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**Abstract**

Research suggests that the wellbeing of single parents is a sociological issue which has been explored to a considerable extent in the Western context but not in the Middle East. While there are some theoretical studies in the context of the Middle East there is no evidence of empirical research on single parent wellbeing in the context of Kuwait despite the fact that the number of single parents is growing in the past decade. Contemporary research has shown that wellbeing is a multidimensional construct which could be influenced by a number of background and social factors.

This research empirically investigated the impact of select background factors on the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait and also investigated the association between five separate dimensions of social wellbeing and three dimensions of subjective wellbeing. The research takes mainly a quantitative approach and makes use of both first generation statistical tools as well as Structural Equation Modelling. Standard items from existing wellbeing scales were used to develop the multi-dimensional scale used in this research and reliability and validity tests were conducted. The sample consisted of 391 working single parents in Kuwait selected based on stratified random sampling from three representative ministries with a cross sectional survey approach to research.

The research showed that female single parents had higher scores than the male single parents in three dimensions of social wellbeing and the affect dimension of subjective wellbeing. Single parents subjective wellbeing differed with respect to qualifications, but not marital status, income or work experience. A model was developed which shows that social integration is associated with affect; and social contribution, social acceptance, and social actualization with life evaluation, affect and eudaimonia. This means that if single parents feel integrated and accepted within their society then they report greater satisfaction & flourishing. Single parents were also asked to respond qualitatively, to describe their social situation and make suggestions for improvement. The integration of the quantitative and qualitative findings provided a range of recommendations for the Ministry of Social Welfare, Kuwait which might improve the wellbeing of the single parents. The research not only provides empirical evidence for the state of wellbeing of single parents, but also adds to the body of knowledge in the field of single parent wellbeing in Kuwait.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1. Overview
This chapter provides the background to the study and discusses some of the challenges faced by single parents. The chapter highlights how single parent issues constitute a social issue which needs attention and is important to study. The chapter gives the detailed social context in which the research has been undertaken and provides background about the social as well as economic setting in Kuwait over the past few decades. This chapter provides the problem statement and lists the research questions. The chapter defines the aims and objectives of this research. The significance of research is explained in this chapter. The chapter concludes with a glossary of terms and the structure of the thesis.

1.2. Background
A single parent family may be defined as, “A family comprising of a single mother or father having their own dependent child or children” (Kotwal & Prabhakar, 2009, p. 197). Accordingly, a single parent is a person without a partner bringing up a child or children. Single parenthood may be the result of a parent being separated/divorced, widowed, or premarital birth of child/children, female headed homeless family, noncustodial parent, grandparent as single parent etc. It is observed that the number of single parents is growing globally, for instance, in the USA in the year 2006 there were about 12.9 million single parent families and in 2011, the number grew to about 13.7 million (Essien & Bassey, 2012). On average, in the US about 35% of children are reared by single parents (National Kids Count, 2016). The global figure shows that about one fourth to one third of families are single parent families (Single Parent Families, 2016). These statistics are available in the global context and mostly in Western countries and no detailed data is available for Middle Eastern countries including Kuwait. In Kuwait it is found that the number of single parents has grown from 109,326 in the year 2012 to 138,574 in 2016 (Central Statistical Bureau Kuwait, 2017), which indicates about 27 percent increase in a span of four years and the number keeps growing.

Acting as a single parent, be it a father or a mother, is a challenging task as the roles and responsibilities discharged by two people will have to be managed by a single individual.
The single parent will be responsible for looking after the child/children and settling them in their life. Usually in a typical Kuwaiti family, the mother takes care for the upbringing of the children while the father provides financial support and security for the child as well as the mother. But in the case of the single parents, the lone parent will have to perform this dual role, that is, family provider as well as home maker. Under such circumstances, the social, economic and emotional state of the single parent will be much different from that of the typical parents. Wellbeing in simple words is a state of comfort, it has a social context, and it is based on the self-perception of one’s circumstance and functioning in society (Zhang et al., 2010). A study of the wellbeing of single parents is an important area of research, as it opens avenues to improve their state of being in the society. Thus, this research has a specific focus on the social wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait.

Earlier research shows that growing up in single parent families can have an adverse effect on both children as well as the single parents (e.g., Mackey, 1994, Swisher, 1997; Usakli, 2013). Single parenthood is very common in Western countries and is spreading across other countries since the past decade. A much debated topic regarding single parenthood is the wellbeing of single parents, especially the mothers (Entmacher et al., 2014). A decade long study by Entmacher et al., (2014) revealed that the poverty level of single American mothers was five times higher than married parents.

