was not a factor where a resident was looking for expert professional help for the specialised needs (health, education and legal problems), for assistance with highly private and often embarrassing social-emotional problems (see, also, Litwak and Szelenyi, 1969, and Wellman, 1979, p.1214), or for needs such as permanent accommodation and destitution which would put large demands on the source and place the respondent in a high state of dependency for a prolonged period. Clearly, for these needs, local sources were not acceptable substitutes for preferred supports.

These results are very similar to those of Litwak and Szelenyi (1969), Wellman (1979) and Fischer (1982, p.175). In Fischer's terms:

The implication of these findings is that there is indeed nothing mystical about proximity. Nearby associates are preferred when nearness is critical. When proximity is less critical - and these are often situations involving the most intimacy, sacrifice, and faith - there is little or no preference for those nearby. in matters of minor need,

people turn to neighbours, and in matters of great need they turn to intimates wherever those people live. Indeed, where the need is very great, distance is not an object, because people will come from far away. They are similarly consistent with other findings on neighbours, that they largely provided house care and rarely provided 'serious' assistance. (Fischer, 1982, p.175)

They are also similar to the results of other studies which have found that, depending on the need in question, social and support networks can be activated in the absence of ongoing face-to-face interaction (Litwak, 1960; Firth, Hubert and Forge, 1969; Litwak and Szelenyi, 1969).

As shown in the next section, when compared with previous studies, what is particularly impressive about these results is the size of the distances involved. We are talking here about distances in excess of 500km and respondents' choices between close intimates this far away and less close friends and neighbours living within one kilometre. It would seem, then, that distance is as much (and as little) a barrier to support seeking whether it is moderate or very large.

The findings by Fischer (1982, pp.175-76) and Fischer and Jackson (1977, pp.120-21) that 'distance (is) simply another cost of social relations' (Fischer, 1982, p.175) cannot be assessed on the basis of the present data because most respondents were reasonably comfortable financially and because of the small population surveyed. Perhaps these respondents had made the necessary adaptations that urban people seem to make so that active relationships with intimates and supports can be maintained despite the distances which are involved for highly mobile populations (Fischer and Jackson, 1977, pp.124-25). However, whether 'distance is simply another cost' for people separated from

preferred supports by distances of the magnitude involved in the present study remains to be addressed by future research.

LOCATION

For the most part, respondents were forced to choose between sources in town or those more than 500km away. Because of the concentration of Australia's population in urban areas, most non-local sources were in the regional service centres, Townsville, Cairns and Mt Isa. Though this applied to both named and unnamed sources it was especially so for the latter. Very few unnamed sources were in the state capital, Brisbane, or in smaller satellite centres such as Cooktown, Renmark or the Atherton Tablelands.

Whether they were named or unnamed, local sources were cited more frequently than non-local because more respondents knew of them and because they were more accessible.

NAMED OR UNNAMED SUPPORTS

All respondents chose within-family, non-family named, and unnamed supports. This accords with results from studies by Henderson and Argyle (1985) and McCaughey (1987), and another in rural Pennsylvania by Martinez-Brawley and Blundall (1989) indicating that their respondents preferred 'a combination of kin, friends, neighbours, and the formal system' (p.515), rather than a particular kind of support.

Overall, slightly more non-family named than unnamed sources were cited. Which was preferred depended on the need rather than respondent characteristics. These results challenge suggestions reported in Chapter 3 that rural people, especially the more

'traditional', prefer to use natural supports and may even have some aversion to using formal services. Martinez-Brawley and Blundall (1989) also found almost no reluctance to use formal services amongst their farm families. Of 44 families, only two 'expressed clear opposition to the formal system' (Martinez-Brawley and Blundall, 1989, p.515).

Still, however, as with the Institute of Family Studies' Geelong Study (1983, pp.33 and 35), residents did rate non-family named supports a little higher than unnamed at both the local and non-local levels. There are four possible explanations for this.

First, they may have anticipated that their named supports would contribute more to problem resolution. Because of greater personal commitment to the respondent and their family, named sources might be more likely to go 'beyond the call of duty' than unnamed sources which provide help simply because they are employed to do so.

Second, respondents may have viewed unnamed sources as places to go only after their own efforts had failed to resolve the problem. Kin and friends, on the other hand, may have been viewed as normal 'first-line' sources of assistance. If so, then respondents would be likely to rate unnamed sources lower on the assumption that the respondent themselves would be making some contribution to resolving their own problems. This was the explanation offered by the Institute of Family Studies for similar results in an urban area (1983, pp.35 and 37).

Third, unnamed sources were chosen more frequently for needs such as destitution for which the respondent would be likely to make some contribution to resolving their own problems. In contrast, named sources were chosen more frequently for needs such as the social-emotional problems where the respondent no longer felt able to help

themselves at all. This would result in the overall contributions of unnamed supports being rated lower than named vis-a-vis the respondent's own contribution.

Fourth, the different overall ratings of named and unnamed sources may simply have reflected the different levels of potential resolvability of those needs for which each was preferred. Thus, unnamed sources were more popular for needs such as the community issues which were more resistant to resolution. Named supports, on the other hand, were more frequently cited for needs such as child care which could be resolved more easily.

As data from this investigation throw no further light on these possible explanations they must be left to further research.

Named supports were more respondent and family specific than unnamed because fewer respondents knew of each named source's existence.

UNNAMED SUPPORTS

Residents related with unnamed supports in regional centres to a far greater extent than those in the closer satellite centres or Brisbane. Six reasons for this can be suggested for the preference for sources in regional rather than satellite centres.

First, many government and non-government human service organisations do not have offices in the relevant satellite centres.

Second, when they travel to distant larger centres, residents generally do many things such as shopping, banking, visiting friends and relatives, making major purchases such as motor vehicles and machinery, consulting with professionals such as medical, legal and

financial specialists, and, if necessary, visiting human service organisations. All of these will only be found together in regional centres.

Third, it is less expensive for many residents to go to a regional than a satellite centre because they can stay with relatives or friends and because most goods are cheaper (see Chapter 2). In fact, visiting intimates is usually an important reason for the journey in the first place. As results show, respondents' intimates were more likely to be found in regional than satellite centres.

Fourth, human service organisations in regional centres provide a far greater range of services than those in satellite centres.

Fifth, most satellite offices are required to make recommendations to regional centres on many individual cases. Regional administrators will then make the final decisions. Correctly, therefore, residents reason that they might as well go the extra distance to the regional office rather than deal with intermediaries in a satellite office.

Finally, most satellite centres are only slightly less difficult to get to than regional centres anyway. Thus, for example, once a Capeville resident has reached the relevant satellite centre, Mareeba, their regional centre, Cairns, is only a further one hour drive along a high quality, sealed road. This is paltry compared with the eight to ten hours they have already travelled over difficult terrain.

Unnamed supports were chosen for the reasons one would expect: because their function is to help with the need in question; because they possess material resources or expertise useful for dealing with the problem; or because the respondent believed that the source was responsible for solving the problem in the first place. Most respondents

seemed to know which organisations could help with which problems even though they may have been over 500km away.

Because Australia's human services are essentially specialised or 'categorical', respondents chose unnamed sources according to need.

The most frequently cited local organisations were hospitals, schools, local government and, for Capeville residents, their citizens organisation. These are obvious choices given the needs investigated and, with the exception of police, they were the only formal human service organisations in the towns.

Local employers were often cited for help with finding employment. Probably because they were already in the workforce and because the towns' workforces were predominantly male anyway, men were more hopeful about obtaining work locally than were women.

Local employees were also cited frequently, especially for child care and some material needs. They were always chosen by private entrepreneurs, probably because they were more likely to have a perspective which views meeting these needs as a contractual matter. They were more likely to be chosen for the material needs by more financially comfortable respondents. Private entrepreneurs gave local employees lower ratings than did public servants. This is probably because they had more flexible working hours and conditions and were, therefore, more able to make some contribution themselves toward solving the problem. This was particularly apparent, for example, for child care needs and incapacity.

The most frequently chosen non-local unnamed sources were a popular Member of Parliament, the Royal Flying Doctor Service, the Department of Social Security, the Commonwealth Employment Service, the Queensland Education Department, private solicitors and private boarding schools. All but the last were in regional centres.

When compared with all unnamed sources, there was nothing distinctive about these, either with respect to which kinds of respondents chose them, or their anticipated contribution to problem resolution.

Local Government or Citizens Organisations

Capeville was the only town which was not a seat of local government. Two results suggest that Gulftown and Bushland respondents tended to use their shire council for representation on a variety of community issues, while those in Capeville were more inclined to use their citizens organisation as an alternative, probably because it was more accessible, because residents knew more about it, and because they were involved in managing it.

First, while the Gulf and Bush Shire Councils were widely used by residents in Gulftown and Bushland, the Cape Shire Council was hardly used at all by Capeville residents. The latter more frequently chose the Capeville Progress Association, though almost no Gulftown or Bushland residents chose their equivalent citizens organisations.

Second, the same kinds of residents chose the Gulf and Bush Shire Councils as chose the Capeville Progress Association. It was those who selected the Cape Shire Council who were different - they were almost exclusively permanent, long-term residents in private enterprise. Possibly, these had been in town long enough to become acquainted

with the Council and its staff and to have seen some results from past Council intervention in public and, perhaps, their business affairs.

Distance was probably the main obstacle to Capeville residents approaching the Cape Shire Council for representation, though some may have felt that the Council was more concerned with the more densely populated areas around Cooktown than with small outposts such as Capeville. That distance may have been the major factor is indicated by the finding that the local Cape Shire Council representative in Capeville was rated similarly to Gulf and Bushland Council sources, while Council members and staff located in Cooktown were rated far lower than any of these. However, while distance itself was probably important, distance affects other relevant variables such as access, visibility and perceived responsiveness to local issues.

People with most confidence in the Capeville Progress Association were those involved in managing it, those socially embedded in the local community through kinship and, perhaps, strong local friend networks, and those with more confidence in local unnamed sources more generally. Most likely, these residents were more deeply committed than others to the welfare of the whole community, at least partly because their own long-term well-being was so closely tied to it.

As with people in other towns, at least some Capeville residents saw their local government as being responsible for issues such as essential services and unemployment. For these, then, they were opting to use their Progress Association to represent their grievances to the Cape Shire Council.

Thus, Capeville residents appeared to be using their Association not only as an alternative to local government to represent their interests to the relevant authorities, but also to

represent their interests to local government itself when this was responsible for the services in question. In these situations, residents of the towns which were seats of local government were more likely to take their grievances direct to their shire council.

Members of Parliament

Five results indicate that usage of Members of Parliament for the needs investigated depended entirely on who they were, their visibility, and their relationships with their constituents rather than the fact that they were the sitting member.

First, while one M.P. was very popular his three colleagues were hardly mentioned at all. Second, he was even cited in Gulftown which was outside of his electorate. Third, he was often cited as a named support rather than as a Member of Parliament, and often for personal needs as well as shared community concerns.

Fourth, this Member was anticipated to contribute more to resolving communities' and residents' problems than were his three colleagues who were generally rated fairly low relative to other sources. However, his higher ratings were restricted to Bushland residents. It was also in Bushland that a number of residents claimed a personal relationship with him, indicating unusual popularity in this town. In the other towns people did not choose him because they thought he could contribute more than his colleagues. They simply seem to have been more aware of his existence.

Fifth, this Member was the only M.P. in fact the only unnamed source, selected because of confidence in his ability to help solve the problem in question. This, however, was mostly restricted to long-term residents and men. Perhaps long-term residents had had more positive experiences of him both personally and professionally than more recent

arrivals, and perhaps confidence in an elected representative was more important to men than women.

However, the popular Member was not anticipated to be more effective than most other unnamed sources. He was simply used by more residents than were his three colleagues and most other unnamed sources.

The question arises as to who had least faith in their Members of Parliament. On the one hand, they were rated lower by permanent than temporary or more-or-less permanent residents. Qualitative information suggests that permanent residents' greater personal investment in the local community and region may have resulted in them being pessimistic about being able to do anything about the community issues investigated. At first glance, this is contradicted by the finding that Members of Parliament in general, including the popular Member, were rated higher by respondents with stronger local ties. However, the important variable here was residential permanence, not whether residents had local kin or how strong their local intimate networks were. It could be suggested, then, that regardless of local ties, residents who had decided to live in town permanently would see themselves and their families as being more affected in the long-term by local conditions. Because of this they would be more concerned about these. In turn, this could make them more pessimistic than their less permanent neighbours when they observed a lack of progress on local issues.

KEY HELPERS

In view of previous literature (for example, Caplan, 1974; Kelley, Kelley, Gauron and Rawlings, 1977; and Bergstrom, 1982), it was surprising to find that there were no local (or non-local) key helpers in the sub-populations studied. This result is even more remarkable

when it is considered that a source had to be cited for only one of 26 needs to be counted as a support for that respondent. Even where a local person was cited by two or three unrelated neighbours, they were usually chosen because of their professional skills or material resources and not because of personal qualities or their reputation for being a helpful person.

This accords with results of a study by Kelley and Kelley (1985, pp.361-62) which also failed to identify local key helpers in Iowa towns.

(a) surprising finding in the Iowa study was the large number of people named as natural helpers but the few who were named more than once. The Iowa study was aimed at community helpers, with the expectation that a few natural leaders would emerge in a rural area. This expectation was not realised; a total of 95 persons were named, most only once.

Unfortunately, the authors did not attempt to explain this result.

However, the finding does run counter to some United States research (for example, Martinez-Brawley and Blundall, 1989) which has found key helpers in country towns. Five reasons can be suggested for the different results.

First, the United States research was conducted in much larger towns than were investigated here. Key helpers are more likely to exist in these because with larger populations it requires a far smaller proportion of the population to seek help from a given support for them to be recognised as a key helper.

Second, residents of very small towns may be more concerned about maintaining privacy and boundaries between their nuclear family and the rest of the community than those in larger towns. Small isolated communities can operate as more-or-less closed systems with little internal structural differentiation. This would make it difficult to maintain a distinct identity as an individual and family. Residents, then, would presumably go to greater lengths to maintain their family (and individual) boundaries. Evidence to support this comes from earlier research (Cheers, 1985) which found that this, indeed, was a conscious concern for residents and an issue which had frequently been observed by remote area human service providers.

Third, some rural (Martinez-Brawley and Blundall, 1989, pp.515-16) as well as urban United States studies (Gibson, 1972; Roberts and Thorsheim, 1982) have identified local churches and religious leaders as key helpers both in direct helping roles and as key information points for other services (Martinez-Brawley and Blundall, 1989, p.520). However, as the authors note in their report, Martinez-Brawley and Blundall's results may have been partly biased toward clergy because they had been used as a starting point for their snowball sample (1989, p.516).

Research stressing the importance of the church in rural helping networks has also been conducted by Levenberg (1976), Gottlieb (1983, pp.92-93), Wilke, Kenkel and Brown (1984), and Eakins and Keven (1988). However, Bates, Clarke and Bertsche (1980, p.198) qualified the general suggestion that the church is important when they found that longer-term residents in their mining town relied heavily on the church while short-term residents relied more on local natural key helpers (p.198). But other studies by Heffernan and Heffernan (1985) and Mermelstein and Sundet (1986) found similar results to those of the present study: the church did not appear to play a significant helping role in the recent farm crisis in several midwestern states in the United States.

Why the church did not play a key helping role in these towns is easy to see. A church and resident clergyman existed in two of the towns. However, these served the Aboriginal populations virtually exclusively, and religious services were structured accordingly. The minister in Capeville was an Aboriginal man, appointed by and responsible to a church in an exclusively Aboriginal community about 400km away. Clearly, he was appointed by an Aboriginal community to serve another Aboriginal community. Given the high level of segregation between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities in Capeville at the time of this investigation it is highly unlikely that non-Aboriginal people would have availed themselves of his services.

The Gulftown minister was an unusual non-Aboriginal person who was extremely well accepted in the Aboriginal community but not amongst the non-Aboriginal population. His style of religious services clearly did not appeal to the latter. As with his Capeville colleague, he was clearly appointed to serve the local Aboriginal population.

The fourth possible reason for the lack of key natural helpers in these towns is that the sub-populations investigated did not have extensive local kin networks. This is in contrast to the towns studied by Bates, Clarke and Bertsche (1980) and Martinez-Brawley and Blundall (1989). Because of the lack of local kin structures, it would probably be less likely for local key helpers to emerge in the towns investigated here. Perhaps they would have existed had there been more kin related families living in these towns. Results reported in Chapter 6 clearly indicate high usage of local kin by respondents who had them. The suggestion is also supported by Bates, Clarke and Bertsche's (1980) results demonstrating that longer-term residents, those more likely to have local kin in their mining town, were more likely than short-term residents to use kin for assistance.

Fifth, and again in contrast to Martinez-Brawley's and Blundall's (1989) towns, these three settlements grew at about the same time that reasonably efficient long-distance transport and communication were being developed in Australia. Thus, in contrast to the Pennsylvania towns, they had not existed for one or two centuries in virtual isolation from other settlements and the wider society. Consequently, strong local interpersonal loyalties, customs and traditions had not had the same opportunity to develop to nearly the same extent within these non-Aboriginal and partly Aboriginal sub-populations. Moreover, these towns are characterised by high population turnover and highly transient public servants such as teachers, council workers and remote area nurses. All these factors would probably impede the development of strong local social structures and, consequently, the emergence of key helpers.

The lack of local natural key helpers meant that non-family named sources were highly respondent or at least family specific.

OTHER FAMILY MEMBERS

All childrearers and most children chose both within-family and non-family named sources.

Most within-family selections were children choosing childrearers or childrearers choosing each other. For the most part, within-family sources were anticipated to contribute slightly more to problem resolution than unnamed and other named supports regardless of need, respondent characteristics and source type.

Children selected their parents almost always because they were dependent on them. They also generally adhered to the common supposition that mothers rather than fathers are more frequently their preferred supports. Mothers were reported to be more central as

supports for children than fathers and were regarded as more useful. However, these results should be treated cautiously because many mothers responded on behalf of their children and, because of this may have overrepresented themselves. Both mothers and fathers received high ratings from their children.

Almost as many women chose their male partners as men their female partners, and they rated each other's contributions about equally. This varied according to need with women being chosen more frequently for the more intense social-emotional problems. Partners chose each other most often, and especially, for the social-emotional needs because they regarded their partner as the closest person to them emotionally. In contrast, however, they chose each other most frequently for their children's education problems because they were committed to joint problem-solving for these issues.

Partners were also found by Hoyt and Babchuck (1983, p.85) to be clearly preferred for assistance with social-emotional problems by respondents in a large urban sample and for the same reasons, by Primomo, Yates and Woods (1990) for a sample of women with chronic illness. Similarly, Kurdek (1989) found that, among newlyweds, support from spouses was negatively correlated with stress levels. Husbands were also found by Giesen, Maas and Vriens (1989) to be extremely important to farm women's well-being. Finally, Brown and Harris (1978) found that only a husband or romantic partner offered protection against depression for working-class mothers exposed to a major life stressor, and Levitt, Weber and Clark (1986) found that spousal support contributed to marital well-being more than any other kind of relationship. Thus, there is strong support from other studies for the present suggestion that, regardless of gender, joint childrearsers rely heavily on each other for support for some needs, such as social-emotional problems.

However, these results run counter to some previous research which suggests that males are much more likely to use their female partners for emotional support than vice-versa (Lowenthal and Haven, 1968; and Lentjes and Jonker, 1985, p.24). Perhaps isolation from other supports and the need to maintain boundaries between the family and an often socially intense community increases the need for interdependence of joint childrearsers. This would be in agreement with Urey and Henggeler's (1983) argument that living in remote, isolated areas increases reliance on the immediate family (pp.34, 40 and 42). Cotterell (1984) also found that women in mining towns tended to rely on the support of their immediate nuclear families whereas those in country towns were more likely to use their kin dominated support networks (pp.108-109 and 110). It is also in agreement with Gibson's (1972) and Hoyt and Bachuck's (1983, p.92) results indicating that for married people, the nuclear family is a more common source of support than extended family kin.

Respondents generally anticipated receiving more support from other family members than from non-family named sources. This could reflect the degree of emotional closeness of the respondent-source relationship or a belief that other family members were more committed to the welfare of the respondent than people outside the family. Which is the case must be left to further research, though it should be remembered that the difference was only small.

NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORTS

Around one in four local non-family named sources were chosen because respondents thought that their preferred supports were too far away to be useful. Despite this, however, respondents had access to sources who they believed could make a substantial contribution to solving their problems.

Gender

Previous literature concerning physical and emotional caring suggests that, amongst non-family named supports, women are cited more frequently than men (for example, Allan, 1983, p.425; Hoyt and Babchuck, 1983, p.84; Kendig, 1986; Flaherty and Richman, 1989). This was also generally the case in the present investigation, though there was some variation between needs. When men were chosen it was mostly in combination with their wives.

As we shall see when we review specific needs, the preference for women was strong amongst kin and virtually non-existent for non-kin sources. According to these results, then, men may play a greater role when support is received from non-kin sources. For the most part, kin supports were older people, most often mothers and mothers-in-law, or older siblings, mostly sisters and sisters-in-law. Allan (1983, p.425), too, suggested that amongst kin, the burden of care often falls on mothers, sisters, daughters and other female relatives.

Intimate Social Networks and Social Support Networks

The structures of respondents' non-family named support networks were closely aligned with the structures of their intimate social networks with respect to location, size and density. The composition of both kinds of networks were also similar in that respondents tended to choose supports from the dominant sections of their intimate networks. Thus, those with kin dominated networks tended to choose kin, while those whose networks were dominated by friends were more likely to choose friends. Wellman (1979) and Richards and Salmon (1983, p.39) also found a tendency for respondents to specialise in one kind of intimate relationship, kin or friends. However, respondents in the present study went further than this: at a more specific level, they also tended to choose local or

non-local kin or friends depending on which group of intimates dominated their social networks.

Because respondents drew most of their non-family named supports from their intimate social networks those with stronger networks tended to feel more secure within their named support networks. Results also indicate that residents with stronger local social linkages, especially those with local kin, appear to have felt more supported than those without these. They were more likely to choose local non-family named supports, thereby circumventing the problems involved in seeking help over great distances. They also rated the contributions of several different kinds of sources, not only local non-family named supports, higher.

The Respondent-source Relationship and Distance as Factors In Support-seeking

The overriding factor in respondents' choice of non-family named supports was the respondent-source relationship rather than distance. This, too, was found in studies by Litwak (1960a and b, 1965), Sussman and Burchinal (1962), Adams (1964, 1968) Sussman (1965), Litwak and Szelenyi (1969), Wellman (1979, pp.1214 and 1219), d'Abbs (1983, p.11), and Wellman and Wortley (1990, p.566).

After a thorough review of the literature, d'Abbs (1983) qualified this general conclusion with the comment that distance is not an issue only for people with 'the necessary resources to overcome the additional costs imposed on maintaining social relationships' (p.40). Results of the present study do not appear to support this conclusion. In that family income was not related to who respondents chose for support. However, it should be remembered that there were very few genuinely low income families in the population investigated.

Overall, respondents clearly preferred for support important and extremely important permanent members of their intimate social networks and people they had known for some time (see, also, Wellman, 1979; Wellman and Wortley, 1990).

Even amongst kin, respondents preferred their closest relatives (see, also, Sussman and Burchinal, 1962; Wellman, 1979). More specifically, results confirmed the conclusions reached by Adams (1970) and Lentjes and Jonker (1985) that most support coming from kin was from older parents to adult children and that more distant kin stood as reserves if the former were unavailable or otherwise unable to assist.

Virtually all non-family named supports were either respondents' kin or friends, and very few were people with whom they were not closely associated on a personal level. This accords with previous research on Australian and other populations such as that by Sussman (1959, 1965), Litwak (1960a and b; 1965), Sussman and Burchinal (1962), Adams (1964; 1968), Cotterell (1984, p.108), Henderson and Argyle (1985), Kendig (1986), McCaughey (1987), Chatters, Taylor and Neighbors (1989) and Wellman and Wortley (1989). The preference for kin and close friends also coincides with conclusions from extensive reviews by Sussman and Burchinal (1962) and Wellman (1990). What is perhaps surprising is the extent to which respondents were prepared to traverse vast distances to seek help from these people rather than use local substitutes.

The overwhelming preference for kin or friends also overlaps with, but is slightly different to the conclusions reached by Rosow (1967), Croog, Lipson and Devine (1972, p.40), Allan (1979), Chatters, Taylor and Jackson (1985, pp.610-11) and Willmott (1986, p.2; 1987). These researchers concluded that the nuclear and extended families provide the first line of support, with friends and neighbours filling a supplementary rather than a

substitutive role. However, this general conclusion was challenged by Gibson (1972) who, as in the present study, found that whether respondents relied on kin or close friends depended on the problem at hand and that there was no overall preference.

Results from the present study indicate that, other things being equal, the closer the respondent-source relationship, the higher the support's anticipated contribution to resolving their problems. It should be remembered, however, that differences were small, possibly because respondents were asked to only choose sources they believed would be helpful. Still, though, the finding is identical to conclusions drawn from a study of men recuperating from severe illness by Croog, Lipson and Levine (1972, p.35) and another of social-emotional problems by Hoyt and Babchuck (1983, p.92).

One possible explanation for this finding is that people feel more comfortable about and are more likely to seek help from their intimate social networks because of expectations concerning long-term reciprocity (Fisher, Goff, Nadler and Chinsky, 1988). Assumedly, anticipated reciprocity reduces the psychological 'price' to be paid for receiving help. Fisher, Goff, Nadler and Chinsky (1988) went on to suggest that reciprocity expectations increase with the emotional closeness of the relationship between the help-seeker and help-giver (pp.279-80). This argument is consistent with help-seeking studies which have found that people are more likely to ask for help to the extent that they anticipate the opportunity to reciprocate at some future time (Morris and Rosen, 1973; Greenberg, 1980; Greenberg and Westcott, 1983; Nadler, 1983; Nadler, Mayseless, Perri and Tchemerinsky, 1983).

To return to the present study, self-help was rated higher than assistance received from other family members, who were rated slightly higher than kin, who in turn were rated slightly higher than friends, who were rated higher than unnamed sources. By definition, a

person's relationship with themselves is the closest possible kind of relationship. It could be reasonably assumed that in most situations their relationship with their partner would be closer than the relationships they would normally have with other people outside the immediate family. At least for individual needs, respondents themselves reported closer relationships with their kin supports than with their friends when 'closeness' was measured by whether they were intimates, how important they were to respondents, and relationship permanence and duration. And a person would normally be closer to a relative or friend than to a functionary in an organisation who they do not know or who, at best, is a casual acquaintance.

As in other studies (for example, Croog, Lipson and Devine, 1972; d'Abbs, 1983; Wellman and Wortley, 1989), even when choosing amongst kin, respondents clearly preferred close to more distant relatives and the kin they chose were almost all extremely important intimates with whom they had permanent relationships.

Some respondents were content to seek help from more emotionally and/or relationally distant local kin. However, when seeking help from non-local kin they were particularly concerned to go to only their closest relatives, mostly mothers and mothers-in-law. This was possibly for two reasons.

First, seeking help over the greater distance, often asking sources to come to town, places large demands on, and often involves considerable inconvenience to and, perhaps, greater potential indebtedness to sources. As was found by Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) for American and Hungarian populations, respondents found it more acceptable to ask this of their closest relatives, perhaps because of long-term reciprocity expectations.

Second, the inconvenience and expense involved in contacting non-local sources would probably require a major stimulus. As we shall see when we review specific needs, respondents were more likely to seek help over greater distances when the problem concerns highly private, embarrassing and, perhaps, stigmatised situations such as social-emotional problems and destitution, and/or those which make large demands of sources and place the respondent and their family in a relatively high state of dependency. As we shall also see, for these kinds of problems respondents were highly concerned only to involve their closest associates, most often their kin, no matter how far away they were (see, also, Litwak and Szelenyi, 1969 and Richards and Salmon, 1983, pp.16-17).

Reasons for selecting non-family named sources depended on whether they were kin or friends but mostly supported the conclusion that respondents chose sources for relationship reasons.

Regardless of whether they were local or non-local, kin were chosen primarily because the respondent generally preferred kin for support and this, in turn, was usually because they belonged to a close kin network. That reasons for choosing kin did not vary according to their location again indicates that distance was only a minor factor in support-seeking.

Kin were almost always chosen because the respondent preferred to seek help from kin rather than because of their resources or personal qualities. This was also found by Wellman (1990). In turn, the main reason given for kin preference was that the respondent believed they belonged to a very close kin network where, presumably, problems are openly discussed and mutual aid is expected. Because this investigation aimed at breadth of coverage rather than depth of information, more precise reasons cannot be ascertained. Nevertheless, these results are in keeping with the earlier suggestion that kin networks, especially close kin networks, have strong expectations for long-term

reciprocity. But it is also consistent with other possible explanations: internalised normative expectations that one should attempt to seek help from kin before approaching other named sources; a concern with keeping one's personal problems within the kin network for the sake of privacy and because kin often know about one's personal problems anyway; and long-term role complementarity where children continue to seek help from their parents into adulthood because of strong interaction patterns built up over two decades of relating.

Friends, on the other hand, were chosen mostly because of their close relationship with the respondent and/or the respondent's family, particularly their children. This accords with the hypothesis by Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) that 'the major factor holding friendship ties together is affectivity' (p.469). The exceptions were the few non-local friends chosen for support, most of whom were selected because they had relevant skills and resources. As we shall see when we review specific needs, these were chosen for only a limited number of situations. Local friends, on the other hand, were chosen mostly because of the respondent-source relationship, either by itself or in combination with their local availability.

Local and non-local friends were chosen for much the same reasons, again indicating that distance was not a major factor in support seeking. However, local friends were chosen a little more often for relationship reasons and, of course, their local availability, and non-local friends for their resources. Thus, where respondents believed that the respondent source relationship was important in their choice of a support, most could find a local friend who could suffice rather than resorting to the more difficult and usually more expensive process of seeking help from a non-local, but perhaps closer friend. However, for needs where resources and skills were more important, the respondent would often seek help

from the friend with those resources rather than accept a local alternative who didn't have them.

Local friends were most likely to be chosen simply because they were locally available rather than for relationship reasons by temporary and more-or-less permanent residents than permanent, and public servants rather than private entrepreneurs. These would probably be less likely to have developed close enduring personal friends in their towns. Note, though, that the crucial variable here is residential permanence rather than residential length. With a temporary outlook, residents may refrain from developing close personal friendships while those with a permanent perspective are more likely to let their local social roots grow. It could, of course, work the other way round: people who have been unable to develop close local friendships may be more likely to plan to leave town, while those who have established close local friendships may decide to stay permanently. Data from this study throw no further light on this question.

Non-local friends, on the other hand, were more likely to be chosen for relationship reasons by respondents with fewer friends who were intimates. This may be because, having fewer friends, these people were more selective and used them only for particular problems.

Finally, the strength of respondents' ties with their non-local named supports and the irrelevance of distance to these is also suggested by the fact that even though they had not maintained regular face-to-face contact with one-third of these supports over the two years preceding data collection they were still prepared to seek help from them. Wellman (1979, p.1214), too, found that potentially supportive relationships could often lie dormant over vast distances for many years to be activated in situations of intense need.

Similarly, Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) hypothesised that 'contacts among extended family kin can be maintained despite breaks in face-to-face contact' (p.465).

In conclusion, for the most part, the respondent-source relationship seems to have been the most important factor in respondents' choice of supports. After reviewing the relevant literature, Wellman, Craven, Whitaker, Stevens, Shorter, Du Toit and Bakker (1973) reached the same general conclusion:

The ways in which individuals are related to intimates are more meaningfully associated with the likelihood of support than are their social characteristics. Interesting associations existed for all of the qualities analyzed In general, it is clear that the study of interpersonal dynamics and not social statics offers more analytic power (p.162).

What the present study has contributed to this thesis is that, for many needs and many people, it holds regardless of vast distances and regardless of the fact that a person may be living in a small isolated and often socially intense community with an extremely dense social structure.

Respondents with and without Local Kin

Whether or not respondents had local kin influenced source selection, reasons for their selections and source ratings.

Respondents with local kin differed from those without. They had lived locally for longer, had more kin in their social networks, and more of their intimates were living locally. In contrast with those without local kin, they could be characterised as long-term residents

and 'kin people' with strong local social ties. Consequently, they were more likely to have denser, kin dominated support networks, and more named supports living locally. As with Fischer's (1982, pp.81 and 85) and Cotterell's (1984, pp.108-9) respondents, they were also more likely than their neighbours to choose kin for support.

Respondents with local kin tended to choose them for support, though some chose non-local kin as well. Compared to their neighbours without local kin they were disinclined to seek help from friends, especially non-local friends (see, also, Bates, Clarke and Bertsche, 1980). Whether the present respondents chose local or non-local kin seemed to depend on the strength of their ties with local kin: the stronger these were the more likely they were to choose local kin. Whether they chose local kin or local friends seems to have depended on whether they had kin or friend dominated intimate social networks, at least within the local social environment. Again, the relationship between respondents' intimate social networks and their choice of supports is clear.

Respondents with local kin were also more likely than those without to choose kin because they believed they were part of a close kin network. This is in contrast to those without local kin who tended to give general kin preference as the reason. This may indicate that the more 'traditional' remote area residents, defined here as those connected to the region through stronger kinship ties, are more likely to belong to a close kin network than the less 'traditional'.

Further support for this suggestion comes from four sources. First, possibly the most 'traditional' of remote area residents, those tied to the region through both kinship and through owning a local private enterprise, were the most likely of all residents to give a close kin network as the reason for choosing local kin. Second, general kin preference, rather than a close kin network, was more likely to be given as the main reason for

choosing non-local kin by possibly the least 'traditional' of residents, public servants and respondents without local kin. Third, those with local kin were more likely than those without to choose even non-local kin because of a close kin network rather than because of general kin preference. Fourth, among respondents with local kin, those with fewer kin in their support networks and fewer local compared with non-local non-family named supports were also the most likely to choose local kin because of their availability rather than because of a close kin network.

Establishing the causal direction is the problem with this argument. Thus, do the more 'traditional' remote area residents have a closer kin network than other people, or do 'non-traditional' remote area residents choose to spend part of their lives a long way from kin precisely because they do not feel geographically tied to a particularly close kin network? The latter suggestion accords with Connerly's finding that people in lower income urban households were 'less likely to plan a move when they have friends and relatives living nearby' (Connerly, 1986, p.186).

For their part, respondents without local kin mostly chose between non-local kin and local friends. This is in contrast to studies such as that by Bates, Clarke and Bertsche (1980) who found that recent arrivals in their 'boom town' tended to rely on work associates and informal helpers such as bartenders. The former were not as significant in the towns studied here because they were not 'single company' towns, while the latter were not used by residents, perhaps because seeking help from them would be highly visible in very small hotels in very small towns such as these. As with other results, whether respondents without local kin chose non-local kin or local friends partly depended on the make-up of their social networks: those with relatively more kin in their intimate social networks chose them for support, while those with relatively more local friends in their networks chose them.

Residents with strong local social ties through kinship and, perhaps, friend networks appear to have felt more generally secure than those without in the knowledge that their needs would be met with the help of their supports. Because of this, these respondents rated a number of sources including joint childrearsers, local kin and non-local friends higher than those without local kin. Cotterell (1984) also found that women in mining towns were less well socially integrated into their local communities and, partly because of this, suffered higher levels of stress than their counterparts in traditional country service towns. He suggested that, because of geographic mobility and the structure of mining work, their social and support networks were more fragile, more superficial and less trustworthy than those of country town women (pp.111-12). Essentially the same results were obtained for mining towns by a number of other Australian researchers including Brealey and Newton (1978) and Williams (1981).

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Sources

Given that the populations of these towns were approximately half Aboriginal and half non-Aboriginal it is remarkable that so few Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander sources were chosen by these residents and then mostly by kin. This is evidence of the strong social segregation between the two communities observed during field trips.

CHILDREN'S SOURCES

Most of the children in these families were oriented toward their nuclear families when it came to support seeking. They were even more inclined to nominate their parents than their teachers for assistance with education problems. This may well also be the case for children in families in larger Australian settlements. However, it could also be because of the high mobility of some of these families or because, as a group, these children had few

local peers and were geographically isolated from other potential non-family supports. The latter suggestion was supported by the few young people who cited boarding school peers for help with social-emotional problems during the Dry season but not during the Wet season when they were mostly at home. Clearly, though, comparable data from other kinds of Australian settlements are needed to answer the questions of whether these children were more reliant on their families than other Australian children and, if so, why.

Within families, children saw mothers as being more central and more helpful as supports than fathers. However, this could have been the result of the fact that more mothers than fathers were interviewed about their young children.

Outside the nuclear family, children preferred same gender peers. As with their parents, these were overwhelmingly important permanent members of their intimate social networks. However, most had been fairly short-term acquaintances, possibly because of either a natural high turnover of close friends amongst children generally or because of the high mobility of some of these families. Again, only precisely comparable data from other Australian settlements can throw further light on this issue.

Though most children seemed to trust that their social-emotional needs would be met, many lacked the same degree of confidence with respect to educational problems, and many were pessimistic about finding a job.

Finally, most adolescents did not know what they would do about the five community issues. Clearly, they had not given these matters much thought. Perhaps they did not believe that they could affect them directly or perhaps they saw them as 'adult business'. As with other questions, we need comparable data from other kinds of Australian

settlements to see whether this is unique to small remote towns or a common phenomenon for Australian adolescents.

Younger children gave their sources (especially their parents) higher ratings than older, but this relationship must be viewed cautiously because many of the young children were not interviewed directly.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TOWNS

Results from the three towns were very similar. Thus, pooling of residents into the one population can be justified. Because of this, we might also be able to hypothesise that support seeking may be similar for similar kinds of residents living in similar kinds of towns in at least Northern Australia and, perhaps, in other similar regions in Australia.

In all, there were only four differences between the towns.

First, Gulftown respondents did not have any local non-family kin at all. Though this obviously meant that they couldn't choose any for support, it did not give rise to other significant between-town differences.

Second, as discussed earlier, residents of Capeville, the only town which was not a seat of local government, appeared to use their citizens organisation as a local, accessible alternative to shire council sources. This is worthy of future investigation.

Third, Bushland residents appear to have had a special liking for the popular Member of Parliament, though he was also cited by residents of the other two towns. They were also more likely than people in Gulftown and Capeville to choose him because they had

confidence in his abilities, and they also believed he would contribute more to resolving shared community issues. These results support the earlier suggestion that he was so popular because of who he was and his relationships with residents rather than merely because he was a sitting member.

Fourth, Bushland residents were a little more optimistic than those in the other two towns about their sources' contributions to resolving their problems. That this held for a variety of sources lends further weight to the result. Perhaps the fact that Bushland was not quite as remote as the other two towns on a number of indicators meant that residents felt a little more generally supported than their counterparts in the more isolated Gulftown and Capeville.

SPECIFIC NEEDS: CHILDREARERS

As suggested in Chapter 6, specific needs could be grouped conceptually and according to whether respondents preferred named and/or unnamed sources for assistance.

COMMUNITY ISSUES

Respondents were asked about community issues to ascertain their main sources of representation with the authorities responsible for providing services to the local region. Three results suggest that respondents did perceive pathways to these, though they may be few and limited in their ability to influence decision-making. First, few respondents failed to report a source for these issues. Second, most sources were chosen because they were in a relevant position in a relevant organisation. Third, while ratings for the

community issues were generally lower than those for most other needs, respondents generally believed that their representatives could have some influence.

Respondents overwhelmingly chose unnamed sources for representation rather than prominent, potentially influential local people. Even the few named sources chosen, such as remote area nurses and shire clerks, were personal associates cited because they were in a relevant formal position. This challenges the suggestion that people in remote areas tend to use informal channels of political influence.

Across all community issues, three sources of representation were clearly visible to, and frequently used by these people: for those in Gulftown and Bushland, their locally based shire council; for Capeville residents whose shire council was over 300km away, their local citizens association; and one particularly popular Member of State Parliament.

Gulftown and Bushland residents saw their shire councils as important links with the formal service system, most of which was located far away. Some also cited it for some issues because it was responsible for the services in question. By implication local government seemed to be viewed by respondents as being visible, accessible and responsive to their needs.

In the absence of a locally based shire council, some Capeville residents saw their local citizens organisation as an alternative more visible, accessible and viable link with distant services. These were primarily people directly involved in the organisation itself and those who were more deeply rooted in the local area through kinship ties and, for some, ownership of a local business.

One particular sitting Member of Parliament was the other main link, but only because of his relationships with the towns and their residents, and because he was a visible presence in the community for long-term residents who had, through past experience, come to have confidence in his ability to influence statutory decision-making.

Finally, of all needs, respondents anticipated that their sources, named and unnamed alike, would contribute least to resolving the community issues. This probably reflects the nature of the problems. These were all complex issues which would require decision-making and action at the highest administrative and political levels and, inevitably, the injection of substantial funding. All other needs were personal problems which, while complex, could be handled without extensive administrative and political involvement.

For some respondents, distance operated as a constraint when seeking representation for four of the five community issues. This was strongest for essential services, but it was also true for education, health and child care. Clearly, these people would prefer to go direct to the higher administrative levels of responsible organisations, but did not believe that they had real access to these because they were so far away. They did not think that writing letters and making telephone calls provided this. Why distance was not a constraint for the unemployment issue was probably because respondents were unclear about where to seek representation from for this anyway and because many were pessimistic that anything could be done about the problem.

Health

Residents generally saw the popular Member of Parliament and local government or the Capeville Progress Association as their main representative links with organisations providing health services. Local government provided a direct inroad to health services for all three towns because local councillors were members of the regional hospital board.

The Member of Parliament was cited because he was a State Member and, in Queensland, health is a State Government issue. He was also cited in Bushland because some residents recalled that he had successfully taken action on these issues in the past.

There were two reasons why residents did not cite their remote area nurse choosing, in a sense, to 'go over her head'. First, in all towns the main items on the local health agenda at the time of fieldwork were the perennial ones of high nurse turnover and inadequate hospital facilities and resources. Indeed, at the time of data collection, Gulftown and Bushland residents were very concerned that they might be losing their highly popular current nurse. In both towns, residents correctly saw that their nurse could not take action on these issues herself because of her formal position. Second, respondents saw this as a town and regional issue, rather than one which directly concerned their current nurse. In a very real sense, these people felt that the community, and not the nurse, was responsible for (or 'owned') their hospital. Still, though, respondents often commented that they would consult with their nurse in planning strategies to deal with health issues even though, in the final analysis, residents and not the nurse would have to take the action.

Education

For the most part, respondents appear to have been content to use official channels within the Queensland Education Department to seek action in response to their grievances about education services. This may have resulted from four factors. First, the Department had a strong local presence in the form of primary schools and was, therefore, seen to be accessible. Second, these families were intimately linked with the Department in their daily lives through the education of their children. Third, they valued education highly and Parents and Citizens Associations were strongly supported. Through these, the community was represented in the provision of services at the local level, so that

residents may not have felt a need to participate at higher administrative levels. Fourth, at the time of data-collection, principals and teachers appear to have had good working relationships with their respective communities.

Child Care

There was little consistency in responses concerning child care services. A number of respondents either did not know who or where to contact about these or gave their nominated source a low rating. This was probably because they had no previous local experience with formal child care services which had never existed in these towns. Realistically, they also believed that their town had insufficient population to warrant providing these kinds of services. In all, then, it appears that many residents hadn't given these kinds of services much thought until they were asked about them in the interview situation.

