

JUDGEMENTS AS SOCIAL NARRATIVE:  
AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF APPEAL JUDGEMENTS IN  
CLOSELY CONTESTED PARENTING DISPUTES  
IN THE FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA 1988 – 1999

Submitted by  
Lawrie Moloney  
M.A (Melb), M Sc (Edin).

A Thesis submitted in total fulfilment  
of the requirements for the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Institute for Education  
La Trobe University  
Bundoora, Victoria 3083  
Australia

February, 2002

For Jack & Kath

## CONTENTS

SUMMARY	x
STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP	xi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xii
SECTION 1: SHIFTING VISIONS OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY	1
CHAPTER 1	1
Post-separation parenting decisions in Australia:	
Issues of Process and Outcome	1
Decisions about children in family law: setting the scene for the research	1
Presumptive decision-making: an overview	4
Non-presumptive principles	6
Studies of non-presumptive judicial process in parenting cases	10
<i>Family law texts</i>	10
<i>Formal qualitative inquiries</i>	13
<i>Quantitative studies</i>	18
Current knowledge of processes and outcomes	22
Formal rationale for the current research	24
Conducting the empirical research	26
CHAPTER 2	28
Responding to the social stigma of divorce:	
Presumptive decision-making principles of patriarchy, motherhood & blame	28
Background	28
The patriarchal solution	29
Motherhood and the emergence of domesticity	34
Reward and blame	44
Thematic summary	47
The Unclear Ingredients of the Maternal Revolution	49
CHAPTER 3	55
Divorce and the “Silent” Revolution”	55
The Formal Abandoning of Presumptive Principles	55
The legacy of fault and what to do about children	59
“Abandoning” maternal preference	65
Thematic summary	75
CHAPTER 4	77
Multiple Narratives of Children and Families	77
Children as individuals. The Challenge of the Single Instance	77
Deconstructing the Nuclear Family	82
Continuing Modernist and Postmodernist Tensions in Family Law	87
Continuing socio-legal narratives “in the best interests of the child”	96

## SECTION 2: ANALYSING CLOSELY-CONTESTED CASES

### CHAPTER 5

Methodology	108
Introduction	108
Sampling	109
Methodological strengths and limitations	120

### CHAPTER 6

Results: First-level analysis	126
Content analysis of appeal judgements: the cases	128
Case 01: <i>A &amp; J</i>	128
Type of case	128
Legal details and outcomes	128
Selection criteria	129
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	130
The judgement as narrative	131
Initial hypotheses	134
Case 02: Christianos	135
Type of case	135
Legal details and outcomes	135
Summary	135
Selection criteria	136
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	136
The judgement as narrative	137
Initial hypotheses	139
Case 03: Doyle	139
Type of case	139
Legal details and outcomes	139
Summary	140
Selection criteria	140
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	141
The judgement as narrative	141
Initial hypotheses	143
Case 04: Drenovac	143
Type of case	143
Legal details and outcomes	143
Summary	143
Selection criteria	144
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	144
The judgement as narrative	146
Initial hypotheses	148
Case 05: Duck	148
Type of case	148

Legal details and outcomes	148
Summary	149
Selection criteria	149
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	149
The judgement as narrative	150
Initial hypotheses	151
Case 06: Firth	152
Type of case	152
Legal details and outcomes	152
Summary	153
Selection criteria	153
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	154
The judgement as narrative	154
Initial hypotheses	156
Case 07: Fisk	156
Type of case	156
Legal details and outcomes	157
Summary	157
Selection criteria	157
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	158
The judgement as narrative	158
Initial hypotheses	160
Case 08: Hong	160
Type of case	160
Legal details and outcomes	160
Summary	161
Selection criteria	162
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	162
The judgement as narrative	163
Initial hypotheses	165
Case 09: <i>K &amp; Z</i>	165
Type of case	165
Legal details and outcomes	165
Summary	165
Selection criteria	166
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	167
The judgement as narrative	167
Initial hypotheses	169
Case 10: Kneller	169
Type of case	169
Legal details and outcomes	169
Summary	170
Selection criteria	170
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	171
The judgement as narrative	171
Initial hypotheses	173
Case 11: Lalor	173