Research into the wellbeing of single parents demands attention because earlier studies have shown that single parents are treated differently by society in many countries, and in particular the children raised by one biological parent can be subject to inferior social and economic living conditions in comparison to children raised by both biological parents (Thompson et al., 2001; Usdansky, 2003 and Usakli, 2013). Sociological studies have revealed that children with a single parent may suffer from a lack of emotional support and perform poorly academically, while single parents are more likely to be poor and in some settings, may be more likely to be involved in crime or drug use (Leone, 1997). Single parenting involves issues such as custody of the child, raising of the children, visitation issues of the parent, inadequate government or societal assistance, influence of social forces on single parenting have also been documented (Usdansky, 2003). Single parenting issues may be more severe in the case of women and the study by Kotwal and Prabhakar (2009).
has revealed that about 56% of single parent women avoided social functions. The women reported the reason for not attending social functions was because of low self-esteem, lack of identity and poverty issues. The same study also revealed that about 50% of single mothers had changed their lifestyle after entering into single parenthood due to depression and the lack of companionship. Kotwal and Prabhakar (2009) have reported cases where single mothers have experienced trauma and reached a stage which made it difficult for them to discharge their child-care responsibilities. A study on single parenthood has become increasingly important because earlier research has argued that single parent families: can contribute to violent crime (Mackey, 1994); have been unfairly stigmatized and face discrimination (Essien & Bassey, 2012; Young, 1994); and face rejection from society, culture and religion (Essien & Bassey, 2012). In fact, researchers have expressed that there is a need for attitudinal change and social orientation on the part of the societal members towards single parents, especially the mothers (Essien & Bassey, 2012).

1.3. The Social Issue and its Importance

Social research has the power to make life better by understanding the complexity of human lives and the understanding of the issues that affect them so that the public may be given an influential role in offering services that can make a difference to everyone (Chanfreau et al., 2008). Single parenting has been considered as a social and sociological issue by a group of researchers from across the world (Burgess, 1970; Kimani and Kombo, 2010). Single parenting is a growing concern in Kuwait in recent times (Kuwait Times, 2013). Among many different possibilities leading to single parenthood, divorce is of special concern. The divorce rate in Kuwait has increased from 30 percent in 2005 to 45 percent in 2009 (Alqashan, 2009). Further, it was found that almost 55 percent of couples filing for divorce in Kuwait have not completed even four years of married life, and 25 percent not even completed one year (Kuwait Times, 2013). Still more alarming recent news is that about half the marriages in Kuwait end in divorce. A lack of compassion and acceptance of each other was the main cause for divorce. Negligence, inability to share responsibilities, and adultery were the other causes (Gulf News Kuwait, 2015). These reports indicate how important a social issue divorce is in the context of Kuwait.
In a comparative study, it was reported that the increased divorce rate has resulted in almost 45% of all Kuwaiti children living in a single-parent home in comparison to 40% of children in the United States (Alqashan, 2009; Tanner, 2002). Research and Statistics Department in the Ministry of Justice have shown that only 20 percent continued with the marriage among 5,662 couples who attended marriage counselling (Kuwait Times, 2013). While 62 percent of those who divorced had no children, 34 percent had one to three children and 3 percent had four to six children (Kuwait Times, 2013). Negative attitudes towards single parents, if any, can lead to ill-being including severe psychological stress to these parents as observed by many researchers (e.g. Kimani and Kombo, 2010; Kotwal and Prabhakar, 2009). It is important to investigate whether single parents consider themselves be at a disadvantage to parents with their marriages intact. If it is so, then there is a need to find the cause for such a situation and bring a systematic reformation that should be initiated in society so that the single parents can lead their lives with pride and dignity on par with the two-parent families. In other words, it is important to undertake a study which investigates the social and subjective dimensions of the wellbeing of single parents.

Sociology as a discipline has a tradition of analysis of family values, organisation, and behavior (Esping-Andersen, 1999; Lucifora & Meurs, 2012). Research has shown that strong family values had many different positive influences on wellbeing (Alesina & Giuliano, 2012; Ljunge, 2011). However, how these family values would influence wellbeing has not been adequately explored. One way of defining family values is to express it in terms of roles and responsibilities which are reciprocal among the members (Lucifora & Meurs, 2012). Thus, it is clear that family values do have a role to play in the welfare and financial security of the members of the family. There is a need to relate family values to cultural components, particularly in the Arab-Islamic sources. The social interaction of a family has also emerged as an important area of research. The nuclear family of Kuwait, or in general the Arab, is distinctly different from that of the Western countries and is in a transition stage.

The Handbook of Arab Cultural Awareness (2006) describes the family values in many different ways. Kuwait is typical to that of any Arab nation and distinctly different from the Western world. In the Arab context, the family is considered to be the central building
block of the society. Elders and fathers have a special ‘elevated place’ in the family. Among the children, the male is considered to be more important than the female. Polygamous families are accepted but not recommended in the Arab world in general. Most of these traditional values are changing.