Essential Services

Residents seem to have agreed that essential services was an issue for local government, even though Capeville people felt the need to approach the non-local shire council through their local citizens organisation. This was because shire councils were responsible for some of the services included in the question and because respondents saw it as a legitimate link with distant formal organisations responsible for the other services. That one in five respondents reported distance to be at least part of the reason for source selection for this issue indicates that they would go direct to the relevant authorities, but believed they had little real access to them.

A number of respondents either failed to cite a source for these issues or gave their source a low rating. Qualitative responses indicated that many residents had grown sanguine about problems in essential services.

Unemployment

Members of Parliament and local government were seen as the main sources of representation concerning the local unemployment issue. Most residents saw this as a problem facing the Aboriginal community only. Results and impressions from interviews indicated that few residents were clear about which government departments were responsible for doing something about the problem. They chose Members of Parliament because they saw it as a problem which could only be dealt with at the highest administrative levels, and local government because this was the largest local employer. Concerning the latter, they reasoned that the most direct way of dealing with the problem was for a major local employer to provide more jobs.

However, local unemployment was the community issue for which respondents, especially private entrepreneurs, expressed general pessimism. They did this in three ways. First, a relatively high number, all private entrepreneurs, reported that they deliberately wouldn't do anything about the problem. Second, the most frequent reason for this response as well as others was either that residents believed nothing could be done about it, or that the problem was of no interest to them personally. Third, of all needs, ratings were lowest for this one.

Private entrepreneurs claimed that their pessimism was based on their experiences of attempting to employ local Aboriginal workers. They believed that these efforts had been largely unsuccessful. Observations from the field and unreported discussions with Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal residents alike suggest that the most employable Aboriginal men generally worked away from town during the Dry season which is when most local casual employment opportunities become available. Those remaining in town seemed to be either unemployable because of ill-health or lack of skills, or did not find the offer of occasional casual work sufficiently attractive to change their daily routines, enter the

employment on their Commonwealth Employment Service income statements, and, perhaps, lose some of their unemployment benefit.

PERSONAL UNEMPLOYMENT

If unemployed, respondents would seek work through the usual channels. Those committed to staying in the region, primarily because of strong local kin networks, would 'do the rounds' of local employers and those not so committed would leave town and report to an office of the Commonwealth Employment Service. However, probably because their potential employers were friends, the former were more hopeful of obtaining employment, at least in the short-term.

For personal unemployment, these respondents cited very similar sources to those mentioned by urban respondents in other studies. Thus, they were fairly evenly divided about whether they would seek work through the Commonwealth Employment Service or through their own efforts. This is similar to results from a 1983 study by the Australian Institute of Family Studies which found that 67% of Geelong respondents cited the Commonwealth Employment Service and 33% believed they would rely on their own efforts to find work (Institute of Family Studies, 1983).

SPECIALISED NEEDS

The three 'specialised needs' were identified as such because widely recognised and accepted expert professional services exist for these in urban Australia and, for health and education problems, in these towns. Local services did not exist for legal problems.

Residents of all kinds were content to use recognised relevant organisations and qualified personnel for health, education and legal problems, often in conjunction with, or after consulting their joint childrearer. As has been found in other studies (for example, Bulmer, 1987, pp.177-78), where recognised and widely accepted professional skills are required respondents indicated that they would seek this expertise. Even those who preferred named sources for health and education chose close relatives and friends with relevant training and experience. Preferred sources for education problems were the children's teachers and, for health problems, the local hospital and the Royal Flying Doctor Service. Of all needs, unnamed sources were rated highest for these three, especially health and education problems.

Legal problems were a little different to the other two. Though most respondents preferred relevant organisations and professionals (mostly solicitors) for these, more chose named sources than for health or education problems. This is probably because legal expertise was not available locally and because a number of respondents had kin or friends who could either provide expert advice themselves or refer the respondent elsewhere for assistance.

As with other needs, when choosing named sources for legal assistance respondents preferred close kin and friends, though there was no clear preference between the two. This was the only need for which men were preferred, demonstrating that, at least in these residents' minds, legal problems were part of the male, rather than the female role. As with other needs, distance did not constrain source selection.

SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS

Four of the five social-emotional needs, psychological, emotional, social integration and childrearer problems, are different from the specialised needs in two ways. First, while specialised services do exist in urban Australia for these kinds of problems they are neither widely recognised nor generally accepted. Second, in Australian society, these tend to be highly private matters, somewhat socially stigmatised and usually personally embarrassing. Psychological, emotional and social integration problems are also highly individual matters whereas childrearer and child development problems obviously involve at least one other person within the nuclear family. Results generally reflected these differences.

Leaving child development problems aside for now, named sources were overwhelmingly preferred for the four other social-emotional needs. This is in contrast to the specialised needs for which unnamed sources were overwhelmingly preferred. This could have been because of the highly private, stigmatised and embarrassing nature of these needs, the fact that natural supports are particularly well-suited to providing 'highly particularistic resources such as love or self-esteem' (Brody, 1985, p.338) required for them, lack of information about non-local services, the unacceptability of these to many people, their distance from the towns, and/or the fact that there were no relevant local services. However, it is unlikely that distance was a factor because this was not an issue for respondents seeking assistance from named sources for these needs.

Respondents cited only their closest associates for these needs: joint childrearsers, closest kin, mostly mothers and mothers-in-law, or close friends. This has also been found by many previous researchers including Croog, Lipson and Devine (1972), Fischer (1982, p.132), Hoyt and Babchuck (1983, p.97), the Institute of Family Studies (1983, p.26),

Henderson and Argyle (1985), Kurdek (1989), Primomo, Yates and Woods (1990), and Wellman and Wortley (1990, p.566 and pp.580-81).

Even joint childrearsers were chosen because respondents regarded them as the closest person to them emotionally. That joint childrearsers are preferred for social-emotional problems has also been found in studies by Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960), Gibson (1972), Veroff, Douvan and Kulka (1981), Hoyt and Babchuck (1983 p.92), the Institute of Family Studies (1983, p.26), Kurdek (1989), and Primomo, Yates and Woods (1990).

Male childrearsers chose their partners only a little more frequently than females chose theirs, though the difference was more pronounced for social integration, arguably the most intense of these kinds of needs. These results are in keeping with previous literature and research about social-emotional problems, though the difference is not as great as might have been expected. This literature covers both rural and urban populations (for example, Lowenthal and Haven, 1968 and Fischer, 1982, p.128) and suggests that for needs such as these, more men seek support from their partners than women. Women, it has been suggested, tend to have more options available through non-family kin and friend networks (Bell, 1975).

The relative lack of gender difference found in this study may have resulted from joint childrearsers being forced to rely on each other for support because of their isolation from other sources. However, this seems doubtful for two reasons. First, distance did not seem to be a significant factor in respondents' selection of other sources for these needs. More than for other personal problems, respondents did not give geographic reasons for selecting local sources. Respondents were prepared to communicate or travel over vast distances to seek help from their preferred sources. Second, respondents chose their partners primarily because they regarded them as the closest person to them emotionally,

not because of the inaccessibility of more preferred supports. The reasons for the lack of a strong gender difference is worthy of future research.

Childrearer problems were different from psychological, emotional and social integration problems in that respondents chose partners for these primarily because they preferred joint decision-making rather than because of emotional closeness. This makes sense because these problems clearly involve their partners and are not purely individual matters.

Named supports were chosen for these needs primarily because respondents saw these supports as being emotionally very close to them. Distance, kinship and even gender either did not play a role or were only minor considerations. Possibly because of this, non-family named sources were anticipated to contribute substantially toward resolving psychological, emotional and social integration problems, regardless of how far away they were.

Respondents choosing kin clearly preferred women for these needs, thereby confirming previous research which suggests that female kin are the main caregivers for these kinds of problems (Fischer, 1982, p.132; Antonucci, 1985; Lin, Woelfel and Dumin, 1986, p.290; Chatters, Taylor and Neighbors, 1989; Wellman and Wortley, 1990, pp.576-77). However, this was not the case for those choosing amongst friends. Overall, male friends were chosen as frequently as female. Male friends were chosen mostly by other men, although women were chosen by both men and women.

It is difficult to know why respondents rated non-family named sources, whether kin or friends, moderately low for childrearer problems. Perhaps they believed that, in the final analysis, only they and their partner could resolve them. This would mean that any outside

helper could give only limited assistance. This suggestion is supported by observations made during interviews that, for these problems, most respondents assumed that they would first discuss the matter with their partner regardless of whether they eventually chose them for assistance.

A number of respondents preferred self-reliance for psychological, emotional and social-integration problems. The main reason they gave for this as well as for other non-source responses was that they did not suffer from these problems. Whether they said this because of the stigma attached to these issues or whether it was accurate could not be ascertained from these data. This question warrants further investigation.

On the other hand, self-reliance was rarely given for the two **social** social-emotional needs, childrearer and child development problems. At the very least, respondents believed that they should discuss these with the other people involved.

In three respects, child development problems seem to fall midway between the specialised needs and the other social-emotional problems. First, the formal services which exist in urban Australia to deal with these are more widely recognised and probably more widely accepted than those dealing with the other social-emotional needs. But, on the other hand, they are probably not as widely recognised and accepted as hospitals, nurses and medical practitioners for health problems, or school teachers for children's educational problems. Second, at least for the childrearer, these problems may not be as stigmatised or as personally embarrassing as the other social-emotional needs, though they are probably more so than most specialised health, education and legal problems. Third, while the other social-emotional problems can be kept totally private or contained within the immediate family, this is probably not the case for child development problems. If one's child engages in abnormal behaviour, has poor social skills, or is otherwise

developmentally unusual this is usually obvious to other people, especially in these small remote towns.

Results reflected these similarities and differences between child development problems and specialised needs on the one hand, and social-emotional needs on the other.

In common with the social-emotional needs, respondents frequently cited named sources, most often their partner. As with the specialised needs, a number of respondents cited unnamed sources, mostly the Royal Flying Doctor Service, local hospitals or school teachers, thereby indicating their willingness to take these problems to formal organisations. Also in common with the specialised needs, few respondents chose non-family named sources and, when they did, it was personal associates who they believed had relevant expertise, rather than close kin and friends chosen for relationship reasons.

Childrearsers with older children were more likely than those with younger to consult unnamed sources, whereas those in younger families were content to handle the problem together with their partner. Perhaps these people thought that the child development problems of older children were more serious and more urgent than those of younger.

Respondents generally believed that local teachers would contribute more to resolving child development problems than the Royal Flying Doctor Service or their remote area nurse. Why this was so cannot be ascertained from these data. The data give no help here as respondents chose both education and health professionals because of their professional expertise. On the face of it, respondents appear to have believed that teachers were better equipped by training and experience to deal with these problems. Or perhaps they thought that daily interaction with their child might have placed their

teacher in a better position to understand and, consequently, contribute toward a solution to the problem.

Almost no childrearsers chose non-local services for child development problems. This may indicate either that they did not know of them or that they were content to let available local sources deal with them. Distance can be ruled out because it was not a factor in respondents' preference for local rather than non-local non-family named sources.

CHILD CARE PROBLEMS

For three reasons non-family named sources were overwhelmingly chosen for the four child care needs. First, respondents could not report formal child care services because they did not exist in these towns. Second, child care needs are not the kinds of problems for which most respondents would leave town either permanently or temporarily and seek help from unnamed sources located somewhere else. Third, these needs were defined in such a way that respondents were unlikely to choose their joint childrearsers. Still, though, results are in keeping with the Institute of Family Studies' results from an urban area which was well serviced by formal child care services that 'few respondents with children made use of formal child care services, the majority preferring to leave their children with family, relatives or friends' (p.29). Again, the lack of services cannot fully explain these results or those of the present study.

The only unnamed sources chosen with any consistency for child care were local employees, employed to either look after the children or to assist with the family business while the respondent looked after them. These were always selected by private entrepreneurs, who were clearly applying a 'business' perspective to these problems.

The fact that women were chosen virtually exclusively for these needs clearly demonstrates that respondents saw child care as a female role. This was also found by Hill (1989). As with other needs they preferred either local or non-local direct kin or local friends. As was also found by Bryson and Thompson (1972, pp.71-74) and Hill (1989) for urban samples, the latter were mostly mothers of young children.

Most non-family named supports were important intimates, though fewer were permanent friends than were chosen for the social-emotional needs. This is in keeping with the earlier suggestion that respondents were most concerned about seeking support from only their closest associates for private, embarrassing, stigmatised problems. Clearly, the need for child care assistance is not like this. It remains impressive, though, that so many respondents still refused to choose more casual acquaintances for these needs.

As with other needs, kin were chosen because the respondent generally preferred to seek assistance from these rather than non-kin. Friends, on the other hand, were chosen because of their relationship with the respondent and their family, and sometimes because they were available locally.

As would be expected, childrearsers in older families did not find temporary child care or occasional prolonged child care to be a problem and were more likely than those in younger families to be self-reliant in these situations.

Who a resident turned to for help largely depended on whether they had kin living locally.

Those with local kin overwhelmingly preferred kin, especially local kin. Of these, respondents choosing between local and non-local kin were more likely to choose non-local for constant prolonged care and local for the other three situations. Local kin were

also found by d'Abbs to be an important resource for urban people for temporary occasional child care assistance (d'Abbs, 1983, pp.17-18). As discussed earlier, for these respondents non-local kin chosen for support were more likely to be closer to respondents both emotionally and relationally than local kin. Thus, again we see that for those needs which place highest demands on the source and which create the greatest dependency for the respondent, here prolonged constant child care, respondents preferred to seek help from only their closest associates whether they were local or not. Again, the respondent-source relationship was more important in source selection than proximity.

Respondents without local kin, on the other hand, either chose non-local kin or local non-kin. They were more likely to choose non-local kin for prolonged constant assistance, usually over large distances and often at some expense, and local non-kin for the other three needs (see, also, Hill, 1989). Again, distance was less important than the respondent-source relationship when seeking help for a high demand, high dependency need. Even so, the importance of relationship factors and the relative unimportance of distance is underlined by the finding that even for the low demand temporary care situations some respondents were still prepared to traverse large distances to seek help from their closest associates.

Clearly, the most demanding of all child care needs, and the one which had the potential to place the respondent in the greatest state of dependency was the prolonged constant situation. More than for the other three needs, for this situation respondents generally chose only their closest, most permanent intimates and those with whom they had the longest relationships regardless of where they were living. These were mostly kin (see, also, Sussman and Burchinal, 1962) but, especially for respondents without local kin, they

were sometimes friends. Where they were friends, respondents almost always chose those with whom they had a strong relationship.

Furthermore, among child care needs respondents were least likely to cite distance from preferred supports as the main reason for source selection for prolonged constant care.

In addition to the extent of demands made of the source and the degree of dependency created for the respondent, the other factor relevant to source selection for occasional child care would obviously be local availability.

MATERIAL PROBLEMS

Respondents almost never chose their partners for the material problems because these were presented as needs shared by both childrearsers.

Named sources were clearly preferred for all these needs except prolonged destitution and permanent accommodation. Prolonged destitution is arguably the most stigmatised and personally embarrassing of all the material needs and permanent accommodation the most dependency creating and demanding of supports. In keeping with the argument developed thus far many respondents may have found that the disadvantages involved in asking natural supports for help with these, even very close kin and friends, were too great to contemplate. Gibson (1972) also found that his respondents were disinclined to seek help from kin for severe financial problems, preferring to approach banks for a loan (p.15). The finding also parallels research which demonstrates that people are more likely to use formal sources for problems which are highly stigmatising and invisible to their social network and for which their intimate network does not possess the resources necessary to

cope with the problem (Fisher, Winer and Abramowitz, 1982; Nadler and Fisher, 1986; Fisher, Goff, Nadler and Chinsky, 1988).

Another possible explanation for why relatively more respondents chose unnamed sources for prolonged destitution and permanent accommodation than for the other material needs was because clearly identifiable unnamed sources exist to help with them: the Department of Social Security for prolonged destitution and real estate agents for permanent accommodation. However, this does not explain why unnamed sources were not cited more frequently for other material needs for which clearly identifiable sources exist: real estate agents and local accommodation through hotels, guesthouses and caravan parks for temporary accommodation, and the Department of Social Security and emergency relief funds for temporary destitution.

For permanent accommodation, relatively more older than younger respondents preferred to be self-reliant. This could have been because they had accumulated more resources such as a second house, capital, or insurance policies and family homes which could be used to raise extra finance.

Unnamed Supports

Which unnamed sources were chosen depended on the need, and those chosen most frequently were relevant and logical. Most were chosen because they controlled access to resources relevant to problem resolution. They were rated moderately highly, suggesting that respondents were reasonably secure in the knowledge that these kinds of needs would be met. The Department of Social Security was the most frequently chosen source for prolonged destitution simply because providing material aid in the form of income maintenance payments is its main function.

The Department of Social Security was perhaps the most acceptable welfare organisation to respondents. This is demonstrated by the finding that the needs with which it was associated, prolonged and temporary destitution, were the only material needs for which respondents chose to rely on welfare organisations rather than their own personal resources and initiative.

Why this was so might be explained by three factors. First, by definition, respondents would not have any private resources to draw upon when destitute. Second, as suggested above, the alternative of going to even close kin or friends for this need seemed to be generally unpalatable to respondents. Third, white Australians, even Australians in remote areas, either never did or no longer have the resistance to seeking income-maintenance from government sources found for rural people in other countries. From the time of their first arrival, non-Aboriginal Australians have always been dependent on governments to meet many different kinds of needs (Mendelsohn, 1979, p.35; Dickey, 1980, pp.1-29; Jones, 1983, pp.7-8).

The Department of Social Security was also chosen by some respondents for temporary destitution, along with non-government welfare organisations such as the St Vincent de Paul Society and employers. For this and temporary accommodation, some residents, mostly temporary public servants, were in the fortunate position of being able to turn to their employers who, they believed, would be responsible for solving the problem.

Employers and real-estate agents were the most frequently cited unnamed sources for permanent accommodation. The fact that real-estate agents in regional centres were chosen assumes that some respondents would leave town if they found themselves in this situation. For this and other needs, leaving town was chosen primarily by temporary,

short-term public servants without local social roots through kin and, perhaps, friend networks, and who were not financially committed to the region.

None, however, felt a need to leave town if in need of temporary accommodation. Most frequently cited unnamed sources for this were local hotels, guesthouses and caravan parks.

Respondents reporting unnamed sources for household assistance and incapacity were private entrepreneurs choosing local employees.

For all material needs, employees were cited by four kinds of respondents: private entrepreneurs; those who were less self-reliant; those who could afford to employ them; and respondents who were embedded in quite close non-local social and support networks but had no local kin or strong local social networks. Apparently, the needs in question, household assistance and incapacity, were not sufficiently severe to warrant seeking help from distant supports. Rather than turn to more casual local acquaintances respondents preferred to employ people to help.

Probably because most of this population were neither poor nor totally bereft of supports, most preferred to rely on their own private resources and initiative rather than welfare organisations for all of these needs except destitution. United States research suggests that 'traditional' rural people have an aversion to using welfare services. The only relevant evidence from the present study is that respondents relying on their own resources and initiative and those turning to external supports were no different. This, of course, suggests that the United States hypothesis may not hold for this population.

Named Supports

Partners were rarely chosen for these needs because they were presented as needs shared by both childrearsers.

Though non-family named sources varied to some extent according to the problem at hand they were similar to those chosen for many other needs. In general, they were close kin and intimate, personally important, permanent friends. Kin were also found to be important providers of concrete and material aid by Sussman and Burchinal (1962), Croog, Lipson and Devine (1972), Fischer (1983, p.132) and the Institute of Family Studies (1983, p.28). Given this, though, respondents showed a little more flexibility in who they sought help from for these needs than for the more personal social-emotional problems.

As with the child care situations, whether a respondent had kin living locally had a major bearing on who they chose for help amongst their non-family named supports.

As with the child care needs, respondents with local kin generally chose either local or non-local kin. They chose their emotionally and relationally closest kin for prolonged and temporary destitution and permanent accommodation, even though they may have been some distance away. As noted earlier, the former were probably the most embarrassing and stigmatised of the material needs, and the latter the situation which would place the greatest demands on supports and place the respondent in the highest state of dependency.

In contrast, these respondents were less insistent on choosing only their closest kin and friends, regardless of distance, for the less 'serious' needs of household assistance (see, also, Fischer, 1982, p.98), and temporary accommodation. These needs are less 'serious' in the sense that they are low demand, low dependency needs which are usually neither

embarrassing nor stigmatised. They are also needs for which locally available supports would be particularly relevant.

Incapacity is somewhat of an anomaly because it could be viewed as intimate, demanding and dependency creating if the source were asked to care for the ill partner, or less so if they were asked to simply help with domestic or business duties. Most respondents appeared to interpret this need in the latter sense. Consequently, as with household assistance and temporary accommodation, respondents with local kin were not so concerned to seek help only from their closest relatives. They were more prepared to seek help from less emotionally and relationally close local kin.

Respondents without local kin followed a similar pattern. As with the child care needs, they sought help predominantly from either non-local kin or local non-kin. For the least embarrassing, demanding, and dependency creating needs, and those for which local availability would be relevant - prolonged and temporary household assistance - most were content to seek help from local friends. That respondents rated friends highest for these compared with the other material needs also suggests that they were more content to seek help from them.

In accordance with Sussman and Burchinal's (1962) results, for two of the most stigmatised and embarrassing needs, prolonged and temporary destitution, these people were more concerned to seek help from non-local kin. This was also the case for prolonged incapacity, as it was for Sussman and Burchinal's (1962) results for which many would bring in only their closest non-local kin to help in the situation. This parallels results for the child care needs: they saw the prolonged caring situation as more demanding of the source and more dependency creating than the temporary situation.

Results were less clear for temporary incapacity and accommodation for which approximately equal numbers chose non-local kin and local non-kin. Perhaps they saw these as only moderately embarrassing, demanding and dependency creating. More likely, however, insufficient respondents without local kin chose non-family named sources for these needs for clear results to emerge.

Distance

For all responses, distance was cited as at least part of the reason for around one in five selections for temporary incapacity and household assistance, indicating that respondents were content to settle for local sources for these needs, even though they would prefer other non-family named supports if these were more accessible. This was also the case for around one in four local selections for these needs.

However, distance from preferred supports was rarely given as a reason for choosing supports, including local sources, for permanent accommodation or for destitution.

For the 'in-between' needs, incapacity and temporary accommodation, some, but not many, respondents cited distance as at least part of the reason for the selections they eventually made.

CHILD CARE COMPARED WITH MATERIAL NEEDS

It is instructive to compare sources chosen for child care and material needs.

First, respondents rarely chose unnamed sources for child care assistance but frequently chose them for some material needs, especially destitution and permanent accommodation. Clearly, there were no formal child care services in these towns and

these are not the kinds of needs for which respondents would seek assistance from non-local organisations. Most unnamed sources chosen for material needs were obvious, and all were visible to and accepted by respondents.

Second, for both child care and material needs, when choosing amongst non-family named sources respondents chose only their closest kin or friends for those needs which would place greatest demands on sources, those which placed the respondent in the greatest state of dependency, those which were more socially stigmatised and/or those which were most personally embarrassing. For the most part, this was regardless of the distances involved. The review by Fisher, Goff, Nadler and Chinsky (1988) found that embarrassment and the high demand nature of the need also acted as a deterrent to help-seeking in general. Similarly, the Institute of Family Studies (1983) also found that respondents were more likely to seek help from kin for 'personal' things' (p.29) , and friends for 'everyday help with such things as 'looking after homes, help with household repairs and so on' (1983, p.29). Similar findings emerged from the review by Fisher, Goff, Nadler and Chinsky (1988) who found that friends and neighbours were used for 'short-term, non-serious everyday problems' and kin for 'long-term more serious problems' (pp.284-85). And the same results were found by Litwak and Szelenyi (1969), Shulman (1976) and Fischer (1982, pp.80 and 132).

The most extreme needs in these respects were prolonged constant child care, destitution and permanent accommodation and respondents chose only their closest kin and friends for these.

Third, for needs which were less demanding, dependency creating, stigmatised and/or embarrassing many respondents indicated that they would still prefer their closest associates but settled for local neighbours because they were locally available. The most

vivid examples of these were temporary occasional child care and household assistance. For these needs, then, distance clearly played a part in source selection.

Fourth, for both sets of needs, the choice amongst non-family named sources for residents with local kin was usually between very close non-local kin and less emotionally close local kin. The choice for residents without local kin, on the other hand, was between non-local kin and more emotionally distant local friends.

Fifth, respondents were more flexible in their choice of non-family named supports for both the child care and the material needs than they were when seeking support for the more intense social-emotional needs. For the latter, only their closest associates would do, regardless of how far away they were.

Sixth, while women were clearly preferred for both sets of needs, more men were chosen for the material needs, especially destitution and temporary accommodation, either by themselves or in combination with women. Clearly then, overall, physical caring, especially for children, bedridden partners and assistance with household chores, was seen as 'women's work'. Providing money and other material supplies, and decisions concerning who should live in one's house were seen to be either joint male-female partnership issues or more a matter for men to decide.

Arguably, women were chosen more frequently than men for help with material needs at least partly because of the needs investigated. For example, relatively more men may have been selected for these needs and consequently overall had respondents been asked about help with building repairs on their houses, mechanical repairs on their cars and machinery, moving and tending stock, recreational activities for older children, physical protection, and assistance with transport.

Men were often cited as supports by other men for the social-emotional needs, especially when choosing amongst friends rather than kin. Thus, in contrast to physical caring, at least some men preferred to seek emotional support from other men.

Seventh, local friends chosen for child care assistance had been known to respondents for a slightly shorter period than those chosen for all material needs except household assistance. They were also more likely to be younger mothers of younger families and, with the exception of those chosen for prolonged constant child care, more had lived locally for a shorter period. These results suggest (a) the existence of an informal local child care network where mothers of young families help look after each others' children; and (b) the preponderance of short-term temporary residents amongst parents of young children in these towns. Hill (1989) found similar results.

In addition to the present investigation, several studies have found that kin are preferred for high demand, high dependency, stigmatised and/or embarrassing needs. For instance, Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) and Richards and Salmon (1983) found that kin, even those located far away, were preferred for long-term commitments, friends for needs which are less severe in the ways referred to, and neighbours for 'those tasks which require everyday contact, time-urgent tasks, (and) tasks which require long-term commitment' (Litwak and Szelenyi, 1969, p.471). Richards and Salmon (1983) also found that expectations for and receipt of kin aid increased directly with the 'scale of the emergency' (p.39). Finally, after reviewing the literature and earlier empirical research, Wellman (1990) concluded that kin were the important supports for the more long-term and demanding problems.

SPECIFIC NEEDS: CHILDREN

Depending on their age, children were asked about education problems, psychological, emotional and social integration problems, personal unemployment, and education and unemployment as community issues. For all but the community issues they were either dependent on their parents or chose obvious unnamed sources.

For each of the social-emotional needs almost all children indicated that they would seek help from one or both parents, most often their mothers. Like their parents they predominantly chose intimates and personal associates because of the closeness of their relationship with them. They showed no preference for males or females, kin or friends, peers or older adults. The only non-local sources they chose were peers from boarding school. Virtually no unnamed sources were chosen for these needs.

They made obvious choices for education problems: either their teachers or parents, usually their mothers. However, they did rate their parents higher than their teachers. This might have been because of the individual attention that a parent can give compared to a teacher. Or it may indicate a stronger ongoing educational relationship with their parent/s compared to their teachers because of the high mobility some of their families and/or high turnover of their teachers.

The importance of mothers to these children is demonstrated by the findings that they were selected more frequently than fathers, and that they were given higher ratings. However, it should be stressed that virtually all children not interviewed alone were interviewed through or with mothers rather than fathers. Clearly, mothers may have inflated their ratings of their own contributions to solving their children's problems.

Obvious sources were also chosen for employment: local employers or the Commonwealth Employment Service.

It was clear that, as a group, the adolescents had not thought about, and could not report possible sources of representation for the community issues. Either they did not care about these issues or had not yet been sufficiently socialised into the adult community to feel some responsibility for and/or to know what to do about them. As none reported that the issues were of no interest to them, it is suggested that they had not yet 'graduated' into the adult community. Whether this would also be the case in other rural and urban communities is a question for further research.

Children were generally satisfied that they would receive adequate assistance for their problems, though they were not very hopeful of gaining employment. Perhaps this was a reflection of the lack of jobs in these towns for young people and their acceptance of, and perhaps despair about this.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TOWNS

There were only three significant between-town differences.

First, Capeville childrearsers were more likely to choose their local citizens association for all community needs except education and less likely to choose the Cape Shire Council. This has been discussed.

Second, Gulftown respondents did not have any non-family kin living locally. This was reflected in the underrepresentation of kin and local kin amongst Gulftown supports compared to the other two towns.

Third, Bushland childrearsers were a little more optimistic than those in the other two towns about their supports' potential contributions to helping them resolve their problems. This result held for a variety of sources and across a variety of needs. It is unclear why this was the case, though Bushland was not as remote on several measures as Gulftown or Capeville and it was slightly larger. Perhaps Bushland residents felt more secure because their town was not as isolated as the other two towns.

SEASONALITY AS A FACTOR IN SOURCE SELECTION

The overwhelming conclusion from between season comparisons is that seasonality played only a very minor role in source selection. Respondents chose much the same sources for much the same reasons in the Wet and Dry seasons. Only 2.5% of responses were changed for reasons associated with seasonality. These changes were highly respondent and need specific. There was some concentration of changes amongst some respondents but there was nothing unusual about these people.

As would be expected, almost all changes were from non-local Dry supports to local Wet sources, and from non-local kin and friends either to self-reliance, joint childrearsers or local friends. Also as would be expected, most changes were made because of the difficulties involved in the source coming to town or the respondent going to the source.

It would seem then that, when necessary, respondents could establish contact with their preferred sources in the Wet season by air, telephone, mail and often even by road. Modern technology has reduced the extent of their physical isolation from supports. Clearly, while many of these people may have been physically isolated from their intimates, especially during the Wet season, they were confident that they could obtain help from them if needed at any time of year. This, of course, may not be the case for their neighbours living on more isolated properties. Further research on this question is needed for other population groups.

Finally, contrary to expectations there were no differences between respondents changing and those not changing their supports because of seasonality. In general, then, no identifiable population group, including temporary, short-term residents without local kin and whose closest intimates were more than 500km away, believed themselves to be more isolated from their supports in the Wet than the Dry seasons.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusions from this study are as follows.

Generalisability of Results

1. Because they were so similar, results for the three towns may be regarded as hypotheses for similar people in similar towns in other similar regions of Australia.

Seasonality as a Factor in Source Selection

2. Seasonality did not significantly influence support-seeking behaviour.

Residential Permanence and Self-reliance

3. Permanent residents were more self-reliant than temporary, regardless of how long they had lived in the region.

Feelings of Social Security

4. These people felt generally secure that they could manage the problems presented, either unaided or with the help of formal services and natural supports, even though these may not have been their ideally preferred sources of assistance.
5. Respondents with local kin, those with stronger local social ties, and those with stronger social networks felt more secure in their support networks.

Distance and Relationship Closeness as Factors In Source Selection

6. Distance from supports limited respondents' options for some needs, especially when choosing from non-family natural supports. However, it was not a primary determinant of who they chose for assistance or the quantity or quality of help they anticipated receiving.
7. Many respondents were determined to seek help over large distances from very close intimates for private, embarrassing and socially stigmatised needs, for needs which place great demands on the source, and for needs which would normally force the respondent and their family into a state of high dependency on the source. However, distance was a relevant consideration for a number, though still a minority, of respondents seeking help for other kinds of needs.
8. Overall, the closer the respondent-source relationship the greater the anticipated contribution of the support to resolving the problem.

9. Respondents were prepared to seek help from relevant distant service organisations, provided that these were visible, accessible and acceptable.
10. Most non-local service organisations used by these residents were in regional service centres.
11. Overall, the respondent-source relationship was more important than distance in choosing non-family natural supports. Respondents overwhelmingly preferred close kin and friends, members of their intimate social networks, and permanent, long-term associates, especially when choosing non-local sources.

Relative Use of Natural Supports or Formal Services

12. Whether respondents used natural supports or formal services and, if the latter, which services they used, depended on the need in question rather than who the respondent was.

Formal Services

13. While respondents believed that they had access through their representatives to decision-making about services, these were few and were not seen to be very influential.
14. The most frequently reported local organisations were hospitals, schools and, where there was a local office, shire councils.

15. Where the town was not a seat of local government residents tended to use their local citizens organisation as an alternative source of representation for community interests.
16. Members of Parliament were only used to represent local interests where they were highly visible to, and had well established relationships with residents.

Natural Supports

17. There were no local or non-local key natural helpers for these residents.
18. Overall, joint male and female childrearsers chose each other equally for support and anticipated equal contributions to problem resolution, though there was some variation amongst needs.
19. While female kin were chosen more frequently than male, male and female friends were chosen equally.
20. Respondents' non-family natural supports were drawn primarily from their intimate social networks. Consequently, their social and support networks had similar structures, composition and location.
21. Respondents with local kin tended to be embedded in close kin networks and, when selecting non-family natural supports, they tended to choose either local and non-local kin.
22. Those who did not have local kin tended to choose either non-local kin or local friends depending on whether their social networks were kin or friend dominated.

23. The natural support networks of non-Aboriginal respondents were almost exclusively confined to non-Aboriginal people.

Sources Chosen for Specific Needs

24. For representation of community interests respondents chose relevant organisations or people in relevant formal positions, for the most part their shire council if it was local, their citizens organisation if their shire council was some distance away, or one very popular Member of Parliament.
25. For specific community issues: respondents had faith that the relevant authority would respond to their grievances about education services; they were confused about who to contact concerning the lack of child care services; they sought representation for health service deficiencies from their local government or citizens organisation, or from the popular Member of Parliament; they saw local government as responsible for some essential services, and as a source of representation for others, though they were pessimistic about it having much influence; and while they would approach M.Ps., local government or their citizens organisation for representation on the local unemployment problem, they saw it as exclusively an Aboriginal issue and a rather hopeless situation.
26. When faced with unemployment, respondents with local social ties would seek and, they believed, find employment locally, while those without local ties would leave town and seek work elsewhere.
27. These people were content to seek help for specialised needs (education, health and legal problems) from relevant professionals, especially if these were local.

Amongst natural supports men and not women were seen to have the relevant expertise and/or aptitude to advise on legal matters.

28. For child development problems, respondents nominated either joint childrearsers or formal services. Among the latter the majority chose local school teachers and principals, though a number chose their remote area nurse. Educators were anticipated to be more helpful than health professionals. Parents of younger children chose their partner, while those with older children were more likely to choose informal services. The latter may have regarded social-emotional developmental problems of their children as more serious and urgent than the former.
29. Only emotionally closest kin and friends were chosen for psychological, emotional, childrearer and social integration problems. Distance was not a relevant factor in selecting sources for these needs. Formal services were rarely chosen. More males chose their female partners than vice-versa, though the difference was not great. They chose each other because they regarded their partner as their closest intimate. Amongst non-family kin, far more women than men were chosen, while both were chosen equally amongst friends. Male friends were chosen mostly by men.
30. Non-family female kin and friends were chosen almost exclusively for child care assistance. While they were chosen primarily because of the closeness of their relationship with the respondent or their family, respondents were not as insistent about this as they were for the social-emotional needs. As with other needs, emotionally closer supports were more likely to be chosen for prolonged constant care, the most demanding and dependency creating child care need. Distance was

less likely to be a factor in selecting sources for this situation. There was some evidence that local child care networks existed amongst young mothers in these towns.

31. Whether respondents chose natural supports or formal services to help with material needs depended on the need in question. Formal services were chosen for the material needs because they had access to resources relevant to dealing with the problem. As with other needs, respondents were more insistent about choosing only their closest associates for the more private, personally embarrassing, socially stigmatised, demanding and/or dependency creating needs. However, respondents were more likely to choose unnamed supports for the two needs which were arguably highest on these factors, permanent accommodation and prolonged destitution. This was possibly because of the reluctance of many to approach even their closest associates for assistance with these. Women were the preferred natural supports for most material needs, though men were frequently reported for financial assistance and temporary accommodation.

Children's Supports

32. Children were primarily nuclear family oriented in their support-seeking behaviour, preferring their mothers to their fathers. Outside the family, they tended to choose same gender peers and intimates with whom they believed they had permanent relationships.

CHAPTER 8: IMPLICATIONS FOR HUMAN SERVICES AND CONCLUSION

The overriding aim of this investigation was to develop implications for human services for the needs investigated. A central argument throughout this thesis has been that people in remote areas do not receive a fair share of resources allocated for Australian human, especially welfare, services. If so, and evidence provided in Chapter 2 supports the suggestion, social justice demands that we ask how residents can be provided with relevant and effective resources and services to help them meet the needs investigated when they arise. The rest of this chapter addresses the question of how this might be done.

However, it should be noted at the outset that many of the services and resources recommended here are not intended for all residents of these communities who are in need, regardless of their circumstances. As with similar assistance for other Australians, some will be subject to means tests.

As this was not an investigation of specifically needy, 'at risk', or poor populations, implications cannot be drawn for these. Consequently, implications discussed here should be regarded as working hypotheses for future research, theory and service development. Still, though, results for the six low income families were similar to those for the entire population and family income did not influence anticipated support seeking. Thus, there is some evidence to suggest that the support seeking of low income families and those in greatest need might be similar to that of many of their neighbours.

Another limitation which should be reiterated is that this investigation has not addressed the question of whether residents would use services if they were locally available. It

would be wrong to conclude that for those needs where they preferred natural supports, respondents would still choose these if they had local access to relevant formal services.

But this is not the point. The strong probability remains that, for many of these needs, relevant locally based services do not and will not exist in communities such as these in the foreseeable future because the per capita costs are just far too high. For example, continuing professional counselling services and formal child care centres will not be provided in small remote communities in Australia. Thus, the question of local availability is irrelevant to many services.

Finally, a guiding principle of the present study has been that we might be able to provide remote area residents with more effective personal support services by linking these with their preferred supports. However, the study was designed so that respondents could, if they wished, indicate a preference for formal and other services. This, of course, provided the opportunity to identify formal services which are acceptable to and used by residents. A central assumption of the following discussion is that, where feasible and where it is not otherwise indicated, effective remote area services should relate to residents' preferred supports. On this assumption, then, for those needs for which residents prefer formal services, these should continue to be provided in an accessible and relevant form.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR SERVICES TO CHILDREARERS

Unless otherwise indicated, discussion in this section refers to services for childrearsers.

Perhaps the most important finding for policy and services is that, with some exceptions, these people preferred similar supports regardless of who they were. For example,

contrary to Burda, Vaux and Schill's (1984) result, women did not appear to have superior support resources to men. Consequently, for the most part, we can confidently develop the same policies and services for all people living in non-Aboriginal families in these towns, regardless of whether they are permanent or temporary residents, how long they have lived there, whether they are public servants or private entrepreneurs, and so on.

However, this should not be taken to mean that the same policies and services will cope adequately with the needs of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal populations. This investigation has not addressed the needs of the former.

A second important result is that preferred supports were virtually the same in the Dry and Wet seasons. Thus, for the most part, services and policies do not need to make special arrangements for different sources for the Wet season. Of course, exceptions will inevitably occur, such as the resident who needs assistance to access distant supports in the Dry season but who may need to be subsidised for local arrangements in the Wet. This, of course, is not to say that services should disregard possible variations between the kinds of problems experienced in the Dry and Wet seasons, who experiences them, and with what degree of intensity. These issues have not been investigated here.

HELPING RESIDENTS TO OBTAIN ASSISTANCE FROM FAR AWAY

Overall, respondents' supports were satisfactory whether they were first preferences or local substitutes. Thus, where formal services cannot be provided locally or where a resident cannot gain access to distant services, we have some reason to believe that providing resources so that they can contact their preferred supports would be of substantial benefit. This might mean subsidising local arrangements, helping them to contact non-local sources through subsidised long-distance telephone calls, or providing

financial assistance either to bring supports to town or for residents to travel to preferred supports for assistance. Results reported in Chapter 6 clearly indicate that for most needs, distance did not affect how helpful the source was anticipated to be.

Given this, though, it was the public servants and temporary residents without local kin, especially those with kin dominated intimate social networks, who had some problems securing adequate support for some needs. In addition to providing resources for these to gain access to distant supports, perhaps there is a need for the development of local community support processes. These could include, for example, helping new residents to form social links with other residents when they first arrive in town and forming local mutual aid groups, especially to provide help during the earlier stages of residency. Facilitating these could be one function of the regional social developers or welfare workers proposed by Cheers (1990a, c and d). Employers can also use a variety of strategies to support staff relocating to a remote area (Zapf, 1989; Lonne, 1990).

It was also significant that residents had not maintained regular face-to-face interaction with one in three of their natural supports during the two years preceding data-collection. As indicated in Chapter 4, merely knowing that one has intimates who would come to one's aid if the need arose contributes to a feeling of being supported, even though no specific help has been provided. For both reasons - to keep one's supports 'active' in the sense of being potential supports, and to reassure oneself of the help available - it seems important for a resident to maintain contact with them. This contact would probably be more powerful where it involves at least occasional face-to-face interaction.

This principle is well recognised by those government departments and mining companies which provide assistance for employees to periodically leave a remote location for brief periods to be amongst friends and relatives. Given their less secure circumstances, this

would seem to be even more important for low income and otherwise disadvantaged residents where they do not have close kin and friends living locally. Providing assistance for them to leave town periodically would help to keep intimate social ties alive and would reassure them of the help that is potentially available. Failing this, subsidised telephone calls to distant intimates is indicated.

FORMAL SERVICES

Regardless of who they are, these residents were quite willing to use relevant formal services for a variety of needs. Contrary to some rural people in the United States (see Chapters 3 and 7) they did not appear to have ideological or other resistances to using formal human (including welfare) services. Nor did they show a general preference for natural supports over formal services. This, then, cannot serve as a reason to withhold formal services.

For distant services, then, the key question is not so much whether remote area residents would use them but how to make them more accessible and responsive to their needs.

When they sought help from non-local formal services, almost invariably they went to regional rather than satellite centres. Clearly, then, for these people regionalisation, the process of establishing regional offices and increasing their autonomy and responsibilities, should focus on regional centres. Branch offices in smaller satellite centres may well provide excellent, widely used services to people living close to those centres. But they may not connect with people in outlying areas.

Even their non-local natural supports tended to congregate in regional rather than satellite centres.

Given this concentration of both named and unnamed sources in regional centres, whatever information residents obtain about services and entitlements emanating from outside the local region would probably come from these. Consequently, this information should be concentrated in regional centres and, of course, the smaller outlying towns. Information located in satellite centres or the state capital, Brisbane, may not filter through to most of these people.

Perhaps surprisingly, many residents were well informed at a basic level about many non-local formal services. Most knew of the existence of relevant organisations and had a general idea of what they provided. Somehow, this information has been reaching them. The impression gained from field trips is that some people had obtained the information while living in larger centres, some through having enquired previously, and some by asking other local people or geographically distant associates. It was clear, however, that very few had more precise information about the range of provisions available and the internal structures of organisations providing them. Clearly, further attention needs to be given to informing residents of small remote towns about distant services. Research aimed at establishing how these people acquire the information they already have could also help to produce principles to guide future information dissemination.