Type of case	173
Legal details and outcomes	173
Summary	174
Selection criteria	174
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	175
The judgement as narrative	175
Initial hypotheses	176
Case 12: Lavette	176
Type of case	176
Legal details and outcomes	176
Summary	177
Selection criteria	178
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	178
The judgement as narrative	179
Initial hypotheses	181
Case 13: Lavrut	181
Type of case	181
Legal details and outcomes	181
Summary	182
Selection criteria	183
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	183
The judgement as narrative	183
Initial hypotheses	184
Case 14: McCall	185
Type of case	185
Legal details and outcomes	185
Summary	185
Selection criteria	186
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	186
The judgement as narrative	187
Initial hypotheses	189
Case 15: McMillan	190
Type of case	190
Legal details and outcomes	190
Summary	190
Selection criteria	191
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	191
The judgement as narrative	192
Initial hypotheses	193
Case 16: Moddel	193
Type of case	193
Legal details and outcomes	194
Summary	194
Selection criteria	194
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	195
The judgement as narrative	195
Initial hypotheses	197

Case 14: Peterson	197
Type of case	197
Legal details and outcomes	197
Summary	197
Selection criteria	198
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	199
The judgement as narrative	199
Initial hypotheses	201
Case 18: Ploetz	201
Type of case	201
Legal details and outcomes	201
Summary	202
Selection criteria	202
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	202
The judgement as narrative	203
Initial hypotheses	204
Case 19: Re Evelyn	204
Type of case	204
Legal details and outcomes	204
Summary	204
Selection criteria	206
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	206
The judgement as narrative	208
Initial hypotheses	210
Case 20: Robbins	210
Type of case	210
Legal details and outcomes	210
Summary	211
Selection criteria	212
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	212
The judgement as narrative	212
Initial hypotheses	215
Case 21: Ross Doyle	215
Type of case	215
Legal details and outcomes	215
Summary	215
Selection criteria	216
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	216
The judgement as narrative	217
Initial hypotheses	218
Case 22: Sheradin	218
Type of case	218
Legal details and outcomes	219
Summary	219
Selection criteria	219
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	220
The judgement as narrative	221

Initial hypotheses	222
Case 23: Smith	222
Type of case	222
Legal details and outcomes	223
Summary	223
Selection criteria	224
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	224
The judgement as narrative	225
Initial hypotheses	227
Case 24: Toon	227
Type of case	227
Legal details and outcomes	228
Summary	228
Selection criteria	229
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	229
The judgement as narrative	229
Initial hypotheses	231
Case 25: Ward	232
Type of case	232
Legal details and outcomes	232
Summary	232
Selection criteria	233
Core socio-legal issues supporting the judgement	233
The judgement as narrative	233
Initial hypotheses	235
Patterns within the judgments	235
 CHAPTER 7	 238
Second level analysis: Do fathers “win” or do mothers “lose”?	238
“Successful fathers” judgements	241
Summary of “successful fathers” cases	255
“Successful mothers” judgements	257
The case of “Re Evelyn”: A surrogacy dispute	265
Summary of “successful mothers” cases	268
 CHAPTER 8	 272
The persistence of the nurturing/bread-winning dichotomy: contextualising the findings	272
Introduction	272
The legacy of gender-neutral parenting legislation and its “adultist” origins	278
Gender and current Australian family values	282
What do we know now about gender, parenting and child development that we did not know in 1976?	284
Making sense of our current knowledge-base	288
The future of externally-imposed post-separation parenting decisions	291

References	297
Cases Cited	309
Notes	310

### **Figure**

1. Outline of purposeful sampling: Screening criteria of AustLII cases	110
--	-----

### **Tables**

1. Cases by Name, Type, Feature and Judge at First Instance	116
2. Residence Order and Year of Judgement	118
3. Gender and Status of Applicant and Appellant	119
4. Descriptions of mothers and fathers in “successful fathers” and “successful mothers” cases	240

## SUMMARY

The thesis is divided into two sections. Section 1 explores the psycho-social and legal constructions of family, parenting and children that have influenced judicial decision-making in parenting disputes following separation and divorce. Particular attention is paid, first, to the circumstances surrounding the shift from paternal to maternally-based presumptions about the parenting of children; and second, to the more recent and somewhat puzzling shift to a presumption of gender neutrality. The extent to which fault has continued as a less overt decision-making criterion is also considered.