There are many different studies focused on issues related to single parenthood. A group of researchers in the context of the USA, UK and Middle East countries have focused their study on the economic, demographic, cultural and religious aspects related to single parenthood (Ibsen Al Faruqi, 1985, cited in Alqashan and Alkandari, 2010; Hetherington and Kelly, 2002; Trent and South, 1992). Another group of researchers in the context of the USA and UK have studied the influence of education on single parenthood (Hyman and Wright, 1979; Krishnan, 1994; Thornton, 1989; Trent and South, 1992). The influence of financial status on single parenthood has been the focal theme in many studies (e.g., Gelissen, 2003; Goldscheider and Waite, 1986; Kapinus and Johnson, 2002; Krishnan, 1994). The reasons for single parenthood have been the focus of several researchers (Alexis and Lisa, 2007; Allen et al., 2004; Andrew, 2010; Macionis, 2005). The proposed research study is distinctly different from earlier research in the sense that it will explore the wellbeing based determinants of single parents in Kuwait.

As the number of single parents is growing continuously in the past decade, the study of the wellbeing of single parents is becoming increasingly important as they form a sizable number in the society which demands attention. Al-Kazi (2008) through his research on divorce in Kuwait has found that there is an increase in the female headed single parents in Kuwait living separated even from their parental family after divorce and being economically independent. It is necessary to undertake a study on the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait because it is an important social issue. There has been no such study undertaken on single parents in Kuwait particularly in the quantitative context. Further, research on single parents in the Arab world has established a strong correlation between the divorce of parents and the development of the children, particularly when the divorce of parents takes place when the children are at an age below 25 years (Kapinus, 2004). Hence, for the formation of a healthier society a detailed study about the wellbeing of single parents becomes not only important but also a compelling necessity.
Parsfield et al., (2015) have highlighted the importance of the study of wellbeing by claiming it to be a worthwhile aim in the context of a country and convey that-

“We are not alone in holding this view: theorists and creators of public policy from Aristotle through Mill and Bentham to today’s multi-national agenda-setters such as the World Bank and OECD have, in different forms, stressed the wellbeing of citizens as a goal of policy and governance. Since 2010, the UK Office for National Statistics has collected data on the population’s reported wellbeing, and David Cameron declared in a speech in his first year as prime minister that government should “[measure] our progress as a country, not just by how our economy is growing, but by how our lives are improving; not just by our standard of living, but by our quality of life” (p. 10-11).

The study of wellbeing is important because the outcome of a study on wellbeing can provide information for policy-making by the government bodies. Researchers have linked the study of ‘wellbeing’ into ‘social value’ enhancement (e.g., Muglan, 2010). The social value is considered to be the non-financial impacts of programs, organizations, projects, especially on wellbeing of individuals and communities (Muglan, 2010). The assessment of wellbeing has social value attached to it and has three major benefits: it indicates how satisfied are the citizens of a country with their lives; provides inputs on the comfort or stress encountered by them; and to a great extent results in the realization of the aspirations and potential of the people. How satisfied the citizens are in a country refers to happiness and life satisfaction of the individuals and communities and it defines wellbeing (Allin, 2007 and Dodge et al., 2012). Comfort refers to the good life of the individuals as assessed by them which is again another measure of their wellbeing (White, 2010). Realizations of aspirations and potential is the manifestation of the dreams of an individual to reality and it is also a measure of wellbeing (Ryan & Deci, 2001).

Wellbeing research has been gaining importance during the past three decades around the globe (e.g., Keyes , 1998; Aked at al., 2008; Diener & Chan, 2011; Eiffe et al., 2016). This is because wellbeing is preferred over happiness by psychologists as happiness by virtue is a part of wellbeing and studies have shown that happiness includes aspects such as life satisfaction. Even though happiness and wellbeing are close in their meaning happiness is more of Eudaimonia or flourishing, whereas; wellbeing is living well which includes also
comfort and health (Michalos, 2007; Hicks et al., 2013; Lundblad and Archer, 2015). In surveys, it has been found that those who had scored high in 'wellbeing scales' also had higher scores in satisfaction scales (Agarwal et al., 2010; Moghaddam, 2008; Polit, 2005). Another interesting issue related to wellbeing is that there are different forms of wellbeing which could be at social and subjective wellbeing level and they are all interrelated in some way or the other (Brown et al., 2014 and Disabato et al., 2016).

1.4. Social Context

The social context of this research is the State of Kuwait, an Arab nation. Most of the sociological studies on single parenthood have been carried out in the western context, which is different in many ways in comparison to the Arab world in general and Kuwait in particular.