Of course, residents also need to have local access to information about existing local and non-local services and provisions. The question arises as to where this should be located. There were no local natural key helpers who can be trained and provided with resources to maintain and develop data bases and disseminate information. However, this may not be a reason for not contracting local agents because the role does not really require widely recognised natural helping skills. The alternative is to locate the information in the local formal organisations which are the main connecting links between residents and the

human service system. These are hospitals, schools and, for people living in a town which is a seat of local government, their shire councils. We might also consider using local citizens organisations for people living a long way from their shire council, though the school and hospital would probably suffice. These local organisations are important to these people, both for the services they are designed to provide and for assistance when specialised services are inaccessible, unacceptable or unknown to respondents. The specific service roles they could play will be discussed in relation to specific needs.

THE ABSENCE OF LOCAL NATURAL KEY HELPERS

Where they exist, local natural key helpers provide a convenient accessible point for providing information and some personal services such as counselling. Key helpers can be trained and provided with information, expert backup, consultation and resources to help them provide services. They can also connect local people with services by referring people to them, by interpreting formal services to clients, and by providing some local service continuity. Where they don't exist, such as in these towns, they cannot provide a ready solution to the many problems involved in providing services to residents. Because they were not available in these towns we are forced to consider how to help people gain access to both existing services as well as their preferred natural supports.

THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF CHILDREARERS

Results suggested that childrearsers who were living in isolation from their intimates and supports relied heavily on each other for some needs. Their children, too, seemed highly dependent on the nuclear family, especially their mothers.

Clearly, we need comparable data from urban and other larger settlements before we can conclude that this is due to remoteness and/or settlement size rather than broader cultural factors obtaining throughout wider non-Aboriginal Australian society. If living in a remote location places additional stresses on families, careful thought is needed about how we might relieve these. A range of possible measures can be suggested: providing resources for childrearsers and their children to access alternative supports; visiting professional consultation services; the opportunity to discuss problems with distant experts through telephones and teleconferencing facilities; mobile counselling and family support services; public education programmes; connecting young people with alternative local supports; facilitating the development of local mutual aid groups; and developing activity groups for young people and children.

NATURAL NON-FAMILY SUPPORTS

As a group, these people were connected with kin and friends, and local and non-local natural support networks.

Previous suggestions concerning the strength of local natural support networks in rural and remote areas were not generally supported by this investigation for this population. Even where residents had local kin and friends, many still preferred emotionally closer non-local intimates for the more personal, embarrassing, stigmatised, demanding and dependency creating needs. Even so, respondents did use local kin and/or friends fairly consistently for other kinds of needs such as for occasional and temporary constant child care and for household assistance.

Measures designed to connect residents with their natural supports will vary according to the need. For non-local supports, resources may have to be provided either to help

residents travel to their supports or to help supports travel to residents. Subsidised lengthy telephone calls might also assist. The importance of this strategy to women's support systems was underlined by Moyal (1990) in her rejection of timed local calls as a policy for Australia. Mutual support amongst residents in similar circumstances, such as parents of young children, can be facilitated by subsidising local helping arrangements, supporting mutual aid groups and providing meeting facilities in schools, hospitals and shire offices.

PERMANENT RESIDENTS AND THOSE WITH LOCAL KIN

Permanent residents were more self-reliant than their neighbours, and those with local kin and stronger local social networks seemed to be a little more confident than others that their needs would be met. These results coincide with common stereotypes concerning the social networks and self-reliance of 'traditional' remote area residents. It must be remembered, however, that even these people reported self-reliance sparingly and chose both named and unnamed supports, often non-local. By implication, they, too, would accept formal services and/or assistance to access their natural supports.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICES TO CHILDREARERS FOR SPECIFIC NEEDS

Which services to provide and how depends on the need in question.

REPRESENTATION

No modern human service system can ignore the right of client populations to participate in decision-making about services intended for them. Nor can it be denied that maximum service effectiveness requires intelligent feedback from users. This is even more important for remote populations in an urbanised country such as Australia because service planners and policy formulators are located in large cities, far from the regions, contexts and people they are planning services for. For the most part, they are not drawn from remote populations.

The overall comment from these people was that they believed they did have channels through which their collective community interests could be represented, though they had some doubts about how influential these could be. Their local sources of representation were particularly important because they often found that distance acted as a constraint on their being able to approach relevant authorities directly.

For the most part, the most widely used sources of representation were local government, local citizens organisations, and one particularly popular Member of the Queensland State Parliament. Clearly, if resident participation is to be supported, shire councils and citizens organisations must be provided with resources and assistance to pursue this function. State and federal governments and non-government organisations must also make it possible for them to participate in policy formulation and service planning.

That residents saw local government as a source of representation was perhaps surprising given the lack of previous acknowledgement of this role in the literature. These results support recent calls (Cheers, 1990c) for the establishment of the role of remote region social developer which would be attached to local government and include community

representation functions. It is suggested that local government community developers might embrace this role.

However, people living in outlying settlements tend not to connect with local government, preferring to use their local citizens organisation. In these areas, then, resources should be provided so that these organisations can represent local community interests effectively. The remote region social developer (or local government community developer) would assist them to pursue this function.

Results of this study have clear implications for State and Federal politicians. Residents will seek representation from them only if they are highly visible, have good relationships with their constituents, and have previously demonstrated their effectiveness and commitment to the region concerned. The fact that only one of the four relevant Members of Parliament had established any degree of local credibility in these towns suggests that they cannot be relied upon to effectively represent local community interests. This adds further weight to the argument that local government and local citizens organisations should be seen as the locus for this role and be provided with adequate resources to implement it.

Respondents seemed confident that a direct approach to the Queensland Education Department about deficiencies in education services would yield satisfactory results. There may be lessons in this for other service organisations. Perhaps having a local physical presence, staff who are well integrated into the community, and formal links with service users and a wide cross-section of the rest of the community contributes to an organisation's credibility with and acceptability to local people. These factors may also facilitate feedback from the community and the organisation's responsiveness to local needs.

Local government, citizens organisations and Members of Parliament were seen as sources of representation for health issues and local government for essential services.

While non-Aboriginal residents were generally unconcerned about local unemployment, their suggestion that local government should employ more local people seems to be well founded. Present efforts to provide community employment funds to local government and other local employers should be continued. Clearly, though, programmes such as these will only have a lasting effect on local unemployment if they provide training according to prevailing national standards.

PERSONAL UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment did not appear to be a problem for residents with local social and other ties. They were quite confident of obtaining work through local employers.

However, almost without exception, respondents without these ties (and some with them) indicated that, if unemployed, they would leave town permanently, move to a regional centre, and look for work through the Commonwealth Employment Service and/or personal contacts. They clearly did not want to stay in town unemployed. Many such families would need financial assistance to move from town to a larger centre where their chances of rejoining the workforce would be greater. This could be provided through either the Commonwealth Employment Service or the Department of Social Security.

SPECIALISED NEEDS

Residents were confident that their health and education problems would be dealt with effectively by local hospitals and the Royal Flying Doctor Service on the one hand, and their children's schools on the other.

Those with sufficient resources to gain access to private legal services or who had access to these through their employer seemed confident of obtaining effective advice and representation. However, this would not be the case for residents with insufficient finance to employ a private solicitor or even to travel to a regional centre to consult one. Nor did these have any local alternatives.

A number of reports (Moseley and Packman, 1983; Elliott, 1984; National Consumer Council, 1986; The Lord Chancellor's Legal Aid Advisory Committee, 1986; Blacksell, Clark, Economides and Watkins, 1988) have noted the relative deprivation of rural areas in the United Kingdom with respect to legal advice services and have attempted to formulate some innovative service strategies. Moseley and Packman (1986) recommended mobile services, though these are prone to problems involving confidentiality and the need to obtain necessary information quickly (Kempson, 1982, 1984). Making greater use of the telephone has also been tried but, again, the need for confidentiality of legal information can reduce the effectiveness of this kind of service (Clark and Unwin, 1980).

After their extensive review of the literature and a number of experimental projects Blacksell, Clark, Economides and Watkins (1988) did not have any clear recommendations about rural legal advice services, though they appear to have favoured mobile services. Other scholars seem to agree that there are few viable alternatives even for non-remote rural areas beyond mobile services linked with formal public legal aid services centralised in

larger population centres. The options are even more limited for the more remote areas. In view of this, the only viable solution for these people appears to be a visiting legal aid service. As with all visiting services, though, this would be more effective if there were some local continuing service, even though it would not be staffed by fully qualified solicitors.

Ideally, both the visiting and the local continuing service would be based in a local organisation which has some legal expertise and which is recognised by residents. Reviewing results, four respondents cited local police sergeants for legal consultation and a number of shire clerks, though the latter were cited as named rather than unnamed sources. There are obvious insurmountable role-conflicts involved in police giving legal advice and being associated with a visiting legal aid service. For instance, it would be extremely difficult and legally untenable for them to simultaneously investigate and provide legal advice to suspects.

The shire and deputy shire clerks, on the other hand, do have some relevant legal training, and their job constantly involves them in legal matters. As we have already seen, local government is an extremely well recognised and accepted organisation in towns which are seats of local government. What is being proposed, then, is that in these towns an independent visiting legal aid service would be located in the shire council building. The local continuing service would also be provided by local government, most likely the Shire and/or Deputy Shire Clerk or an assistant working in consultation with a legal aid office in the relevant regional centre.

The difficulty, of course, arises in those towns such as Capeville which are a long way from their shire council office. In keeping with arguments thus far, the legal aid service could connect with the citizens organisation. The continuing service would be provided by a

local agent, probably a prominent citizen with some experience in legal matters. Each of the towns investigated here had at least one such resident.

Of course, the local administration and continuing service should be adequately resourced from the legal aid office.

SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS

For psychological, emotional, social integration and childrearer problems, respondents clearly preferred natural supports, either their partners or very close kin and friends.

As proposed earlier, the heavy reliance on partners suggests the need for family support services to relieve some of the burden placed upon nuclear families by the lack of formal services and distance from other supports.

The location of residents' natural supports for these needs influenced their accessibility. Clearly, those without local kin had the most difficulties obtaining help because local substitutes for non-local close kin and friends were mostly unacceptable to them. But even some respondents with local kin chose very close intimates who were living some distance away.

Three service options can be suggested: a visiting professional counselling service; a telephone counselling service; or providing resources to facilitate resident-support interaction.

For three reasons, visiting counselling services may be limited in their effectiveness. First, many residents may fail to use them because they are publicly visible. Second, by its very

nature counselling is a complex, ongoing interactional process which requires regular contact and monitoring, usually over several weeks. This cannot be provided by a service which visits infrequently, unless there is service continuity at the local level. So, maximum effectiveness would require a local person who would be acceptable to a wide cross-section of the population. It will be recalled that for these needs respondents overwhelmingly preferred only their closest and most intimate kin and friends. Local key natural helpers did not exist for these sub-populations for these or any other needs. Clearly, then, it is highly unlikely that most of these people would accept counselling from another local person either as a 'fill-in' for visiting professionals or as a full service in itself.

Telephone counselling services also suffer from a lack of service continuity. In the past they have also suffered from confidentiality problems, though this is no longer the case for most remote Australian settlements. Even in urban areas, telephone counselling services are designed for, and are most effective in emergency situations such as potential suicides and acute depression. They often refer clients on to other services for continuing counselling. This, of course, is to no avail where the continuing service is not available locally. Moreover, the complex intimate nature of counselling alluded to earlier means that effective ongoing counselling cannot be provided over the telephone. Thus, telephone counselling services are limited in their usefulness in towns such as these, though they might be able to provide 'once-off', temporary help in emergencies.

Clearly, most of these people would consider seeking help for these problems only from their closest intimates, no matter where they live. They were also confident that the help provided by these would contribute greatly to resolving their problems. It would seem, then, that providing resources to facilitate resident-source interaction is the service option of choice for these situations. This could be done, for example, by subsidising lengthy long-distance telephone calls and/or by providing free access to public communication

facilities in hospitals, schools and shire councils. Deeply troubled residents might be assisted to travel to distant supports and/or services.

Child development problems were different to the other social-emotional needs in that many more respondents chose informal services.

That partners were frequently chosen for these, especially in young families, again suggests the need for family support services. These might include, for example: family education programmes conducted from the school or hospital; resources and facilities so that parents can discuss childrearing problems with specialists in regional centres; and facilitating mutual aid groups among local parents or, through the use of teleconferencing facilities, among parents living some distance apart.

However, many residents, mostly those with older children, were happy to use local schools and hospitals for these problems. Informal discussions with teachers and remote area nurses revealed that, while they were often consulted about child development problems, they did not believe they had the necessary expertise to provide sound advice. What seems to be needed is a visiting child development specialist, such as a social worker or child psychologist, attached to either the hospital or the school.

There are reasons for and against attaching these to either organisation. Both schools and hospitals have high local credibility and relate with most residents on a day-to-day basis. Both also have the potential to provide a local continuing service through either teachers or the remote area nurse. However, both have visibility problems in that it is likely to be common knowledge that a family has consulted a visiting child development specialist. But, as noted earlier, these kinds of problems are likely to be common knowledge in a small community anyway.

More residents reported seeking help from the school than from the hospital. They also rated the anticipated help higher. These results, together with the fact that the Queensland Education Department already has a Guidance and Special Education Branch, point toward local schools being the preferred location. But these do have two possible limitations. First, confidential information about children and families can easily filter through to teachers and influence their teaching and educational assessment of the child. To repeat, though, in a small community teachers are likely to have this information anyway. Second, schools have not traditionally been involved with preschool children. This problem may be short-lived, however, because preschool education may become incorporated into the Queensland Education Department in the future.

Conceivably, hospitals could host a visiting child development consultation service, or clinic, in much the same way as it hosts the Royal Flying Doctor Service. The clinic would be conducted every few weeks, taking referrals from the remote area nurse, who would then provide local service continuity. Inevitably, though, this would involve the addition of extra functions to already overloaded hospital matrons. A number of researchers have identified the problems associated with adding 'marginal' functions to traditional 'core' roles (Scott, 1989). Scott (1989) pointed to the possible 'diminution of standards, a reduction in the size of the population to be served and an increase in worker stress' (p.7) among maternal and child health nurses in Australia and Hollingworth (1980) suggested this might lead to goal displacement among Anglican priests. Harrison (1980) found that role ambiguity and role conflict led to burnout and work related stress among child protection social workers.

Clearly, additional part-time staff would need to be employed in local hospitals were child development consultation to be added to their functions. Inevitably, this would be a local

person, adequately trained and resourced. The unanswered question here is whether residents would be willing to discuss child development issues with another local person. Results reported in Chapter 7 suggest that they may be reluctant to do so. If so, this would probably be the case whether or not the 'consultant' were employed in a relevant official role.

On balance, then, local schools may be the preferred location for a visiting child development expert, with teachers providing service continuity. Of course, adequate resources would have to be provided and staffing levels adjusted accordingly.

CHILD CARE PROBLEMS

Formal child care services in the form of a special child care centre will probably not be provided in Australian towns of this size in the foreseeable future. Consequently, we appear to have no choice but to use formal resources to help grease the wheels of preferred natural support processes.

These people were more flexible in their choice of supports for child care than for social-emotional needs. But this did vary according to how much help was required. In general, the more extensive the care required, the more likely respondents were to seek help from close kin and friends, no matter how far away they were. If we were to support this with resources we would help pay the costs involved in respondents either bringing a support to town or one childrearer taking their children somewhere else for the required assistance.

Where the help required was less extensive, respondents were prepared to seek help locally. There was even some evidence to suggest the existence of local reciprocal child

care networks amongst mothers of young families. The cost of these local informal arrangements could be subsidised for low income families so that, as in urban areas, people providing approved child care can receive payment.

Private entrepreneurs deserve special mention because they frequently indicated that they would employ someone to either help look after the children or to lighten business demands so that they can attend to their children's needs themselves. Where the help is required by a low income family, these arrangements could be subsidised either directly or through tax deductions.

MATERIAL PROBLEMS

Preferred supports for the material needs varied according to the need. So too, then, would service implications. As with the child care situations, respondents chose to seek help from only their closest associates for needs which are intimate, embarrassing, stigmatised, demanding and/or dependency creating. This was regardless of how far away they were.

In keeping with arguments thus far, where residents are content to use formal services these should be strengthened, extensively publicised, and made highly accessible. Where they prefer only their closest friends and relatives and these are some distance away, resources should be provided to enable greater access to them. Finally, where local substitutes are acceptable or preferred sources are local anyway, local helping arrangements should be subsidised for low income families.

Destitution

Most respondents were content to use Australia's public income-maintenance organisation, the Department of Social Security, for prolonged destitution. Rather than debate the relative merits of this, continued efforts should be directed toward ensuring that this organisation is highly accessible and its provisions widely publicised.

Many respondents were content to use established organisations such as the Department of Social Security and non-government welfare organisations for temporary destitution. Given that the latter are in regional centres, emergency relief funds should be available locally and should be widely publicised. If emergency relief funds were locally available at the time of data collection, only one respondent knew of their existence. To ensure adequate publicity and to ensure responsible supervision of their disbursement, they might best be made available through local government.

Residents seeking relief from friends and relatives would do so only from their closest associates, most of whom were a long way away. In most cases, this meant obtaining money and other supplies rather than leaving town. It is difficult to see how resources could be provided to facilitate this process. Perhaps this would be unnecessary if emergency relief funds were locally available. On the other hand, respondents choosing to leave town permanently to seek work and/or to be with relatives or friends could be assisted to do so.

Household Assistance

At the other end of the spectrum, most respondents were content to use other local people, even more casual acquaintances, for help with domestic chores and house maintenance over both the short- and long-term. For low income families these local informal arrangements could be subsidised.

As with the child care situations, some private entrepreneurs chose to employ extra staff. This, too, could be subsidised either directly or through tax concessions.

Accommodation

How to help residents in need of permanent accommodation seems to depend on whether they have local social roots and/or other commitments to the region. Respondents without these and who did not have an employer responsible for providing housing indicated that they would leave town permanently and seek accommodation through the usual formal channels such as real estate agents. In the short-term, many of these would live with close friends or relatives. Low income families in this situation could be given assistance to leave town and their supports might be subsidised for the inconvenience and extra costs involved in accommodating them.

Residents with local social roots and/or other local commitments chose to remain in town. In the short-term some would stay in local private market accommodation such as caravan parks, hotels and guesthouses. Low income families forced to resort to the former could be subsidised for the costs involved.

For both short- and long-term accommodation many residents would stay with local friends or relatives. As with other needs this could be subsidised so that supports might be compensated for the extra costs and inconvenience involved. This might also decrease the perceived dependency of the client family on their supports.

Incapacity

Anticipated responses to incapacity were mixed in that some respondents would seek help from natural supports locally, some would bring distant supports to town to help out,

and some private entrepreneurs would employ more staff. Each of these options can be supported by adequate and appropriate resources.

SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

The overriding result for children was that they were highly nuclear family oriented in their support seeking behaviour. This might be further evidence of the extra pressures placed on these families because they live remotely. A range of family support programmes to help reduce these pressures were suggested earlier.

Some young people cited boarding school peers for education problems and social-emotional needs. Two of these commented that they did not have ready access to these in the Wet season and, because of this, would seek help from their mothers in the Dry. Clearly, these young people had not found acceptable local peer substitutes for these needs. This seems unfortunate given the well recognised importance to adolescents of strong peer group ties and is just one further unnecessary burden on their families. Perhaps subsidies could be available for adolescents to telephone their distant friends and maybe even visit them during the long summer school vacation. Teleconferencing facilities might also be used to facilitate mutual aid groups involving a number of young people living some distance apart.

Adolescents did not seem to feel involved in the shared community issues, such as education and employment, that affected their daily lives. Nor did it occur to them to represent their own interests in relation to these.

There are three implications here. First, it may be even more important in rural and remote areas than in urban to connect young people with their surrounding adult community through their schools. This could be done by discussing community issues in the classroom, through special projects focussed on local community issues, and by developing a partnership between the school and the community which would involve parents, other citizens and children and young people in community action programmes.

The second implication is that efforts may need to be made to officially involve young people as active participants in formal community decision-making and action structures such as local citizens organisations and local government. Third, Members of Parliament should also obtain information about the needs and perspectives of young people from them directly rather than assuming that these will be represented by their parents.

As a group, the young people who were interviewed were not particularly confident of securing work locally. Local employment creation programmes leading to nationally recognised qualifications are called for and, if necessary, unemployed youth should be assisted to leave town and seek work in larger centres.

SUMMARY

In sum, twelve service strategies have been suggested.

- 1 Resources should be provided to some existing local organisations so that they can expand and/or modify existing functions. For example, local government and local citizens organisations could be supported so that they can represent community interests more effectively.

- 2 Some existing local organisations such as schools and hospitals should continue to provide present services.
- 3 Some non-local organisations such as the Department of Social Security should continue to provide services and these should be more extensively publicised and made more accessible.
- 4 Specialists should visit these kinds of towns, attached to appropriate local organisations which can also provide a continuing local service.
- 5 Subsidies and technological resources should be made available for residents to contact distant supports.
- 6 Financial and technological resources should be made available to connect people with similar needs living some distance apart with each other.
- 7 In some situations some residents should be helped to leave town so that they can obtain necessary assistance.
- 8 Costs involved in bringing supports to town and keeping them there for a period should be subsidised.
- 9 Local supports should be subsidised either through direct payments or through tax concessions to private entrepreneurs.
- 10 Supports might be subsidised to help meet the extra costs involved in providing help.

- 11 A variety of family support programmes should be developed to help reduce the extra demands that may be placed on families in remote areas.
- 12 Young people need to be sensitised to local community issues. Formal structures need to be developed both through the school and through other local organisations so that they can actively participate in community representation processes.

For the sake of public accountability, strategies five to ten require (a) some assessment of need, (b) decisions about the kind and amount of assistance required, and (c) responsible supervision of how funds are allocated and used. There are at least three ways these tasks can be executed when resources are disbursed a long way from where the ultimately responsible authorities are located.

First, authorities can try to oversee the process, such as where the Queensland Department of Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs supervises local child care arrangements. This is virtually impossible when regional offices are so far away.

Second, local multifunction community-based organisations could be contracted by the relevant authorities to assume these responsibilities. This seems promising for those towns which have such an organisation.

The third alternative is to contract these supervisory functions to another existing local organisation. The question, of course, is which organisation? For three reasons this should probably be the shire council in those towns which are seats of local government. First, they are well recognised by, and easily accessible to most residents. Second, council staff are organisationally, legally and politically accountable for their functions both

to local people and to state and federal governments. Third, shire councils have the financial expertise and accounting mechanisms to successfully manage funds.

However, for two reasons shire councils may have difficulty fulfilling these responsibilities in the more remote settlements in the region. First, as noted earlier, responsible supervision of the day-to-day disbursement and usage of funds is virtually impossible from a distance. Second, results from the present study have indicated that most people in towns which are not seats of local government may rarely relate to their shire council anyway.

Of the two other local human service organisations usually found in settlements of this size, schools and hospitals, hospitals are probably more relevant to a larger number of needs investigated here. Like shire council officers, hospital staff are well accepted by and accessible to residents, and are legally accountable. They also have high credibility. Unlike councils, they do not have extensive financial expertise, though they are accustomed to managing a budget.

Another reason why hospitals might be able to supervise the allocation and use of resources is that they would probably be involved in many of the decisions anyway. For example, a professional judgement would have to be made by a remote area nurse concerning whether a resident is sufficiently emotionally distressed to warrant free long-distance telephone calls to a support.

The other advantage of hospitals is that in the regions investigated they are partly responsible to regional hospital boards which have local representation.

However, we must be careful not to overload already busy remote area nurses with extra functions. The issue here is not so much who supervises funds but in which organisation they should be located. Thus, the hospital could employ a local person on a part-time basis to manage these resources.

Finally, where an organisation such as this operates as an agent for another organisation which has legal responsibility for the resources being provided, this should be subject to explicit and detailed contractual agreements. These contracts would clearly specify roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability. They should also provide reasonable autonomy for the local organisation to make day-to-day decisions unencumbered by the need to obtain approval from a large distant bureaucracy.

CONCLUSION

In Chapter 3 it was suggested that linking formal services with non-formal supports may be a cost efficient, accessible, relevant, appropriate and acceptable way of providing personal support services to people living in remote areas.

Results from the present study provide some support for this idea for some needs. However, they also provide some evidence for suggestions that the concept is somewhat imprecise and that it is not sufficient in itself as a strategy for all needs. Results support a more sophisticated and detailed notion of 'interweaving' of formal services and non-formal support (Bulmer, 1987, pp.x, xii, 174, 175-80).

Both 'linking' and 'interweaving' can be placed within a broader service framework variously referred to in the United Kingdom and the United States as 'community care' or

'community social work' (Hadley and McGrath, 1980; Hadley and Hatch, 1981; Martinez-Brawley, 1986, 1989, 1990, pp.213-239; Bulmer, 1987). The present study can be placed within and has implications for this framework. It has responded to Bulmer's (1987) call.

What is needed now are attempts to use analytic network methods to study empirically social support and social care.

Several such works in the health field have been cited, but there are fewer studies in the personal social services.

Knowing more about social ties around an individual - both local and non-local - is an essential prerequisite to planning integrated care. (pp.140-41).

Community care assumes that people have a dual commitment to their own and their family's welfare as well as to the well-being of the community as a whole. It shifts the focus from direct service provision by formal organisations to the role of the community in helping to meet the needs of its members. This includes, of course, social policy and formal service organisations facilitating non-formal support processes within and, according to Bulmer, beyond the locality.

Community care has a number of roots. Martinez-Brawley (1990, p.68), suggested that the concept is related to what Etzioni described as a shift from a 'me first' model of the social sciences to an 'I and we' model (Etzioni, 1989). Put simply, the 'me first' model assumes that the overarching motivation of people is self-interest. The 'I and we' model, on the other hand, assumes that people have two primary motivations: self-interest and morality. With regard to the latter Etzioni (1989) observed that:

..... one's 'judging self' examines one's desires and evaluates them according to several criteria, the most important of which are moral and social values. (Etzioni, 1989, p.A44)

He went on to suggest that while the individual has a moral status and moral rights so, too, does the community as a whole. By virtue of being a social entity, the individual is wedded to, in fact part of, this communal morality.

Thus, the individual is motivated by self-interest, and both they and their community by moral judgements applied to individual interests.

Martinez-Brawley (1990, pp.213-39) applied these ideas to rural communities and suggested that residents are motivated by a dual commitment: to their own and their family's interests; and to the needs and interests of the community as a whole. The latter arises partly from a shared collective sense of morality, and partly from an awareness that one's own welfare and that of their family is inextricably linked to the welfare of the community as a whole.

On this basis, Martinez-Brawley (1990, pp.213-39) went on to suggest that in rural areas human service organisations and personnel should also be directed by this dual commitment: to the needs of the individuals and families they serve; and to the well-being of the community as a whole.

The second foundation of community care can be found in the United Kingdom where the Seebohm Report (1968) attempted to move the structure of social services from a highly differentiated and bureaucratically focussed system to a more integrated community

based network of care in and by the community. According to this Report, the community is both the provider and the recipient of social services.

Essentially, the Seebohm Report proposed that providing for human welfare would be more effective, relevant and appropriate when lay members of a community help each other rather than when services are provided directly by formal, mostly government, organisations. The role of the human services is to facilitate, support and resource this process and to act as a backup when community support fails or is unavailable to the individual or family concerned.

As noted by Bulmer (1987, pp.3-4), a weakness of the Seebohm Report's recommendations was the tendency to restrict the concept of community care to the local community. It remained for the Barclay Report (1982) to broaden the focus from the local community to people's non-formal supports no matter where they are.

Because Martinez-Brawley (1990) was explicitly concerned with stable, long-established rural communities she, too, tended to associate community care or, as she terms it, community oriented social work, with locality. To be fair though, as with the Barclay Report, she too admitted the importance of rural people's non-local non-formal supports.

Despite this, after reviewing the literature, Bulmer (1987, p.35) concluded that the association between locality and community care has never been completely severed. This is possibly as it should be because, as found by numerous studies (including the present one) people find at least some help for some needs from within their local social environment. On this basis, Bulmer (1987) concluded that community care is a viable service model which inevitably entails some focus on the local community, though it

should be sufficiently flexible to include residents' non-formal networks no matter where they are (Bulmer, 1987, pp.215-217).

The third foundation of community care lies in what Hadley and Hatch (1981) identified as the failure of the modern welfare state to make significant progress in resolving the main social problems such as poverty, unemployment and housing. They pointed out that despite vast increases in expenditure on social services in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, both absolutely and as a portion of national expenditure, poverty and unemployment levels remain much the same as they were some decades ago. Partly because of this, they and Hadley and McGrath (1984) called for a new model of social services provision in the form of smaller decentralised administrative units which work with the local community to plan and provide services.

The fourth foundation of community care lies in the accumulation of evidence over half a century demonstrating that non-formal support, especially from the nuclear family, other relatives and close friends is an extremely important continuing source of help for most people. Some of this evidence was reported in Chapter 4. On this basis, writers such as Froland, Pancoast, Chapman and Kimboko (1981a and b) and Gottlieb (1983, 1988) have been empirically exploring models of service provision which engage non-formal supports.

For these small remote communities in far northern Australia, the results of the present study have five implications for the community care service model.

First, the fact that many respondents used their local community based organisations to represent local interests lends support to Martinez-Brawley's (1990, pp.25-51) suggestion that people in rural communities share a local commitment to the welfare of the community as a whole. Thus, for the most part, shared community concerns were a matter for local

collective action rather than representation by non-local sources. Even when they sought help from the most popular non-local source, their sitting Member of Parliament, it was because, at least with respect to his official functions, they experienced him as being intimately tied with, perhaps even part of their community.

Second, respondents also made extensive use of whatever local expertise was available for those needs for which they believed specialised assistance was necessary (health and education problems). Thus, where possible, they focussed on the local community as being the 'first-line' of assistance. However, they were not resistant to seeking formal help over large distances when it was not available locally. For these needs, their desire for skilled help for a given problem overrode their focus on the local community as a source of assistance when the two clashed.

Third, for many needs, strong kin and/or emotional ties were more important than membership of an interlocking, locally based social and support network in deciding where to seek help from. This was especially so for high demand, high dependency, stigmatised and embarrassing needs. These results, then, underline the folly of assuming that membership of a local community is the most important criterion that people use when choosing who to seek help from.

Fourth, residents who were most likely to seek help from local non-formal supports were those who had strong local kin and, in some cases, friend ties. For the most part, these were permanent residents with local businesses. Models of service provision which accord primacy to membership of the local community are probably most appropriate to these kinds of people.

Fifth, having said this, there was some evidence for the existence of fairly strong local mutual aid networks, especially in relation to low demand, low dependency, and non-stigmatised, non-embarrassing needs, and for those for which local availability was an important issue in seeking help. This applied most strongly to occasional and short-term child care assistance and to help with domestic tasks. Service models focussing on non-formal support within the local community may be most appropriate to these kinds of needs.

Overall, then, for these sub-populations of these towns, a service model which emphasises provision within and, to some extent by the local community has limited applicability. In support of Bulmer's conclusions (1987, pp.213-39), more sophisticated models are called for which recognise the importance of both local and non-local sources, and which differentiate according to needs, residents and communities.

It is possible that community focussed service models were developed in communities with longer histories than those studied here; with more extensive local kin ties; with stronger and longer local ties amongst friends; communities which are more homogeneous with respect to values, lifestyle, and demographic factors such as family life stage; and with relatively more residents intending to spend the rest of their lives in the community.

These towns were certainly not like that. They had existed for decades rather than centuries and had developed at a time when modern means of long-distance travel and communication were becoming widely available. They had very few non-Aboriginal residents who had spent all, or even most of their adult lives in them. A minority of these residents had local kin and most were either short-term residents or were undecided about

whether they would spend the rest of their lives in their town. Clearly, an unsophisticated community oriented service model is too simplistic for these towns.

The other facet of community care is the provision of personal support by non-formal sources in a person's natural environment. Earlier welfare writings on this issue (for example, Seeborn, 1968) seem to have gone too far in calling for personal support services to be provided primarily by non-formal supports or for these to serve as the 'first-line' of assistance.

Perhaps this is why the concept of linking formal services with non-formal supports has been so heavily emphasised in past writings: if non-formal supports are the main or first-line of support, then the main function of formal services should be to help them do their work better.

Results from this investigation question this approach.

For some needs, residents of these towns were clear that they preferred formal supports, even though they may be some distance away. They have assumed that Australian society has an obligation to provide for some basic necessities such as ongoing income security when the market economy fails to provide for them and their families. They have also agreed with respondents from other studies (Bulmer, 1987, pp.177-78) that, in modern society, some needs require highly trained, specialised professional assistance. For most of these people the concept of linking formal services with non-formal supports simply does not apply to these needs: they prefer the help to come from formal service organisations as a normal first-line function.

Without doubt, though, for many of the needs investigated here respondents were clear that they preferred the assistance of people in their natural social environment, especially their closest intimates. They also anticipated that these would provide more effective help than relevant formal services. For these needs, implications for human services have been developed. However, in retrospect, the concept of 'linking' may be a little too vague to describe these service strategies and may need further development.

Two kinds of broad 'linking' strategies can be suggested. First, all or part of a formal service can be provided to a person through an intermediary, here a non-formal support. The intermediary could be a local key helper who is trained and equipped to provide the service. Or it could be a volunteer, employed and trained to provide the service.

The second kind of linking occurs where an organisation facilitates the interaction between a person and one or more of their natural supports. This happens, for example, where an organisation subsidises long-distance telephone calls or helps a resident to move away from town to be amongst relatives and/or friends some distance away. The crucial point here is that the organisation is not 'providing a service through an intermediary'. Indeed, the organisation exerts little or no influence over the kind of help provided. This is entirely the product of the interaction between the resident and their support. In this sense, then, it makes little sense to speak of an organisation 'linking' with non-formal supports or even with a recipient of help. The only 'linking' which occurs is between the recipient and their support source, and the organisation plays a facilitating role only. Most of the service strategies discussed earlier in this chapter which focus on non-formal supports are of this kind.

This is reminiscent of the distinction between 'created' and 'embedded' support relationships discussed in Chapter 3. However, it is also different. That distinction was

between two kinds of support relationships; the present one is between two kinds of roles being played by a service organisation with respect to (a) the support, (b) the recipient of help, and (c) the nature of the help provided.

In sum, then, the concept of linking formal services with non-formal supports seems a little too imprecise to adequately describe the service implications developed earlier in this chapter.

Where does this leave us?

First, a service model based on a locally defined community is clearly too narrow for most residents and most of the needs investigated here. However, for some people (especially those with strong local social and business roots) and for some needs this kind of model fits nicely with their sense of local identification and their preferred supports.

Second, according to respondents, some needs are best provided for directly by formal service organisations and, for others, by non-formal supports without much interference from formal services. Here too, then, a place must be found for both formal services and non-formal supports.

Third, while we can conceptualise linking in terms of (a) a service being provided through a local intermediary and (b) a service organisation facilitating, or 'greasing the wheels' of natural helping processes the latter seems to be most applicable to these towns. This is possibly for four reasons:

- 1 The lack of local key helpers means that there is no ready-made local non-formal service delivery point or intermediary;

- 2 The degree of isolation and the small size of these towns means that any 'volunteers' that might be employed as part of the service delivery chain are local people and are probably best regarded as natural supports;
- 3 The fact that most service organisations are so far away from the towns means that they would have little influence on the help, or 'services', provided by 'volunteers' anyway; and
- 4 Residents were satisfied with the kind of help that they anticipated would be provided naturally by their chosen non-formal supports.

Fourth, the service strategy of choice depends on the need in question and, to a lesser extent, the type of resident being considered. At least for these towns it makes no sense whatsoever to speak globally about 'the most appropriate strategy'.

These conclusions seem to fit very well with Bulmer's (1987, pp.x, xii, 174, 175-89) concept of interweaving of formal and non-formal support. If we define community care as assistance which is to some extent locality-based, which is provided with some involvement of formal organisations and which also involves some care being provided by non-formal supports then, for these towns, a number of service strategies are available.

Shared community issues may be most effectively taken up by the community as a whole through local community-based organisations. Needs, such as income security, for which residents believe that (in Australia) national and/or state governments are morally responsible should be provided by these authorities, perhaps with the assistance of paid local agents. Those needs, such as health and education problems, which residents believe require assistance from highly trained professionals may also be best provided for

directly through formal organisations, either through a local branch office, or through a local continuing service supported by highly trained visiting professionals. Finally, there are also a number of needs which may best be met by other people in a residents' normal social environment, whether these be local and/or non-local. For these, the broad role of formal organisations would be to facilitate the interaction between a resident and their supports. This can be done in a variety of ways by, for example: subsidising local care arrangements; subsidising long-distance communication; helping a resident to bring a support to town to help out; or helping a resident family to leave town either permanently or temporarily so they can receive the help they need.

Choice of strategy should take a number of factors into account, most importantly: the need in question; resident and resident family characteristics; the location of relevant formal services in relation to the community; the location of the resident's preferred non-formal supports; the moral obligation of the wider society to ensure that the need is met; the resources available to potential non-formal supports; and the expertise required to provide the assistance effectively.

The personal support package suitable for any given community must be tailored to that community and its residents. Specific recommendations have been made with respect to these three towns and we can take some heart that they are very similar for each community. However, this study has clearly demonstrated the importance of basing service packages on thorough investigation of the social and support networks of residents, their preferences regarding supports, their ecological and social context, and the relevant local and non-local service infrastructures. The present investigation vindicates Bulmer's call (1987, pp.140-41) for precise study of the relevant factors operating within and emanating from a locally defined community before making service recommendations for it.

In conclusion, a change has been taking place in thinking about personal support services in the United Kingdom and the United States. Following the collapse of the feudal system of providing for human well-being in Europe (Trattner, 1974; Gilbert and Specht, 1981, pp.18-19), policies concerning the provision of personal support in the Western world have steadily increased provision by government and government funded formal organisations; and have increasingly adopted service models which require larger administrative structures, greater centralisation, higher levels of staff training, and tighter government control (Hadley and Hatch, 1981). From the beginning, these were urban solutions to urban problems.

This trend accelerated dramatically during and after the 1920's as a result of several factors. First, in Australia as in other Western countries, the Great Depression convinced politicians that the parallel system of minimal government provision and haphazard non-government charity was insufficient to handle major social problems such as widespread unemployment and destitution (Dickey, 1980, pp.157-63). Second, the Depression also convinced us that to avoid repeating the disaster, governments must keep some control over both the economy and human services. Third, war-time governments and oppositions promised to care for returning service men and women and their families as well as the many single parent families left after the war (Dickey, 1980, pp.167-84). Consequently, in Australia, Labour governments of the time, wedded to an ideology of direct government provision, devoted substantial resources to personal support services (Dickey, 1980, pp.167-84). Fourth, the prosperity of the 1950's and 1960's made it relatively easy to continue to expand government provision for the health, welfare and education of the population (Dickey, 1980, pp.185-212).

Of course, this scenario changed with the oil crisis of the early 1970's and other international economic developments and the subsequent need for tight fiscal restraint.

These influences resulted in governments looking for ways to relieve themselves of some of the accumulated large burden of providing human services. Partly because of these pressures, politicians and senior public administrators have encouraged experimentation with the role of non-formal supports in service provision.

Three other developments have been occurring throughout the 1970's and 1980's which have fuelled the search for alternative ways of providing help to those in need.

First, Hadley and his colleagues in the United Kingdom (Hadley and McGrath, 1980, 1984; Hadley and Hatch, 1981) have been producing strong evidence that for all the investment in social services, the major social problems have not been significantly reduced. This realisation has led to further refinement and operationalisation of the concept of community care through the development and evaluation of innovative service programmes (for example, Hadley and McGrath, 1984).

Second, in the United States a number of researchers such as Froland, Pancoast, Chapman and Kimboko (1981a and b) and Martinez-Brawley (1986, 1989, 1990) have been investigating and writing about the respective roles of formal services and non-formal supports in providing for the welfare of people in need.

Third, half a century of research on social networks and social support has revealed that for many human needs support from non-formal sources remains an extremely common and effective way of dealing with many human problems (Gottlieb, 1988).

On the one hand, then, we have been forced to look for less bureaucratic, less centralised, less professionally skilled and less expensive ways of providing for the welfare of the nation. And, on the other hand, we have found that for many needs and many

people this may be possible to achieve if we interweave formal services with non-formal support processes. On the basis of the accumulated evidence, it can now be suggested that, for some needs, this may be more than just a convenient cost-cutting, vote-catching measure; it may even be more effective than a simple model of direct provision by government and non-government organisations.

As noted by Bulmer (1987, pp.140-41) we need empirical studies of which kinds of help provided by which sources, and how, are most useful to which people in which situations. As tends to happen with new ideas, especially those relating to deeply cherished notions such as 'community' and 'natural support', the literature has contained some romantic imagery. This has led to the development of some support strategies which are not based on empirical information or even careful thinking.

The present investigation has contributed some empirical data and careful thought to the literature about the interweaving of formal and non-formal support.

By taking as the research location a region which, by any standards, is extremely remote from most formal services we have been forced to think through support strategies which do not rely entirely on direct provision by formal sources. Even so, some unexpected results have led to conclusions that for some needs residents do indeed prefer the help of distant formal and non-formal sources and, perhaps more to the point, find that support received from these is highly effective.

If these people still prefer formal services to non-formal supports for some needs even when the former are over 500km away and the latter within one kilometre, then how much more true would this be of people for whom formal services are more accessible?

It has been suggested that an important role for formal authorities is to help 'grease the wheels' of non-formal support, without being able to influence the form of the help provided. This is the difficult part. Recent history has wedded those involved in planning and providing personal support services to a concept of direct provision by formal organisations and highly trained professionals according to established service models, methods and techniques based on more-or-less clearly defined ideologies. They are likely to find it extremely difficult to trust that non-formal supports can and will provide effective support to people in need. It will be even more difficult for public administrators to provide resources to facilitate this process. It remains to be seen whether they are ready to take this step.

To return to the people living in remote areas of Australia. Unless public administrators, social planners and service providers are willing to provide more resources to facilitating non-formal helping with respect to some needs, residents will simply continue to miss out on their rightful share of the resources devoted to personal support in this country. Some people will receive ineffective help, and some no help at all for some of their needs.