In Section 2, judgements in recent closely contested parenting cases in the Family Court of Australia are analysed as contemporary socio-legal narratives. A systematic, in-depth examination of a heterogeneous sample of publicly accessible cases revealed that gender-based assumptions continue to dominate judicial thinking about parenting and family structure. In particular, it was found that outcomes that favoured mothers correlated with perceived evidence of conformity to a maternal stereotype of self-sacrifice on behalf of the child(ren). Outcomes favouring fathers usually resulted from situations in which mothers were judged to fall short of these stereotyped expectations. Fathers' roles, even in cases in which their applications were successful, generally continued to be equated with breadwinning and support. Their capacities as nurturers to their children were either not mentioned or treated with scepticism.

In the light of the findings, tensions between continuing gender-based roles in families, public attitudes to parenting and preferred family structure, and recent changes in our scientific knowledge base regarding gender and parenting are reviewed. Implications of the persistence of the breadwinning/nurturing dichotomy both within the Australian culture and family court judgements are discussed. Particular attention is drawn to the impact of the confused circumstances in which gender-neutral parenting principles came about in the 1970s.

## STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

Except where reference is made in the text of the thesis, this thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgement in the main text of the thesis.

This thesis has not been submitted for the award of any degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

Lawrie Moloney  
February 18, 2002

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to those many friends, colleagues, supervisees and students, too numerous to mention, who have shared with me a passionate interest in finding better ways to assist adults and children in the difficult processes associated with family separation and re-formation. Thanks to those who understand that, though not glamorous and not for the feint-hearted, the work has “character building” qualities, interspersed with moments of great reward. Rewards come from the clients themselves, especially the children and from opportunities to work across professional boundaries.

The legal and non-legal professionals who work effectively in what is known as family law are very special people. Perhaps appropriately, their success is rarely recognised or appreciated outside of the families they assist and outside small clusters of other colleagues. Nonetheless, their thoughts and struggles to understand better the complexities of their trade have inspired me to write on child and family issues in the past and to undertake and complete the present project.

Due to a number of contingencies, especially the unfortunate financial cuts to universities in recent times, the present project experienced several false starts. In retrospect, the rather lengthy gestation period was probably no bad thing. Thus with the support of my university’s outside studies program and the opportunity to spend that time at the Australian Institute of Family Studies (AIFS), I found I was able to complete the bulk of the writing in a relatively short space of time.

For this support I am grateful to La Trobe University and to my colleagues in the Counselling and Psychotherapy Unit within the School of Public Health. I am especially thankful to Dr George Wills and Dr Helen Gardner, who told me at the time of my sabbatical leave to go away and not come back until I had finished. At the same time, I am aware that no matter how well one endeavours to plan these things, one’s fellow academics always find themselves shouldering extra responsibilities at such times. I

sincerely thank those who did this on my behalf and I hope to return the favour.

I am most grateful to Elisabeth Zinschitz, who provided a willing and patient ear, usually at the end of long-distance telephone calls, whilst much of the writing took place. I am also extremely grateful to the staff at AIFS. The Director, David Stanton, and the then Deputy Director, Dr Peter Saunders, made me very welcome. I was given an office and complete access to the Institute's wonderful library. I felt like a child in a sweet shop. I was left alone when I needed to read and write – but was always offered assistance when I needed it, whether in the form of help with computers, tracing difficult to find material, or simply a chance to bounce ideas around.

Two members of the AIFS family law team deserve special mention. Dr Belinda Fehlberg freely shared with me her extensive knowledge of family law and pointed me in the direction of a suitable data base. Bruce Smyth assisted me in ways that are simply too numerous to recount. He encouraged, criticised, brought cups of tea, advised on formatting, read drafts and put in some late nights with me towards the end. His belief in the project was unshakeable and I cannot thank him enough.

Dr Raymon Lewis was my supervisor. Raymon is the sort of supervisor that all adult students deserve. He is encouraging and enthusiastic yet retains a critical eye. There were several points at which I now recognise I may have lost my way without him. Family law is ultimately about everything. Without Raymon the thesis would have been considerably longer without being any better. Though it is ultimately for others to judge, my hope is that with Raymon's assistance, the thesis has finished up as readable, whilst making a contribution to the field *and* staying within the word limits.

Finally, a more personal acknowledgement: whilst conducting this research, my relationship with my partner, Banu, was unfortunately ending. Much that is in this thesis speaks to matters that we discussed together over many years. During our time together, as during our time apart, we have also jointly shared the parenting of our two beautiful children, Jonathon and Jeremy. We brought and bring to our parenting quite different styles and attributes. But never has it occurred to us, I believe, that

our differing contributions were not of equal value. Perhaps that is the source of my passion for the child-related aspects of family law.