Kuwait has seen several changes in its social and economic setting over the past few decades. The economic and social life of Kuwait changed after World War II as it was discovered to be the third largest reservoir of oil at that time (Ashton, 1998). Over a period, the economy of Kuwait has stabilized, and it has been able to provide its citizens with free healthcare, public employment, education, and housing. Thus, an increased social concern is quite evident (Kuwait Petroleum Corporation, 2014; Public Authority for Housing Welfare, 2017). With a population of about 4 Million with growth rate of about 3 percent annually (Worldometer, 2017), Kuwait is now a tax-free country with an open economy and has about 10% of world reserve of crude oil with a GDP of about US$ 150 Billion and per capita income of about US$ 57,600 (The World Factbook, 2015). The Human Development Index of Kuwait is 0.814, Life expectancy 74.3 years, and with the GDP growth rate of about 8.5% Kuwait is one of the fastest growing Arab regions. The Kuwait economy is dominated by oil with 90% of the export revenues (Human Development Report, 2014). About 91% of the government jobs are occupied by Kuwaitis, and 94% of private company based jobs are occupied by expatriates (Oxford Business Report, 2014). It is important to note that compared to the population of the country the number of single parents is considerable compared to any other country, further the concern is that the number keeps increasing year by year and this necessitates the initiation of a detailed study on the wellbeing of single parents.
Single parenthood is a global phenomenon and research studies have found that it has resulted in children staying with the single parent (Catherine, 2010) who in many cases are females (Current Population Survey, 2006). The Arab society has undergone a transformation regarding its lifestyle and the family system is much different than that in the western countries.

El-haddaad (2003) discussed the influence of urbanization, family structure reorientation, family morality, work culture of women, marriages and divorce, globalization and family, epidemic diseases, and ageing in the context of Gulf countries in general and several instances as specifically applicable to Kuwait. These changes have impacted the social life of the Kuwaitis in many different ways, and each of these aspects is discussed in the following paragraphs.

1.4.1. Urbanization

The migration of people from rural to the urban region has played a significant role in urban transformations. Changes are also affecting the family and the individual in the context of the current urban transformation. The urban transformation is mainly attributed to the discovery of oil, making the Gulf attract an international market. Internationalization has led to changes in family life. In fact, the highest rate of urbanization was recorded in Kuwait which was 90%, against 85% in Bahrain, and 70% in Qatar. El-haddaad (2003) found that urbanization had brought change in family relations. Global values have been imbibed by many families in Kuwait in the urban region. Personal tastes and interests regarding family life were also influenced by urbanization (Zayed, 1998). Abu-Bakr and Al–Amoudi (1994) observed that the changes were found to be rapid from one generation to the other. Even contact with the society of origin was found to be reduced in the Gulf region (Baqader, 1998).

1.4.2. Family Structure

Changes in the family structure were also prevalent over a period, and the Arab families started to shrink to smaller sizes (El-haddaad, 2003). The reduction in the number of family members was so rapid that there were predictions that the concept of family itself would vanish someday. The modernity brought some changes in family structure which included
reduced size of family; reduced traditional kinship in family; and the father losing authority in making decisions about the future of a son or daughter (Baqer, 1994). These changes led into two conflicting views, one being the formation of small sized conjugal family, and the other large sized extended family (Zayed, 1998). The traditional Arab families preferred the large sized family, whereas the modern Arabs preferred the smaller family with family planning. The desire for independently enjoying parental life was making the traditional lifestyle with elders in the family less important.

Changes in the roles, responsibilities, and activities of the Gulf family are the other transformation in the Gulf over a period. Services available in the urban societies have eased the tasks of the household such as washing and ironing clothes, washing dishes, cooking, the conduct of family functions, rearing children, etc. The complete change in the economic system also has a role to play in these transformations (El-haddaad, 2003). The changes brought in schooling, and the emphasis on education has also made children grow closer to their friends rather than being attached to the family as in traditional family structures.

1.4.3. Globalization

Changes in the mode of communication and the medium available for children and youngsters to exchange their views on issues of mutual interest has also brought changes in the way that children and parents communicate (El-haddaad, 2003). Western influence is quite evident as the youth is in touch with their counterparts from many different parts of the world. Globalization, according to El-haddaad, (2003), has also impacted the mode of communication between the parents and the children in the family as many of the youngsters join to work at a very early age due to the opportunities available. The change in lifestyle induced through the work culture in the globalized environment also contributes to the change from traditional to the modern lifestyle.