Above all else, it is hoped that this investigation has contributed some careful thought about services based on empirical data and careful consideration of existing literature to the question of how to provide personal support services to residents of Australia's remote areas. It is for them that the study was done.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, J.A. (1979), Types of Rural Communities, in W. Shera (ed.), **Rural Social Work Forum Conference Proceedings**, School of Social Work, University of Victoria, Victoria.
- Adams, B. (1964), Structural Factors Affecting Parental Aid to Married Children, **Journal of Marriage and the Family** 26, 327-31.
- Adams, D. (1979), **Childhood Malignancy: The Psychosocial Care of the Child and his Family**, C.C. Thomas, Springfield Ill.
- Adams, N.B. (1970), Isolation, Function, and Beyond: American Kinship in the 1960's, **Journal of Marriage and the Family** 32, 575-97.
- Aitkin, R.C.B. (1969), Measurement of Feelings using Visual Analogue Scales, **Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine** 62, 989-93.
- Albers, D.A. and Thompson, J.V. (1980), Social Work Education and Rural Practice: What's in a Name? Plenty! in L.J. Richard and N. St-Amard (eds.), **Values In Conflict, Fifth Canadian Social Work Forum**, Department of Social Work, Universite de Moncton, New Brunswick, 13-36.
- Allan, G. (1979), **A Sociology of Friendship and Kinship**, Allen and Unwin, London.
- Andrews, G., Tennant, C., Hewson, D. and Vaillant, G. (1978), Life Events Stress, Social Support, Coping Style and Risk of Psychological Impairment, **Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease** 166, 307-15.
- Aneshensel, C.S. and Frerichs, R.R. (1982), Stress, Support, and Depression: A Longitudinal Causal Model, **Journal of Community Psychology** 10, 363-76.
- Antonovsky, A. (1974), Conceptual and Methodological Problems in the Study of Resistance Resources and Stressful Life Events, in B.S. Dohrenwend and B.P. Dohrenwend, B.P. (eds.), **Stressful Life Events: Their Nature and Effects**, Wiley, N.Y., 245-58.
- Antonucci, T.C. (1985), Personal Characteristics, Social Support, and Social Behavior, in E. Shanas and R.H. Binstock (eds.), **Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences** (2nd Edition), Van Nostrand, N.Y., 94-128.
- Antonucci, T.C. and Depner, C.E. (1982), Social Support and Informal Helping Relationships, in T.A. Wills (ed.), **Basic Processes In Helping Relationships**, Academic Press, N.Y., 233-54.
- Auslander, G. and Litwin, H. (1988), Sociability and Patterns of Participation: Implications for Social Service Policy, **Journal of Voluntary Action Research** 17, 25-37.

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1973), **Income Distribution 1968-69, Part 2** (Reference No. 17.8), ABS, Canberra.
- _____, Queensland Office (1985), **Queensland Yearbook, 1985, No.45**, ABS, Queensland Office, Brisbane.
- _____, Queensland Office (1985), **Queensland Yearbook, 1986, No.46**, ABS, Queensland Office, Brisbane.
- _____ (1986), **Small Area Census Data, 1986**, ABS, Canberra.
- _____ (1986), **Yearbook Australia, No.70**, ABS, Canberra.
- Australian Commission of Inquiry into Poverty (AGCIP) (1975a), **Financial Aspects of Rural Poverty**, Australian Government Printing Service (AGPS), Canberra.
- _____ (1975b), **First Main Report, April 1975: Poverty in Australia, Volume 1**, Australian Government Printing Service (AGPS), Canberra.
- Australian Pre-School Committee (1973), **Report: Care and Education of Young Children**, AGPS, Canberra.
- Australian Rural Adjustment Unit (1984), **Needs of the West: Recommendations from the Conference on North-Western Queensland**, Australian Rural Adjustment Unit, University of New England, Armidale.
- Australian Schools Commission (1973), **Schools in Australia**, Report of the Interim Committee, AGPS, Canberra.
- Avery, W.P., Lonsdale, R.E. and Volgyes, I. (eds.) (1980), **Rural Change and Public Policy: Eastern Europe, Latin America and Australia**, Pergamon, N.Y.
- Balmer, C. (1974), The Rural Family, in J. Krupinski and A. Stoller (eds.), **The Family in Australia**, Pergamon, NSW, 144-56.
- Bandler, R., Grinder, J. and Satir, V. (1976), **Changing with Families**, Science and Behaviour Books, Palo Alto.
- Barclay Report, the (1982), **Social Workers: Their Role and Tasks** (Report of a working party under the chairmanship of Mr R.M. Barclay), Bedford Square Press, London.
- Barnes, J.A. (1954), Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish, **Human Relations** 7, 39-58.
- _____ (1972), **Social Networks**, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.
- Barrera Jr., M. (1981), Social Support in the Adjustment of Pregnant Adolescents: Assessment Issues, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support**, Sage, Beverly Hills, 69-96.
- Barth, R. (1983), Social Support Networks in Services for Adolescents and their Families, in J.K. Whittaker, J. Garbarino and Associates, **Social**

Networks: Informal Helping In the Human Services,
Aldine, N.Y., 299-331.

- Bates, V.E., Clarke, F.W. and Bertsche, J.W. (1980), Developing Comprehensive Community Helping Systems in Boom Towns: The Potential of Informal Helping, in J. Davenport III and J.A. Davenport (eds.), **The Boom Town: Problems and Promises in the Energy Vortex**, University of Wyoming, Laramie.
- Beels, C.C. (1978), Social Networks, the Family and the Schizophrenic Patient: Introduction to the Issue, **Schizophrenia Bulletin** 4, 512-21.
- _____ (1981), Social Support and Schizophrenia, **Schizophrenia Bulletin** 7, 58-72.
- Bell, R.A., LeRoy, J.B. and Stephenson, J.J. (1982), Evaluating the Mediating Effects of Social Support Upon Life Events and Depressive Symptoms, **Journal of Community Psychology** 10, 325-40.
- Bell, R.R. (1975), **Female and Male Friendship Patterns**, unpublished paper presented to the Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand Conference, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Belle, D. (ed.) (1982), **Lives In Stress: Women and Depression**, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Berger, P.L. and Neuhaus, R.J. (1977), **To Empower People**, American Enterprise Institute, Washington.
- Berkman, L. and Syme, S.L. (1979), Social Networks, Host Resistance, and Mortality: A Nine-year Follow-up Study of Alameda County Residents, **American Journal of Epidemiology** 109, 186-204.
- Bernard, H.R. and Killworth, P.D. (1977), Informant Accuracy in Social Network Data II, **Human Communication Research** 4, 3-18.
- Bernard, H.R., Killworth, P.D. and Sailer, L. (1980), Informant Accuracy in Social Network Data IV: A Comparison of Clique-level Structure in Behavioral and Cognitive Network Data, **Social Networks** 2, 191-218.
- _____ (1982), Informant Accuracy in Social Network Data V: An Experimental Attempt to Predict Actual Communication from Recall Data, **Social Science Research** 11, 30-66.
- Birkel, R. and Repucci, N.D. (1981), **Social Networks, Information Seeking and the Utilization of Services**, unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of Virginia.
- Blacksell, M., Clark, A., Economides, K. and Watkins, C. (1988), Legal Services in Rural Areas: Problems of Access and Local Need, **Progress In Human Geography** 12, 47-65.
- Bloom, J., Ross, R. and Burnell, G. (1978), The Effect of Social Support on Patient Adjustment after Breast Surgery, **Patient Counseling and Health Education** 1(2), 50-59.

- Blythe, B.J. (1983), Social Support Networks in Health Care and Health Promotion, in J.K. Whittaker, J. Garbarino and Associates, **Social Support Networks: Informal Helping in the Human Services**, Aldine, N.Y., 107-31.
- Bohannon, P. (1970), The Six Stations of Divorce, in P. Bohannon (ed.), **Divorce and After**, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 33-62.
- Boissevain, J. and Mitchell, J.C. (eds.) (1973), **Network Analysis: Studies in Human Interaction**, Mouton, The Hague.
- Bott, E. (1957), **Family and Social Networks: Roles, Norms, and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families**, Tavistock, London.
- _____ (1971), **Family and Social Networks: Roles, Norms, and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families (Second Edition)**, Tavistock, London.
- Bowlby, J. (1969), **Attachment and Loss, Vol.1: Attachment**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- _____ (1973), **Attachment and Loss. Vol.2: Loss**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- _____ (1977a), The Making and Breaking of Affectional Bonds, Part I, **British Journal of Psychiatry** 130, 201-10.
- _____ (1977b), The Making and Breaking of Affectional Bonds, Part II, **British Journal of Psychiatry** 130, 421-31.
- Brealey, T.B., and Newton, P. (1978), **Mining and New Towns**, CSIRO, Melbourne.
- Brekelbaum, T. (1984), The Use of Paraprofessionals in Rural Development, **Community Development Journal** 19, 232-45.
- Brody, J.G. (1985), Informal Social Networks: Possibilities and Limitations for Their Usefulness in Social Policy, **Journal of Community Psychology** 13, 338-49.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979), **The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design**, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Brown, G.W., Bhrolchain, M. and Harris, T. (1975), Social Class and Psychiatric Disturbance among Women in an Urban Population, **Sociology** 9, 225-54.
- Brown, G.W., Davidson, S., Harris, T., MacLean, S., Pollack, S. and Prudo, S. (1977), Psychiatric Disorder in London and North Uist, **Social Science and Medicine** 11, 367-77.
- Brown, G.W., and Harris, T. (1978), **The Social Origins of Depression**, Free Press, N.Y.
- Brown, R. (1977), **Alternative Models for the Delivery of Welfare Services in Central Queensland**, Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education, Rockhampton.

- Brownell, A. and Shumaker, S.A. (1984), Social Support: An Introduction to a Complex Phenomenon, **Journal of Social Issues** 40(4), 1-9.
- Brownlea, A.A. and McDonald, G.T. (1981), Health and Education Services in Sparseland Australia, in R.E. Lonsdale and J.H. Holmes (eds.), **Settlement Systems in Sparsely Populated Regions: The United States and Australia**, Pergamon, N.Y., 322-46.
- Bryson, L. and Thompson, F. (1972), **An Australian Newtown: Life and Leadership in a Working Class Suburb**, Penguin, Ringwood.
- Bulmer, M. (1987), **The Social Basis of Community Care**, Allen and Unwin, London.
- Bunch, J. (1972), Recent Bereavement in Relation to Suicide, **Journal of Psychosomatic Research** 16, 361-66.
- Burda Jr., P.C., Vaux, A. and Schill, T. (1984), Social Support Resources: Variation Across Sex and Sex Role, **Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin** 10, 119-26.
- Burke, R.J. and Weir, T. (1977), Marital Helping Relationships: The Moderators Between Stress and Well-being, **Journal of Psychology** 95, 121-30.
- Burnley, I.H. (1974), The Urbanization of the Australian Population 1947-1971, in I.H. Burnley (ed.), **Urbanization in Australia: The Postwar Experience**, Cambridge University Press, London, 3-15.
- _____ (1981), Population Change and Social Inequalities in Sparsely Populated Regions in Australia, in R.E. Lonsdale and J.H. Holmes (eds.), **Settlement Systems in Sparsely Populated Regions: The United States and Australia**, Pergamon, N.Y., 105-24.
- Burt, R.S. (1980), Models of Network Structure, **Annual Review of Sociology** 6, 79-141.
- _____ (1982), **Toward a Structural Theory of Action**, Academic Press, N.Y.
- Burt, R.S. and Minor, M.J. (eds.) (1983), **Applied Network Analysis**, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Callan, D., Garrison, J. and Zerger, F. (1975), Working with the Families and Social Networks of Drug Abusers, **Journal of Psychedelic Drugs** 7, 19-25.
- Camasso, M.J. and Moore, D.E. (1985), Rurality and the Residualist Social Welfare Response, **Rural Sociology** 50, 397-408.
- Campbell, A. (1981), **The Sense of Well-being in America**, McGraw-Hill, N.Y.
- Campbell, M. and Findlay, S. (1979), The Lone Mummer Approaches: Personal and Professional Competencies for Rural Social Work Practice in Newfoundland and Labrador, in W. Shera (ed.), **Rural Social**

Work Forum Conference Proceedings, School of Social Work, University of Victoria, Victoria.

- Caplan, G. (1974), Support Systems, in G.Caplan (ed.), **Support Systems and Community Mental Health**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- Caplan, G. and Killilea, M. (1976), **Support Systems and Mutual Help: Multidisciplinary Explorations**, Grune and Stratton, N.Y.
- Caplan, J. (1974), **Support Systems and Community Mental Health: Lecture on Concept Development**, Behavioral Publications, N.Y.
- Caplan, R. (1979), Patient, Provider and Organization: Hypothesized Determinants of Adherence, in S.J. Cohen (ed.), **New Directions In Patient Compliance**, Heath, Lexington, Mass.
- Carveth, W.B. and Gottlieb, B.H. (1979), The Measurement of Social Support and its Relation to Stress, **Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science** 11, 179-87.
- Cassel, J. (1974), Psychosocial Processes and 'Stress': Theoretical Formulations, **International Journal of Health Services** 4, 471-82
- _____ (1976), The Contribution of the Social Environment to Host Resistance, **American Journal of Epidemiology** 104, 107-23.
- Cassileth, R. and Hamilton, J. (1979), The Family with Cancer, in B. Cassileth (ed.), **The Cancer Patient: Social and Medical Aspects of Care**, Lea and Febinger, Philadelphia, 233-47.
- Cauce, A.M., Felner, R.D. and Primavera, J. (1982), Social Support in High Risk Adolescents: Structural Components and Adaptive Impact, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 10, 417-28.
- Chatters, L.M., Taylor, R.J., and Neighbors, H.W. (1985), Size and Composition of the Informal Helper Networks of Elderly Blacks, **Journal of Gerontology** 40, 605-14.
- _____ (1989), Size of Informal Helper Network Mobilized during a Serious Personal Problem among Black Americans, **Journal of Marriage and the Family** 51, 667-676.
- Cheers, B. (1985), Aspects of Interaction in Remote Communities, **Australian Social Work** 38(3), 3-10.
- _____ (1987), The Social Support Network Map as an Educational Tool, **Australian Social Work** 40(3), 18-24.
- _____ (1988), **Providing Marriage and Family Counselling Services to Rural and Remote Areas**, Queensland Marriage Counselling Service, Brisbane.
- _____ (1990a), **Preferred Organisational Locations for Remote Region Social Developers and Welfare Workers**, unpublished paper, Department of Social Work and Community Welfare, James Cook University of North Queensland, Townsville.

- _____ (1990b), Rural Disadvantage in Australia, **Australian Social Work** 43(1), 5-13.
- _____ (1990c), **The Need for Regional Social Developers In Remote Regions of Australia**, unpublished paper, Department of Social Work and Community Welfare, James Cook University of North Queensland, Townsville.
- _____ (1990d) **The Need for Remote Region Welfare Workers In Remote Areas of Australia**, unpublished paper, Department of Social Work and Community Welfare, James Cook University of North Queensland, Townsville.
- _____ (1991) Problems of Families in Remote Towns, **Australian Social Work** 44(3), 37-41.
- Chesler, M.A. and Barbarin, O.A. (1984), Difficulties of Providing Help in a Crisis: Relationships Between Parents of Children with Cancer and Their Friends, **Journal of Social Issues** 40(4), 113-34.
- Chinitz, B. (1960), The Effect of Transportation Forms on Regional Economic Growth, **Traffic Quarterly** 14(April), 130-33.
- Clark, D. and Unwin, K. (1980), **Information Services In Rural Areas: Prospects for Telecommunications Access**, Geobooks, Norwich.
- Coates, B.E., Johnston, R.J. and Knox, P.L. (1977), **Geography and Inequality**, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Coates, D., Renzaglia, G. and Embree, M. (1983), When Helping Backfires: Help and Helplessness, in J. Fisher, A. Nadler and B. DePaulo (eds.), **New Directions In Helping, Volume 1**, Academic Press, N.Y., 251-79.
- Coates, D. and Wortman, C.B. (1980), Depression Maintenance and Interpersonal Control, in A. Baum and J.E. Singer (eds.), **Advances In Environmental Psychology: Volume 2. Applications of Personal Control**, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, N.J., 149-82.
- Cobb, S. (1974), A Model for Life Events and Their Consequences, in B.S. Dohrenwend and B.P. Dohrenwend (eds.), **Stressful Life Events**, John Wiley, N.Y.
- _____ (1976), Social Support as a Moderator of Life Stress, **Psychosomatic Medicine** 38, 300-14.
- _____ (1979), Social Support and Health Through the Life Course, in M.W. Riley (ed.), **Aging from Birth to Death**, Westview Press, Boulder, Colo., 93-106.
- Cobb, S. and Kasl, S.V. (1977), **Termination: The Consequence of Job Loss**, Publication N10SH 77-224, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
- Coburn, B. (1982), Aboriginal Community Councils and the Delivery of Services, in P. Loveday (ed.), **Service Delivery to Remote**

Communities, The Australian National University, North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, 11-15.

- Cochran, M.M. and Brassard, J.A. (1979), Child Development and Personal Networks, **Child Development** 50, 601-16.
- Cohen, S. and McKay, G. (1984), Social Support, Stress and the Buffering Hypothesis: A Theoretical Analysis, in A. Baum, J.E. Singer and S.E. Taylor (eds.), **Handbook of Psychology and Health, Volume 4**, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, N.J., 253-67.
- Colletta, N.C. (1979), Support Systems After Divorce: Incidence and Impact, **Journal of Marriage and Family** 41, 837-46.
- Colletta, N.C. and Gregg, C.H. (1981), Adolescent Mothers' Vulnerability to Stress, **Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease** 169, 50-54.
- Collier, K. (1984), **Social Work with Rural Peoples: Theory and Practice**, New Star Books, Vancouver.
- Collins, A.H. and Pancoast, D.L. (1976), **Natural Helping Networks: A Strategy for Prevention**, National Association of Social Workers, Washington.
- Commonwealth Council for Rural Research and Extension (1981), **Rural Research In Northern Australia: A Report to the Council**, AGPS, Canberra.
- Commonwealth of Australia, Hospitals and Health Services Commission (1976), **Rural Health in Australia**, AGPS, Canberra.
- Commonwealth of Australia, Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts (1976), **Report on Education of Isolated School Children**, Parliamentary Paper 296/1976, AGPS, Canberra.
- Connell, H.M., Irvine, L. and Rodney, J. (1982), Psychiatric Disorder in Queensland Primary Schoolchildren, **Australian Paediatric Journal** 18, 177-80.
- Connerly, C.E. (1986), The Impact of Neighbourhood Social Relations on Prospective Mobility, **Social Science Quarterly** 67, 186-264.
- Conter, K., Hatch, D. and D'Augelli, A. (1980), Enhancing the Skills of Cub Scout Den Leaders, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 8, 77-85.
- Cooley, C.H. (1902), **Human Nature and the Social Order**, Charles Scribner's Sons, N.Y.
- Cornish, J.K. (1989), **Queensland Yearbook, 1989, No.48**, (ABS Catalogue No.1301.3), ABS, Queensland Office, Commonwealth of Australia, Brisbane.
- Cotterell, John L. (1984), Social Networks of Mining Town Women, **Australian Journal of Social Issues** 19, 101-12.

- Courtenay, P.P. (1982), **Northern Australia: Patterns and Problems of Tropical Development in an Advanced Country**, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.
- Cowen, E., Gesten, E., Boike, M., Norton, P., Wilson, A. and De Stefano, M. (1979), Hairdressers as Caregivers: 1. A Descriptive Profile of Helping Involvements, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 7, 633-48.
- Craig, R.A. and Killen, A.E. (1984), Farm Families: A Focus for Australian Rural Social Work? **Australian Social Work** 37(1), 19-26.
- Croog, S.H., Lipson, A. and Levine, S. (1972), Help Patterns in Severe Illness: The Roles of Kin Network, Non-family Resources, and Institutions, **Journal of Marriage and the Family** (February), 32-41.
- D'Abbs, P. (1982), **Social Support Networks: A Critical Review of Models and Findings**, Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.
- _____ (1983), **Family Support Networks and Use of Formal Services in Geelong**, paper presented to the Australian Family Research Conference, Australian National University, Canberra.
- D'Augelli, A. (1983), Social Support Networks in Mental Health, Chapter 3 in J.K. Whittaker, J. Garbarino and Associates, **Social Support Networks: Informal Helping in the Human Services** Aldine, N.Y.
- D'Augelli, A.R., Vallance, T.R., Danish, S.J., Young, C.E. and Gerdes, J.L. (1981), The Community Helpers Project: A Description of a Prevention Strategy for Rural Communities, **Journal of Prevention** 1, 209-24.
- Dakof, G.A. and Taylor, S.E. (1990), Victims' Perceptions of Social Support: What is Helpful from Whom?, **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology** 58, 80-89
- Davenport, J. and Davenport III, J. (1982), Utilizing the Social Network in Rural Communities, **Social Casework** 83, 106-113.
- Davenport III, J. and Howard, L.C. (1981), The Use of Adult Education Activities to Promote Natural Helping Networks in Energy Boom Towns, in R. Delaney (ed.), **Enhancing Human Services: Mobilizing the Rural Community**, Canadian Rural Social Work Forum, Conference Proceedings, Department of Social Work, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, 86-88.
- Davies, B. (1980), **The Cost-Effectiveness Imperative, the Social Services and Volunteers**, The Volunteer Centre, Berkhamsted.
- De Araujo, G., Van Arsdell, P.P., Holmes, T.H. and Dudley, D.L. (1973), Life Change, Coping Ability and Chronic Intrinsic Asthma, **Journal of Psychosomatic Research** 17, 359-63.
- Dean, A. and Ensel, W.M. (1982), Modelling Social Support, Life Events, Competence and Depression in the Context of Age and Sex, **Journal of Community Psychology** 10, 392-408.

- Dean, A. and Lin, N. (1977), The Stress-Buffering Role of Social Support: Problems and Prospects for Systematic Investigation, **Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease** 165, 403-17.
- Dean, A., Lin, N. and Ensel, W.M. (1980), The Epidemiological Significance of Social Support Systems, in Roberta G. Simmons (ed.), **Research In Community Health, Vol.2**, JAI Press, Greenwich.
- Dean, A., Lin, N., Tausig, M. and Ensel, W.M. (1980), **Relating Types of Social Support to Depression in the Life Course**, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York.
- Delaney, R. (ed.) (1981), **Enhancing Human Services: Mobilizing the Rural Community, Canadian Rural Social Work Forum**, Conference Proceedings, Department of Social Work, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay.
- Demone Jr., H.W. (1982), Human Resources for Mental Health Services, in H.C. Schulberg and M. Killilea (eds.), **The Modern Practice of Community Mental Health**, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 540-64.
- Department of Community Services, Policy Coordination Unit (1986), **Low Incomes and Social Issues in Rural and Provincial Australia**, Department of Community Services, Canberra.
- Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (1983), **Review of Australia's Demographic Trends 1983**, AGPS, Canberra.
- Department of Sociology, University of New England (1974), **Rural Poverty in Northern New South Wales**, Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, AGPS, Canberra.
- Dickey, B. (1980), **No Charity There: A Short History of Social Welfare in Australia**, Nelson, Melbourne.
- Dickman, P. (1981), Kenora Street Patrol, in R. Delaney (ed.), **Enhancing Human Services: Mobilizing the Rural Community, Canadian Rural Social Work Forum**, Conference Proceedings, Department of Social Work, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, 86-88.
- DiMatteo, M.R. and Hays, R. (1981), Social Support and Serious Illness, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support** Sage, Beverly Hills, 117-48.
- Dohrenwend, B.S. and Dohrenwend, B.P. (1978), Some Issues in Research on Stressful Life Events, **Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease** 166, 7-15.
- Donald, C.A., Ware, J.E., Brook, R.H. and Davies-Avery, A. (1978), **Conceptualization and Measurement of Health for Adults in the Health Insurance Study: Volume IV**, Social Health, Publication No. R-1987, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1978.

- Dressler, W.W. (1985), Extended Family Relationships, Social Support, and Mental Health in a Southern Black Community, **Journal of Health and Social Behaviour** 26, 39-48.
- Dubos, R. (1965), **Man Adapting**, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Duck, S.W. and Gilmour, R. (eds.) (1981), **Personal Relationships 1: Studying Personal Relationships**, Academic Press, London.
- Dunham, W.H. (1959), **Sociological Theory and Mental Disorder**, Wayne State University Press, Detroit.
- Dunkel-Schetter, C. (1984), Social Support and Cancer: Findings Based on Patient Interviews and their Implications, **Journal of Social Issues** 40(4), 77-98.
- Durkheim, E. (1951), **Suicide: A Study in Sociology** (G. Simpson, ed., and J.A. Spaulding and G. Simpson, Trans.), The Free Press, Glencoe (original published in 1897).
- Eakins, S.K. and Kleven, S.L. (1988), Inter-church Ministries of Nebraska: The Farm Crisis Response Network, **Human Services in the Rural Environment** 12, 29-32.
- Eaton, W.W. (1978), Life Events, Social Supports, and Psychiatric Symptoms: A Re-Analysis of the New Haven Data, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 19, 230-34.
- Eckenrode, J. and Gore, S. (1981), Stressful Events and Social Supports: The Significance of Context, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support**, Beverly Hills, Sage, 43-68.
- Edgerton, J.W. (1983), Models of Service Delivery, in A.W. Childs and G.B. Melton (eds.), **Rural Psychology**, Plenum Press, N.Y., 275-303.
- Ehrlich, P. (1985), Informal Support Networks meet Health Needs of Rural Elderly, **Journal of Gerontological Social Work** 9, 85-98.
- Eisenberg, L. (1979), A Friend, Not an Apple, a Day will help Keep the Doctor Away, **American Journal of Medicine** 66, 551-53.
- Ell, K. (1984), Social Networks, Social Support, and Health Status: A Review, **Social Service Review** March, 133-49.
- Elliott, D. (1984), **Rural Rights: The Report of the Work of the Northumberland Rural Citizens' Advice Bureau Experiment**, NACAB, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- _____ (undated), **The Spatial Dimension of Social Support**, Working Paper No. 300, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, Berkeley.
- Ellis, A. (1986), **Distance Education and Isolated Australia**, paper presented to the CSIRO-AIUS National Conference on Remote Settlements, Alice Springs.
- Etzioni, A. (1989), The 'Me First' Model in the Social Sciences is Too Narrow, **The Chronicle of Higher Education** February 1, p.A44.

- Faris, R.E. and Dunham, W.H. (1939), **Mental Disorders In Urban Areas** University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Faulkner, W. and French, S. (1983), **Geographic Remoteness: Conceptual and Measurement Problems**, Unpublished Internal Paper, Bureau of Transport Economics, Canberra.
- Festinger, L., Schachter, S. and Back, K. (1950), **Social Pressures In Informal Groups: A Study of Human Factors in Housing**, Harper and Row, N.Y.
- Field Research Corporation (1979), **In Pursuit of Wellness, Report to the Office of Prevention**, Department of Mental Health, State of California.
- Firth, R., Hubert, J., and Forge, A. (1969), **Families and their Relatives**, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- _____ (1982), **To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks In Town and City**, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Fischer, C. (1971), **The Urban Experience**, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Fischer, C. (1977), **Perspectives on Community and Personal Relations**, in C.S. Fischer, R.M. Jackson, C.A. Stueve, K. Gerson, L.M. Jones and M. Baldassare, **Networks and Places: Social Relations In the Urban Setting**, Free Press, N.Y.
- _____ (1982), **To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks In Town and City**, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- _____ (undated), **The Spatial Dimension of Social Support**, Working Paper No. 300, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, Berkeley.
- Fischer, C.S., and Jackson, R.M. (1977), **Suburbanism and Localism**, in C.S. Fischer, C.A. Stueve, K. Gerson, L. McCallister Jones and M. Baldassare, **Networks and Places: Social Relations In the Urban Setting**, The Free Press, N.Y., 117-38.
- Fischer, C.S., Jackson, R.M., Stueve, C.A., Gerson, K., Jones, L.M. and Baldassare, M. (1977), **Networks and Places: Social Relations In the Urban Setting**, Free Press, N.Y.
- Fisher, J.D., Goff, B.A., Nadler, A., and Chinsky, J.M. (1988), **Social Psychological Influences on Help Seeking and Support from Peers**, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Marshalling Social Support: Formats, Processes, and Effects**, Sage, Beverly Hills, pp. 267-304.
- Fisher, E.H., Winer, D., and Abramowitz, S.I. (1982), **Seeking Help for Psychological Problems**, in A.Nadler, J.D. Fisher, and B.M. DePaulo (eds.), **New Directions In Helping (Vol.3)**, Academic Press, N.Y.
- Flaherty, J., and Richman, J. (1989), **Gender Differences in the Perception and Utilization of Social Support: Theoretical Perspectives and an Empirical Test**, **Social Science and Medicine** 28, 1221-28.

- Folds, R. (1985), Health and Education Workers as Community Developers, **Australian Journal of Social Issues** 20, 228-33.
- Fookes, T.W. (1986), **A Research Approach to Understanding Life in Remote Communities: Theoretical Developments of Social and Economic Impacts**, paper presented to the CSIRO-AIUS National Conference on Remote Settlements, Alice Springs.
- French Jr., J.R.P. (1974), Person-Role Fit, in A. McLean (ed.), **Occupational Stress**, Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill.
- French Jr., J.R.P. and Kahn, R.L. (1962), A Programmatic Approach to studying the Industrial Environment and Mental Health, **Journal of Social Issues** 18, 1-47.
- Froland, C. (1979), Talking About Networks that Help, in C. Froland and D.L. Pancoast (eds.), **Networks for Helping**, Portland State University, Regional Research Institute, Portland.
- Froland, C., Pancoast, D.L., Chapman, N.J. and Kimboko, P.J. (1981a), **Helping Networks and Human Services**, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- _____ (1981b), Linking Formal and Informal Support Systems, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support**, Sage, Beverly Hills, 259-75.
- Futterman, E. and Hoffman, I. (1973), Crisis and Adaptation in the Families of Fatally Ill Children, in J. Anthony and C. Koupernick (eds.), **The Child In His Family: The Impact of Death and Disease, Volume 2**, Wiley, N.Y., 127-44.
- Fyfield, J.A. (1970), Rural-Metropolitan Aspects, in P.J. Fensham (ed.), **Rights and Inequality In Australian Education**, Cheshire, London.
- Garbarino, J. (1983), Social Support Networks: Rx for the Helping Professions, in J.K. Whittaker, J. Garbarino and Associates, **Social Support Networks: Informal Helping in the Human Services**, Aldine Publishing Company, N.Y., 3-28.
- Garbarino, J., Stocking, S. and Associates (1980), **Protecting Children from Abuse and Neglect: Developing and Maintaining Effective Support Systems for Families**, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Gartner, A. and Riessman, F. (1977), **Self-help In the Human Services**, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

- Gerritsen, R. (1982), Blackfellas and Whitefellas: The Politics of Service Delivery to Remote Aboriginal Communities in the Katherine Region, in P. Loveday (ed.), **Service Delivery to Remote Communities**, The Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, 16-31.
- Gershon, M. and Biller, H. (1977), **The Other Helpers**, D.C. Heath, Lexington, MA.
- Gerstel, N. and Riessman, C.K. (1981), **Social Networks In a Vulnerable Population: The Separated and Divorced**, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association, Los Angeles.
- Gibson, G. (1972), Kin Family Network: Overheralded Structure in Past Conceptualizations of Family Functioning, **Journal of Marriage and the Family**, February, 13-23.
- Giesen, C., Maas, A., and Vriens, M. (1989), Stress Among Farm Women: A Structural Model Approach, **Behavioral Medicine** 15(2), 53-62.
- Gilbert, N. and Specht, H. (1981), Emergence of the Institution, in N. Gilbert and H. Specht, **The Emergence of Social Welfare and Social Work**, Second Edition, F.E. Peacock, Itasca, Ill., 18-21.
- Ginsberg, L. (ed.) (1976), **Social Work In Rural Communities: A Book of Readings**, Council on Social Work Education, N.Y.
- Goldberg, E. (1981), **Social Networks as a Factor In the Health of Older Married Women**, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association, Los Angeles.
- Golding, J.M., Siegel, J.M., Sorenson, S.B., Burnam, M.A. and Stein, J.A. (1989), Social Support Sources Following Sexual Assault, **Journal of Community Psychology** 17, 92-107.
- Goode, W. (1963), **World Revolution and Family Patterns**, Free Press, N.Y.
- Goodfellow, M. (1983), Reasons for Use and Nonuse of Social Services Among the Rural Elderly, **Human Services In the Rural Environment** 8(4), 10-16.
- Gore, S. (1978), The Effect of Social Support in Moderating the Health Consequences of Unemployment, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior**, 19, 157-65.
- _____ (1981), Stress-buffering Functions of Social Supports: An Appraisal and Clarification of Research Methods, in B.S. Dohrenwend and B.P. Dohrenwend, B.P. (eds.), **Stressful Life Events and their Contexts**, Prodist, N.Y., 202-22.
- Gottlieb, B.H. (1975), The Contribution of Natural Support Systems of Primary Prevention Among Four Subgroups of Adolescent Males, **Adolescence** 10, 207-20.
- _____ (1976), Lay Influences on the Utilization and Provision of Health Services: A Review, **Canadian Psychological Review** 17, 126-36.

- _____ (1981a), Preventive Interventions Involving Social Networks and Social Support, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support**, Sage, Beverly Hills, 201-32.
- _____ (1981b), Social Networks and Social Support in Community Mental Health, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support**, Sage, Beverly Hills, 11-42.
- _____ (1983), **Social Support Strategies: Guidelines for Mental Health Practice**, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- _____ (1985), Assessing and Strengthening the Impact of Social Support on Mental Health, **Social Work** 30, 293-300.
- _____ (1988a), **Marshaling Social Support: Formats, Processes and Effects**, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- _____ (1988b), Marshaling Social Support: The State of the Art in Research and Practice, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Marshaling Social Support: Formats, Processes, and Effects**, Sage, Beverly Hills, 11-51.
- Gottlieb, B.H. and Todd, D.M. (1979), Characterizing and Promoting Social Support in Natural Settings, in R.F. Munoz, L.R. Snowden and J.G. Kelly (eds.), **Social and Psychological Research In Community Settings**, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 183-242.
- Granovetter, M.S. (1973), The Strength of Weak Ties, **American Journal of Sociology** 78, 1360-80.
- _____ (1974), **Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers**, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Greenberg, M.S. (1980), A Theory of Indebtedness, in K. Gergen, M.S. Greenberg, and R. Willis (eds.), **Social Exchange: Advances In Theory and Research**, Plenum, N.Y.
- Greenberg, M.W., and Westcott, D.R. (1983), Indebtedness as a Mediator of Reactions to Aid, in J.D. Fisher, A. Nadler, and B.M. DePaulo (eds.), **New Directions In Helping Vol.1: Recipient Reactions to Aid**, Academic Press, N.Y.
- Gregory, G. (1979), **Welfare, Community Development and Service Delivery In Rural Australia**, unpublished paper delivered to the 49th ANZAAS Conference, Auckland.
- Gumpert, J. (1985), A Model for Group Work Practice in Rural Areas, **Social Work with Groups** 8(3), 49-57.
- Gurin, G., Veroff, J., and Feld, S. (1960), **Americans View their Mental Health**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- Hadley, R. and Hatch, S. (1981), **Social Welfare and the Failure of the State**, Allen and Unwin, London.
- Hadley, R., and McGrath, M. (1980), **Going Local: Neighbourhood Social Services**, National Council of Voluntary Organization, Bedford Square Press, London.

- _____. (1984), **When Social Services are Local: The Normanton Experience**, Allen and Unwin, London.
- Haley, J. and Hoffman, L. (1967), **Techniques of Family Therapy**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- Hammer, M. (1981), Social Supports, Social Networks, and Schizophrenia, **Schizophrenia Bulletin** 7, 45-57.
- _____. (1984), Explorations into the Meaning of Social Network Interview Data, **Social Networks** 6, 341-71.
- Hammer, M., Makiesky-Barrow, S. and Gutwirth, L. (1978), Social Networks and Schizophrenia, **Schizophrenia Bulletin** 4, 522-45.
- Handler, J.F. and Hollingsworth, E.J. (1971), **The Deserving Poor**, Markham, Chicago.
- Hansell, N. (1968), Casualty Management Method: An Aspect of Mental Health Technology in Transition, **Archives of General Psychiatry** 19, 281-89.
- _____. (1976), **The Person-in-Distress: On the Biosocial Dynamics of Adaptation**, Behavioral Publications, N.Y.
- Hanton, S. (1980), Rural Helping Systems and Family Typology, **Child Welfare** LIX, 419-26.
- Hargrave, J. (1982), The Aboriginal Health Worker Programme, in P.Loveday (ed.), **Service Delivery to Remote Communities**, The Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, 132-34.
- Harlow, H.E. (1959), Love in Infant Monkeys, **Scientific American** 200, 68-74.
- Harper, J. and Richards, L. (1979), **Mothers and Working Mothers**, Penguin, Melbourne.
- Harris, C.C. (1983), **The Family and Industrial Society**, George Allen and Unwin, London.
- Harris, S., Crawford, J.G., Gruen, F.H. and Honan, N.D. (1974), **The Principles of Rural Policy in Australia: A Discussion Paper**, AGPS, Canberra.
- Harrison, W.D. (1980), Role Strain and Burnout in Child Protective Service Workers, **Social Service Review** 54(3), 31-44.
- Hassinger, E.W. (1976), Pathways of Rural People to Health Services, in E.W. Hassinger and L.R. Whiting (eds.), **Rural Health Services: Organization, Delivery, and Use**, Iowa State University Press, Ames.
- Hattie, J.A., Sharpley, C.F. and Rogers, H.J. (1984), Comparative Effectiveness of Professional and Paraprofessional Helpers, **Psychological Bulletin** 95, 534-41.

- Hawkins, J.D. and Fraser, M.W. (1983), Social Support Networks in Treating Drug Abuse, in J.K. Whittaker, J. Garbarino and Associates, **Social Support Networks: Informal Helping in the Human Services**, Aldine, N.Y., 355-80.
- Heffernan, W.D. and Heffernan, J.B. (1985), **Survey of Families Leaving Farming for Financial Reasons: A Preliminary Summary**, Department of Rural Sociology, Columbia, MO.
- Heller, K. (1979), The Effects of Social Support: Prevention and Treatment Implications, in A.P. Goldstein and F.H. Kanfer (eds.), **Maximizing Treatment Gains: Transfer Enhancement in Psychotherapy**, Academic Press, N.Y., 353-82.
- Heller, K. and Mansbach, W.E. (1984), The Multifaceted Nature of Social Support in a Community Sample of Elderly Women, **Journal of Social Issues** 40, 99-112.
- Heller, K. and Swindle, R.W. (1983), Social Networks, Perceived Support, and Coping with Stress, in R.D. Felner, L.A. Jason, J.N. Moritsugu and S.S. Farber (eds.), **Preventive Psychology: Theory, Research, and Practice**, Pergamon, N.Y., 87-103.
- Henderson, M and Argyle, M. (1985), Source and Nature of Social Support given to Women at Divorce/Separation, **British Journal of Social Work** 15, 57-65.
- Henderson, S. (1977), The Social Network, Support and Neurosis: The Function of Attachment in Adult Life, **British Journal of Psychiatry** 131, 185-91.
- _____ (1980), A Development in Social Psychiatry: The Systematic Study of Social Bonds, **Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease** 168, 63-69.
- Henderson, S., Byrne, D.G., Duncan-Jones, P., McAuley, H., Adcock, S., Scott, R. and Steel, G.P. (1978), Social Bonds in the Epidemiology of Neurosis: A Preliminary Communication, **British Journal of Psychiatry** 132, 463-66.
- Henderson, S., Byrne, D.G., Duncan-Jones, P., Scott, R. and Adcock, S. (1980), Social Relationships, Adversity and Neurosis: A Study of Associations in a General Population Sample, **British Journal of Psychiatry** 136, 574-83.
- Henderson, S. and Duncan-Jones, P. (1981), **Neurosis and the Social Environment**, Academic Press, Sydney.
- Henderson, S., Duncan-Jones, P., McAuley, H. and Ritchie, K. (1978), The Patient's Primary Group, **British Journal of Psychiatry** 132, 74-86.
- Heyman, S.R. (1983), Problems in Program Development and the Development of Alternatives, in A.W. Childs and G.B. Melton (eds.), **Rural Psychology**, Plenum, N.Y., 233-73.
- Hill, M. (1989), The Role of Social Networks in the Care of Young Children, **Children and Society** 3(3), 195-211.

- Hinkle Jr., L.E. (1974), The Effect of Exposure to Culture Change, Social Change, and Changes in Interpersonal Relationships on Health, in B.S. Dohrenwend and B.P. Dohrenwend (eds.), **Stressful Life Events**, John Wiley, N.Y.
- Hinkle Jr., L.E. and Wolff, H.G. (1958), Ecologic Investigations of the Relations Between Illness, Life Experiences and the Social Environment, **Annals of Internal Medicine** 49, 1373-88.
- Hirsch, B.J. (1979), Psychological Dimensions of Social Networks: A Multimethod Analysis, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 7, 263-78.
- _____ (1980), Natural Support Systems and Coping with Major Life Changes, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 8, 159-72.
- _____ (1981), Social Networks and the Coping Process: Creating Personal Communities, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support**, Sage, Beverly Hills, 149-70.
- Holland, P.W. and Leinhardt, S. (eds.) (1979), **Perspectives on Social Network Research**, Academic Press, N.Y.
- Hollingworth, P. (1980), **The Anglican Parish Priest and the Welfare Obligation**, unpublished MSW Thesis, Department of Social Work, University of Melbourne.
- Holmes, J.H. (1973), Population Concentration and Dispersion in Australian States: A Macrogeographic Analysis, **Australian Geographical Studies** 11, 150-70.
- _____ (1977), Population, in D.N. Jeans (ed.), **Australia: A Geography**, Sydney University Press, Sydney, 331-53.
- _____ (1981a), Lands of Distant Promise, in R.E. Lonsdale and J.H. Holmes (eds.), **Settlement Systems In Sparsely Populated Regions: The United States and Australia**, Pergamon Press, N.Y., 1-13.
- _____ (1981b), Sparsely Populated Regions of Australia, in R.E. Lonsdale and J.H. Holmes (eds.), **Settlement Systems In Sparsely Populated Regions: The United States and Australia**, 70-104.
- _____ (1984a), Australia: The Dilemma of Sparse Population and High Expectations, in G. Enyedi and R.E. Lonsdale (eds.), **Rural Public Services: International Comparisons**, Westview Press, Boulder, 163-84.
- _____ (1984b), The Domestic Satellites and Remote Area Communications, **Australian Geographical Studies** 22, 122-28.
- _____ (1985), Policy Issues Concerning Rural Settlement in Australia's Pastoral Zone, **Australian Geographical Studies** 23, 3-27.
- _____ (1987), Locational Disadvantage and Inverse Health Care in Queensland: A Response, **Australian Geographical Studies** 25, 110-120.