Babysitting of the children has also been introduced in the Arab post-globalization on a larger scale than ever before as married members in the family prefer to move to independent houses away from their parents and there will be nobody to look after the children particularly when both the parents are employed. Ali (1983) has expressed that the children would have the culture of the babysitter if the baby sitter is of different nationality,
which is not completely Arab when the babysitter has a different nationality. The domestic servants (maids) or babysitters who are employed from overseas rear the children based on their culture and the child may imbibe a new culture different from the Arab culture. Moreover, the babysitters do not receive any formal training, so they rear the child according to their own cultural ways (Zayed, 1998). It was surprising to note that a survey in Kuwait indicated that more than 80% of Kuwaiti women opposed replacing the system of babysitting (El-haddaad, 2003). The same survey also observed that employability of both the parents was not the sole reason for employing foreign baby-sitters or nannies and regardless of other engagements it was preferred by the Gulf families. This can be attributed to the change in functions and the wealth accumulation as well as the desire for the comforts of life.

Economic abundance was also characterized by the formation of a culture that has given undue importance to all the different forms of possessions such as villas, vehicles, domestic aid, and the extravaganza. These changes, in turn, bring their forms of lifestyles and change in the family functions and values. According to El-haddaad (2003) over attachment to belongings will reduce socialization and take away the traditional values of the Arab culture.

1.4.4. Working women

Not only in Kuwait but in the entire Arab world the number of working women is on the rise since past several decades (Baqader, 1979). But at the same time, Arab men were not happy marrying working women or graduates (El-haddaad, 2003). But this trend is now changing as the youth are moving away from the traditional lifestyles. The nontraditional approach makes the entire orientation towards a married life to be different. However, it has improved the involvement of women in deciding about important issues of the household. There is an opposition for this new role of women by some sections of the society (El-haddaad, 2003).

1.4.5. Marriage and divorce

Marriage and divorce are also influenced by the changes in the living conditions in Kuwait. One major trend observed in the Middle East is the moving from arranged marriage to the
marriage by earlier consociation (Baqer, 1994). While the traditional system believed in early marriages, late marriages are now becoming more and more apparent. While marriage through earlier consociation is observed to be more in number the disassociation of the married couple leading towards divorce is also becoming common (Baqer, 1994).

Arab countries are undergoing a form of family transformation since the past several decades. However, the degree of transformation and the rate of transformation may vary between the Arab countries. In a study conducted by Baqer (1994), it was found that there was a mixed reaction to the acceptance of traditional and modern values of marriage. The study showed that women would prefer divorce if the husband had two wives. Youngsters in this study considered marriage as a socially important event but did not attach much traditional value to it. Baqer (1994) concluded that there were issues such as the nature of work and qualifications had a bearing on the participant’s view of marriage.

1.4.6. Epidemic Diseases

Propagation of epidemic diseases has also been rapid in modern times among which HIV/AIDS is considered a major challenge (El-haddaad, 2003). The fear of such epidemics has also impacted social life, and in the context of families, it demands a higher level of trust between the partners and the possibility of suspicion is on the rise. Drug use is not a major issue in Kuwait. However, the fear factor is in connection to the spread of sexually transmitted diseases (El-haddaad, 2003).

1.4.7. Changes to Kuwaiti culture

It is evident that family life, value system, youth behavior, lifestyles and culture in the Gulf countries, in general, has been undergoing changes during the past several decades. The changes have led to an erosion of traditional values and one issue in this connection is the care for older parents. While there could be several reasons for abandoning older parents, their ability to adjust with the younger generation and adaptability to the technology driven lifestyle are considered to be dominant (Fido and Al-Saad, 2013). According to Zayed (1998), the education received by the women in the society is in the forefront of the role change and status change for them in the family. Single parenthood has been more challenging to those who are in the nuclear family structure in comparison to the extended
family (Fido and Al-Saad, 2013). The pre-Islamic Arabs found their strength in tribes. Islam extended their strength beyond the tribe and men were given specific responsibilities and duties towards their wives and children, and children were advised to honor their father and mother. But now men and women are expected to provide the economic and emotional support to children about their social position (Barakat, 1985). When specific duties were assigned by the elders to the members of the family, there used to be a type of unity developed in the family. This unity is lost in the modern world as the power and authority of decision making is transferred to the economic support provider in the family (Barakat, 1985).

Social and cultural change due to civic awareness has been rapid after the invasion of Iraq in 1990, and there has been a rising level of education in the youth. About 70 percent of the citizens in Kuwait are under the age of 29 and Globalization, and social networking has provided the impetus for social awareness (Ghabra, 2014). It has also been observed that the Kuwaiti youth is inclined towards the Western culture, in general owing to the revolution in computer technology and this has an impact on the lifestyle and wellbeing of the young community in Kuwait (Ghabra, 2014).

Kuwait is characterized by a homogenous race, the connected social network of people, and Islamic values, but at the same time separated by social strata of the ruling family, the old merchant families, the urban class, Shia, and Bedouin (Al-Mekaimi, 2003; Al-Sabah, 2001). Another noticeable feature in Kuwait is gender separation, where men and women gather separately during social activities, and this is considered to be a part of the culture. The study of single parent wellbeing regarding gender difference is of specific importance to the proposed research. This is because there is a different legislation and social attitudes in Kuwait in comparison to the western countries regarding marriage and divorce. Kuwaiti women who marry outside the group, along with their families, are found to be marginalized (Tétreault and Al-Mughni, 1995). In contrast, the families of Kuwaiti men who marry non-Kuwaitis are treated no differently from families in which both spouses are Kuwaitis. Marriage to foreigners also causes Kuwaiti women to lose some of their rights (Tétreault and Al-Mughni, 1995). These disparities regarding the economic benefits and
social lifestyle between the male and the female residents of Kuwait necessitate the study of the wellbeing of the single parents regarding the gender differences.

1.5. Wellbeing and social change

‘Wellbeing’ is a social concept and it is important to study it because it is based on the perception of the individual rather than an objective reality (McGregor, 2007). According to the very foundation of sociology, the interactions between the individual and the society where he/she lives can impact the state of wellbeing. Wellbeing of single parents has its bearing on the society to a considerable extent as they form a particular section of the society. Researchers have attempted to study how policy makers contribute to the wellbeing at the individual level. For instance, Reeler (2007) has made attempts to find the gap developed between policy makers and practitioners. The gap was mainly in terms of the ‘theorizing’ of the wellbeing by the policy makers and the actual state of the citizens of the country. There are three major theories regarding change in society which may bridge the gap as discussed in the following paragraphs.

Emergent change in society is considered to be the most enduring form of change. In simple terms, it is the change taking place in the members of the society through the experiences they undergo (Reeler, 2007). Emergent change in society may have an influence on the social wellbeing of single parents because both conscious and unconscious learning about the wellbeing may be based on the emerging changes in the society. Currently, it is a globalized economy that is prevailing in the world, and it is having an impact in Kuwait. Many multinational companies have entered into the market in Kuwait, and the government has ties with the top companies around the globe for both its infrastructure and human resource development. As this study focuses on single parents in government organizations, the changes due to globalization may have emergent changes in the society which may in turn influence the social wellbeing of the single parents.

Transformative change is caused by the crisis faced by the society at a particular stage (Reeler, 2007). A tense situation or a contradictory relationship between the members of the society and the world they live in may force them to undergo a transformative change. The contrast between the emergent change and the transformative change is that the former is a process of learning, while the latter is that of unlearning. The members of the society
undergoing transformative change need to free themselves from the set beliefs and ways of life which they had considered to be the most appropriate. The wellbeing of a particular section of society, for example, single parents, can be drastically influenced by transformative change. More specifically, the social wellbeing of single parents can be influenced by the transformative change effected in the society. Transformative change refers to the philosophical, practical and strategic process (Reeler, 2007). All the five dimensions of social wellbeing: social integration, social acceptance, social contribution, social coherence, and social actualization (Keyes, 1998; Zhang et al., 2010) can be influenced by the transformation that can take place in the society. Reeler (2007) gives the example of the crisis in the 1990s in South Africa which was witnessed by the teachers regarding students' behavior in the context of severe punishment. A similar situation may arise due to the transformative change taking place in the society which in turn may influence the social wellbeing of single parents.

*Projectable change* is the ability of the members of the society to induce changes in themselves to meet the future requirements as predicted by them (Reeler, 2007). In the context of the single parents it is obvious that their wellbeing is a function of how they identify and solve problems which they may encounter as well as their plans for the future.

The above three major theories of global social change need not necessarily exist separately and one may interact with the other in bringing about a change (Reeler, 2007). There could be a situation where emergent change could be supported by the sub-processes of transformative or projectable change.

### 1.6. Social wellbeing of single parents

The sociological perspectives are of significance in the context of social wellbeing of single parents. Reflexive modernization demands a review of all the fundamental social principles because change in society is ongoing (Beck et al., 2003). The assumption of reflective modernism is that its state is dynamic. Predicting the future under such uncertain conditions is a complex dynamic problem. The solution Beck et al., (2003) suggest is to pass the theory through conceptualization, followed by the empirical investigation. This is of specific relevance to the proposed research in the sense that the theory of social wellbeing of single parents is empirically validated after the conceptualization.
In the sociological perspective, post-industrialization leads to detraditionalisation which in turn can cause individualization of social life. There are two diametrically opposite social views: while one claims that breaking of traditional ties leads to moral disintegration, the other view is that it can promote pluralism of lifestyles (Beck et al., 2003). However, many researchers have focused on the study of family bonds and responsibilities and examined the interaction between these two opposed poles (e.g. Gillies et al. 2001).