- Holmes, T.H. and Rahe, R.H. (1967), The Social Readjustment Rating Scale, **Journal of Psychosomatic Research** 11, 213-18.
- Hooyman, N. (1983), Social Support Networks in Services to the Elderly, in J.K. Whittaker, J. Garbarino and Associates, **Social Support Networks: Informal Helping In the Human Services**, Aldine, N.Y., 134-64.
- Horwitz, A. (1977a), Social Networks and Pathways to Psychiatric Treatment, **Social Forces** 56, 87-105.
- _____ (1977b), The Pathways into Psychiatric Treatment: Some Differences Between Men and Women, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 18, 169-78.
- House, J.S. (1981), **Work Stress and Social Support**, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- House, J.S. and Wells, J.A. (1978), Occupational Stress, Social Support, and Health, in G. McLean, G. Black and M. Colligan (eds.), **Reducing Occupational Stress: Proceedings of a Conference**, USDHEW (NIOSH) Publication No.78-140, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington D.C., 8-29.
- Hoyt, D.R. and Babchuck, N. (1983), Adult Kinship Networks: The Selective Formation of Intimate Ties with Kin, **Social Forces** 62, 84-101.
- Hughes, C.C., Trembly, M.A., Rapoport, R.N. and Leighton, A.H. (1960), **People of Cove and Woodlot**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- Hugo, G. (1983), Internal Migration in Australia: Some First Glimpses from the 1981 Census, in Royal Geographical Society of Australasia (Queensland Incorporated) and Australian Population Group (Queensland Regional Group), **Migration in Australia**, Royal Geographical Society of Australasia (Queensland Incorporated), Queensland, 221-83.
- Humphreys, J.S. (1985), A Political Economy Approach to the Allocation of Health Care Resources: The Case of Remote Areas of Queensland, **Australian Geographical Studies** 23, October, 222-42.
- _____ (1987), Locational Disadvantage and Inverse Care in Queensland: A Rejoinder, **Australian Geographical Studies** 25, 121-28.
- Hunter, A. (1978), Persistence of Local Sentiment in Mass Society, in D. Street (ed.), **Handbook of Contemporary Urban Life**, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 133-62.
- Husaini, B.A., Neff, J.A., Newbrough, J.R. and Moore, M.C. (1982), The Stress-buffering Role of Social Support and Personal Competence Among the Rural Married, **Journal of Community Psychology** 10, 409-26.
- Hymovich, D. (1976), Parents of Sick Children: Their Needs and Tasks, **Pediatric Clinics of North America** 23, 225-32.

- Institute of Family Studies (1983), **Social Support in an Australian Community: First Report to Respondents of a Survey Conducted in Geelong, May 1982**, Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.
- Iscoe, I., Bloom, B.L. and Spielberger, C.D. (eds.) (1977), **Community Psychology In Transition**, Hemisphere, Washington, DC.
- Ittleson, W.H., Proshansky, H.M. and Rivlin, L.G. (1970), The Environmental Psychology of the Psychiatric Ward, in H.M. Proshansky, W.H. Ittleson and L.G. Rivlin (eds.), **Environmental Psychology: Man and His Physical Setting**, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, N.Y., 419-39.
- Jacobsen, D.E. (1986), Types and Timing of Social Support, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 27, 250-64.
- Jeffrey, D. and Webb, D.J. (1972), Economic Fluctuations in the Australian Regional System, 1955-70, **Australian Geographical Studies** 10, 141-60.
- Jenkins, L. and Cook, A.S. (1981), The Rural Hospice: Integrating Formal and Informal Helping Systems, **Social Work** 26, 414-16.
- Johnson, H.W. (1980), Rural Human Services, in H.W. Johnson (ed.), **Rural Human Services: A Book of Readings**, Peacock, Itasca, 49-54.
- Johnson, L.C. (1980), Human Service Delivery Patterns in Nonmetropolitan Communities, in H.W. Johnson (ed.), **Rural Human Services: A Book of Readings**, Peacock, Itasca, 65-74.
- Jones, W.L. (1978), **Getting Settled: A Longitudinal Study of the Experiences of Newcomer Family Members in Canberra**, unpublished PhD thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.
- _____ (1980), Couple Network Patterns of Newcomers in an Australian City, **Social Networks** 2, 357-70.
- Jordan, A. (1975), **Long-term Unemployed People under Conditions of Full Employment**, AGPS, Canberra.
- Kadushin, C. (1966), The Friends and Supporters of Psychotherapy: On Social Circles in Urban Life, **American Sociological Review** 31, 781-802.
- Kaplan, B.H. (1975), Toward Further Research on Family and Health, in B.H. Kaplan and J.C. Cassel (eds.), **Family and Health: An Epidemiological Approach**, Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 89-106.
- Kaplan, B.H., Cassel, J.C. and Gore, S. (1977), Social Support and Health, **Medical Care** 15, 47-58.
- Kasarda, J. and Janowitz, M. (1974), Community Attachment in Mass Society, **American Sociological Review** 39, 328-39.

- Kearney, G.E. and Black, N.L. (1985), **Human Resources Research: Current Studies and Future Needs**, unpublished paper presented to The Northern Australian Development Council Seminar, Mackay.
- Keller, S. (1968), **The Urban Neighborhood**, Random House, N.Y.
- Kelley, P. and Kelley, V. (1985), Supporting Natural Helpers: A Cross-Cultural Study, **Social Casework** 66, 358-67
- Kelley, V.R., Kelley, P.L., Gauron, E.F. and Rawlings, E.I. (1977), Training Helpers in Rural Mental Health Delivery, **Social Work** 22, 229-31.
- Kelly, J. (1977), **The Ecology of Social Support Systems: Footnotes to a Theory**, unpublished paper presented at the 85th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, September.
- Kempson, E. (1982), **Village Contacts: A Guide to Setting up a Village-based Advice Service**, Community Information Project, London.
- _____ (1984), **CAB Services In Rural East Devon: A Review of the Operation and Possible Development of the East Devon Mobile CAB Service**, Acumen, London.
- Kendig, H.L. (1986), **Intergenerational Exchange**, In H.L. Kendig (ed.), **Ageing and Families: A Support Networks Perspective**, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 85-109.
- Kenkel, M.B. (1986), Stress-Coping-Support in Rural Communities: A Model for Primary Prevention, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 14, 457-78.
- Kessler, R.C. (1982), Life Events, Social Supports, and Mental Health, in W.R. Gove (ed.), **Deviance and Mental Illness**, Sage, Beverly Hills, 247-71.
- Kessler, R.C. and McLeod, J.D. (1985), Social Support and Psychological Distress in Community Surveys, in S. Cohen and S.L. Syme (eds.), **Social Support and Health**, Academic Press, N.Y., 19-40.
- Killilea, M. (1982), Interaction of Crisis Theory, Coping Strategies, and Social Support Systems, in H.C. Schulberg and M. Killilea (eds.), **The Modern Practice of Community Mental Health**, Jossey-Bass, 163-214.
- Killworth, P.D. and Bernard, H.R. (1976), Informant Accuracy in Social Network Data, **Human Organization** 35, 269-96.
- _____ (1979), Informant Accuracy in Social Network Data III: A Comparison of Triadic Structure in Behavioral and Cognitive Data, **Social Networks** 2, 19-46.
- Kiritz, S. and Moos, R.H. (1974), Physiological Effects of Social Environments, **Psychosomatic Medicine** 36, 96-114.
- Knoke, D. and Kuklinski, J.H. (1982), **Network Analysis**, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.

- Korte, C. (1980), Urban-Nonurban Differences in Social Behavior and Social Psychological Models of Urban Impact, **Journal of Social Issues** 36(3), 29-51.
- _____ (1983), Help-Seeking in a City: Personal and Organizational Sources of Help, in A. Nadler, J.D. Fisher and B.M. DePaulo (eds.), **New Directions In Helping, Vol.3: Applied Perspectives on Help-Seeking and -Receiving**, Academic Press, N.Y., 255-71.
- Koyama, J. (1970), Rural-urban Comparison of Kinship Relations in Japan, in R. Hill and R. Konig (eds.), **Families In East and West**, Moten, Hague.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1989), Social Support and Psychological Distress in First-Married and Remarried Newlywed Husbands and Wives, **Journal of Marriage and the Family** 51, 1047-52.
- Langdale, J.V. (1976), Australian Urban and Regional Development Planning: A Regional Centre Strategy, **Australian Geographer** 13, 1976, 264-71.
- Laumann, E.O. (1973), **Bonds of Pluralism**, John Wiley, N.Y.
- Laumann, E.O. and Pappi, F.U. (1976), **Networks of Collective Action: A Perspective on Community Influence Systems**, Academic Press, N.Y.
- Lawrence, G. (1987), **Capitalism and the Countryside: The Rural Crisis in Australia**, Pluto Press, Leichhardt, Sydney.
- Lazarus, R.S. and Cohen, J.B. (1977), Environmental Stress, in I. Altman and J.Wohlwill (eds.), **Human Behavior and the Environment: Current Theory and Research**, Plenum, N.Y.
- Lazarus, R.S. and Launier, E. (1978), Stress-related Transactions between Person and Environment, in L.A. Pervin and M. Lewis (eds.), **Perspectives In Interactional Psychology** Plenum, N.Y., 287-327.
- Learmonth, A.T. and R. Grau. (1969), **Maps of Some Standardised Mortality Ratios for Australia for 1965-1966 Compared with 1959-1963**, Occasional Paper No.8, Department of Geography, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Learmonth, A.T. and Nichols, G.C. (1965), **Maps of Some Standardised Mortality Ratios for Australia, 1959-1963**, Occasional Paper No.3, Department of Geography, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Lee, G.R. and Cassidy, M.L. (1981), Kinship Systems and Extended Family Ties, in R.T. Coward and W.M. Smith (eds.), **The Family In Rural Society**, Westview Press, Bolder, Colorado, 57-71.
- _____ (1985), Family and Kin Relationships of the Rural Elderly, in R.R. Coward and G.R. Lee (eds.), **The Elderly In Rural Society**, Springer, N.Y., 151-69.

- Lee, G.R., and Whitbeck, L.B. (1987), Residential Location and Social Relations among Older Persons, **Rural Sociology** 52(1), 89-97.
- Lee, N.H. (1969), **The Search for an Abortionist**, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Leighton, A.H. (1959), **My Name Is Legion**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- Leinhardt, S. (ed.) (1977), **Social Networks: A Developing Paradigm**, Academic Press, N.Y.
- Lemert, E.M. (1962), Paranoia and the Dynamics of Exclusion, **Sociometry** 25, 2-20.
- Lentjes, S. and Jonker, J.M.L. (1985), Social Support Networks: A Literature Study, in J.A.Yoder (ed.), **Support Networks in a Caring Community: Research and Policy, Fact and Fiction**, Martinus, Dordrech, 5-37.
- Leutz, W.N. (1976), The Informal Community Caregiver: A Link Between the Health Care System and Local Residents, **American Journal of Orthopsychiatry** 46, 678-88.
- Levant, R.F. (1984), **Family Therapy: A Comprehensive Overview**, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Levenberg, S. B. (1976), Building Consultative Relationships with Rural Fundamentalists Clergy, **Professional Psychology** 7, 553-58.
- Levine, S., Tulkin, S., Intagliata, R., Perry, J. and Whitsom, E. (1978), **The Paraprofessional: A Brief Social History**, unpublished paper, Department of Psychology, SUNY, Buffalo.
- Levitt, M.J., Weber, R.A., and Clark, M.C. (1986), Social Network Relationships as Sources of Maternal Support and Well-being, **Developmental Psychology** 22, 310-16.
- Lieberman, M., Borman, L. and Associates (1979), **Self-Help Groups for Coping with Crisis**, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Lieberman, M. and Mullan, J. (1978), Does Help Help: The Adaptive Consequences of Obtaining Help from Professionals and Social Networks, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 6, 499-517.
- Liem, R. and Liem, J. (1978), Social Class and Mental Illness Reconsidered: The Role of Economic Stress and Social Support, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 19, 139-56.
- Lin, N., Dayton, P.W. and Greenwald, P. (1977), The Urban Communication Network and Social Stratification, in B. Ruben (ed.), **Communication Yearbook I**, Transaction Books, New Brunswick, N.J., 107-19.
- Lin, N., Dean, A. and Ensel, W.M. (1979a), **Constructing Social Support Scales: A Methodological Note**, unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Stress, Social Support, and Schizophrenia, September 24-25, Burlington, Vermont.

- _____ (1979b), **Development of Social Support Scales**, unpublished paper presented at the Third Biennial Conference on Health Survey Research Methods, Reston, Va.
- _____ (1981), Social Support Scales: A Methodological Note, **Schizophrenia Bulletin** 7, 73-89.
- Lin, N., Simeone, R.S., Ensel, W.M. and Kuo, W. (1979), Social Support, Stressful Life Events, and Illness: A Model and Empirical Test, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 20, 108-19.
- Lin, N., Woelfel, M. and Dumin, M.Y. (1986), Gender of the Confidant and Depression, in N. Lin, A. Dean, and W. Ensel (eds.), **Social Support, Life Events, and Depression**, Academic Press, Orlando, Florida, 283-306.
- Lincoln, R.A., Najmann, J.M., Wilson, P.R. and Matis, C.E. (1983), Mortality Rates in 14 Queensland Reserve Communities, **The Medical Journal of Australia** 16 April, 357-60.
- Linn, J.G. and McGranahan, D.A. (1980), Personal Disruptions, Social Integration, Subjective Well-being, and Predisposition Toward the Use of Counseling Services, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 8, 87-100.
- Lipowski, Z.J. (1969), Psychosocial Aspects of Disease, **Annals of Internal Medicine** 71, 1197-206.
- Litwak, E. (1960a), Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion, **American Sociological Review** 25, 385-94.
- _____ (1960b), Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion, **American Sociological Review** 25, 9-21.
- _____ (1965), Extended Kin Relations in an Industrial Democratic Society, in E. Shanas and G.F. Streib (eds.), **Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations**, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs.
- _____ (1978), Agency and Family Linkages in Providing Neighborhood Services, in D. Thurz and J. Vigilante (eds.), **Reaching People: The Structure of Neighborhood Services**, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Litwak, E. and Szelenyi, I. (1969), Primary Group Structures and their Functions: Kin, Neighbours, and Friends, **American Sociological Review** 34, 465-81.
- Loder, L.F. (1965), **Report of the Committee of Investigation Into Transportation Costs In Northern Australia**, Mimeo, Canberra.
- Logan, M.I., Maher, C.A., McKay, J. and Humphreys, J.S. (1975), **Urban and Regional Australia: Analysis and Policy Issues**, Sorrett, Malvern, Vic.
- Lonne, R.E. (1990), Beginning Country Practice, **Australian Social Work** 43(1), 31-39.

- Lonsdale, R.E. (1980), The Quest for Regional Equity and Employment Opportunity in Rural Australia, in W.P. Avery and R.E. Lonsdale (eds.), **Rural Change and Public Policy: Eastern Europe, Latin America and Australia**, Pergamon, N.Y., 195-211.
- _____ (1981), Drawing Conclusions from an Examination of Two Nations, in R.E. Lonsdale and J.H. Holmes (eds.), **Settlement Systems in Sparsely Populated Regions: The United States and Australia**, Pergamon Press, N.Y., 377-86.
- Lonsdale, R.E. and Holmes, J.H. (eds.) (1981), **Settlement Systems in Sparsely Populated Regions: The United States and Australia**, Pergamon Press, N.Y..
- Lopata, H.Z. (1979), **Women as Widows: Support Systems**, Elsevier, N.Y.
- Loveday, P. (1982a), Access to Services - Some Social and Political Complications, in P.Loveday (ed.), **Service Delivery to Remote Communities**, The Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, 107-11.
- _____ (ed.) (1982b), **Service Delivery to Remote Communities**, The Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin.
- Lowenthal, M.F. and Haven, C. (1968), Interaction and Adaptation: Intimacy as a Critical Variable, **American Sociological Review** 33, 20-30.
- Lynch, J. (1977), **The Broken Heart**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- Marsden, P.V. and Lin, N. (1982), **Social Structure and Network Analysis**, Sage, N.Y.
- Marshall, J.V. (1979), **Report on the Survey by the Queensland Medical Board of Registered Medical Practitioners**, Queensland Department of Health, Brisbane.
- Martinez-Brawley, E.E. (1982), **Rural Social Work and Community Work in the U.S. and Britain**, Praeger, N.Y.
- _____ (1986), Community-oriented Social Work in a Rural and Remote Hebridean Patch, **International Social Work** 29, 349-72.
- _____ (1989), **Community Oriented Social Work: Some International Perspectives**, unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, State College.
- _____ (1990), **Perspectives on the Small Community: Humanistic Views for Practitioners**, NASW Press, Silver Spring, MD.
- Martinez-Brawley, E.E. and Blundall, J. (1989), Farm Families' Preferences toward the Personal Social Services, **Social Work** 34, 513-22.
- Mazer, M. (1976a), **People and Predicaments**, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- _____ (1976b), The Influence of the Rural Community on the Mental Health of its Inhabitants, in P.Keller and O.Murray (eds.), **Handbook of**

Rural Community Health, Human Sciences Press, N.Y., 52-61.

- McCaughey, J. (1987), **A Bit of a Struggle: Coping with Family Life in Australia**, McPhee Gribble/Penguin, Melbourne.
- McFarlane, A.H., Neale, K.A., Norman, G.R., Roy, R.G. and Streiner, D.L. (1981), Methodological Issues in Developing a Scale to Measure Social Support, **Schizophrenia Bulletin** 7, 90-100.
- McGlashan, N. (1977), Spatial Variation in Cause-Specific Mortality in Australia, in N. McGlashan (ed.), **Studies in Australian Mortality, Occasional Paper No.4**, University of Tasmania Environmental Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart.
- McGrath, J.E. (1970), **Social and Psychological Factors In Stress**, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, N.Y.
- McKenzie, R. (1926), **The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community**, in R. Park and E. Burgess (eds.), **The City**, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- McKinlay, J. (1972), Some Approaches and Problems in the Study of the Use of Services: An Overview, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 13, 115-51.
- _____ (1973), Social Networks, Lay Consultation and Help-seeking Behaviour, **Social Forces** 51, 275-92.
- McQueen, D.V. and Celentano, D. (1981), **The Role of Social Support System and Problem Drinking Among Women**, unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association, Los Angeles.
- Mead, G. (1934), **Mind, Self and Society**, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Medvene, L.J. (1984), Self-help and Professional Collaboration, **Social Policy** 14(4), 15-18.
- Meenaghan, T.M. and Washington, R.O. (1980), **Social Policy and Social Welfare**, Free Press, N.Y.
- Melton, G.B. (1983), Ruralness as a Psychological Construct, in A.W. Child and G.B. Melton (eds.), **Rural Psychology**, Plenum Press, N.Y., 1-13.
- Mendelsohn, R. (1979), **The Condition of the People: Social Welfare in Australia 1900-1975**, George Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Mermelstein, J. and Sundet, P. (1986), Rural Community Mental Health Centers' Response to the Farm Crisis, **Human Services in the Rural Environment** 10(1), 21-26.
- Michel, A.V. (1968), Kinship Relations and Relationships of Proximity in French Working Class Households, in N.W. Bell and E.F. Vogel (eds.), **A Modern Introduction to the Family**, Free Press, N.Y.

- Milbrath, L.W. (1979), Policy Relevant Quality of Life Research, **Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science** 444, 32-45.
- Milgram, S. (1967), The Small-World Problem, **Psychology Today** 1, 62-67.
- Miller, K. and Ingham, J. (1976), Friends, Confidants and Symptoms, **Social Psychiatry** 11, 51-57.
- Miller, K. and Iscoe, I. (1963), The Concept of Crisis: Current Status and Mental Health Implications, **Human Organization** 22, 195-201.
- Millikan, E. and McGowan, R. (1981), The Indigenous Vs Itinerant Workers, in R. Delaney (ed.), **Enhancing Human Services: Mobilizing the Rural Community**, Canadian Rural Social Work Forum, Conference Proceedings, Department of Social Work, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay.
- Minuchin, S. (1974), **Families and Family Therapy**, Tavistock, London.
- Mitchell, J.C. (1969), **Social Networks in Urban Situations**, University of Manchester Press, Manchester.
- Mitchell, J.C. (1973), Networks, Norms, and Institutions, in J. Boissevain and J.C. Mitchell, **Network Analysis: Studies in Human Interaction**, Mouton, The Hague, 15-35.
- Mitchell, J.C., Billings, A.G., and Moos, R.H. (1982), Social Support and Well-being: Implications for Prevention Programs, **Journal of Primary Prevention** 3(2), 77-98.
- Mitchell, R.E. and Hurley Jr., D.J. (1981), Collaboration with Natural Helping Networks: Lessons from Studying Paraprofessionals, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support**, Sage, Beverly Hills, 277-98.
- Monk, J.J. (1980), Social Change through Education: Problems of Planning in Rural Australia, in W.P. Avery, R.E. Lonsdale and I. Volgyes (eds.), **Rural Change and Public Policy: Eastern Europe, Latin America and Australia**, Pergamon, N.Y., 129-55.
- Moos, R.H. (1974a), **Evaluating Treatment Environments**, John Wiley, N.Y.
- _____ (1974b), **The Social Climate Scales: An Overview**, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- _____ (1976), **The Human Context: Environmental Determinants of Behavior**, John Wiley, N.Y.
- Moos, R.H., and Mitchell, R.E. (1982), Social Network Resources and Adaptation: A Conceptual Framework, in T.A. Wills (ed.), **Basic Processes in Helping Relationships**, Academic Press, N.Y.
- Moran, P. and O'Connor, K. (1981), Change in the Location of Primary Schools in the Wimmera, Victoria, 1947-1976, in R.E. Lonsdale and J.H. Holmes (eds.), **Settlement Systems in Sparsely Populated Regions: The United States and Australia**, Pergamon Press, N.Y., 262-75.

- Morical, L. (1975), **Training Trainers of Rural Housewife Peer Counselors**, unpublished Report on National Institute of Mental Health Grant No.MH14070.
- Moriwaki, S.Y. (1973), Self-disclosure, Significant Others, and Psychological Well-being in Old Age, **Journal of Health and Social Behaviour** 14, 226-32.
- Morris, S.C., and Rosen, S. (1973), Effects of Felt Adequacy and Opportunity to Reciprocate on Help-seeking, **Journal of Experimental Social Psychology** 9, 265-76.
- Moseley, M.J. and Packman, J. (1983), **Mobile Services in Rural Areas**, University of East Anglia, Norwich.
- _____ (undated), **The Spatial Dimension of Social Support, Working Paper No.300**, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, Berkeley.
- Moyal, A. (1990), Telephones Needed for Australia's Social Support System, **Impact** 20(8), p.15.
- Mueller, D.P. (1980), Social Networks: A Promising Direction for Research on the Relationship of the Social Environment to Psychiatric Disorder, **Social Science and Medicine** 14A, 147-61.
- Musgrave, W.F, Rickards, P.A. and Whan, I.F. (1975), **Poverty among Farmers in New South Wales and Queensland, In Financial Aspects of Rural Poverty**, Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, AGPS, Canberra.
- Myers, J., Lindenthal, J.J. and Pepper, M. (1975), Life Events, Social Integration and Psychiatric Symptomatology, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 16, 421-27.
- Nadler, A. (1983), Personal Characteristics and Help-Seeking, in B.M. DePaulo, A. Nadler and J.D. Fisher (eds.), **New Directions In Helping, Vol. 2: Help-Seeking**, Academic Press, N.Y., 303-40.
- Nadler, A., and Fisher, J.D. (1986), The Role of Threat to Self-esteem and Perceived Control in Recipient Reaction to Aid: Theory Development and Empirical Validation, **Advances In Experimental Social Psychology**, Academic Press, N.Y.
- Nadler, A., Mayseless, O., Perri, N., and Tchemerinsky, A. (1983), **Help Seeking as a Function of Self-esteem and Perceived Opportunity to Reciprocate**, unpublished manuscript, Tel-Aviv University, Israel.
- National Consumer Council (1986), **Good Advice for All**, NCC, London.
- National Hospitals and Health Services Commission Interim Committee (1974), **Hospitals In Australia**, AGPS, Canberra.
- Neighbours, H.W., and Jackson, J.S. (1984), The Use of Informal and Formal Help: Four Patterns of Illness Behavior in the Black Community,

American Journal of Community Psychology 12, 629-44.

- Neil, C.C., Brealey, T.B. and Jones, J.A. (1983), Deligitimization of Mental Health Myths of New Remote Mining Communities in Australia, **Community Health Studies** 7, 42-53.
- Neil, C.C. and Jones, J.A. (1986), **Environmental Stresses and Mental Health In Remote Resource Boom Communities**, unpublished paper presented to The National Conference on Remote Settlements, Alice Springs.
- Nelson, J.C. (1983), **Family Treatment: An Integrative Approach**, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Nilsen, S. (1979), **Assessment of Employment and Unemployment Statistics for Non-metropolitan Areas**, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington D.C.
- Nuckolls, K.B., Cassel, J.C. and Kaplan, B.H. (1972), Psychosocial Assets, Life Crisis and the Prognosis of Pregnancy, **American Journal of Epidemiology** 95, 431-41.
- Nurius, P.S., Lovell, M., and Edgar, M. (1988), Self-Appraisals of Abusive Parents: A Contextual Approach to Study and Treatment, **Journal of Interpersonal Violence** 3, 458-67.
- Osgood, M.H. (1977), Rural and Urban Attitudes Toward Welfare, **Social Work** 22; 41-47.
- Packard, V. (1972), **A Nation of Strangers**, McKay, N.Y.
- Park, R. and Burgess, E. (eds.) (1926), **The City**, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Patterson, J.M. and McCubbin, H.I. (1983), Chronic Illness: Family Stress and Coping, in C.R. Figley and H.I. McCubbin (eds.), **Stress and the Family: Volume 2. Coping with Catastrophe**, Brunner/Mazel, N.Y., 21-36.
- Patterson, S.L., Germain, C.B., Brennan, E.M. and Memmott, J. (1988), Effectiveness of Rural Natural Helpers, **Social Casework** 69, 272-79.
- Pattison, E.M. (1973), Social System Therapy, **American Journal of Psychotherapy** 18, 396-409.
- _____ (1977), A Theoretical-empirical Base for Social System Therapy, in E.F. Foulks, R.M. Wintrob, J. Westermeyer and A.R. Favazzo (eds.), **Current Perspectives in Cultural Psychiatry**, Spectrum, N.Y.
- Pattison, E.M., de Francisco, D., Wood, P., Frazier, H. and Crowder, J.A. (1975), A Psychosocial Kinship Model for Family Therapy, **American Journal of Psychiatry** 132, 1246-51.
- Paykel, E.S., Myers, J.K., Dienelt, M.N., Klerman, G.L., Lindenthal, J.J. and Pepper, M.P. (1969), Life Events and Depression: A Controlled Study, **Archives of General Psychiatry** 21, 753-60.

- Pearlin, L.I., Lieberman, M., Menaghan, E. and Mullan, J. (1981), **The Stress Process**, *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour* **22**, 337-56.
- Pearlin, L.I. and Schooler, C. (1978), **The Structure of Coping**, *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour* **19**, 2-21.
- Pilisuk, M. and Froland, C. (1978), **Kinship, Social Networks, Social Support and Health**, *Social Science and Medicine* **12B**, 273-80.
- Pinneau Jr., S.R. (1975), **Effects of Social Support on Psychological and Physiological Stress**, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Platt, E. and Brentnall, B. (1985), **Results of Questionnaire Sent to Nurses Working In Areas Where There is no Resident Doctor** unpublished paper presented to the Third National Conference of the Remote Area Nurses Association, Townsville.
- Polak, P. (1971), **Social Systems Intervention**, *Archives of General Psychiatry* **25**, 110-17.
- _____ (1972), **Techniques of Social System Intervention**, in J.H. Masserman (ed.), *Current Psychiatric Therapies*, Grune and Stratton, N.Y.
- Polak, P., Egan, D., Vandenberg, R. and Williams, W.V. (1975), **Prevention in Mental Health: A Controlled Study**, *American Journal of Psychiatry* **132**, 146-49.
- Poole, D.L. and Daley, J.M. (1985), **Problems of Innovation in Rural Social Services**, *Social Work* **30**, 338-44.
- Primomo, J., Yates, B.C., and Woods, N.F. (1990), **Social Support for Women during Chronic Illness: The Relationship among Sources and Types to Adjustment**, *Research in Nursing and Health* **13**, 153-61.
- Queensland Health and Medical Service (1979), **Annual Report**, Queensland Health and Medical Service, Brisbane.
- Rabkin, R. (1970), **Inner and Outer Space: Introduction to a Theory of Social Psychiatry**, Norton, N.Y.
- Radford, W.C. and Wilkes, R.E. (1975), **School Leavers In Australia 1971-1972**, Australian Council for Educational Research, Hawthorn, Vic.
- Rashke, H.J. (1977), **The Role of Social Participation in Postseparation and Postdivorce Adjustment**, *Journal of Divorce* **2**, 129-40.
- Richards, L. (1978), **Having Families**, Penguin, Melbourne.
- Richards, L. and Salmon, J. (1983), **Family Life Stage: The Neglected Divlder**, unpublished paper presented to the Australian Family Research Conference, Canberra.
- Richardson, R. and Pfeifferberger, C. (1983), **Social Support Networks for Divorced and Stepfamilies**, in J.K. Whittaker, J. Garbarino and Associates, *Social Support Networks: Informal Helping In the Human Services*, Aldine, N.Y., 219-47.

- Riessman, F., Moody, H.R. and Worthy Jr., E.H. (1984), Self-help and the Elderly, **Social Policy** 14(4), 19-26.
- Roark, D.O. (1973), **A Survey of Social Studies Teachers' Attitudes Toward Poverty and Welfare Programs in Oklahoma**, unpublished PhD dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma.
- Roberts, B., and Thorsheim, H. (1982), The Approach of Social Ecology: A Partnership of Support and Empowerment, **Journal of Primary Prevention** 3, 140-43.
- Romney, A.K., and Weller, S.C. (1984), Predicting Informant Accuracy from Patterns of Recall Among Individuals, **Social Networks** 6, 59-77.
- Rosow, I. (1967), **Social Integration of the Aged**, Free Press, N.Y.
- Rubin, Z. (1973), **Liking and Loving: An Invitation to Social Psychology**, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, N.Y.
- Rueveni, U. (1975), Network Intervention with a Family in Crisis, **Family Process** 14, 193-203.
- _____ (1977), **Networking Families in Crisis**, Human Sciences, N.Y.
- Rumley, D. (1983), Ideology, Regional Policy and Applied Geography: The Case of the Kimberley, Western Australia, **Australian Journal of Social Issues** 18, 233-44.
- Rutter, M. (1972), **Maternal Deprivation Reassessed**, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.
- Salmon, P.W. and Weston, R.E. (1974), **Human Adjustments in Rural Towns: The Impact of Changes in Agriculture on Quality of Life**, School of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Melbourne, Melbourne.
- Sanders, W. (1982), Delivering Social Services to Remote Aborigines, in P.Loveday (ed.), **Service Delivery to Remote Communities**, The Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, 96-106.
- Sandler, I.N. (1980), Social Support Resources, Stress and the Maladjustment of Poor Children, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 8, 41-52.
- Sandler, I.N. and Lakey, B. (1982), Locus of Control as a Stress Moderator: The Role of Control Perceptions and Social Support, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 10, 65-81.

- Sarason, B.S., Sarason, I.G., Hacker, T.A. and Basham, R.B. (1985), Concomitants of Social Support: Social Skills, Physical Attractiveness, and Gender, **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology** 49, 469-80
- Sarbin, T.R. (1968), Notes on the Transformation of Social Identity, in L.M. Roberts, S. Greenfield and M.H. Miller (eds.), **Comprehensive Mental Health: The Challenge of Evaluation**, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 97-115.
- Satir, V. (1967), **Conjoint Family Therapy: A Guide to Theory and Technique**, Revised Edition, Science and Behavior Books, Palo Alto.
- Satir, V., Stachowiak, J. and Taschmaan, H.A. (1975), **Helping Families to Change**, Jason Aronson, N.Y.
- Schaefer, C., Coyne, J.C. and Lazarus, R.S. (1981), The Health-Related Functions of Social Support, **Journal of Behavioral Medicine** 4, 381-406.
- Schiltz, M.E. (1979), **Public Attitudes Toward Social Security, 1935-1965**, Research Report No.33, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.
- Schulman, M.D., and Armstrong, P.S. (1989), The Farm Crisis: An Analysis of Social Psychological Distress among North Carolina Farm Operators, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 17, 423-441.
- _____ (1990), Perceived Stress, Social Support and Survival: North Carolina Farm Operators and the Farm Crisis, **Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare** 17(3), 3-33.
- Scott, D. (1989), **Broadening the Role of Primary Service Providers**, unpublished paper presented to the 21st Conference of the Australian Association of Social Workers, Social Work in the Australian Context, Townsville.
- Scott, J.P. and Roberto, K.A. (1987), Informal Supports of Older Adults: A Rural-Urban Comparison, Family Relations: **Journal of Applied Family and Child Studies** 36, 444-49.
- Seebohm Report (1968), **Report of the Committee on Local Authority and Allied Personal Social Services (Cmnd. 3703)**, HMSO, London.
- Shinn, M., Lehmann, S. and Wong, N.W. (1984), **Journal of Social Issues** 40(4), 55-76.
- Shulman, N. (1976), Role Differentiation in Networks, **Sociological Focus** 9, 149-58.
- Shumaker, S.A. and Brownell, A. (1984), Toward a Theory of Social Support: Closing Conceptual Gaps, **Journal of Social Issues** 40(4), 11-36.
- Sklar, L.S. and Anisman, H. (1981), Stress and Cancer, **Psychological Bulletin** 89, 369-406.

- Smith, B. (1984), **Planning for Subsidised Welfare Services: The Needs of Remote Areas**, unpublished paper, Australian Department of Social Security, Mount Isa.
- (1986), **The Delivery of Personal Welfare Services to Small Remote Rural Towns**, unpublished paper, Department of Behavioural Sciences, James Cook University of North Queensland, Townsville.
- Smith, B., Adams, M. and Burgen, D. (1990), **Where to Now? Department of Social Security Payments and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities in Northern Australia**, Darwin.
- Smith, N. (1984), **Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space**, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- (1986), On the Necessity of Uneven Development, **International Journal of Urban and Regional Research** 10, 87-104.
- Smith, R.A. (ed.) (1978), **Manpower and Primary Health Care: Guidelines for Improving/Expanding Health Service Coverage in Developing Countries**, The University Press of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- Snowdon, G. (1982), The New Federalism: Remote Control for Remote Communities, in P.Loveday (ed.), **Service Delivery to Remote Communities**, The Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, 87-95.
- Sontag, S. (1978), **Illness as a Metaphore**, Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, N.Y.
- Sosa, R., Kennell, J., Klaus, M., Robertson, S. and Urrutia, J. (1980), The Effect of a Supportive Companion on Perinatal Problems, Length of Labour, and Mother-Infant Interaction, **New England Journal of Medicine** 303, 597-600.
- Speck, R.V. and Attneave, C. (1973), **Family Networks**, Pantheon, N.Y.
- Speck, R.V. and Rueveni, U. (1969), Network Therapy: A Developing Concept, **Family Process** 8, 182-91.
- Spinner, B. (1978), **Privacy Maintenance and Self-Disclosure**, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Spitz, R.A. (1946), Anaclitic Depression: An Inquiry into the Genesis of Psychiatric Conditions in Early Childhood II, **Psychoanalytic Study of the Child** 2, 313-42.
- Sprenkle, D.H. and Cyrus, C.L. (1983), Abandonment: The Stress of Sudden Divorce, in C.R. Figley and H.I. McCubbin (eds.), **Stress and the Family: Volume 2. Coping with Catastrophe**, Brunner/Mazel, N.Y., 53-75.
- Srole, L., Langner, T.S., Michael, S.T., Kirkpatrick, P., Opler, M.K. and Tennie, T.A.C. (1977), **Mental Health In the Metropolis**, Harper, N.Y.

- Stanley, O. (1982), Some Problems in the Provision of Banking Facilities, in P.Loveday (ed.), **Service Delivery to Remote Communities**, The Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, 50-55.
- Stimson, R.J. (1981), Problems of Living in Isolated Communities: The Eyre Peninsula and Port Lincoln, South Australia, in R.E. Lonsdale and J.H. Holmes (eds.), **Settlement Systems In Sparsely Populated Regions: The United States and Australia**, Pergamon Press, N.Y., 189-214.
- Stokols, D. and Shumaker, S.A. (1982), The Psychological Context of Residential Mobility and Well-Being, **Journal of Social Issues** 38(3), 149-171.
- Sturmey, R. (1989), **Research Needs In Rural/Remote Service Provision: Report to the Portfolio Analysis Unit of the Department of Community Services and Health on the Think Tank held at the University of New England on July 17 and 18, 1989**, The Rural Development Centre, the University of New England, Armidale, NSW.
- Suchman, E.A. (1965), Stages of Illness and Medical Care, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 6(Fall), 114-28.
- Sussman, M.B. (1959), The Isolated Nuclear Family: Fact or Fiction, **Social Problems** 6, 333-39.
- _____ (1965), Relationships of Adult Children with their Parents in the United States, in E.Shanas and G.F. Streib (eds.), **Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations**, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 62-92.
- Sussman, M.B., and Burchinal, L. (1962), Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualisations of Family Functioning, **Marriage and Family Living** 24, 231-40.
- Tartellin, T. (1984), **Availability of Welfare Services - Western Queensland**, unpublished paper presented to The Needs of the West Conference, Australian Rural Adjustment Unit, Townsville.
- Taylor, J.E. (1989), **Personal Communication**.
- Teasdale, J.D., and Fennel, M.J.V. (1982), Immediate Effects on Depression of Cognitive Therapy, **Cognitive Therapy and Research** 6, 343-52.
- The Aboriginal and Islanders Welfare Services Sub-committee, Mt Isa Welfare Council (undated), **The Needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People In the Mt Isa Region**, Mt Isa Welfare Council, Mt Isa.
- The Lord Chancellor's Legal Aid Advisory Committee (1983), **33rd Annual Report (1982-3)**, HMSO, London.

- The Secretariat, The Joint Officers' Committee of the Local Government Ministers' Conference (1980), **The Rural Local Government Study: An Analysis of the Functions and Finances of Rural Authorities**, AGPS, Canberra.
- Thoits, P.A. (1981), Undesirable Life Events and Psychophysiological Distress: A Problem of Operational Confounding, **American Sociological Review** 46, 97-109.
- _____ (1982a) Conceptual, Methodological, and Theoretical Problems in Studying Social Support as a Buffer Against Life Stress, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 23, 145-59. , 145-59.
- _____ (1982b), Life Stress, Social Support, and Psychological Vulnerability: Epidemiological Considerations, **Journal of Community Psychology** 10, 341-62.
- _____ (1983), Multiple Identities and Psychological Well-being: A Reformulation and Test of the Social Hypothesis, **American Sociological Review** 48, 174-87.
- Thomas, W. and Znaniecki, F. (1920), **The Polish Peasant in Europe and America**, Alfred A. Knopf, N.Y.
- Thomas, W.I. and Thomas, D.S. (1928), **The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs**, Knopf, N.Y.
- Todd, D.M. (1980), **Social Networks, Psychosocial Adaptation, and Preventive/Developmental Interventions: The Support Development Workshop**, paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal.
- Toffler, A. (1970), **Future Shock**, Bantam, N.Y.
- Tolsdorf, C.C. (1976), Social Networks, Support, and Coping: An Explanatory Study, **Family Process** 15, 407-17.
- Tomlinson, D.G. and Tannock, P.D. (1982), **Review of the Assistance for Isolated Children Scheme**, Commonwealth Department of Education, Canberra.
- Trattner, W. I. (1974), **The Background**, In W.I. Trattner, **From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America**, The Free Press, N.Y., 1-14.
- Turner, R.J. (1981), Experienced Social Support as a Contingency in Emotional Well-Being, **Journal of Health and Social Behavior** 22, 357-67.
- _____ (1983), Direct, Indirect, and Moderating Effects of Social Support on Psychological Distress and Associated Conditions, in H.B. Kaplan (ed.), **Psychosocial Stress: Trends in Theory and Research**, Academic Press, N.Y., 105-155.
- Urey, J.R. and Henggeler, S.W. (1983), Interaction in Rural Families, in A.W. Childs and G.B. Melton (eds), **Rural Psychology**, Plenum Press, 33-44.

- Vallance, T. (1977), **Indigenous Caregiving Networks in Primary Prevention**, Report on National Institute of Mental Health Grant No.MH14883.
- Vallance, T.R. and D'Augelli, A.R. (1982), The Helping Community: Characteristics of Natural Helpers, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 10, 197-205.
- Valle, R., and Vega, W. (1980), **Hispanic Natural Support Systems: Mental Health Promotion Perspectives**, State of California Department of Mental Health, Sacramento.
- Vaux, A. (1985), Variations in Social Support Associated with Gender, Ethnicity, and Age, **Journal of Social Issues** 41, 89-110.
- Vaux, A., and Athanassopoulou, M. (1987), Social Support Appraisals and Network Resources, **Journal of Community Psychology** 15, 537-55.
- Vega, W., and Mirand, M.R. (1985), **Stress and Hispanic Mental Health**, DHHS Publication No.ADM85-1410, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.
- Verco, D.J.A. and Whiteman, L.A. (1970), Equality of Opportunity in Education in Relation to Rural and City Children in New South Wales, in F.M. Katz and R.K. Browne (eds.), **Sociology and Education**, Macmillan, Sydney.
- Veroff, J.B. (1981), The Dynamics of Help-Seeking in Men and Women: A National Study, **Psychiatry** 44, 189-200.
- Veroff, J.B., Douvan, E., and Kulka, R.A. (1981), **The Inner American: A Self-portrait from 1957-1976**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- Wade-Marshall, D. (1982), And Deborah will Talk to the Women, in P.Loveday (ed.), **Service Delivery to Remote Communities**, The Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, 69-77.
- Wagenfeld, M.O. (1977), **Cultural Barriers to the Delivery of Mental Health Services in Rural Areas: A Conceptual Overview**, unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Rural Community Mental Health, National Institute of Mental Health, Rockville, Md.
- Wagenfeld, M.O. and Ozarin, L.D. (1982), Serving the Underserved through Rural Mental Health Programs, in H.C. Schulberg and M.Killilea (eds.), **The Modern Practice of Community Mental Health** Jossey-Bass, N.Y., 467-85.
- Walder, G. (1986), **Personal Communication**.
- Walker, K.N., MacBride, A. and Vachon, M.L.S. (1977), Social Support Networks and the Crisis of Bereavement, **Social Science and Medicine** 11, 35-41.
- Wallston, B.S., Alagna, S.W., DeVellis, B.M. and DeVellis, R.F. (1983), Social Support and Physical Health, **Health Psychology** 2, 367-91.

- Walmsley, D.J. (1980), **Social Justice and Australian Federalism: An Inquiry Into Territorial Justice and Life Chances In Australia**, Department of Geography, University of New England, Armidale.
- Walpole, R. (ed.), **Rural Health: A Blueprint for Improvement In the Rural Health Services of Australia**, Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, Melbourne.
- Ward, R.A., Sherman, S., and LaGory, M. (1984), Subjective Network Assessments and Subjective Well Being, **Journal of Gerontology** 39, 216-23.
- Warheit, G.J. (1979), Life Events, Coping, Stress and Depressive Symptomatology, **American Journal of Psychiatry** 136, 502-507.
- Warren, D.I. (1981), **Helping Networks**, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN.
- Webber, M.M. (1970), Order in Diversity: Community Without Propinquity, in R. Gutman and Peponoe (eds.), **Neighborhood, City and Metropolis**, Random House, N.Y., 791-811.
- Weisenfeld, A.R. and Weiss, H.M. (1979), A Mental Health Consultation Program for Beauticians, **Professional Psychology** 10, 786-92.
- Weisman, A.D. and Worden, J.W. (1975), Psychosocial Analysis of Cancer Deaths, **Omega** 6, 61-75.
- Weiss, N.S. (1973), Marital Status and Risk Factors for Coronary Heart Disease: The United States Health Examination Survey of Adults, **British Journal of Preventive Medicine** 27, 41-43.
- Weiss, R.S. (1969), The Fund of Sociability, **Transactions** 6, 36-43.
- _____ (1974), The Provisions of Social Relationships, in Rubin, Z. (ed.), **Doing Unto Others: Joining, Molding, Conforming, Helping, Loving**, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 17-26.
- _____ (1975), **Marital Separation**, Basic Books, N.Y.
- Wellman, B. (1979), The Community Question: The Intimate Networks of East Yorkers, **American Journal of Sociology** 84, 1201-31.
- _____ (1981), Applying Network Analysis to the Study of Support, in B.H. Gottlieb, B.H. (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support**, Sage, Beverly Hills, 171-200.
- _____ (1990), The Place of Kinfolk in Personal Community Networks, **Marriage and Family Review** 15(1-2), 195-228.
- Wellman, B., Craven, P., Whitaker, M., Stevens, H., Shorter, A., Du Toit, S., and Bakker, H. (1973), Community Ties and Support Systems: From Intimacy to Support, in L.S. Bourne, R.D. Mackinnon, and J.W. Simmons (eds.), **The Form of Cities In Central Canada**, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 152-67.