Normative claims are based on evaluation or assessment of a person about a standard, ideal or the value system one adheres to (Dorschel, 1988). Descriptive claims are concrete, and there are positive associations between the variables. Descriptive claims are close to reality as they are based on facts. In the proposed research the data is based on the perceptions of single parents which are normative claims. In the sociological perspective, normative claims are more or less culture based. This is because all the normative claims are derived through the culture of the society and are governed by the social structure and social cohesion. In fact, all the five dimensions of social wellbeing studied in this research are based on the normative claims of the single parents as perceived by them.

**Wellbeing and happiness**
Ahmed (2010) in *The Promise of Happiness* deals with the operations of happiness in contemporary society. Ahmed links happiness to a social state of being. Ahmed gives due consideration to the social forms: family, marriage, fairness, etc., to be happiness-causes. Ahmed's challenges the reader to reconsider why belief in pursuing certain objects may give happiness. In the context of the proposed research, the work of Ahmed reiterates the importance of considering happiness measurement as a part of wellbeing measurement as there is a link between wellbeing and happiness.

**1.7. Summary of Social Context**
To summarize the aforementioned studies, in terms of the social context, Kuwait a dominant Arab country has undergone a phenomenal change as observed by a group of researchers (Ashton, 1998; Catherine, 2010; El-haddaad, 2003). Public Authority for Housing Welfare(2017) and Kuwait Petroleum Corporation(2014) have emphasized the need for social concern. It is identified that single parenthood is a global phenomenon and is now prominent in Kuwait (Catherine, 2010; Current Population Survey, 2006; El-
haddaad 2003). There has been a transformation of the society into a globalized way of life (Al –Amoudi, 1994; Baqader, 1998; El-haddaad, 2003; Zayed, 1998). Family structure in the Arab world including Kuwait has transformed from a large to a smaller nuclear structure and the responsibilities of the members have changed over time (El-haddaad, 2003; Fido and Al-Saad, 2013). Globalization has also been responsible for inducing changes in the lifestyle of societal members (Ali, 1983; El-haddaad, 2003; Zayed, 1998). The concept of working women has also been responsible for changes in the lifestyle of the people (Baqader, 1979; El-haddaad, 2003). Researchers have observed the changes in the value system, youth behavior, lifestyles and culture in the Arab countries in general (Fido and Al-Saad, 2013; Zayed, 1998).

McGregor (2007) was one among those who considered wellbeing as an important social concept. Reeler (2007) was another researcher who considered that wellbeing should be an important consideration in policy making for the betterment of society. The literature indicated the presence of three dominant theories which enabled the bridging of the gap between the measures taken by the policy makers and the practitioners: Emergent change, which spoke about the most enduring form of change; Transformative change, which was the result of the crisis faced by the society; and Projectable change, which is the ability of the members of the society to induce change in themselves to meet the demands of the society. These three theories make an attempt to build the bridge between the practice and the measures by the policy makers.

**Statement of the Problem**

Kuwait has witnessed an increasing rate of single parents due to multiple reasons including: divorce, death of spouse, and premarital sex leading to the lone father or mother becoming the custodian of the child or children. This results in the single parent discharging the duty of both parents single handedly. The sociological issues of these single parents will be different from the couple parents who share the responsibilities of looking after the children. These single parents might face numerous challenges on economic, social, and emotional front and unless they are equipped with confidence and the necessary resources. In addition, their lives may be affected by the stresses of their day-to-day responsibilities. While there are some discrete studies on the wellbeing of single parents, these are
qualitative in nature and the few which are quantitative have been conducted in the Western context. Despite the fact that the social issues of single parents demand attention, there has been no study undertaken to investigate single parents in Kuwait with specific focus on their social and subjective wellbeing. Thus, this research will undertake a quantitative study to determine whether the background factors of single parents influence their social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing, and also, to examine the relationships between social and subjective wellbeing. The findings from the study will add to the body of knowledge and literature on the social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait.

1.8. Research Questions

The proposed research through a cross-sectional survey design will explore how background factors may influence the wellbeing of employed single parents in the government sector of Kuwait. Further, it investigates the association of social and subjective wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait.

Following are the research questions:

1. What is the status of Kuwaiti single parents regarding the various dimensions of wellbeing?
2. What are the relationships among the dimensions of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing?
3. What background factors impact the wellbeing of Kuwaiti single parents?
4. What policy recommendations can be drawn from the study to strengthen the social and the subjective wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait?