- Wellman, B. and Leighton, B. (1979), **Networks, Neighborhoods, and Communities: Approaches to the Study of the Community Question**, **Urban Affairs Quarterly** 14, 363-90.
- Wellman, B., and Wortley, S. (1989), **Brothers Keepers: Situating Kinship Relations in Broader Networks of Social Support**, **Sociological Perspectives** 32(3), 273-306.
- _____ (1990), **Different Strokes from Different Folks: Community Ties and Social Support**, **American Journal of Sociology** 96, 558-88.
- Wethington, E. and Kessler, R.C. (1986), **Perceived Support, Received Support, and Adjustment to Stressful Life Events**, **Journal of Health and Social Behaviour** 27, 78-89.
- Whittaker, J.K. (1983), **Mutual Helping in Human Service Practice**, in J.K. Whittaker, J. Garbarino and Associates, **Social Support Networks: Informal Helping in the Human Services**, Aldine, N.Y., 29-67.
- Whittaker, J.K., Garbarino, J. and Associates (1983), **Social Support Networks: Informal Helping in the Human Services**, Aldine Publishing Company, N.Y.
- Wilcox, B.L. (1981a), **Social Support in Adjusting to Marital Disruption: A Network Analysis**, in B.H. Gottlieb (ed.), **Social Networks and Social Support**, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, 97-115.
- _____ (1981b), **Social Support, Life Stress and Psychological Adjustment: A Test of the Buffering Hypothesis**, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 9, 371-86.
- Wilke, S.K., Kenkel, M.B. and Brown, R. (1984), **Rural Clergy's Attitudes and Activities in Primary Prevention**, **Journal of Rural Community Psychology** 5, 15-33.
- Williams, A.W., Ware Jr., J.W., and Donald, C.A. (1981), **A Model of Mental Health, Life Events, and Social Supports Applicable to General Populations**, **Journal of Health and Social Behaviour** 22, 324-36.
- Williams, C.R. (1981), **Open Cut: The Working Class in an Australian Mining Town**, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Williams, S. (1984), **Sustainable Rural Resettlement: The Report**, Australian Rural Adjustment Unit, University of New England, Armidale.
- Williamson, J.G. (1965), **Regional Inequality and the Process of National Development: A Description of Patterns**, **Economic Development and Cultural Change** 13(3), Part 2, 8-9.
- Willmott, P. (1986), **Social Networks, Informal Care and Public Policy**, Policy Studies Institute Research Report No.655, London.
- _____ (1987), **Friendship Networks and Social Support: A Study in a London Suburb**, Policy Studies Institute, London.
- Windschuttle, K. (1980), **Unemployment**, Revised Edition, Penguin, Ringwood.

- Winkler, R., and van Keppel, M. (1984), **Relinquishing Mothers In Adoption: Their Long-term Adjustment**, Institute of Family Studies Monograph No.3, Institute of Family Studies, Melbourne.
- Wooster, J.H. (1972), **Attitudes Toward Poverty, Social Services, and Adherence to the Protestant Ethic In a Rural Colorado Community**, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, Colorado.
- Wortman, C.B. and Dunkel-Schetter, C. (1979), Interpersonal Relationships and Cancer: A Theoretical Analysis, **Journal of Social Issues** 35(1), 120-55.
- York, R., Denton, R. and Moran, J. (1989), Rural and Urban Social Work Practice: Is There a Difference? **Social Casework** 70, 201-209.
- Young, C. (1977), **The Family Life Cycle, Australian Formation Project**, Monograph No.6, A.N.U., Canberra.
- Young, C.E., Giles Jr., D.E., and Plantz, M.C. (1982), Natural Networks: Help-giving and Help-seeking in Two Rural Communities, **American Journal of Community Psychology** 10, 457-69.
- Young, E.A. (1982), Aboriginal Community Stores, in P. Loveday (ed.), **Service Delivery to Remote Communities**, The Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, 62-68.
- Zapf, M.K. (1989), **Adjustment Experiences of Social Workers In Remote Northern Communities: A Study of Culture Shock**, unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Toronto.
- Zeller, S.H. (1987), Grieving for the Family Farm, **Human Services In the Rural Environment** 10, 27-29.
- Zimring, C.M. (1981), Stress and the Designed Environment, **Journal of Social Issues** 37(1), 145-71.
- Zola, I.K. (1964), Illness Behavior of the Working Class, in A.E. Shostak and W. Gomberg (eds.), **Blue Collar World: Studies of the American Worker**, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW AND RESPONSE SCHEDULES

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW AND RESPONSE SCHEDULES

NUMBER: _____

FAMILY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

=====

FAMILY IDENTIFICATION

FAMILY NUMBER....._____

TOWN NUMBER....._____

SHEET 1, COLUMN 4

Gulftown	1
Capeville	2
Bushland	3

FAMILY NUMBER....._____

SHEET 1, COLUMN 5

01-

DATA COLLECTION....._____

SHEET 1, COLUMN 7

Dry....1
Wet...2

=====

NUMBER: _ _ _ _

INTRODUCTION

Thankyou for agreeing to be included in this study which is funded by James Cook University. My own position is Lecturer in the Department of Behavioural Sciences.

I have now been studying life in remote areas for several years - how residents live, what's important them, what problems they have and so on.

This information is helping us to develop relevant and useful services. Right now I'm focussing on health, education and welfare, but I'll also be asking you about essential services such as roads and power supply.

To be realistic, people in remote areas will probably never receive exactly the same services as people in cities. So my thinking is that we have to find out when people living in remote areas would want to use the services of government departments and other organisations, and when they would prefer to help themselves or seek help from their relatives, friends or neighbours. Then we can develop services which will help residents to help themselves and each other better.

All that you tell me will be held in strictest confidence, and no person or place will be identified in my research reports. When the information you give me goes into the computer, everyone is given a number. Names of people and places are not entered.

In this interview I'd like to find out some things about your family and the people in it.

Before we finish I'll arrange times when I can see each of you by yourselves. These interviews will be to find out some things about the people who are important to you and where you would go for help if you had certain kinds of problems.

We know that life can be very different between the Wet and the Dry. So I'll be back in January or February next year to repeat the interviews.

NUMBER: _____

FAMILY MEMBERSHIP

I now want to find out who is in this immediate family. But first I'll explain what I mean by this.

There are two groups of people in an immediate family: the adults and the children. The adults are involved in raising the children on a more-or-less daily basis and both groups have a lot to do with each other because of this.

There might be someone else who is living in the house. They are not in the immediate family unless they are fairly heavily involved in raising the children on a day-to-day basis or unless they are a child who relies on the adults in the family to some extent.

Usually, all family members live in the same house. But some might often be away. Or they might often live somewhere else because of work, or school, or because that's just the way things are. Where an adult is often away from home, they are in the family only if they are involved in raising the children and if they have a lot to do with the other adults in the family because of this.

Where it is a child who is not always living at home, they are in the family only if the adults of the family are the people who are making the decisions which will probably have the biggest effects on the child's life in the long run. For example, these might be about their education, their religious upbringing, or where they live.

Only people who have been in the family for at least two years are included here. But of course, I also want to include children born in the last two years.

QUESTION 3: Now, with this in mind, who is in this immediate family?

SHEET 1, COLUMN 1:

First name and initial of family name.

Order: Oldest male childrearer, then other
childrearsers followed by children.
Both groups in chronological order.

QUESTION 4: Not counting children younger than 2, have any of these people been in this family for less than 2 years?

IF YES:

Delete from Sheet 1

QUESTION 5: Do all these people usually live in this house?

SHEET 1, COLUMN 2:

Yes1 ---> QUESTION 12

No..... ---> QUESTIONS 6 and 7

Unclear..... ---> QUESTIONS 6 and 7

NUMBER: ____

QUESTION 6: Which family members don't usually live in this house?

SHEET 1, COLUMN 2: No...2

QUESTION 7: Where does ____ (non-household family members) usually live?

SHEET 1, COLUMN 3: Place of Residence..... Unclear.....9
--

FOR ADULTS NOT USUALLY LIVING IN FAMILY RESIDENCE ('2' in Sheet 1, Column 2)

---> QUESTIONS 8 AND 9

QUESTION 8: Over the past two years, what part has ____ played in raising the children?

Discuss with family and decide whether childrearing role.

IF NO CHILDREARING ROLE: Delete from Sheet 1

QUESTION 9: Over the past two years, what kind of relationship has ____ had with ____ (other adult family members)?

IF NO INTENSE RELATIONSHIPS PARTLY FOCUSSED AROUND CHILDREARING: Delete from Sheet 1

FOR CHILDREN NOT USUALLY LIVING IN FAMILY RESIDENCE: ('2' in Sheet 1, Column 2)
--

---> QUESTIONS 10 AND 11

QUESTION 10: Over the past two years, who has been making the decisions which will probably have the biggest effects on ____'s life in the long run? Decisions about his/her education or religious upbringing, for example.

IF NOT BEING RAISED IN FAMILY: Delete from Sheet 1

NUMBER: _____

QUESTION 11: Over the past two years, has _____ been living in a family other than this one?

IF YES:

Discuss and decide which family has mainly be raising the child for previous 2 years.

If not this family: Delete from Sheet 1

FOR OLDER CHILDREN ---> QUESTIONS 12-14

QUESTION 12: Has _____ left school?

IF YES ---> QUESTIONS 13-14

IF NO ---> QUESTION 15

QUESTION 13: In your opinion, does _____ rely on _____ (apparent childrearsers) to some extent?

IF YES ---> QUESTION 15

IF NO ---> QUESTION 14

QUESTION 14: In your opinion, does _____ play an important part in raising _____ (younger children)?

IF NO:

Delete from Sheet 1

NUMBER: _____

QUESTION 15: Taking all this into account, your family has these people in it.

READ OUT LIST ON SHEET 1, COLUMN 1

Is there anyone else who you think is in this immediate family?

IF YES ---> QUESTION 16

IF NO ---> QUESTION 17

QUESTION 16: Who?

Discuss and decide whether member of immediate family.

IF FAMILY MEMBER:
Add to Sheet 1, Column 1**QUESTION 17:** Is there anyone on this list who you don't really think is a member of this family?

IF YES --> QUESTION 18

IF NO --> QUESTION 19

QUESTION 18: Who?

Discuss and decide whether member of immediate family.

IF NOT A FAMILY MEMBER:
Delete from Sheet 1

=====

SHEET 1, COLUMNS 4, 5 & 7: COMPLETE

SHEET 1, COLUMN 6: INDIVIDUAL CASE NUMBER: 001-

TRANSFER SHEET 1, COLUMNS 1 AND 4-7 TO SHEET 2, COLUMNS 1 AND 2

=====

NUMBER: ____

3 MONTHS RESIDENCE**QUESTION 19:** Have any of these people been living in _____ for less than 3 months?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 3:

Yes.....2

No1

=====

NUMBER: _____

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Now that we've worked out who's in the family, I would like to find out some things about each of you.

FAMILY POSITION

There are two kinds of people in a family.

Childrearsers are the people who are seen by the children and by people who know the family as raising the children, usually on a day-to-day basis. They are usually adults, and usually the parents of the children.

But sometimes, a family doesn't always live together. When they don't, the childrearsers are the people who are making those decisions which will probably have the biggest effects on the children's lives in the long run. For example, these might be about their education, their religious upbringing, or where they live. Where it is a child who does not always live in the family home, it is because the childrearsers believe that this is in the best interests of the child. If it were possible, both the child and the childrearsers would want to be living together.

QUESTION 20: Who are raising the children in this family?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 4:	
Childrearser.....	1

QUESTION 21: And who are the children being raised in the family?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 4:	
Child.....	2

QUESTION 22: Is there anyone who you aren't sure about whether they're a childrearser or a child?
Discuss and decide whether child or childrearser.

SHEET 2, COLUMN 4:	
Childrearser.....	1
Child.....	2
Unclear.....	9

NUMBER: _____

GENDER AND AGE

QUESTION 23: Is _____ male or female?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 5:

Male..... 1

Female..... 2

QUESTION 24: _____; how old are you?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 6:

Age to nearest year

SHEET 2, COLUMN 7:

Preschool child..... 1

Primary school child..... 2

High school child..... 3

Adult..... 4

CODE BORDERLINE CASES NOW

NUMBER: _____

FAMILY LIFE STAGE

WHERE NO 'CHILDREN' OLDER THAN HIGH SCHOOL AGE:
Enter Family Life Stage on Sheet 3, Column 2 ---> QUESTION 26

WHERE 'CHILDREN' OLDER THAN HIGH SCHOOL AGE ---> QUESTION 25

QUESTION 25: Is there anyone in this family who is older than school age and who still relies on _____ (childrears) to some extent?

IF YES ---> RECORD DETAILS BELOW

IF NO ---> QUESTION 26

[illegible]

Pre-school children only	2
Preschool and primary school children.....	3
Primary school children only.....	4
Primary and high school children.....	5
High school children only.....	6
High school children and children who have left school (Details below).....	7
Children who have left school only.....	8
Other family (Details below).....	10
Unclear (Details below).....	99

DETAILS	

11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533

NUMBER: _____

RESIDENTIAL LENGTH**QUESTION 26:** Of Individuals:

Roughly how long has _____ lived in _____, or within 50 kilometres of _____?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 8: To nearest year
--

QUESTION 27: Of Families:

I would like to know how long this family has been living in _____, as a family. If you were married here or started living together in _____, then we'll take this as the starting date.

Now; how long has this family lived in _____, or within 50 kilometers of _____, as a family?

SHEET 3, COLUMN 3: To nearest year
--

RESIDENTIAL PERMANENCE**QUESTION 28:** Of Individuals:

_____; do you expect to remain in _____, or within 50 kilometres of _____:

SHEET 2, COLUMN 9:	
Permanently.....	3
More-or-less permanently.....	2
Only temporarily.....	1
Unclear.....	9

QUESTION 29: Of Family:

If disagreement between childrearsers about their own residential permanence, discuss.

If still disagreement, code as 'unclear'.

SHEET 3, COLUMN 4:	
Permanently.....	3
More-or-less permanently.....	2
Only temporarily.....	1
Unclear.....	9

NUMBER: ____

ETHNICITY AND EDUCATION

QUESTION 30: ____; do you think of yourself as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 10:

No.....	1
Yes.....	2
Unclear.....	9

QUESTION 31: ____; what is the highest level of education you have reached so far?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 11:

Postgraduate Degree.....	5
Bachelors Degree or Graduate Diploma.....	4
Diploma, Trade, or other equivalent.....	3
Certificate/s.....	2
No qualifications; not still at school.....	1
Still at school.....	8
Unclear.....	9

NUMBER: _____

OCCUPATION, EMPLOYMENT MODE, EMPLOYING ORGANISATION

I'm now going to ask you a few questions about the main kind of work that you do. This is the work that takes up most of your working time. This might be work that you get paid for, or it might be work that you don't get paid for. But it should be work which contributes to the wider economy or which contributes to the welfare of your family, other people or to the community in general.

QUESTION 32: _____; what kind of work do you do?

_____; which of the following best describes it?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 12:

Professional.....	1
Semi-professional.....	2
Trade; technical.....	3
Administration.....	4
Clerical.....	5
Sales.....	6
Service (eg. in tourism, recreation, sport).....	7
Farming.....	8
Fishing.....	9
Transport.....	10
Home management.....	11
Other semi-skilled.....	12
Other unskilled.....	13
Other.....	14
None; unemployed.....	15
Combination.....	16
Unclear.....	99

QUESTION 33: _____; do you work for yourself or for someone else?**Sheet 2, Column 13:**

Self-employed.....	1
Employee.....	2
Home manager.....	3
Collective.....	4
Other.....	5
Not employed.....	6
Combination.....	7
Unclear.....	9

Self-employed: work in a private enterprise in which you have a substantial financial interest relative to other investors.

Employee: work in an organisation in which you have no or little financial interest relative to other investors.

NUMBER: ____

QUESTION 34: ____; what kind of organisation do you do this work in?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 14:

A private enterprise.....	1
Public service.....	2
Elected government position.....	3
Semi-government organisation.....	4
Community-based organisation.....	5
Other (details).....	6
Not employed.....	7
Other (Details).....	8
Unclear.....	9

FAMILY MEMBER	DETAILS

Private enterprise: an organisation privately owned by one or more individuals and/or organisations.
 Public service: a local, state, or federal government department, instrumentality, or semi-government instrumentality.

NUMBER: _ _ _ _

ABSENCE AND LOCATION

In remote areas, some people can spend a lot of time away from home.

The next two questions ask about this. In these questions I'm talking about the times when you are away from the family's home for 24 hours or more.

QUESTION 35: _____; how often are you away from this town for 24 hours or more?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 15:

- | | |
|---|---|
| I am never or rarely away from town..... | 1 |
| I am regularly away from town for 3-7 days at a time, on average at least twice each month..... | 2 |
| I am regularly away from town for 7 days or more. This adds up to around at least six weeks every six months..... | 3 |
| Other (Details)..... | 8 |
| Unclear..... | 9 |

PERSON	OTHER DETAILS

NUMBER: _____

QUESTION 36: _____; would you say that?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 16:

You are never or rarely away from home for 24 hours or more.....	1
You are frequently away from town for 24 hours or more, but usually within 50 kilometres of it.....	2
You are frequently more than 50 kilometres away from town for 24 hours or more.....	3
Other (Details).....	8
Unclear.....	9

PERSON	OTHER DETAILS

=====

NUMBER: _____

RESPONDENT FAMILY CHARACTERISTICSTRANSFER FAMILY CASE NUMBER FROM SHEET 1, COLUMNS 4,5,7 TO SHEET 3,
COL 1

Much of what you have just told me is about each of you as an individual. Now I want to ask some more things about you as a family.

FAMILY INCOME

QUESTION 37: Taking all possible sources into account, roughly how much money did this family earn, before tax, in the year ending 30th June, 1987?

SHEET 3, COLUMN 5:

Enter approximate amount

SHEET 3, COLUMN 6:

Less than \$5,000.....	1
5,000 - \$9,999.....	2
\$10,000 - \$14,999.....	3
\$15,000 - \$19,999.....	4
\$20,000 - \$24,999.....	5
\$25,000 - \$29,999.....	6
\$30,000 - \$34,999.....	7
\$35,000 - \$39,999.....	8
\$40,000 - \$44,999.....	10
\$45,000 - \$49,999.....	11
\$50,000 - \$54,999.....	12
\$55,000 - \$59,999.....	13
\$60,000 or more.....	14
Unclear.....	99

QUESTION 38: Who earns the most money in the family?

SHEET 2, COLUMN 17:

Main income earner.....	1
Other family members.....	2
Unclear.....	9

NUMBER: _____

FAMILY TYPE

QUESTION 39: How are the people in this family related?

Discuss filial relationships with respondents and classify.

SHEET 3, COLUMN 7:

Restricted Natural Family.....	1
Extended Natural Family.....	2
Restricted Step Family.....	3
Extended Step Family.....	4
Non-filial Family.....	5
Other (Details).....	8
Unclear.....	9

Restricted Natural Family: one or two childrearsers who (where there are two) apparently maintain a sexual relationship with each other, one or more of their joint natural offspring, and no other family members.

Extended Natural Family: a Restricted Natural Family with the addition of one or more childrearsers who have natural filial relationships with at least one member of the Restricted Natural Family.

Restricted Step Family: one or two childrearsers who (where there are two) apparently maintain a sexual relationship with each other, their joint natural offspring and/or at least one child who is the natural offspring of only one childrearser. This excludes Restricted Natural Families.

Extended Step Family: a Restricted Step Family with the addition of one or more childrearsers who have natural filial relationships with at least one member of the Restricted Step Family.

Non-filial Family: one or more members do not have a natural filial relationship with one or more others, and the family is neither a Restricted nor an Extended Step Family. (Details).

Other: none of the foregoing.

DETAILS

NUMBER: _____

ACCESS TO TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATION

QUESTION 40: How much access does this family have to a vehicle which is usually in good repair and which is suitable for long distance travel in local conditions at most times of the year?

SHEET 3, COLUMN 8:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Someone in this family owns such a vehicle..... | 1 |
| No-one in this family owns such a vehicle.
However, if the need arose, someone in the family
would have fairly immediate access to one..... | 2 |
| No-one in this family would have fairly immediate
access to such a vehicle if the need arose..... | 3 |

QUESTION 41: How much access does this family have to long-range communication devices?

SHEET 3, COLUMN 9:

- | | |
|---|---|
| There is a long-range two-way communication device in
the family home..... | 1 |
| The family home does not have a long-range
communication device. However, the family would have
immediate access to one in this town in an emergency..... | 2 |
| The family home does not have a long-range
communication device. Nor would the family have
immediate access to one in this town in an emergency..... | 3 |

=====

NUMBER: _____

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: CHILDREARERS=====
INTRODUCTION

The interview with your family was to find out some things about the people in it.

Now I would like to ask you some questions about the people who are important to you, and about where you would go for help if you had any problems.

This information is necessary if we are to develop sensible health, education and welfare services which take account of the particular lifestyles and circumstances of people living in remote areas.

All that you tell me will be held in strictest confidence, and no person or place will be identified in my research reports. When this information goes into the computer, everyone is given a number. No names are entered.

Do you have any questions before we start?

=====
SOCIAL NETWORK

QUESTION 1: Could you tell me those people who you have personal contact with and who are important to you?

Don't include people you have contact with only because you have to - for example, because of business or professional reasons.

These people might live here in _____, or they might live somewhere else. Your contact with them might be in person, or by telephone, or by writing to them. They might be people in your family, friends, people who live near here, or just other people that you have some personal contact with.

Don't leave people out just because you don't see them very often.

I'll ask the question again: Could you tell me those people who you have personal contact with and who are important to you?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 1: First name and initial of family name

This is your list. I want you to really make sure that you are happy with it.

QUESTION 2: Is there anyone who you think should not be on this list?

DELETE FROM SHEET 5, COLUMN 1

NUMBER: _____

QUESTION 3: Is there anyone else who you think should be on it?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 1 First name and initial of family name
--

SHEET 5, COLUMN 5: '1' for all intimates

RELATIONSHIP IMPORTANCE**QUESTION 4:** How important to you is _____?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 7:	
Extremely important.....	3
Important.....	2
Not especially important.....	1
Unclear.....	9

NUMBER: _____

SUPPORT SOURCES

I am going to ask you to imagine that you have certain kinds of problems while you are living here in _____. For each problem imagine that it is so serious that you think you have to do something about it. Also imagine that you are going to go somewhere for help with the problem.

What I want to know is who or where you would first go to for help with the problem. This might be different for different kinds of problems, but it could be the same person or place every time. It might be someone you know, or it might be someone you have never met before. It might not be a person at all - it might be a government department, or some kind of organisation. Or it might just be someone in a particular job - like a nurse or the flying doctor. It might be someone in your family, a friend, or someone else you know personally. It might be someone living here in _____, or close to here. Or they might be living somewhere else. And it doesn't matter if you would ask for their help by visiting them, ringing them up, or writing them a letter.

You might really think that you wouldn't want to get help from anywhere for the problem - that you would just want to keep it to yourself. If you think this, please say so - but only if you are absolutely certain that you would not try to get help from anywhere at all.

Remember:

- 1 Imagine you have the problem I tell you about, while you are living here in _____.
- 2 Imagine that the problem is so serious that you think you have to do something about it.
- 3 Imagine that you would go to someone or some place for help with the problem.
- 4 Tell me the very first person or place you would go to for help, no matter who or where it is.
- 5 If you think you would not go anywhere for help, please say so - but only if you believe it very strongly.

Do you have any questions before we go through the problems?

NUMBER: _____

FOR QUESTIONS 5-30:	
1	SHEET 4, COLUMN 2: External source..... 1 Self..... 2 Unclear..... 9
2	SHEET 4, COLUMN 3: First name and initial of source's family name Position and/or organisation Self..... 2 Unclear..... 9
3	SHEET 4, COLUMN 4: WHY THE SOURCE
4	SHEET 4, COLUMN 5: METHOD OF SUPPORT-SEEKING Face-to-Face Interaction..... 1 Telephone..... 2 Correspondence..... 3 Indirect..... 4 Combination..... 5 (1/2/3/4) Unclear..... 9
5	SHEET 4, COLUMN 6: HOW MUCH CONTRIBUTION Their help would not contribute to solving the problem at all Their help would solve the problem entirely Unclear..... 9

Indirect Contact: contact initially occurring through another person, or intermediary. This has to be for the sole purpose of establishing contact of an acceptable kind to the respondent with the anticipated source of support. Contact of an acceptable kind includes the respondent asking the intermediary to introduce them to the anticipated support source, or otherwise establishing rapport between them.

NUMBER: _____

SHARING TASKS

- QUESTION 5**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in coping if it looked like _____ (partner) was going to be incapacitated for a few weeks?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your coping with this situation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 6**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in coping if it looked like someone in your family was going to be incapacitated for several months or longer?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your coping with this situation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 7**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the children on a daily basis, over a period of several months?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the children?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 8**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the children on a daily basis, but only for a few weeks?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the children?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

NUMBER: _____

- QUESTION 9**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the children from time to time, over a period of several months?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the children?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 10**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the children from time to time, but only for a few weeks?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the children?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 11**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the house, over a period of several months?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the house?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 12**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the house, but only for a few weeks?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the house?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

NUMBER: _____

PROBLEM-SOLVING ASSISTANCE AND/OR INTERVENTION

- QUESTION 13**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help with a family health problem?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward your handling this health problem?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 14**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help if you were worried about how one of your children was going with their school work?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward your solving these problems with school work?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 15**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help if you thought there were problems between _____ and _____ (childrearsers)?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 16**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help if you were worried about how one of your children was developing psychologically or socially?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

NUMBER: _____

- QUESTION 17**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help with a problem inside yourself - like feeling depressed, or that you weren't getting along with other people?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward your solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 18**
- a Where would you first go for help with finding temporary accomodation if you or your family suddenly found that you had nowhere to live?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your finding temporary accomodation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 19**
- a Where would you first go for help with finding permanent accomodation if you or your family suddenly found that you had nowhere to live?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your finding permanent accomodation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 20**
- a Where would you first go for help with obtaining basic necessities such as money, food, or clothing if you or your family were temporarily destitute?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your obtaining these basic necessities?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

NUMBER: _____

- QUESTION 21**
- a Where would you first go for help with obtaining basic necessities such as money, food, or clothing if it looked like you or your family were going to be destitute for some time?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your obtaining these basic necessities?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 22**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help with a family or personal legal problem?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward your handling this legal problem?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 23**
- a Where would you first go for help in finding work if you were unemployed and wanted a job?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your finding work?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

REPRESENTATION

- QUESTION 24**
- a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the health services provided to this town?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____ ?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this representation?
 - d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about these health services?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

NUMBER: _____

QUESTION 25 a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the education services provided to this town?

b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____?

c How would you contact _____ for this representation?

d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about these education services?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

QUESTION 26 a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the child care services provided in this town?

b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____?

c How would you contact _____ for this representation?

d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about these child care services?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

QUESTION 27 a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the unemployment situation in this town?

b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____?

c How would you contact _____ for this representation?

d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about the unemployment situation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

QUESTION 28 a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the essential services provided to this region such as electricity, water, transport, or the state of the roads?

b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____?

c How would you contact _____ for this representation?

d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about these essential services?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

NUMBER: _____

EMOTIONAL ASSISTANCE

- QUESTION 29** a Where would you first go for help if you felt that no-one liked you, cared for you, understood you, or valued you simply because you are you; someone you could trust enough to bare your soul to?
- b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
- c How would you contact _____ for this help?
- d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

SOCIAL INTEGRATION

- QUESTION 30** a Where would you first go for help if you felt all alone in the world, that no-one could possibly see things the way that you do, and that there was no-one out there who would come to your aid if the need arose?
- b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
- c How would you contact _____ for this help?
- d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

SHEET 5, COLUMN 1:

Transfer source names from SHEET 4, COLUMN 3

Ensure no duplication on SHEET 5

SHEET 5, COLUMN 6:

Listed as Support Source.....	1
Not listed as Support Source.....	2

SHEET 5, COLUMN 5:

Listed as Intimate.....	1
Not listed as Intimate.....	2

=====

NUMBER: _____

INTIMATE AND SUPPORT SOURCE IDENTIFICATION

I want to make sure that I don't mistake any of the people you've mentioned for someone else. To do this, I have to write down the first name of at least one person they live with, like their husband or wife, or their mother or father.

But remember, no-one but you and I will ever know who they are. When this information goes into the computer, everyone is given a number. No names are entered.

QUESTION 31: Could you please tell me the first name and the initial of the family name of someone that each of these people lives with - like their husband or wife, or their parents?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 2:

First name and second initial

Live alone or not applicable.....	2
Unclear.....	9

QUESTION 32: Which of these people are in the same immediate family as each other?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 4:

Name of person in same immediate family

=====

INFORMATION ABOUT INTIMATES AND SUPPORT SOURCES

Now I would like to know some more about each of these people and your relationships with them.

RELATIONSHIP DURATION AND PERMANENCE

QUESTION 33: How long have you known _____?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 8:

Nearest year (starting with '0')

Never met..... 98

Unclear..... 99

QUESTION 34: Do you think you will continue to have personal contact with _____ for many years to come?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 9:

Yes..... 3

Probably..... 2

No..... 1

Unclear..... 9

CONTACT MODE

QUESTION 35: Over the past two years, how have you and _____ usually got in touch with each other?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 10:

No direct contact..... 1

Correspondence..... 2

Telephone, 2-way, telegram..... 3

Correspondence; and telephone, 2-way and/or telegram..... 4

Face-to-face..... 5

Correspondence; and face-to-face..... 6

Telephone, 2-way and/or telegram; and face-to-face..... 7

Correspondence; and telephone, 2-way and/or telegram; and face-to-face..... 8

Unclear..... 9

NUMBER: _____ 658

GENDER, AGE AND ETHNICITY

QUESTION 36: Is _____ male or female?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 11:

Male.....	1
Female.....	2

QUESTION 37: How old is _____?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 12:

Age to nearest year

Unclear.....99

QUESTION 38: Would _____ think of him/herself as:

SHEET 5, COLUMN 14:

Neither Aboriginal nor Torres Strait Islander.....	1
Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.....	2
Unclear.....	9

QUESTION 40: Does _____ work for themselves or for someone else?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 16:

Self-employed.....	1
Employee.....	2
Home manager.....	3
Collective group.....	4
Other.....	5
None; unemployed.....	6
Combination.....	7
Unclear.....	9

Self-employed: work in a private enterprise in which alter has a substantial financial interest relative to other investors.

Employee: work in an organisation in which alter has no or little financial interest relative to other investors.

QUESTION 41: What kind of organisation does _____ do this work in?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 17:

A private enterprise.....	1
Public service.....	2
Elected government position.....	3
Semi-government organisation.....	4
Community-based organisation.....	5
Other (details).....	6
None; unemployed.....	7
Unclear.....	9

ALTER	DETAILS

Private enterprise: an organisation privately owned by one or more individuals and/or organisations.

Public service: a local, state, or federal government department, instrumentality, or semi-government instrumentality.

KINSHIP

Now I would like to know who on this list is a relative of yours.

QUESTION 42: Which of the following best describes your relationship with _____?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 18:

- | | |
|---|---|
| _____ is in your immediate family..... | 1 |
| _____ was once in this immediate family..... | 2 |
| You were once in the same immediate family as _____..... | 3 |
| Someone in your present immediate family once lived
in the same immediate family as _____..... | 4 |
| Other nuclear family of kin specified in values 3 or 4..... | 5 |
| Other kin..... | 6 |
| Not kin..... | 7 |
| <hr/> | |
| Unclear..... | 9 |

PLACE AND LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

QUESTION 43: Where does _____ usually live?

Discuss and, where relevant, help respondent decide.

SHEET 5, COLUMN 19
Place of residence

Unclear..... 9

QUESTION 44: Roughly how far is this from _____ (respondent's town)?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 20:

- | | |
|--|---|
| In _____..... | 1 |
| Outside of, but less than 100 kilometres from _____..... | 2 |
| 100-299km from _____..... | 3 |
| 300-499km from _____..... | 4 |
| 500-999km from _____..... | 5 |
| 1000km from _____; Australia, TSI, or PNG..... | 6 |
| Not Australia, TSI, or PNG..... | 7 |
| Transient..... | 8 |
| Unclear..... | 9 |

NUMBER: _____ 662

QUESTION 45: Roughly how many people live there?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 21:	
0-99 people.....	1
100-399 people.....	2
400-999 people.....	3
1,000-9,999 people.....	4
10,000-49,999 people.....	5
50,000-119,999 people.....	6
12,000 or more people.....	7
Unclear.....	9

QUESTION 46: Roughly how long has _____ (intimate/source) lived in _____,
or within approximately 50 kilometres of _____?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 22:	
To closest year	
Unclear.....	99

=====

INFORMATION ABOUT INTIMATES' AND SOURCES' LIVING GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

DEFINITION OF 'LIVING GROUP'

Not everyone lives in an immediate family. People can also live alone. Or they can be married or kind of married to someone else but without children. Or they can live in the same house with some other people.

The people that someone lives with is called a living group. In a living group, the people live in the same home, they share their money, they share important parts of their lives, and they are important to each other on a personal level.

Just because some people are living in the same home, it doesn't mean they are a living group. For example, young people who are simply sharing a house probably won't be a living group. And a boarder who lives with a married couple probably won't be part of their living group.

Are you clear about what a living group is?

KIND OF LIVING GROUP

QUESTION 47: Now, what kind of group does _____ live with?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 23:

An immediate family which includes dependent children.....	1
An intimate couple without dependent children.....	2
They live alone.....	3
Other (details).....	4
Unclear.....	9

ALTER	DESCRIPTION OF LIVING GROUP

LIVING GROUP POSITION

QUESTION 48: In the group that _____ lives with, is s/he:

SHEET 5, COLUMN 24:

Heavily involved in raising children.....	1
A dependent child.....	2
Neither a child nor heavily involved in raising children.....	3
Unclear.....	9

RESIDENTIAL LENGTH

You said that _____ lives in or near _____. (Sheet 5, Column 19).

QUESTION 49: Out of all the people in _____'s living group, who has lived in or within 50km of _____ the longest, and how long have they lived there?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 25:

To nearest year

Unclear..... 99

ETHNICITY

QUESTION 50: Which of the following best describes the ethnic origin of the people in _____'s family?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 26:

No family member identifies themselves as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander.....	1
One or more family members identify themselves as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander.....	2
All family members identify themselves as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander.....	3
Other (details).....	4

Unclear

LIVING GROUP LIFE STAGE

QUESTION 51: Which of the following best describes the stage that ____'s living group is at?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 27:

Intimate couple intending to have children.....	1
Pre-school children only.....	2
Preschool and primary school children.....	3
Primary school children only.....	4
Primary and high school children.....	5
High school children only.....	6
High school children and children who have left school (details).....	7
Children who have left school only.....	8
Couple who have had children in the past.....	9
Other family (details).....	10
Other solo (details).....	11
Other couple (details).....	12
Other living group (details).....	13
Unclear (details).....	99

DETAILS

NUMBER: _____ 666

LIVING GROUP OCCUPATION, EMPLOYMENT MODE, EMPLOYING ORGANISATION

Now I'm going to ask you about the work of the person who earns the most money in the groups these people live with.

QUESTION 52: What is the main kind of work of the person who earns the most money in _____'s living group?
Which of the following best describes it?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 28:

Professional.....	1
Semi-professional.....	2
Trade or technical.....	3
Administrative.....	4
Clerical.....	5
Sales.....	6
Service (eg. in tourism, recreation, sport).....	7
Farming.....	8
Fishing.....	9
Transport work.....	10
Home management.....	11
Other semi-skilled.....	12
Other unskilled.....	13
Other.....	14
None; unemployed.....	15
Combination.....	16
Unclear.....	99

ALTER	DETAILS

QUESTION 53: Does s/he work for themselves or for someone else?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 29:

Self-employed.....	1
Employee.....	2
Home manager.....	3
Collective group.....	4
Other.....	5
None; unemployed.....	6
Combination.....	7
Unclear.....	9

Self-employed: work in a private enterprise in which alter has a substantial financial interest relative to other investors.

Employee: work in an organisation in which alter has noor little financial interest relative to other investors.

QUESTION 54: What kind of organisation does s/he do this work in?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 30:

A private enterprise.....	1
Public service.....	2
Elected government position.....	3
Semi-government organisation.....	4
Community-based organisation.....	5
Other (details).....	6
None; unemployed.....	7
Unclear.....	9

ALTER	DETAILS

Private enterprise: an organisation privately owned by one or more individuals and/or organisations.

Public service: a local, state, or federal government department, instrumentality, or semi-government instrumentality.

=====

NUMBER: _____ 668

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT SUPPORT SOURCES AND THEIR
LIVING GROUPS**

SHEET 5, COLUMN 6: '1'

And finally, just a little more about the people you thought you would turn to for assistance.

FORMAL SUPPORT POSITIONS

QUESTION 55: Does _____ do any kind of paid or unpaid work which involves helping people with personal, family or community problems?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 31:

Yes..... 1
No..... 2

Unclear..... 9

SOURCE	FORMAL SUPPORT POSITIONS

NUMBER: _____ 670

OTHER FORMAL POSITIONS IN SOURCES' LIVING GROUPS

QUESTION 58: Apart from _____, does anyone in the group that they live with do any other kind of paid or unpaid work for any organisation which is not part of their normal paid employment?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 34:

Yes.....	1
No.....	2
Unclear.....	9

SOURCE	OTHER FORMAL POSITIONS

=====

INTIMATE/SOURCE NETWORK DENSITY

CONSTRUCT SHEET 6: From Sheet 5, Column 1

Now, I would like to know how much these people have to do with each other. We will take each pair in turn.

QUESTION 59: Do _____ and _____ have personal contact and is either of them important to the other?

They might contact each other face-to-face, by writing, by telephone, or by some combination of these. They might contact each other often or only now-and-then.

Do _____ and _____ have personal contact and is either of them important to the other?

SHEET 6:

Link.....	1
No Link.....	2
Unclear.....	9

=====

Once again, thank you for very much for the time and effort you have put into helping us with this study. Research such as this is now contributing to the development of policies and services which are specially geared to people who live in the more remote areas of Australia.

I will be compiling a report of the results and implications of this research toward the end of next year.

Would you be interested in receiving a copy?

IF SO:

Record name and mailing address below

NAME	ADDRESS

=====

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: ADOLESCENTS

With two exceptions, the Adolescent Interview Schedule was identical to the Childrearer Interview Schedule.

- 1 Adolescents were only asked about seven need situations: education problems (Question 14); psychological problems (Question 17); personal unemployment (Question 23); education as a community issue (Question 25); unemployment as a community issue (Question 27); emotional problems (Question 29); and social integration problems (Question 30).
- 2 The wording of Question 14 was changed slightly to read:
 - (a) Where would you first go for advice or help if you were worried about how you were going with your school work?
 - (b) What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - (c) How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - (d) How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward your solving these problems with your school work?

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

- NOTES:** 1 The interview schedule for childrearsers was modified for primary school children. Only those sections which were modified are reproduced here.
- 2 Questions about intimates/sources and the child's relationships with them were addressed to the interview assistant.

INTRODUCTION

_____; I want to ask you some questions about the people who are most important to you, and about who you would go to for help if you had any big problems.

_____ will help you to understand my questions and help me to understand your answers.

How we'll do this is that I'll ask you and _____ the question. Then _____ will help you to work out what I want to know. Then both of you can work out your answer and tell me what it is.

Whatever you tell me will always be a secret between you, me and _____.

SOCIAL NETWORK

QUESTION 1: Who are the people you have something to do with and who are most important to you?

Don't include people you have something to do with only because you have to - like your school teacher.

These people might live here in _____, or they might live somewhere else. You might visit them, or ring them up, or write letters to them. They might be people in your family, or they might be your friends, or they might just be people you have something to do with and who are important to you.

Don't leave people out just because you don't see them very much.

I'll ask the question again: Who are the people you have something to do with and who are most important to you?

SUPPORT SOURCES

Now I want you to imagine that you have certain kinds of problems while you are living here in _____. For each problem imagine that it is so big that you think you have to do something about it.

Also imagine that you are going to go somewhere for help with the problem.

What I want to know is who or where you would first go to for help with the problem. This might be different for different kinds of problems, but it could be the same person or place every time. It might be someone you know, or it might be someone you have never met before. It might not be a person at all - it might be some place like your school or your church. Or it might be someone like a nurse, or the flying doctor, or your school teacher. It might be someone in your family, a friend, or someone else you know. It might be someone living here in _____, or close to here. Or they might be living somewhere else. And it doesn't matter if you would get their help by visiting them, ringing them up, or writing them a letter.

You might really think that you wouldn't want to get help from anywhere for the problem - that you would just want to fix up the problem by yourself. If you think this, tell me - but only if you are really sure that you would not try to get help from anyone at all.

Remember:

- 1 Imagine you have the problem I tell you about, while you are living here in _____.
- 2 Imagine that the problem is big enough that you think you have to do something about it.
- 3 Imagine that you would go to someone for help with the problem.
- 4 Tell me the very first person you would go to for help, no matter who it is.
- 5 If you think you would not go anywhere at all for help, say so - but only if you really think this.

Do you have any questions before we go through the problems?

- QUESTION 14**
- a Where would you first go for help if you were worried about how you were going at school?
 - b Why would you ask _____ for this help?
 - c How would you get in touch with _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____ would be able to help you with the problems in your school work?

- QUESTION 17**
- a Where would you first go for help if you were really upset about something, or if you were having big fights with your friends?
 - b Why would you ask _____ for this help?
 - c How would you get in touch with _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____ would be able to help you with these problems?

- QUESTION 29** a Where would you first go for help if you felt that no-one liked you, or cared for you, or understood you; someone you trusted a real lot?
- b Why would you ask _____ for this help?
- c How would you get in touch with _____ for this help?
- d How much do you think _____ would be able to help you with these problems?

- QUESTION 30** a Where would you first go for help if you felt very lonely and scared?
- b Why would you ask _____ for this help?
- c How would you get in touch with _____ for this help?
- d How much do you think _____ would be able to help you with these problems?

INTIMATE AND SUPPORT SOURCE IDENTIFICATION

Now I have to write down the first name of someone that each of these people lives with, like their mother or father, or their husband or wife.

But remember, who these people are and what you tell me about them will always be a secret between you, me and _____.

- QUESTION 31:** Could you please tell me the first name of someone that each of these people lives with?

-
- QUESTION 34:** Do you think you will continue to have something to do with _____ for many years to come?

- QUESTION 36:** Is _____ a man/woman or a boy/girl?
-

KINSHIP

Now I would like to know who on this list is a relative of _____'s.

- QUESTION 42:** Which of the following best describes _____'s relationship with _____?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 18:

- | | |
|---|---|
| _____ is in _____'s immediate family..... | 1 |
| _____ was once in _____'s immediate family..... | 2 |
| _____ was once in the same immediate family as _____..... | 3 |
| Someone in _____'s present immediate family once lived in the same immediate family as _____..... | 4 |
| Other nuclear family of kin specified in values 3 or 4..... | 5 |
| Other kin..... | 6 |
| Not kin..... | 7 |
| Unclear..... | 9 |
-

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT SUPPORT SOURCES AND THEIR
LIVING GROUPS**

And finally, just a little more about the people you thought _____ would turn to for assistance.

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

- NOTES:**
- 1 Interview schedules for childrearsers were modified for interviews with preschool children.
 - 2 Only sections which were modified are reproduced here.
 - 3 Questions were addressed to the interview assistant.

INTRODUCTION

Thankyou for volunteering to be interviewed about _____.

I would like to ask you some questions about the people who are important to _____, and about where _____ would go for help if s/he had any problems.

All that you tell me will be held in strictest confidence, and no person or place will be identified in my research reports. When this information goes into the computer, everyone is given a number. No names are entered.

Do you have any questions before we start?

SOCIAL NETWORK

QUESTION 1: Could you tell me those people who _____ has personal contact with and who are important to him/her?

Don't include people _____ has contact with only because s/he has to - for example, because they are friends of his/her mother or father.

These people might live here in _____, or they might live somewhere else. _____'s contact with them might be in person, or by telephone, or by writing to them. They might be people in _____'s family, friends, people who live near here, or just other people that s/he has some personal contact with.

Don't leave people out just because _____ doesn't see them very often.

I'll ask the question again: Could you tell me those people who _____ has personal contact with and who are important to him/her?

This is your list. I want you to really make sure that you are happy with it.

QUESTION 4: How important to _____ is _____?

SUPPORT SOURCES

I am going to ask you to imagine that _____ has certain kinds of problems while s/he is living here in _____. For each problem imagine that it is so serious that something has to be done about it. Also imagine that _____ is going to go somewhere for help with the problem.

What I want to know is who or where you think _____ would first go to for help with the problem. This might be different for different kinds of problems, but it could be the same person or place every time. It might be someone _____ knows, or it might be someone s/he has never met before. It might not be a person at all - it might be a government department, or some kind of organisation. Or it might just be someone in a particular job - like a nurse or the flying doctor. It might be someone in _____'s family, a friend, or someone else s/he knows personally. It might be someone living here in _____, or close to here. Or they might be living somewhere else. And it doesn't matter if _____ would ask for their help by visiting them, ringing them up, or writing them a letter.

You might really think that _____ wouldn't want to get help from anywhere for the problem - that s/he would just want to keep it to him/herself. If you think this, please say so - but only if you are absolutely certain that _____ would not try to get help from anywhere at all.

Remember:

- 1 Imagine _____ has the problem I tell you about, while s/he is living here in _____.
- 2 Imagine that the problem is so serious that something has to be done about it.
- 3 Imagine that _____ would go to someone or some place for help with the problem.
- 4 Tell me the very first person or place you think _____ would go to for help, no matter who or where it is.
- 5 If you think _____ would not go anywhere for help, please say so - but only if you believe it very strongly.

Do you have any questions before we go through the problems?

- QUESTION 17** a Where do you think _____ would first go for help with a problem inside him/herself - like feeling depressed, or that s/he wasn't getting along with other people?
 b What do you think is the main reason why _____ would first go to _____ for this help?
 c How do you think _____ would contact _____ for this help?
 d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward solving these problems?
- QUESTION 29** a Where do you think _____ would first go for help if s/he felt that no-one liked him/her, cared for him/her, understood him/her, or valued him/her simply because s/he is him/her; someone _____ trusted a lot?
 b What do you think is the main reason why _____ would first go to _____ for this help?
 c How do you think _____ would contact _____ for this help?
 d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward solving these problems?
- QUESTION 30** a Where do you think _____ would you first go for help if s/he felt very lonely and scared?
 b What do you think is the main reason why _____ would first go to _____ for this help?
 c How do you think _____ would contact _____ for this help?
 d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward solving these problems?

INFORMATION ABOUT INTIMATES AND SUPPORT SOURCES

Now I would like to know some more about each of these people and _____'s relationships with them.

QUESTION 33: How long has _____ known _____?

QUESTION 34: Do you think _____ will continue to have personal contact with _____ for many years to come?

QUESTION 35: Over the past two years, how have _____ and _____ usually got in touch with each other?

KINSHIP

Now I would like to know who on this list is a relative of ____'s.

QUESTION 42: Which of the following best describes ____'s relationship with ____?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 18:

- | | |
|--|---|
| ____ is in ____'s immediate family..... | 1 |
| ____ was once in ____'s immediate family..... | 2 |
| ____ was once in the same immediate family as ____..... | 3 |
| Someone in ____'s present immediate family once lived
in the same immediate family as ____..... | 4 |
| Other nuclear family of kin specified in values 3 or 4..... | 5 |
| Other kin..... | 6 |
| Not kin..... | 7 |
| Unclear..... | 9 |

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT SUPPORT SOURCES AND THEIR
LIVING GROUPS

And finally, just a little more about the people you thought ____ would turn to for assistance.

FAMILY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE - WET SEASON**INTRODUCTION**

Again, thank you for being involved in this study. My interviews this time will be much shorter than last time - this interview should only take a few minutes and individual interviews will take about half an hour for adults and only a few minutes for each of the children.

As I had hoped, the information emerging from this research will be useful in helping us to develop relevant and useful human services for people living in remote areas.

You will remember that I'm trying to find out when people living in remote areas would want to use the services of government departments and other organisations, and when they would prefer to help themselves or seek help from their relatives, friends or neighbours. Armed with this information we can then develop services which will help residents to help themselves and each other better.

As with the other interviews, all that you tell me will be held in strictest confidence, and no person or place will be identified in my research reports. When the information you give me goes into the computer, everyone is given a number. Names of people and places are not entered.

First of all, I'd like to see if anything has changed in the family since I last saw you.

CHANGES TO FAMILY MEMBERSHIP

When I saw you last time we decided that this family had these people in it.

SHOW SHEET 1 TO RESPONDENTS

QUESTION 1: Since then, has anyone else joined this immediate family?

IF YES: Check whether family member according to
Family Interview Schedule, Questions 4-18

SHEET 1: ENTER NEW MEMBERS

QUESTION 2: Since the last interview, has anyone left this immediate family?

IF YES: Check whether no longer a family member according to
Family Interview Schedule, Questions 4-18

COMPLETE SHEET 1, COLUMN 7

Family member in Dry and Wet.....	1
Family member in Dry Only.....	2
Family member in Wet Only.....	3

SHEET 2W: FOR NEW FAMILY MEMBERS

1 Add
2 Allocate town, family and Wet case numbers
3 Complete Sheet 2W according to Family Interview
Schedule Questions 19-36

SHEET 2, COLUMN 1:

Note people who are no longer family members

=====

CHANGES TO FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

QUESTION 3: Has anything changed in the family since I last saw you?

SHEET 3:

Check all information
Record changes

SHEET 3, COLUMN 10:

Family included in Dry and Wet samples.... 1
Family included in Dry sample only..... 2
Family included in Wet sample only..... 3

=====

CHANGES TO INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS

QUESTION 4: Apart from their ages, has anything changed about the people in the family since I last saw you?

SHEET 2:

Check all information
Record changes (apart from age)

=====

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: CHILDREARERS - WET

SHORT/LONG

STANDARD/REPEAT

=====

INTRODUCTION

This interview is similar to the one we did last time. It concerns the the people who are important to you, and where you would go for help if you had any problems.

This information is necessary if we are to develop sensible health, education and welfare services which take account of the particular lifestyles and circumstances of people living in remote areas.

All that you tell me will be held in strictest confidence, and no person or place will be identified in my research reports. When this information goes into the computer, everyone is given a number. No names are entered.

Do you have any questions before we start?

=====

SOCIAL NETWORK

When I saw you last time, you said that these were the people who you have personal contact with and who are important to you.

SHEET 5: SHOW TO RESPONDENT

Is this list the same in the Wet season or does it change in any ways?

QUESTION 1: Would you add any people to this list during the Wet season?

Remember; we are not including people you have contact with only because you have to - for example, because of business or professional reasons.

We are including people who live here in _____, or who are living somewhere else. Your contact with them might be in person, or by telephone, or by writing to them. They might be people in your family, friends, people who live near here, or just other people that you have some personal contact with.

Don't leave people out just because you don't see them very often.

I'll ask the question again: In the Wet season, is there anyone you would add to your list of people who you have personal contact with and who are important to you?

NEW INTIMATES: ADD TO SHEET 5

QUESTION 2: Now; which people on this list are important to you during both the Dry season and the Wet season?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 61:
Dry and Wet intimates...1

QUESTION 3: And which people on this list are important to you only during the Dry season?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 61:
Dry intimates...2

QUESTION 4: And which of these people are important to you only during the Wet season?

SHEET 5, COLUMN 61:
Wet intimates...3

=====

SUPPORT SOURCES - SHORT FORM

As with the last interview, I am going to ask you to imagine that you have certain kinds of problems while you are living here in _____. But this time I want you to imagine that the problems occur during the Wet season. For each problem imagine that it is so serious that you think you have to do something about it. Also imagine that you are going to go somewhere for help with the problem, again, during the Wet season.

For each problem, I will tell you what you told me during the Dry season about who you would go to for help with the problem, why, and how you would contact them. I will then ask you the same questions in relation to the Wet season: who would you go to for help with each problem? why? and how would you contact them?

Remember; what I want to know is who or where you would first go to for help with the problem during the Wet season. This might be different for different kinds of problems, but it could be the same person or place every time. It might be someone you know, or it might be someone you have never met before. It might not be a person at all - it might be a government department, or some kind of organisation. Or it might just be someone in a particular job - like a nurse or the flying doctor. It might be someone in your family, a friend, or someone else you know personally. It might be someone living here in _____, or close to here. Or they might be living somewhere else. And it doesn't matter if you would ask for their help by visiting them, ringing them up, or writing them a letter.

You might really think that you wouldn't want to get help from anywhere for the problem - that you would just want to keep it to yourself. If you think this, please say so - but only if you are absolutely certain that you would not try to get help from anywhere at all.

Remember:

- 1 Imagine you have the problem I tell you about, while you are living here in _____, during the Wet season.
- 2 Imagine that the problem is so serious that you think you have to do something about it, during the Wet season.
- 3 Imagine that you would go to someone or some place for help with the problem, during the Wet season.
- 4 Tell me the very first person or place you would go to for help during the Wet season, no matter who or where it is.
- 5 If you think you would not go anywhere for help during the Wet season, please say so - but only if you believe it very strongly.

Do you have any questions before we go through the problems?

FOR QUESTIONS 5-30:

- 1 Ask Part 'a' of the question
- 2 Remind respondent of their answer in the Dry
- 3 Ask Part 'a' again
- 4 Ask Parts 'b' to 'd'

=====

NUMBER: _____

SUPPORT SOURCES - LONG FORM

As with the last interview, I am going to ask you to imagine that you have certain kinds of problems while you are living here in _____. But this time I want you to imagine that the problems occur during the Wet season. For each problem imagine that it is so serious that you think you have to do something about it. Also imagine that you are going to go somewhere for help with the problem, again, during the Wet season.

What I want to know is who or where you would first go to for help with the problem during the Wet season. This might be different for different kinds of problems, but it could be the same person or place every time. It might be someone you know, or it might be someone you have never met before. It might not be a person at all - it might be a government department, or some kind of organisation. Or it might just be someone in a particular job - like a nurse or the flying doctor. It might be someone in your family, a friend, or someone else you know personally. It might be someone living here in _____, or close to here. Or they might be living somewhere else. And it doesn't matter if you would ask for their help by visiting them, ringing them up, or writing them a letter.

You might really think that you wouldn't want to get help from anywhere for the problem - that you would just want to keep it to yourself. If you think this, please say so - but only if you are absolutely certain that you would not try to get help from anywhere at all.

Remember:

- 1 Imagine you have the problem I tell you about, while you are living here in _____, during the Wet season.
- 2 Imagine that the problem is so serious that you think you have to do something about it, during the Wet season.
- 3 Imagine that you would go to someone or some place for help with the problem, during the Wet season.
- 4 Tell me the very first person or place you would go to for help during the Wet season, no matter who or where it is.
- 5 If you think you would not go anywhere for help during the Wet season, please say so - but only if you believe it very strongly.

Do you have any questions before we go through the problems?

NUMBER: _____

FOR QUESTIONS 5-30:	
1	SHEET 4W, COLUMN 2:
	Source Beyond Self..... 1
	Self..... 2
	Unclear..... 9
2	SHEET 4W, COLUMN 3:
	First name and initial of source's family name
	Position and/or organization
	Self..... 2
	Unclear..... 9
3	SHEET 4W, COLUMN 4: WHY THE SOURCE
4	SHEET 4W, COLUMN 5: METHOD OF SUPPORT-SEEKING
	Face-to-Face Interaction..... 1
	Telephone..... 2
	Correspondence..... 3
	Indirect..... 4
	Combination..... 5
	(1/2/3/4)
	Unclear..... 9
5	INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: HOW MUCH CONTRIBUTION
6	FOR SAME RESPONSES ON PARTS 'a' to 'c': 'SAME'

Indirect Contact: contact initially occurring through another person, or intermediary. This has to be for the sole purpose of establishing contact of an acceptable kind to the respondent with the anticipated source of support. Contact of an acceptable kind includes the respondent asking the intermediary to introduce them to the anticipated support source, or otherwise establishing rapport between them.

FOR REPEAT INTERVIEWS ON QUESTIONS 5-30, PARTS 'd':

- 1 Read out respondent's answers to Parts 'a' - 'c'
- 2 Ask Part 'd'

=====

NUMBER: _____

SHARING TASKS

- QUESTION 5**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in coping if it looked like someone in your family was going to be incapacitated for a few weeks?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your coping with this situation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 6**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in coping if it looked like someone in your family was going to be incapacitated for several months or longer?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your coping with this situation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 7**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the children on a daily basis, over a period of several months?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the children?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 8**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the children on a daily basis, but only for a few weeks?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the children?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

NUMBER: _____

- QUESTION 9**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the children from time to time, over a period of several months?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the children?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 10**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the children from time to time, but only for a few weeks?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the children?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 11**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the house, over a period of several months?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the house?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 12**
- a Where would you first go for extra help in looking after the house, but only for a few weeks?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this extra help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this extra help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s extra help would contribute toward your looking after the house?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

NUMBER: _____

PROBLEM-SOLVING ASSISTANCE AND/OR INTERVENTION

- QUESTION 13**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help with a family health problem?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward your handling this health problem?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 14**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help if you were worried about how one of your children was going with their school work?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward your solving these problems with school work?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 15**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help if you thought there were problems between _____ and _____ (child-rearer/s)?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 16**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help if you were worried about how one of your children was developing psychologically or socially?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 17**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help with a problem inside yourself - like feeling depressed, or that you weren't getting along with other people?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward your solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 18**
- a Where would you first go for help with finding temporary accomodation if you or your family suddenly found that you had nowhere to live?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your finding temporary accomodation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 19**
- a Where would you first go for help with finding permanent accomodation if you or your family suddenly found that you had nowhere to live?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your finding permanent accomodation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 20**
- a Where would you first go for help with obtaining basic necessities such as money, food, or clothing if you or your family were temporarily destitute?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your obtaining these basic necessities?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

093

NUMBER: _____

- QUESTION 21**
- a Where would you first go for help with obtaining basic necessities such as money, food, or clothing if it looked like you or your family were going to be destitute for some time?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your obtaining these basic necessities?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 22**
- a Where would you first go for advice or help with a family or personal legal problem?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this advice or help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this advice or help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s advice or help would contribute toward your handling this legal problem?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 23**
- a Where would you first go for help in finding work if you were unemployed and wanted a job?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward your finding work?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

REPRESENTATION

- QUESTION 24**
- a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the health services provided to this town?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____ ?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this representation?
 - d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about these health services?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 25**
- a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the education services provided to this town?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____ ?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this representation?
 - d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about these education services?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 26**
- a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the child-care services provided in this town?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____ ?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this representation?
 - d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about these child-care services?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

NUMBER: _____

- QUESTION 27**
- a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the unemployment situation in this town?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this representation?
 - d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about the unemployment situation?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

- QUESTION 28**
- a Who would you first ask to represent your interests with the authorities if you wanted something done about the essential services provided to this region such as electricity, water, transport, or the state of the roads?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first seek representation from _____?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this representation?
 - d How much do you think _____ could contribute toward getting something done about these essential services?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

EMOTIONAL ASSISTANCE

- QUESTION 29**
- a Where would you first go for help if you felt that no-one liked you, cared for you, understood you, or valued you simply because you are you; someone you could trust enough to bare your soul to?
 - b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
 - c How would you contact _____ for this help?
 - d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

SOCIAL INTEGRATION

- QUESTION 30 a Where would you first go for help if you felt all alone in the world, that no-one could possibly see things the way that you do, and that there was no-one out there who would come to your aid if the need arose?
- b What is the main reason why you would first go to _____ for this help?
- c How would you contact _____ for this help?
- d How much do you think _____'s help would contribute toward solving these problems?

None at all _____ Solve the problem entirely

=====

SHEET 5, COLUMN 1:

Transfer new support source names from SHEET 4, COLUMN 3

Ensure no duplication on SHEET 5

SHEET 5, COLUMN 59:	
Dry and Wet intimate.....	1
Dry intimate only.....	2
Wet intimate only.....	3
Not listed as alter.....	4

SHEET 5, COLUMN 60:	
Listed as Support Source during Dry and Wet.....	1
Listed as Support Source during Dry only.....	2
Listed as Support Source during Wet only.....	3
Not listed as Support Source.....	4

=====

INTIMATE AND SUPPORT SOURCE INFORMATION

SHEET 5: COMPLETE ACCORDING TO QUESTIONS 3 AND 31-59
ON DRY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

=====

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: ADOLESCENTS - WET

Wet season interviews with adolescents were identical to those with childrearsers although they were only asked about seven needs. Wording of questions asking about these was identical Dry season adolescent interviews.

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN - WET

- NOTES:**
- 1 Wet season interviews with primary school children were similar to those with childrearsers, although wording was modified
 - 2 Only modified sections are reproduced here.
 - 3 Primary school children were only asked about four needs. Wording of questions asking about these was identical to Dry season primary school children interviews.

SHORT/LONG

=====

INTRODUCTION

_____, these questions are like the ones I asked you last time. I am going to ask you some questions about the people who are most important to you, and about who you would go to for help if you had any really big problems.

_____ will help you to understand my questions and help me to understand your answers.

How we'll do this is that I'll ask you and _____ the question. Then _____ will help you to work out what I want to know. Then both of you can work out your answer and tell me what it is.

Whatever you tell me will always be a secret between you, me and _____.

Do you have any questions before we start?

=====

SOCIAL NETWORK

When I saw you last time, you said that these were the people who you have something to do with and who are most important to you.

QUESTION 1: Would you add any people to this list during the Wet season?

Remember, don't include people you have something to do with only because you have to - like your school teacher.

These people might live here in _____, or they might live somewhere else. You might visit them, or ring them up, or write letters to them. They might be people in your family, or they might be your friends, or they might just be people you have something to do with and who are important to you.

Don't leave people out just because you don't see them very much.

I'll ask the question again: In the Wet season, is there anyone you would add to your list of people who you have personal contact with and who are important to you?

=====

SUPPORT SOURCES - SHORT FORM

Like last time, I am going to ask you to imagine that you have certain kinds of problems while you are living here in _____. But this time I want you to imagine that the problems come up during the Wet season. For each problem imagine that it is so big that you think you have to do something about it. Also imagine that you are going to go somewhere for help with the problem, this time during the Wet season.

When we get to each problem, I'll tell you what you told me when I was in _____ last time. I will then ask you the same questions, again: in the Wet season, who would you go to for help with each problem? why? and how would you contact them?

Remember; what I want to know is who or where you would first go to for help with the problem during the Wet season. This might be different for different kinds of problems, but it could be the same person or place every time. It might be someone you know, or it might be someone you have never met before. It might not be a person at all - it might be some place like your school or your church. Or it might be someone like a nurse, or the flying doctor, or your school teacher. It might be someone in your family, a friend, or someone else you know. It might be someone living here in _____, or close to here. Or they might be living somewhere else. And it doesn't matter if you would ask for their help by visiting them, ringing them up, or writing them a letter.

You might really think that you wouldn't want to get help from anywhere for the problem - that you would just want to fix up the problem by yourself. If you think this, tell me - but only if you are really sure that you would not try to get help from anyone at all.

Remember:

- 1 Imagine you have the problem I tell you about, while you are living here in _____, during the Wet season.
- 2 Imagine that the problem is big enough that you think you have to do something about it, during the Wet season.
- 3 Imagine that you would go to someone for help with the problem, during the Wet season.
- 4 Tell me the very first person or place you would go to for help during the Wet season, no matter who or where it is.
- 5 If you think you would not go anywhere for help during the Wet season, please say so - but only if you really think this.

Do you have any questions before we go through the problems?

=====

SUPPORT SOURCES - LONG FORM

Like last time, I am going to ask you to imagine that you have certain kinds of problems while you are living here in _____. But this time I want you to imagine that the problems come up during the Wet season. For each problem imagine that it is so big that you think you have to do something about it. Also imagine that you are going to go somewhere for help with the problem, this time during the Wet season.

What I want to know is who or where you would first go to for help with the problem during the Wet season. This might be different for different kinds of problems, but it could be the same person or place every time. It might be someone you know, or it might be someone you have never met before. It might not be a person at all - it might be some place like your school or your church. Or it might be someone like a nurse, or the flying doctor, or your school teacher. It might be someone in your family, a friend, or someone else you know. It might be someone living here in _____, or close to here. Or they might be living somewhere else. And it doesn't matter if you would ask for their help by visiting them, ringing them up, or writing them a letter.

You might really think that you wouldn't want to get help from anywhere for the problem - that you would just want to fix up the problem by yourself. If you think this, tell me - but only if you are really sure that you would not try to get help from anyone at all.

Remember:

- 1 Imagine you have the problem I tell you about, while you are living here in _____, during the Wet season.
- 2 Imagine that the problem is so serious that you think you have to do something about it, during the Wet season.
- 3 Imagine that you would go to someone or some place for help with the problem, during the Wet season.
- 4 Tell me the very first person or place you would go to for help during the Wet season, no matter who or where it is.
- 5 If you think you would not go anywhere for help during the Wet season, please say so - but only if you believe it very strongly.

Do you have any questions before we go through the problems?

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: PRESCHOOL CHILDREN - WET

- NOTES:**
- 1 Wet season interviews with preschool children were similar to those with childrearsers. Only modified sections are reproduced here.
 - 2 Preschool children were only asked about three needs. Questions asking about these were identical to Dry season preschool children interviews.

SHORT/LONG

INTRODUCTION

Thankyou for volunteering to be interviewed about _____.

This interview is similar to the one we did last time. It concerns the people who are important to _____, and where _____ would go for help if s/he had any problems.

All that you tell me will be held in strictest confidence, and no person or place will be identified in my research reports. When this information goes into the computer, everyone is given a number. No names are entered.

Do you have any questions before we start?

SOCIAL NETWORK

When I was here during the Dry, _____ said that these were the people who _____ has personal contact with and who are important to him/her.

QUESTION 1: Would you add any people to this list during the Wet season?

Remember; we are not including people _____ has contact with only because s/he has to - for example, because they are friends of his/her mother or father.

We are including people who live here in _____, or who are living somewhere else. _____'s contact with them might be in person, or by telephone, or by writing to them. They might be people in _____'s family, friends, people who live near here, or just other people that _____ has some personal contact with.

Don't leave people out just because _____ doesn't see them very often.

I'll ask the question again: In the Wet season, is there anyone you would add to _____'s list of people who s/he has personal contact with and who are important to him/her?

QUESTION 2: Now; in your opinion, which people on this list are important to _____ during both the Dry season and the Wet season?

QUESTION 3: And, in your opinion, which people on this list are important to _____ only during the Dry season?

QUESTION 4: And, in your opinion, which of these people are important to _____ only during the Wet season?

SUPPORT SOURCES - SHORT FORM

When I was here during the Dry season, I asked _____ to imagine that _____ had certain kinds of problems while living here in _____. I'm now going to ask you the same questions. But this time I want you to imagine that the problems occur for _____ during the Wet season. For each problem imagine that it is so serious that something has to be done about it. Also imagine that _____ is going to go somewhere for help with the problem, again, during the Wet season.

When we get to each problem, I'll tell you what you told me when I was in _____ last time. I will then ask you the same questions again: in the Wet season, who do you think _____ would go to for help with each problem? why? and how do you think _____ would contact them?

Remember; what I want to know is who or where you think _____ would first go to for help with the problem during the Wet season. This might be different for different kinds of problems, but it could be the same person or place every time. It might be someone _____ knows, or it might be someone s/he has never met before. It might not be a person at all - it might be a government department, or some kind of organisation. Or it might just be someone in a particular job - like a nurse, or the flying doctor. It might be someone in _____'s family, a friend, or someone else _____ knows personally. It might be someone living here in _____, or close to here. Or they might be living somewhere else. And it doesn't matter if _____ would ask for their help by visiting them, ringing them up, or writing them a letter.

You might really think that _____ wouldn't want to get help from anywhere for the problem - that s/he would just want to keep it to him/herself. If you think this, please say so - but only if you are absolutely certain that _____ would not try to get help from anywhere at all.

Remember:

- 1 Imagine _____ has the problem I tell you about, while s/he is living here in _____, during the Wet season.
- 2 Imagine that the problem is so serious that something has to be done about it, during the Wet season.
- 3 Imagine that _____ would go to someone for help with the problem, during the Wet season.
- 4 Tell me the very first person or place you think _____ would go to for help during the Wet season, no matter who or where it is.
- 5 If you think _____ would not go anywhere for help during the Wet season, please say so - but only if you believe it very strongly.

Do you have any questions before we go through the problems?

SUPPORT SOURCES - LONG FORM

When I was here during the Dry season, I asked _____ to imagine that _____ had certain kinds of problems while living here in _____. I'm now going to ask you the same questions. But this time I want you to imagine that the problems occur for _____ during the Wet season. For each problem imagine that it is so serious that something has to be done about it. Also imagine that _____ is going to go somewhere for help with the problem, again, during the Wet season.

Remember; what I want to know is who or where you think _____ would first go to for help with the problem during the Wet season. This might be different for different kinds of problems, but it could be the same person or place every time. It might be someone _____ knows, or it might be someone s/he has never met before. It might not be a person at all - it might be a government department or some kind of organisation. Or it might be someone in a particular job - like a nurse or the flying doctor. It might be someone in _____'s family, a friend, or someone else _____ knows personally. It might be someone living here in _____, or close to here. Or they might be living somewhere else. And it doesn't matter if _____ would ask for their help by visiting them, ringing them up, or writing them a letter.

You might really think that _____ wouldn't want to get help from anywhere for the problem - that s/he would just want to keep it to him/herself. If you think this, tell me - but only if you are absolutely certain that _____ would not try to get help from anywhere at all.

Remember:

- 1 Imagine _____ has the problem I tell you about, while s/he is living here in _____, during the Wet season.
- 2 Imagine that the problem is so serious that something has to be done about it, during the Wet season.
- 3 Imagine that _____ would go to someone or some place for help with the problem, during the Wet season.
- 4 Tell me the very first person or place you think _____ would go to for help during the Wet season, no matter who or where it is.
- 5 If you think _____ would not go anywhere for help during the Wet season, please say so - but only if you believe it very strongly.

Do you have any questions before we go through the problems?

/ u u

RESPONSE SHEET 1: FAMILY IDENTIFICATION & MEMBERSHIP[illegible]

[illegible]

RESPONSE SHEET 3: FAMILY DETAILS[illegible]

SHEET 4: SUPPORT SEEKING BY NEED

RESPONDENT NUMBER: _____

1	2	3	4	5	6
	a	a	b	c	d
QU	S/O	SRCE.NAME	WHY THE SOURCE	METH	CTR
5					
6					
7					
9					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					

SHEET 4: SUPPORT SEEKING BY NEED

RESPONDENT NUMBER: _____

1	2	3	4	5	6
	a	a	b	c	d
QU	S/O	SRCE.NAME	WHY THE SOURCE	METH	CTR
19					
20					
21					
22					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					

• • •

RESPONDENT NUMBER: _____

[illegible]

SHEET 5: INTIMATE AND SOURCE CHARACTERISTICS

RESPONDENT NUMBER: _____

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

SUPPORT SEEKING BY NEED - WET

This response schedule was identical to the equivalent Dry season response schedule.

APPENDIX 2

VARIABLES AND VARIABLE DEFINITIONS

TABLE 1: RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
TOWN	Town that the respondent has regarded as their normal place of residence for at least three months prior to Dry season interview. (See text for complete definition of 'resident'.)	Nominal	1 Gulftown 2 Capeville 3 Bushland
FAMILY	The respondent's nuclear family. (See text for complete definition.)	Nominal	1 - 45
FAMILY POSITION	The respondent's nuclear family position. (See text for complete definition.)	Nominal	1 Childrearer 2 Child
GENDER	Whether the respondent is male or female.	Nominal	1 Male 2 Female
AGE	Age at last birthday	Ratio	0-54 (Though coded on Family Interview Schedule this was not coded for analyses.)
RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	The number of complete years the respondent has lived in the region (up to 50km radius from town).	Ratio	0 - 49
RESIDENTIAL PERMANENCE	Whether the respondent expects to reside permanently in the region. (See text for complete definition.)	Nominal	1 Temporary 2 More-or-less permanent 3 Permanent
ETHNICITY	Whether the respondent identifies themselves as (a) Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, or (b) neither.	Nominal	1 Neither 2 Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander

TABLE 1: RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
EDUCATION	Level of education successfully attained or for which the respondent is currently working.	Ordinal	1 No tertiary qualifications and not currently enrolled at school. 2 Certificates which are not full trade qualifications or diplomas. 3 Diploma, trade or other equivalent qualification/s, such as law enforcement. 4 Bachelor's degree or graduate diploma. 5 Postgraduate degree.
OCCUPATION	See text for complete definition.	Nominal	1 Professional 2 Semi-professional 3 Trade; technical 4 Administration 5 Clerical 6 Sales 7 Service 8 Farming 9 Fishing 10 Transport 11 Home management 12 Other semi-skilled 13 Other unskilled 14 Other 15 None; unemployed 16 Combination
MINING OCCUPATION	Whether the respondent's main occupation is in the mining industry.	Nominal	1 Mining 2 Not mining 3 More than one main occupation, one of which is in the mining industry.

TABLE 1: RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
EMPLOYMENT MODE	Whether the respondent is self-employed, an employee, or works in some other capacity in their main employment.	Nominal	1 Self-employed 2 Employee 3 Home manager 4 Works in a collective group, such as a religious order 5 Other 6 Not employed 7 Combination
EMPLOYING ORGANISATION	The type of organisation the respondent's main employment is in.	Nominal	1 Private enterprise 2 Public service 3 Elected government position 4 Semi-government organisation 5 Community-based organisation 6 Other 7 Not employed
ABSENCE	Frequency with which the respondent is absent from town.	Ordinal	1 Never or rarely 2 Regularly for three to seven days at a time, on average at least twice each month. 3 Regularly for seven days or more, adding up to around at least six weeks every six months. 4 Longer 5 Other

TABLE 1: RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
LOCATION	Whether the respondent is away from town and, if so, how far.	Ordinal	1 Never or rarely away from town. 2 0 - 49km 3 50km or more
BOARDING SCHOOL ATTENDANCE	Whether the respondent attends boarding school.	Nominal	1 Attends 2 Does not attend
BOARDING SCHOOL LOCATION	How far from town respondent's boarding school is.	Ordinal	1 0 - 499km 2 500km or more
SELF-RELIANCE	The ratio of the number of self-reliance responses given by the respondent to the total number of needs presented to them, excluding 'don't know' and 'not applicable' responses.	Ratio	0 - 1.0

TABLE 2: RESPONDENT FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
TOWN	Town that childrears have regarded as their normal place of residence for at least three months prior to Dry season interviews.	Nominal	1 Gulftown 2 Capeville 3 Bushland
FAMILY TYPE	Type of family structure.	Nominal	1 Restricted natural family 2 Extended natural family 3 Restricted step family 4 Extended step family 5 Non-filial family 6 Other (See text for complete definitions.)
FAMILY SIZE	Number of family members. (See text for complete definition of family member.)	Ratio	0 - 6
FAMILY INCOME	Total before tax family income, in the previous financial year. (See text for elaboration.)	Ordinal	1 Less than \$5,000. 2 \$5,000 to \$9,999. 3 \$10,000 to \$14,999. 4 \$15,000 to \$19,999. 5 \$20,000 to \$24,999. 6 \$25,000 to \$29,999. 7 \$30,000 to \$34,999. 8 \$35,000 to \$39,999. 9 \$40,000 to \$44,999. 10 \$45,000 to \$49,999. 11 \$50,000 to \$54,999. 12 \$55,000 to \$59,999. 13 \$60,000 or more.

TABLE 2: RESPONDENT FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
FAMILY LIFE STAGE	Stage in the family life cycle. (See text for elaboration.)	Nominal	2 Preschool children only. 3 Preschool and primary school children. 4 Primary school children only. 5 Primary and high school children. 6 High school children only. 7 High school children and children who have left school. 8 Children who have left school only. 10 Other family.
FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	Number of years for which the childrearsers have lived in the region (up to 50km radius from town) as joint childrearsers.	Ratio	0 - 22
FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PERMANENCE	Whether the childrearsers expect that they would reside permanently in the region. Determined by discussion. Where there was no apparent agreement the response was coded as missing data.	Nominal	1 Temporary 2 More-or-less permanent 3 Permanent

TABLE 2: RESPONDENT FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
FAMILY ETHNICITY	Family ethnic identity as determined by the childrearsers.	Nominal	1 No family member identifies as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander. 2 One or more family members identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander. 3 All family members identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander.
FAMILY EDUCATION	Education level of family member attaining the highest level. (See text for elaboration.)	Ordinal	Same as for respondent education.
FAMILY OCCUPATION	Main occupation of main income earner.(See text for elaboration.)	Nominal	Same as for respondent occupation.
FAMILY MINING OCCUPATION	Whether the main occupation of the main income earner is in the mining industry. (See text for elaboration.)	Nominal	Same as for respondent mining occupation.
FAMILY EMPLOYMENT MODE	Employment mode of the main income earner. (See text for elaboration.)	Nominal	Same as for respondent employment mode.
FAMILY EMPLOYING ORGANISATION	Employing organisation of the main income earner (See text for elaboration.)	Nominal	Same as for respondent employing organisation.
FAMILY ABSENCE	The number of family members who are regularly absent from town.	Ordinal	1 No members regularly absent. 2 One member regularly absent. 3 Two members regularly absent. 4 Three or more members regularly absent.

TABLE 2: RESPONDENT FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
FAMILY ABSENCE PATTERN	Absence pattern of family member who is most frequently absent from town.	Ordinal	Same as for respondent absence.
FAMILY LOCATION	Location of family member who is furthest away from town during regular absences.	Ordinal	2 0 - 49km 3 50km or more
FAMILY BOARDING SCHOOL ATTENDANCE	Number of children who attend boarding school	Ordinal	1 No children attend. 2 One child attends. 3 Two children attend. 4 Three or more children attend.
FAMILY BOARDING SCHOOL LOCATION	Distance from town of furthest boarding school attended by a child in the family.	Ordinal	1 0 - 499km 2 500km or more.
TRANSPORT ACCESS	Access to a vehicle in good repair suitable for long distance travel in local conditions at most times of the year.	Ordinal	1 A family member owns such a vehicle. 2 No family member owns such a vehicle, but would have fairly immediate access to one if the need arose. 3 No-one in the family has fairly immediate access to such a vehicle.
COMMUNICATION ACCESS	Access to a long-range communication device exists in the family home.	Ordinal	1 A long-range communication device exists in the family home. 2 A long-range communication device does not exist in the family home, but the family would have immediate access to one in an emergency. 3 The family does not have immediate access to a long range communication device.

TABLE 3: CHARACTERISTICS OF INTIMATES AND SUPPORTS

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
RESPONDENT/ RESPONDENT FAMILY	Whether the intimate/support is a respondent and/or a member of a respondent family.	Nominal	1 Respondent 2 Respondent family but not a respondent. 3 Neither respondent nor respondent family.
NUMBER	All intimates/supports were allocated a number. All respondents were identified as an intimate by at least one other respondent. Respondent and intimate/support numbers were identical where they were the same person.	Nominal	1 to 909
FAMILY NUMBER	If the intimate/support is a respondent family member, respondent family number.	Nominal	1 to 45
TOWN NUMBER	If the intimate/support lives in one of the research towns town number.	Nominal	1 to 3
LIVING GROUP POSITION	See respondent characteristics for definitions of 'child-rearer' and 'child'. An additional 'other' category was identified. (See text for definition of a 'living group'.)	Nominal	1 Childrearer 2 Child 3 Other
GENDER	See corresponding respondent characteristic.		
AGE	See corresponding respondent characteristic.		0 - 92
RESIDENTIAL PLACE	The settlement the intimate/support is living in.	Nominal	Settlement name
RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	How long the intimate/support has lived in their current residential place to the nearest year.	Ratio	0 - 88
ETHNICITY	See corresponding respondent characteristic.		
OCCUPATION	See corresponding respondent characteristic.		

TABLE 3: CHARACTERISTICS OF INTIMATES AND SUPPORTS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
MINING OCCUPATION	See corresponding respondent characteristic.		
EMPLOYMENT MODE	See corresponding respondent characteristic.		
EMPLOYING ORGANISATION	See corresponding respondent characteristic.		
RESIDENTIAL PLACE SIZE	Population size of the settlement the intimate/source is living in.	Ordinal	1 0 - 99. 2 100 to 399. 3 400 to 999. 4 1,000 to 9,999 5 10,000 to 49,999. 6 50,000 to 119,999 7 120,000 or more.
SERVICE LOCATION	Whether the intimate's/support's settlement is a centre which provides a number of formal essential and personal support services. (See text for complete definition.)	Nominal	1 Satellite service centre. 2 Regional service centre. 3 State capital (Brisbane) 4 National capital (Canberra). 5 Other service centre in North Queensland. 6 Other major Australian city. 7 Other Australian service centre.
FORMAL SUPPORT POSITIONS	Whether the intimate/support has any formal positions the primary function of which is to help people.	Nominal	1 At least one formal support position. 2 No formal support positions.
OTHER FORMAL POSITIONS	Whether the intimate/support has any formal positions which are not part of their normal paid employment.	Nominal	1 At least one formal position. 2 No formal positions.

TABLE 4: CHARACTERISTICS OF INTIMATES' AND SUPPORTS' LIVING GROUPS

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
LIVING GROUP TYPE	Composition of the intimate's/support's living group.	Nominal	1 Nuclear family with dependent children. 2 Intimate couple without dependent children. 3 Solo. 4 Other
LIVING GROUP RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	Length of residence in current settlement of the member of the living group who has lived there the longest.	Ratio	0 to 88
LIVING GROUP LIFE STAGE	Same as corresponding respondent family characteristic. (with additional values.)	Nominal	1 Intimate couple intending to have dependent children. 2-8 Same as corresponding respondent family characteristic. 9 Have had children in the past, but these are no longer dependent on the childrearer/s. 10 Other family. 11 Other solo. 12 Other couple. 13 Other living group.
LIVING GROUP ETHNICITY	Same as corresponding respondent family characteristic.		
LIVING GROUP OCCUPATION	Same as corresponding respondent family characteristic.		
LIVING GROUP MINING OCCUPATION	Same as corresponding respondent family characteristic.		
LIVING GROUP EMPLOYMENT MODE	Same as corresponding respondent family characteristic.		

TABLE 4: CHARACTERISTICS OF INTIMATES' AND SUPPORTS' LIVING GROUPS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
LIVING GROUP EMPLOYING ORGANISATION	Same as corresponding respondent family characteristic.		
LIVING GROUP FORMAL SUPPORT POSITIONS	Whether any member of the intimate's/support's living group has any formal support positions as defined for intimate support characteristics.		Same as for corresponding intimate/support characteristic.
LIVING GROUP OTHER FORMAL POSITIONS	Whether any member of the intimate's/support's living group has any formal positions as defined for intimate/support characteristics.		Same as for corresponding intimate/support characteristic.

TABLE 5: RESPONDENT - INTIMATE/SUPPORT RELATIONSHIP CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
KIN, FRIEND OR NEITHER	Whether the respondent reports the intimate/support to be kin, friend or neither.	Nominal	1 Kin: related through kinship. 2 Friend: reported to be a friend by the respondent. 3 Other named person.
KINSHIP	Where the intimate/support is kin, the kind of kin relationship.	Nominal	1 Present nuclear family; present member. 2 Present nuclear family; past member. 3 Past nuclear family member. 4 Direct kin of present nuclear family member other than the respondent. 5 Other nuclear family member of kin specified in Values 3 or 4. 6 Other kin. 7 Not kin. (See text for elaboration)
INTIMACY	Whether the support is also reported to be an intimate.	Ordinal	1 Neither an intimate nor personal contact. 2 Not an intimate; personal contact. 3 Intimate.
RELATIONSHIP IMPORTANCE	For intimates, their relative importance to the respondent,	Ordinal	1 Not especially important. 2 Important. 3 Extremely important.
RELATIONSHIP DURATION	The number of years for which the respondent has known the intimate/support.	Ratio	0 - 54 years
RELATIONSHIP PERMANENCE	Permanence of the relationship as perceived by the respondent.	Nominal	1 Temporary. 2 Probably permanent. 3 Permanent.

TABLE 5: RESPONDENT - INTIMATE/SUPPORT RELATIONSHIP CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
DISTANCE	Distance between the respondent's town and the intimate's/support's settlement.	Ordinal	1 Respondent's town. 2 0 - 100km. 3 100-299km. 4 300-499km. 5 500-999km. 6 1,000km or more and the intimate/support lives in Australia, on one of the Torres Strait Islands, or in Papua New Guinea 7 The intimate/support does not live in Australia, the Torres Strait Islands, or Papua New Guinea. 8 The intimate/support does not currently have a normal place of residence.
RESIDENTIAL LOCATION	Whether the intimate/support lives locally (up to 100km radius from the respondent's town) or non-locally.	Nominal	1 Local 2 Non-local
PRIMARY CONTACT METHOD	The main mode of contact between the respondent and the intimate/support over the preceding two years.	Nominal	1 No direct contact 2 Correspondence. 3 Telephone, two-way radio and/or telegram. 4 Correspondence; and telephone, two-way radio and/or telegram. 5 Face-to-face interaction. 6 Correspondence; and face-to-face interaction. 7 Telephone, two-way radio and/or telegram; and face-to-face interaction. 8 Correspondence; and telephone, two-way radio and/or telegram; and face-to-face interaction.

TABLE 6: SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
LOCAL KIN.	Whether or not the respondent has kin living locally (up to 100km from town).	Nominal	0 No local kin 1 Local kin.
NETWORK SIZE	The total number of intimates cited by the respondent.	Ratio	0 to 48
NON-FAMILY NETWORK SIZE	The total number of intimates cited by a respondent who are not members of their present nuclear family.	Ratio	0 to 45
NETWORK KIN	Percentage of the respondent's intimates who are kin.	Ratio	0 to 100
NON-FAMILY NETWORK KIN	Percentage of the respondent's intimates who are kin, and who are not members of their present nuclear family.	Ratio	0 to 100
LOCAL INTIMATES	Percentage of the respondent's intimates who live locally (up to 100km from town).	Ratio	0 to 100
NETWORK DISTANCE	The modal distance of the respondent's intimates from the former's town.	Ordinal	Same as respondent-intimate/support relationship characteristic 'distance'.
LOCAL NETWORK RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	The mean length of local residence of the respondent's intimates who live locally (up to 100km from town).	Ratio	0 to 25 years
LOCAL NETWORK LIVING GROUP RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	The mean length of local residences of the respondent's intimates' living groups which are located locally (up to 100km from town).	Ratio	0 to 13.6 years
RURAL NETWORK	Percentage of the respondent's intimates residing in population centres with up to 9,999 residents.	Ratio	0 to 100
NETWORK DENSITY	The percentage of all possible links between a respondent's intimates which involve a reciprocal or non-reciprocal intimate relationship.	Ratio	0 to 1.0
NON-FAMILY NETWORK DENSITY	The percentage of all possible links between a respondent's intimates which involve a reciprocal or non-reciprocal intimate relationship disregarding links between members of their current nuclear family.	Ratio	0 to 1.0

TABLE 7: ADDITIONAL SUPPORT SOURCE CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
NAMED OR UNNAMED SUPPORT	See text for complete definition.	Nominal	1 Named 2 Unnamed (See text for further elaboration.)
SUPPORT TYPE	See text for elaboration.	Nominal	1 Natural 2 Informal 3 Formal 4 Broad formal support 5 Unclear 6 Combination 7 Not a support position (See text for further elaboration.)
SUPPORT POSITIONS	Support positions held by the support. (See text for complete definition.)	Nominal	Identical to values for support type.
SUPPORT'S LIVING GROUP SUPPORT POSITIONS	The support positions held by members of the support's living group, including the support themselves. (See text for complete definition.)	Nominal	Identical to values for support type.
FORMAL POSITIONS	The main formal position filled by the support.	Nominal	1 Elected representative. 2 Federal or state government minister. 3 Federal, state or local government public service. 4 Other official organisational position. 5 Private professional practitioner. 6 Private individual. 7 Private individuals 8 An organisation generally. 9 A deity such as God or Jesus Christ. 10 No formal position.

TABLE 7: ADDITIONAL SUPPORT SOURCE CHARACTERISTICS
(Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL	The support's administrative level within the organisational hierarchy.	Nominal	1 Low 2 Middle 3 High 4 Very high 5 (See text for further elaboration.)
ORGANISATION TYPE	The type of organisation in which the support is located.	Nominal	1 Government department 2 Semi-government organisation 3 Community-based organisation 4 Profit-making private enterprise 5 Non-profit-making private enterprise 6 Other organisation 7 Support is not an organisation 8 Combination (See text for further elaboration.)
GOVERNMENT LEVEL	The level of government in which the support is employed.	Nominal	1 Federal 2 State 3 Local 4 Unspecified government department 5 Semi-government organisation 6 Support not in a government department 7 Combination

TABLE 7: ADDITIONAL SUPPORT SOURCE CHARACTERISTICS
(Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
SERVICE AREA	The service area of the organisation's main services.	Nominal	1 Welfare 2 Health 3 Education 4 Law 5 Employment and/or unemployment 6 Representing constituents' interests 7 Essential services 8 Housing 9 Combination
WELFARE SERVICE AREA	The welfare service area which the organisation's main services relate to.	Nominal	1 Income maintenance 2 Other essential provisions 3 Home help 4 Child care 5 Child welfare 6 Personal welfare 7 Community welfare 8 Housing 9 Combination 10 No welfare service area.
ESSENTIAL SERVICE AREA	The essential service area of the organisation's main services.	Nominal	1 Power 2 Water 3 Communications 4 Roads and transport 5 State emergency service 6 Other 7 Not an essential service area.
ABORIGINAL OR TORRES ISLANDER SERVICE AREA	Whether or not the organisation serves Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people more-or-less exclusively.	Nominal	1 Yes 2 No

TABLE 8: SUPPORT NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
NAMED/UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK	Percentage of the total support network comprising named supports	Ratio	0 - 100
LOCAL SUPPORTS	Percentage of the total support network located locally (up to 100km from respondent's town).	Ratio	0 - 100
SUPPORT NETWORK DISTANCE	Modal distance of all supports from the respondent.	Ordinal	1 - 7
RURAL SUPPORTS	Percentage of all supports living in settlements with less than 10,000 people.	Ratio	0 - 100
SUPPORT NETWORK CONTRIBUTION	Mean contribution of all supports toward resolution of the respondent's problems.	Ratio	0 - 10
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK SIZE	The number of named supports cited by the respondents.	Ratio	0 - 18
NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK SIZE	The number of named supports cited by the respondents who are not members of their present nuclear family.	Ratio	0 - 17
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK INTIMATES	Percentage of all supports who the respondent also cites as intimates.	Ratio	0 - 100
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK KIN	Percentage of named supports who are kin.	Ratio	0 - 100
NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK KIN	Percentage of named supports who are kin and who are not members of the respondent's present nuclear family.	Ratio	0 - 100
LOCAL NAMED SUPPORTS	Percentage of named supports located locally (0-100km from the respondent's town).	Ratio	0 - 100

TABLE 8: SUPPORT NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	SCALE	VALUES
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK DISTANCE	Modal distance of named supports from the respondent's town.	Ordinal	1 - 7
LOCAL NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	The mean length of local residence of the respondent's named supports' living groups located locally (up to 100km from town).	Ratio	0 - 13.5 years
LOCAL NAMED SUPPORTS' LIVING GROUP RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	The mean length of local residence, of the respondent's named supports' living groups located locally (up to 100km from town).	Ratio	0 - 13.6 years
RURAL NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK	Percentage of all named supports living in settlements with less than 10,000 people.	Ratio	0 - 100
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK DENSITY	The percentage of all possible links between a respondent's named supports which involve a reciprocal or non-reciprocal intimate relationship.	Ratio	0 - 1.0
NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK DENSITY	The percentage of all possible links between a respondent's named supports which involve a reciprocal or non-reciprocal intimate relationship; disregarding links between members of the respondent's nuclear family.	Ratio	0 - 1.0
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK CONTRIBUTION	Mean contribution of all named supports to the respondent solving their problems.	Ratio	0 - 10
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK SIZE	The number of unnamed supports cited by the respondent.	Ratio	0 - 10
LOCAL UNNAMED SUPPORTS	Percentage of unnamed supports located locally (up to 100km from the respondent's town).	Ratio	0 - 100
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK CONTRIBUTION	Mean contribution of all unnamed supports to the respondent solving their problems.	Ratio	0 - 10

APPENDIX 3
VARIABLES NOT ANALYSED

TABLE 1: SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS NOT ANALYSED

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	REASONS FOR EXCLUSION
NETWORK KINSHIP	The modal type of kin relationship between the respondents and their intimates who are kin.	Too imprecise to be useful.
NON-FAMILY NETWORK KINSHIP	The modal type of kin relationship between the respondent and their intimates who are kin but not members of the respondent's current nuclear family.	Too imprecise to be useful.
NETWORK ETHNICITY	The percentage of the respondent's intimates who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.	Too few respondents chose too few intimates who were Aboriginals and/or Torres Strait Islanders for sufficient variability.
NETWORK LIVING GROUP ETHNICITY	The percentage of the respondent's intimates' living groups which have Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander members.	Too few respondents chose too few Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander intimates for sufficient variability.
NETWORK PLACE SIZE	The modal population size of the respondent's intimates in their present residential places.	Trivial for this investigation; confounded with local intimates.
NETWORK RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	The mean residential length of the respondent's intimates in their present residential place.	Trivial for this investigation.

TABLE 1: SOCIAL NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS NOT ANALYSED (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	REASONS FOR EXCLUSION
NETWORK LIVING GROUP RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	The mean residential length of the respondent's intimates' living groups in their present residential place.	Trivial for this investigation.
NETWORK REGIONAL SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's intimates who live in a regional service location.	Trivial for this investigation.
NETWORK QUEENSLAND SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's intimates who live in a Queensland service location.	Trivial for this investigation.
NETWORK AUSTRALIAN SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's intimates who live in an Australian service location.	Trivial for this investigation.
NETWORK RELATIONSHIP DURATION	The mean duration of the respondent's relationships with their intimates. Confounded with network kin.	Too imprecise to be useful; Confounded with network kin.
NETWORK RELATIONSHIP PERMANENCE	The modal permanence of the respondent's relationships with their intimates.	Too imprecise to be useful; Confounded with network kin.
NETWORK RELATIONSHIP IMPORTANCE	The modal importance to the respondent of their relationships with their intimates.	Too imprecise to be useful; Confounded with network kin.
NETWORK CONTACT METHOD	The modal main method of contact used by the respondent and their intimates for communicating with each other over the preceding two years.	Too imprecise to be useful; Trivial for this investigation; Confounded with local intimates.

TABLE 2: SUPPORT NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS NOT ANALYSED

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	REASONS FOR EXCLUSION
SUPPORT NETWORK SIZE	The total number of supports cited by the respondent.	Trivial for this investigation.
NON-FAMILY SUPPORT NETWORK SIZE	The total number of supports cited by the respondent who are not members of their present nuclear family.	Trivial for this investigation.
SUPPORT NETWORK NATURAL SUPPORTS	The percentage of the respondent's support network made up of natural supports.	Trivial for this investigation.
SUPPORT NETWORK INFORMAL SUPPORTS	The percentage of the respondent's support network made up of informal supports.	Trivial for this investigation.
SUPPORT NETWORK FORMAL SUPPORTS	The percentage of the respondent's support network made up of formal supports.	Trivial for this investigation.
SUPPORT NETWORK NO SUPPORT TYPE	The percentage of the respondent's support network made up of supports which are neither natural, formal, nor informal supports.	Trivial for this investigation. Small variability.
SUPPORT NETWORK PLACE SIZE	The modal population size of the settlements in which the respondent's supports are located.	Trivial for this investigation.
SUPPORT NETWORK - REGIONAL SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's support network made up of supports in regional service locations.	Trivial for this investigation.
SUPPORT NETWORK QUEENSLAND SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's support network made up of supports in Queensland service locations.	Trivial for this investigation.

TABLE 2: SUPPORT NETWORK CHARACTERISTIC NOT ANALYSED (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	REASONS FOR EXCLUSION
SUPPORT NETWORK - AUSTRALIAN SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's support network made up of supports in Australian service locations.	Trivial for this investigation.
SUPPORT NETWORK - HOW SUPPORT SOUGHT	The modal method of contacting supports used by the respondent.	Trivial for this investigation; Adds no further information to that yielded by type of support and support location.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK GENDER	The percentage of the respondent's named support network made up of females.	Trivial for this investigation.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK ETHNICITY	The percentage of the respondent's named support network made up of Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders.	Insufficient variability for the variable to discriminate.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK LIVING GROUP ETHNICITY	The percentage of the respondent's named supports living groups made up of Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders.	Insufficient variability for the variable to discriminate.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK PLACE SIZE	The modal population size of the settlements in which the respondent's named supports are located.	Trivial for this investigation; Too imprecise to be useful.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK/REGIONAL SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's named support network made up of supports in regional locations.	Trivial for this investigation.

TABLE 2: SUPPORT NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS NOT ANALYSED (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	REASONS FOR EXCLUSION
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK/QUEENSLAND SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's named support network made up of supports in Queensland locations.	Trivial for this investigation.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - AUSTRALIAN SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's named support network made up of supports in Australian service locations.	Trivial for this investigation.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	The mean length of residence of the respondent's named supports in their present settlement.	Trivial for this investigation.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK LIVING GROUP RESIDENTIAL LENGTH	The mean length of residence in their present settlements of the respondent's named supports' living groups.	Trivial for this investigation.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK LINKS	The modal type of link between the respondent and their named supports (intimate, personal associate, neither).	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful; Too imprecise to be useful.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK RELATIONSHIP IMPORTANCE	The modal degree of importance of the respondent's relationships with their named supports.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful; Too imprecise to be useful.

TABLE 2: SUPPORT NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS NOT ANALYSED (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	REASONS FOR EXCLUSION
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK KINSHIP	The modal type of kin relationship between the respondent and their named supports who are kin.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful; Too imprecise to be useful.
NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK KINSHIP	The modal type of kin relationship between the respondent and their named supports who are kin but not members of their nuclear family.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful; Too imprecise to be useful.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK DURATION	The mean duration of the respondent's relationships with their named supports.	Trivial for this investigation; Confounded with support network kin.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK PERMANENCE	The modal degree of permanence of the respondent's relationships with their named supports.	Trivial for this investigation; Confounded with support network kin.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK CONTACT METHOD	The percentage of the respondent's supports with which they have maintained face-to-face contact over the preceding two years.	Trivial for this investigation.
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK-HOW SUPPORT SOUGHT	The percentage of named supports from which the respondent would seek support through face-to-face interaction.	Trivial for this investigation. Confounded with support network location.

TABLE 2: SUPPORT NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS NOT ANALYSED (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	REASONS FOR EXCLUSION
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - WHY SUPPORT SOUGHT	The modal reason a respondent gives for seeking support from their named supports.	Trivial for this investigation; Too imprecise to be useful.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - INFORMAL SUPPORTS	The percentage of the respondent's unnamed support network made up of informal supports.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - FORMAL SUPPORTS	The percentage of the respondent's unnamed support network made up of formal supports.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - NO SUPPORT TYPE	The percentage of the respondent's unnamed support network made up of supports which are neither formal nor informal supports.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK PLACE SIZE	The modal population size of the settlements in which the respondent's unnamed supports are located.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - NON REGIONAL SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's unnamed support network made up of supports not in regional service locations.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - REGIONAL SERVICE LOCATION	The percentage of the respondent's unnamed support network made up of supports in regional service locations.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK DISTANCE	Modal distance of unnamed supports from respondent.	Trivial for this investigation; Insufficient variability to be useful.

TABLE 2: SUPPORT NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS NOT ANALYSED (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	DEFINITION	REASONS FOR EXCLUSION
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS	The percentage of the respondent's unnamed support network in government departments.	Trivial for this investigation;
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK IN COMMUNITY BASED ORGANISATIONS	The percentage of the respondent's unnamed support network in community-based organisations.	Trivial for this investigation; Few respondents chose any community based organisations.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK IN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE ORGANISATIONS	The percentage of the respondent's unnamed support network in private enterprise organisations.	Trivial for this investigation; Few unnamed sources in private enterprise organisations were cited.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL	The modal administrative level of the respondent's unnamed support network.	Trivial for this investigation; The variable proved to be imprecise.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - ABORIGINAL/TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER SERVICE ORGANISATIONS	The percentage of the respondent's unnamed support network made up of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander service organisations.	Trivial for this investigation; Few Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander service organisations cited.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - HOW SUPPORT SOUGHT	The modal method of contacting the respondent's unnamed supports.	Trivial for this investigation; Adds no further information to that yielded by 'local unnamed sources'.
UNNAMED SUPPORT NETWORK - WHY SUPPORT SOUGHT	The modal reason a respondent gives for seeking support from their unnamed supports.	Trivial for this investigation; Too imprecise to be useful.

APPENDIX 4

REASONS FOR SUPPORT SOURCE SELECTION OR FOR GIVING OTHER RESPONSES

APPENDIX 4: REASONS FOR SUPPORT SOURCE SELECTION OR FOR GIVING OTHER RESPONSES

GENERAL REASONS	SPECIFIC REASONS
Availability and convenience of the source	. The source is local . The source is the most available of all possible sources
The source's possession of needed resources	. Possession of resources . Information about resources available from elsewhere . Relevant information about the specific need . Potentially useful contacts . Relevant expertise . Relevant expertise and a personal relationship with the respondent . Personal skills . Power to obtain resources and/or to influence others
The source's potential effectiveness in contributing toward problem resolution	. The source's previous success in dealing with human problems in general . The source's previous success in dealing with this particular kind of problem . The source's current success in helping the respondent deal with this particular kind of problem . The source's previous success in dealing with these kinds of problems as well as their holding a formal position which is relevant to the situation . The source's personal experience . The source's professional experience . The source's personal and professional experience . The respondent believes that the source is the most likely to successfully help them to resolve the problem
The respondent believes that the source is responsible for helping to resolve the problem	
The source fills one or more formal positions which are relevant to the need	. Relevant position . Relevant position and a personal relationship with the respondent . Relevant position and located locally . Relevant position and the respondent has confidence in the source's ability to contribute toward problem resolution
Preferred self-reliance	

APPENDIX 4: REASONS FOR SUPPORT SOURCE SELECTION OR FOR GIVING OTHER RESPONSES (Continued)

GENERAL REASONS	SPECIFIC REASONS
Preferred reliance on the nuclear family.	. Preferred family reliance for most problems . Preferred family reliance for this particular kind of problem . Preference for maintaining family confidentiality . Preferred family confidentiality in the specific context of a small community
Preference for kin support	. The respondent is part of an especially close kin network . Preference for kin support for most problems . Preference for kin support for this particular kind of problem . Kin preference and their availability and accessibility . Kin preference and the kin source has the relevant power to obtain resources and influence others . Kin preference and the kin source has expertise relevant to the problem
The respondent's personal relationship with the source	. Childhood dependence . The respondent regards the source as the closest person to them emotionally . The respondent regards the source as a close personal friend . The respondent regards the source as a friend . The respondent regards the source as a friend and the source is available . The source has a strong relationship with the respondent's nuclear family . The source has a strong relationship with the respondent's nuclear family and the source is convenient . Specific respondent-source relationship qualities
The respondent's religious faith	
Other positive reasons for choosing the source	
Negative reasons for responses	. The respondent could not think of an alternative . No local sources . Geographic inaccessibility of preferred sources . Geographic inaccessibility of friends . Geographic inaccessibility of kin . Unavailability of kin . The source was chosen because they are not kin . The source was chosen because they are not local . Other negative reasons

APPENDIX 4: REASONS FOR SUPPORT SOURCE SELECTION OR FOR GIVING OTHER
RESPONSES (Continued)

GENERAL REASONS	SPECIFIC REASONS
Preferred inaction	. The situation is hopeless and cannot be helped . The respondent is not interested in the problem . The town is too small to obtain resources needed to deal with the problem . The service in question is not needed in the town . The situation is not a problem for the town . The situation is not a problem to the respondent themselves . The town and its people are not adequately represented
Two sources were cited: each for different reasons	

APPENDIX 5
REASONS FOR RESPONSES

APPENDIX 5 REASONS FOR RESPONSES

REASON	RESPONSE TYPE													
	ALL RESPONSES		NON-SOURCE AND SELF-RELIANCE		SOURCE RESPONSES		UNNAMED SOURCES		NON-FAMILY NAMED SOURCES		WITHIN-FAMILY SOURCES		OTHER RESPONSES	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
AVAILABILITY AND CONVENIENCE	62	2.4	2	0.4	60	2.9	37	4.4	23	3.3	-	-	-	-
Local	61	98.4	2	100.0	59	98.3	36	97.3	23	100.0				
Most available	1	1.6			1	1.7	1	1.7						
RESOURCES	567	22.0	20	4.1	547	26.1	415	49.6	100	14.5	28	5.3	4	12.1
Resources	180	31.7	20	100.0	160	29.3	130	31.3	28	28.0	1	3.6	1	25.0
Information about resources	3	0.5			3	0.5	2	0.5	1	1.0				
Information about the problem	14	2.5			14	2.6	9	2.2			5	17.9		
Contacts	32	5.6			32	5.9	19	4.6	13	13.0				
Relevant expertise	245	43.2			245	44.8	238	57.3	6	6.0			1	25.0
Expertise and relationship	25	4.4			25	4.6	1	0.2	13	13.0	10	35.7	1	25.0
Personal skills	57	10.1			57	10.4	5	1.2	39	39.0	12	42.9	1	25.0
Power	11	1.9			11	2.0	11	2.7						

APPENDIX 5 REASONS FOR RESPONSES (Continued)

REASON	RESPONSE TYPE													
	ALL RESPONSES		NON-SOURCE AND SELF-RELIANCE		SOURCE RESPONSES		UNNAMED SOURCES		NON-FAMILY NAMED SOURCES		WITHIN-FAMILY SOURCES		OTHER RESPONSES	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
EFFECTIVENESS	70	2.7	1	0.2	69	3.3	18	2.2	34	4.9	16	3.0	1	3.0
Success with problems	1	1.4			1	1.4			1	2.9				
Success with this problem	14	20.0	1	100.0	13	18.8	5	27.8	5	14.7	3	18.8		
Success: currently helping	22	31.4			22	31.9			17	50.0	5	31.3		
Success and formal relevance	1	1.4			1	1.4	1	5.6						
Experience: personal	5	7.1			5	7.2			1	2.9	3	18.8	1	100.0
Experience: professional	11	15.7			11	15.9	5	27.8	4	11.8	2	12.5		
Experience: both	10	14.3			10	14.5	2	11.1	6	17.6	2	12.5		
Best chance of success	6	8.6			6	8.7	5	27.8			1	6.3		
SOURCE RESPONSIBLE	51	2.0	2	0.4	49	2.3	42	5.0	5	0.7	2	0.4	-	-

APPENDIX 5 REASONS FOR RESPONSES (Continued)

REASON	RESPONSE TYPE													
	ALL RESPONSES		NON-SOURCE AND SELF-RELIANCE		SOURCE RESPONSES		UNNAMED SOURCES		NON-FAMILY NAMED SOURCES		WITHIN-FAMILY SOURCES		OTHER RESPONSES	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
OTHER FORMAL RELEVANCE	292	11.3	3	0.6	289	13.8	267	31.9	13	1.9	7	1.3	2	6.1
Relevance	181	62.0	3	100.0	178	61.6	175	65.5	2	15.4	1	14.3		
Relevance and personal acquaint	28	9.6			28	9.7	9	3.4	11	84.6	6	85.7	2	100.0
Relevance and local	55	18.8			55	19.0	55	20.6						
Relevance and confidence	28	9.6			28	9.7	28	10.5						
SELF-RELIANCE	268	10.4	257	52.8	11	0.5	9	1.1	-	-	-	-	2	6.1
FAMILY-RELIANCE	143	5.5	27	5.5	116	5.5	1	0.1	-	-	110	20.6	5	15.2
General	62	43.4	26	96.3	36	31.0	1	100.0			35	31.8		
This problem	75	53.4			75	64.7					74	67.3	1	20.0
Confidentiality	5	3.5			5	4.3					1	0.9	4	80.0
Confidentiality: small community	1	0.7	1	3.7										

APPENDIX 5 REASONS FOR RESPONSES (Continued)

REASON	RESPONSE TYPE									
	ALL RESPONSES		NON-SOURCE AND SELF-RELIANCE		SOURCE RESPONSES		UNNAMED SOURCES		NON-FAMILY NAMED SOURCES	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
KIN PREFERENCE	397	15.4	-	-	397	19.0	1	0.1	374	54.1
Close kin	239	60.2			239	60.2			226	60.4
General preference	86	21.7			86	21.7			77	20.6
Preference: this problem	35	8.8			35	8.8			35	9.4
Preference and available/accessible	36	8.6			34	8.6			34	9.1
Preference and Power	2	0.5			2	0.5	1	100.0	1	0.3
Preference and Expertise	1	0.3			1	0.3			1	0.3
PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP	499	19.3	-	-	499	23.8	4	0.5	139	20.1
Childhood dependence	242	48.5			242	48.5			9	6.5
Closest person	128	25.7			128	25.7			26	18.7
Close friend	7	1.4			7	1.4			6	4.3
Friend	54	10.8			54	10.8	2	50.0	52	37.4
Friend and available	25	5.0			25	5.0	1	25.0	24	17.3
Relationship with family	6	1.2			6	1.2			6	4.3
Relationship with family and available	17	3.4			17	3.4	1	25.0	16	11.5
Specific relationship qualities	20	4.0			20	4.0				
									20	5.6

APPENDIX 5 REASONS FOR RESPONSES (Continued)

REASON	RESPONSE TYPE									
	ALL RESPONSES		NON-SOURCE AND SELF-RELIANCE		SOURCE RESPONSES		UNNAMED SOURCES		NON-FAMILY NAMED SOURCES	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
RELIGIOUS FAITH	2	0.1	-	-	2	0.1	-	-	-	-
HELP TO REMAIN IN TOWN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER POSITIVE	1	0.0	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEGATIVE REASONS	93	3.6	43	8.8	50	2.4	43	5.1	3	0.4
No alternative	26	28.0	9	20.9	17	34.0	17	39.5	4	0.8
No local sources	41	44.1	27	62.8	14	28.0	9	20.9	4	100.0
Inaccessibility	5	5.4	3	7.0	2	4.0	2	4.7		
Inaccessible: friend										
kin	7	7.5	3	7.0	4	8.0	3	7.0	1	33.3
Kin unavailable	8	8.6			8	16.0	8	18.6		
Non-kin										
Non-local	4	4.3			4	8.0	3	7.0	1	33.3
Other	2	2.2	1	2.3	1	2.0	1	2.3		

APPENDIX 5 REASONS FOR RESPONSES (Continued)

REASON	RESPONSE TYPE							
	ALL RESPONSES		NON-SOURCE AND SELF-RELIANCE		SOURCE RESPONSES		UNNAMED SOURCES	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
INACTION	132	5.1	131	26.9	1	0.0	-	-
Hopeless	16	12.1	15	11.5	1	100.0	-	-
No interest	22	16.7	22	16.8	-	-	-	-
Town too small	1	0.8	1	0.8	-	-	-	-
Service not needed	2	1.5	2	1.5	-	-	-	-
Not a problem: to town	3	2.3	3	2.3	-	-	-	-
Not a problem: to self	83	62.9	83	63.4	-	-	-	-
Inadequate response	5	3.8	5	3.8	-	-	-	-
TWO SOURCES/ TWO REASONS	4	0.2	-	-	4	0.2	-	-
TOTALS	2581	100.0	487	99.9	2094	99.9	837	100.0
							691	99.9
							533	100.1
							33	100.1

APPENDIX 6
RATINGS OF SPECIFIC UNNAMED SOURCES

APPENDIX 6: RATINGS OF SPECIFIC UNNAMED SOURCES

SOURCE	SOURCE			OTHER UNNAMED SOURCES			DIFFERENCE
	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	eta ²
LOCAL							
Hospitals	7.94	2.11	101	6.45	2.79	731	0.03
Schools	6.85	2.28	88	6.60	2.81	744	0.00
Shire councils	5.60	2.42	68	6.72	2.77	764	0.01
Citizens groups	5.52	2.09	22	6.66	2.77	810	0.00
Capeville Progress Association	5.46	2.09	20	6.66	2.77	812	0.00
General employers	7.59	2.92	28	6.59	2.75	804	0.00
General employees	6.82	2.40	45	6.62	2.78	787	0.00
NON-LOCAL							
Members of Parliament	5.84	3.03	94	6.73	2.71	738	0.01
Popular Member of Parliament	6.24	3.08	79	6.67	2.73	753	0.00
Private solicitors	7.11	2.61	46	6.60	2.77	786	0.00
Department of Social Security	5.79	3.14	32	6.66	2.74	800	0.00
Royal Flying Doctor Service	6.24	2.32	28	6.64	2.78	804	0.00
Queensland Education Department	5.68	3.41	23	6.65	2.74	809	0.00
Commonwealth Employment Service	5.03	3.01	28	6.68	2.74	804	0.01
Boarding schools	8.53	1.98	18	6.59	2.76	814	0.01
BOTH							
Elected representatives	5.89	3.15	114	6.67	2.68	718	0.01
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services	5.76	3.03	15	6.66	2.75	801	0.00

APPENDIX 7

**CHILDREARERS' RATINGS OF THE MOST POPULAR
UNNAMED SOURCES CHOSEN FOR THE COMMUNITY
ISSUES**

APPENDIX 7: CHILDREARERS' RATINGS OF THE MOST POPULAR UNNAMED SOURCES CHOSEN FOR THE COMMUNITY ISSUES

COMMUNITY ISSUE	SOURCE																											ALL UNNAMED SOURCES
	LOCAL HOSPITALS			LOCAL SCHOOLS			LOCAL GOVERN- MENT			LOCAL CITIZENS ORGANI- SATIONS			CAPEVILLE PROGRESS ASSOC- IATION			MEMBERS OF PARLIA- MENT			POPULAR MEMBER OF PARLIA- MENT			ELECTED REPRESENT- TIVES						
	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	
HEALTH	6.97	1.91	7				6.00	2.26	12	5.40	1.90	5	5.40	2.20	4	5.63	2.91	24	5.89	3.10	20	5.37	2.98	30	5.57	2.89	70	
EDUCATION	-	-	-	5.93	1.76	21	8.70	1.41	2	7.70	0.42	2	7.70	0.42	2	6.27	2.72	14	6.51	2.89	12	6.36	3.19	19	5.85	2.59	72	
CHILD CARE	6.35	2.56	6	6.90	2.99	6	5.68	2.79	5	5.80	2.48	4	5.80	2.48	4	6.24	2.76	12	6.47	3.00	10	6.49	2.79	13	5.53	2.65	51	
ESSENTIAL SERVICES	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.68	2.06	12	5.14	2.18	9	4.91	2.21	8	5.91	3.28	20	6.41	3.25	17	5.69	3.24	25	5.20	2.88	69	
UNEMPLOY- MENT	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.97	2.63	30	4.80	2.83	2	4.80	2.83	2	4.93	3.17	21	5.53	3.18	17	5.14	3.25	22	4.97	2.88	50	

APPENDIX 8
BETWEEN-TOWN DIFFERENCES IN SOURCE RATINGS

TABLE 1: BETWEEN-TOWN DIFFERENCES IN RATINGS OF ALL SOURCES

NEED	TOWN									ALL TOWNS			DIFFERENCE eta ²
	GULFTOWN			CAPEVILLE			BUSHLAND						
	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	
COMMUNITY ISSUES													
Health	5.28	2.33	19	5.36	2.92	27	6.53	3.13	37	5.87	2.93	83	0.04
Education	5.09	2.16	19	6.34	2.72	27	6.53	2.71	34	6.13	2.63	80	0.05
Child care	4.61	1.94	15	5.17	2.46	19	6.97	2.84	27	5.83	2.70	61	0.15
Essential services	4.48	2.18	18	4.59	2.89	28	6.17	3.21	33	5.23	2.97	79	0.07
Unemployment	4.83	1.67	13	2.84	2.35	17	6.62	2.95	29	5.13	3.00	59	0.30
PERSONAL UNEMPLOYMENT	7.27	2.23	20	6.20	2.63	26	7.26	2.96	36	6.93	2.71	82	0.03
SPECIALISED NEEDS													
Health	8.28	1.77	20	7.38	2.33	28	9.19	1.26	40	8.40	1.92	88	0.17
Education	7.21	2.38	20	7.66	2.21	28	8.24	2.13	34	7.79	2.23	82	0.04
Legal problems	7.62	2.19	18	7.85	1.86	28	7.34	2.78	40	7.56	2.38	86	0.01
SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS													
Child development	6.69	2.17	18	6.93	2.02	27	8.04	2.44	39	7.39	2.31	84	0.07
Psychological problems	7.61	2.68	19	8.11	1.96	26	8.26	1.99	38	8.06	2.15	83	0.01
Emotional problems	8.14	1.67	19	8.00	1.62	27	8.46	2.11	39	8.24	1.86	85	0.01
Social integration problems	7.97	1.81	18	7.80	1.82	26	8.20	2.51	37	8.02	2.14	81	0.01
Childrearer problems	7.88	2.75	19	7.70	1.74	26	8.33	2.47	39	8.04	2.33	84	0.01

TABLE 1: BETWEEN-TOWN DIFFERENCES IN RATINGS OF ALL SOURCES (Continued)

NEED	TOWN									ALL TOWNS			DIFFERENCE eta ²	
	GULFTOWN			CAPEVILLE			BUSHLAND							
	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f		
CHILD CARE PROBLEMS														
	Prolonged: constant	8.33	1.87	20	8.14	2.61	25	8.85	1.68	37	8.51	2.05	82	0.16
	occasional	8.27	2.08	19	8.53	1.98	24	9.36	1.11	37	8.81	1.71	80	0.28
	Temporary: constant	8.19	2.52	20	8.52	1.41	24	9.22	1.48	37	8.76	1.81	81	0.25
	occasional	8.40	1.89	19	8.19	2.57	24	9.42	1.05	37	8.81	1.89	80	0.28
MATERIAL PROBLEMS														
	Incapacity: prolonged	7.73	2.10	20	7.79	2.35	28	8.52	1.98	40	8.11	2.14	88	0.03
	temporary	7.95	2.07	20	7.59	1.89	28	8.28	2.06	40	7.98	2.01	88	0.02
	Household: prolonged	9.17	1.27	19	8.41	2.18	28	8.97	1.80	39	8.83	1.84	86	0.03
	temporary	9.12	1.31	19	8.68	1.66	28	9.06	1.67	40	8.95	1.59	87	0.01
	Accommodation:													
	permanent	7.53	2.99	17	8.48	2.72	25	8.73	2.19	32	8.37	2.58	74	0.03
	temporary	7.77	2.73	18	8.86	1.75	28	8.79	2.29	38	8.59	2.25	84	0.04
	Destitution: prolonged	7.96	2.45	16	7.86	2.46	27	8.30	2.41	33	8.07	2.41	76	0.01
temporary	7.71	2.52	18	7.76	2.27	28	8.91	1.77	32	8.22	2.19	78	0.07	

TABLE 2: BETWEEN-TOWN DIFFERENCES IN RATINGS OF UNNAMED SOURCES

NEED	TOWN									ALL TOWNS	DIF- FER- ENCE eta ²		
	GULFTOWN			CAPEVILLE			BUSHLAND						
	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f	μ	σ	f				
COMMUNITY ISSUES													
Health	4.92	2.33	16	5.02	2.78	21	6.25	3.13	33	5.57	2.89	70	0.05
Education	5.09	2.17	19	5.80	2.63	22	6.35	2.75	31	5.85	2.59	72	0.04
Child care	4.45	1.81	13	4.88	2.30	17	6.73	2.96	21	5.53	2.65	51	0.15
Essential services	4.32	2.13	17	4.49	2.75	24	6.35	3.08	28	5.20	2.88	69	0.11
Unemployment	4.83	1.66	13	2.98	2.41	14	6.26	3.03	23	4.97	2.88	50	0.23
PERSONAL UNEMPLOYMENT	7.14	2.41	14	6.22	2.68	18	6.38	3.05	25	6.52	2.76	57	0.02
SPECIALISED NEEDS													
Health	8.25	1.81	19	7.61	2.24	22	9.26	1.24	37	8.55	1.84	78	0.15
Education	7.21	2.38	20	7.53	2.47	19	8.14	2.18	29	7.70	2.32	68	0.03
Legal problems	7.75	2.32	12	7.80	1.97	23	7.14	2.73	25	7.52	2.36	60	0.02
SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS													
Child development	5.53	1.55	11	7.35	1.93	18	7.57	2.39	16	6.98	2.16	45	0.15
MATERIAL PROBLEMS													
Accommodation: permanent	6.44	2.92	8	8.50	2.82	12	7.75	3.01	11	7.70	2.93	31	0.08
NOTE: Results are not reported where the frequency for at least one town is less than eight.													

APPENDIX 9
MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

TABLE 1: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-RELIANCE AND NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK SIZE PARTIALISING OUT OTHER VARIABLES

VARIABLES	RELATIONSHIP	f
SELF-RELIANCE AND NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK SIZE	r=-0.39	89
Residential Length	r=-0.39	86
Residential Permanence		
Temporary	r=-0.33	35
More-or-less permanent	r=-0.32	22
Permanence	r=-0.44	28
Family Life Stage (Ordinal)	rho=-0.37	80
Family Life Stage (Dichotomous)		
Young families	r=-0.31	45
Old families	r=-0.44	38
Local Kin		
With local kin	r=-0.44	30
Without local kin	r=-0.36	54
Non-Family Named Support Network Kin	r=-0.35	89

TABLE 2: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL INTIMATES AND LOCAL NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORTS PARTIALISING OUT OTHER VARIABLES

VARIABLES	RELATIONSHIP r	f
LOCAL INTIMATES AND LOCAL NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORTS	0.44	84
Residential Length	0.42	81
Residential Permanence		
Permanent	0.60	32
More-or-less permanent	0.18	21
Temporary	0.50	27
Local Kin		
With local kin	0.51	30
Without local kin	0.29	54
Non-Family Named Support Network Kin	0.45	81

TABLE 3: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL INTIMATES AND NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK INTIMATES PARTIALISING OUT OTHER VARIABLES

VARIABLES	RELATIONSHIP r	f
LOCAL INTIMATES AND NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK INTIMATES	0.36	85
Local Kin		
With local kin	0.28	31
Without local kin	0.37	54
Non-Family Network Kin	0.37	81
Non-Family Named Support Network Kin	0.43	78

TABLE 4: RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SELECTED CHILDREARER CHARACTERISTICS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH LOCAL KIN

	NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK SIZE	NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK DENSITY	NON-FAMILY NETWORK SIZE
NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK KIN	$r = -0.53$ ($f = 28$)	$r = 0.68$ ($f = 28$)	$r = -0.37$ ($f = 28$)
NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK SIZE		$r = -0.37$ ($f = 30$)	$r = 0.34$ ($f = 30$)
NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK DENSITY			$r = -0.48$ ($f = 30$)

TABLE 5: CHILDREARERS WITHOUT LOCAL KIN CHOOSING ADULT LOCAL FRIENDS OR NON-LOCAL ADULT KIN BY NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK KIN PARTIALISING OUT OTHER VARIABLES

VARIABLE	VALUE	MEAN NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORT NETWORK KIN FOR CHILDREARERS CHOOSING					
		LOCAL FRIENDS		NON-LOCAL KIN		eta ²	f
		μ	f	μ	f		
LOCAL INTIMATES	1	33.8	18	64.9	34	0.22	52
	2	32.2	19	47.0	20	0.12	39
	3	36.1	20	53.9	21	0.16	41
	4	4.2	12	83.8	8	0.88	20
LOCAL NON-FAMILY NAMED SUPPORTS	1	39.8	9	77.2	35	0.26	44
	2	37.1	28	47.7	36	0.06	64
	3	17.5	34	48.5	13	0.32	47

TABLE 6: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL UNNAMED SUPPORTS AND NAMED OR UNNAMED SOURCE SELECTION PARTIALISING OUT FAMILY LIFE STAGE FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS	μ	eta ²	f
LOCAL UNNAMED SUPPORTS OF RESPONDENTS CHOOSING: Named sources Unnamed sources	62.5% 46.2%	0.12	34 45
LOCAL UNNAMED SUPPORTS OF CHILDREARERS IN YOUNGER FAMILIES CHOOSING: Named sources Unnamed sources	66.6% 55.2%	0.07	22 16
LOCAL UNNAMED SUPPORTS OF CHILDREARERS IN OLDER FAMILIES CHOOSING: Named sources Unnamed sources	49.7% 39.0%	0.05	10 26

TABLE 7: CHILDREARER CHARACTERISTICS AND SOURCE RATINGS PARTIALISING OUT OTHER VARIABLES

SOURCE	RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTIC	DYADIC RELATIONSHIP OR DIFFERENCE	VARIABLE PARTIALISED OUT	VALUE	RELATIONSHIP OR DIFFERENCE	f
LOCAL SCHOOLS	Residential permanence	$\eta^2 = 0.09$	Employing organisation	Private enterprise Public service Home management	$\eta^2 = 0.04$ $\eta^2 = 0.01$ $\eta^2 = 0.13$	23 21 24
	Employing organisation	$\eta^2 = 0.11$	Residential permanence	Temporary More-or-less permanent Permanent	$\eta^2 = 0.12$ $\eta^2 = 0.07$ -	25 13 -
LOCAL EMPLOYERS	Non-family named support network kin	$r = 0.44$	Residential length	-	$r = 0.08$	13
	Named support network density	$r = 0.56$	Non-family named support network kin	-	$r = 0.46$	18
			Residential length	-	$r = 0.43$	21
LOCAL EMPLOYEES	Self-reliance	$r = -0.33$		-	-	42
	Non-family network size	$r = -0.31$	Employing organisation	Private enterprise Public service Home management	$r = -0.76$ $r = 0.02$ -	31 11 -

TABLE 7: CHILDREARER CHARACTERISTICS AND SOURCE RATINGS CONTROLLING FOR OTHER VARIABLES (Continued)

SOURCE	RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTIC	DYADIC RELATIONSHIP OR DIFFERENCE	VARIABLE CONTROLLED	VALUE	RELATIONSHIP OR DIFFERENCE	f
	Network density	$r = 0.59$	Employing organisation	Private enterprise Public service Home management	$r = 0.69$ $r = 0.05$ -	31 11 -
	Named support network density	$r = 0.45$	Employing organisation	Private enterprise Public service Home management	$r = 0.75$ $r = 0.35$ -	31 11 -
	Residential permanence	$\eta^2 = 0.10$	Residential length	0-3 years 4-11 years 12 years or more	$\eta^2 = 0.55$ $\eta^2 = 0.27$ $\eta^2 = 0.46$	23 34 39
	Non-family network kin	$r = 0.43$	Local kin	No local kin Local kin	$r = 0.50$ $r = 0.15$	60 30
	Network size	$r = -0.31$	Non-family network kin	-	$r = -0.14$	87
	Named support network density	$r = 0.32$	Non-family named support network kin	-	$r = 0.16$	89

TABLE 7: CHILDREARER CHARACTERISTICS AND SOURCE RATINGS CONTROLLING FOR OTHER VARIABLES (Continued)

SOURCE	RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTIC	DYADIC RELATIONSHIP OR DIFFERENCE	VARIABLE CONTROLLED	VALUE	RELATIONSHIP OR DIFFERENCE	f
	Non-family named support network kin	$r = 0.39$	Local kin	No local kin Local kin	$r = 0.18$ $r = 0.00$	66 27
POPULAR MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT	Non-family named support network kin	$r = 0.41$	Local kin	No local kin Local kin	$r = 0.20$ $r = 0.00$	52 27
	Named support network density	$r = 0.34$	Non-family named support network kin		$r = 0.23$	73
LOCAL ADULT KIN	Network density	$r = 0.40$	Network size		$r = 0.21$	22
NON-LOCAL ADULT FRIENDS	Non-family named support network kin	$r = 0.37$	Local kin	No local kin Local kin	$r = 0.20$ $r = 0.08$	41 12