1.9. Aims and Objectives of Research

Quantitative exploration of the determinants of the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait is the primary aim of this research. First, this research aims to conduct a quantitative analysis of the social wellbeing and the subjective wellbeing of single parents. Secondly, it explores background factors that impact on Kuwaiti single parents' wellbeing. Wellbeing is a multidimensional as well as a multi-disciplinary construct and in this study it is interpreted as comprising social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing.
In this research, Social wellbeing is studied concerning its standard dimensions (Keyes, 1998; Zhang et al., 2010). Social wellbeing is viewed more as ‘social wellness’ in the context of this research. The concept of social wellbeing in this research has a broader multifaceted meaning. It is in fact considered as a psychosocial aspect of an individual borrowing from the concept of Zhang et al., (2010) that social wellbeing will make people see their wellbeing as a function of the influence of society in addition to their own efforts.

Subjective wellbeing on the other hand, in the context of this research, is seen more as an outcome of wellbeing of an individual in terms of visible indicators such as satisfaction and happiness, and often referred to as the quality of life the individual leads (Alqashan and Alkandari, 2010; Hicks et al., 2013; Lundblad and Archer, 2015). When people feel happy it is because they feel their lives are going well or if they feel unhappy it is because their lives are not going as expected. Thus, subjective wellbeing could be multi-dimensional research construct that includes diverse phenomena ranging from optimism to pessimism, low anger or no anger to high anger, low or no job satisfaction to high job satisfaction (Hicks et al., 2013 and Lundblad and Archer, 2015). There is research evidence to show the causality between subjective wellbeing and physical health. Subjective wellbeing may not be able to cure a disease as such, but a negative state of subjective wellbeing might aggravate disease (Diener & Chan, 2011). Subjective wellbeing relating to 'affect' includes the positive and negative emotions of the person (Steel et al., 2008). In the context of this research, subjective wellbeing of single parents refers to how they perceive themselves in the general context which includes some of the aforementioned aspects. It has been established that an idea about the subjective well-being of single parents can provide inputs to determine policy. In a country like Kuwait, an understanding of the present situation of single parents can provide inputs to the improvement in the policy of the government towards them. Thus, the detailed study aims to examine the prevailing sociological situation of the single parents and opens up scope for discussions on experiences of the specified section of the society so that implications may be drawn on the improvement of the wellbeing of single parents.

With the aforementioned aims, the following objectives for this research are to:
1. Identify the background factors which could have an influence on the social and subjective wellbeing of the single parents in Kuwait;
2. Determine whether the background factors have an association with the wellbeing of the single parents;
3. Evaluate the effect of the dimensions of the social wellbeing on those of the subjective wellbeing of the single parents; and,
4. Make recommendations to the ministries of Kuwait to improve the wellbeing of single parents.

1.10. Significance of the Research

The significance of this research lies in its ability to add to the body of knowledge in the field of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing of Kuwaiti single parents. First of all, this research is significant because of its positivist research paradigm associated with ‘realist ontology’ and ‘empiricist epistemology’. The ontology according to Blaikie, (2010) is the ‘what’ of the nature of social reality and realist ontology is based on the fact that the social phenomena is independent of the observer. Also, epistemology according to Blaikie, (2010) deals with ‘how’ the nature of social reality can be known, and thus, the empiricist epistemology considers that data exists in the real world and it can be collected through different means. So, this research based on the philosophy of realist ontology and empiricist epistemology considers that the data and information exists in society and can be captured by the survey questionnaire and analyzed and interpreted to arrive at meaningful conclusions in the context of the social and subjective wellbeing of single parents.

A study of the wellbeing of single parents is a significant area of research in sociology owing to its ability to improve the living conditions of single parents. For instance, Willicox (2003) found that single parenthood resulted in increased depression, made social functioning weaker, and resulted in poor mental as well as physical health. Spillman et al., (2006) through their study with a sample of 416 single parents have found that poor psychological and physical health was a common factor. Kotwal and Prabhakar (2009) found that single parents suffered due to financial problems, emotional breakdown, isolation from society, low self-esteem, and lack of confidence. These outcomes were significant as the researchers had made recommendations to the government on how to
alleviate the problems through government intervention. Having identified the significance of studies on wellbeing, The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has been conducting studies on wellbeing since its inception in 1961. In fact, the OECD has identified eleven indicators of wellbeing to measure the state of wellbeing of the citizens in a country (OECD, 2013). Unfortunately, Kuwait is yet to be a member country of OECD so no report is available on the wellbeing of its citizens to date. Again, the wellbeing of citizens has to be studied based on the different sections of society because overall population measures of wellbeing may not throw light on a particular section of the society. Having identified the significance of the study of wellbeing, this research aims to make a significant contribution by identifying the background factors which might influence the social and subjective wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait.

This study can make a significant contribution to research into the wellbeing of single parents as it aims to develop, test, and validate a questionnaire which can be used for the measurement of social and subjective wellbeing of single parents by future researchers in similar studies in other Arab countries.

Social wellbeing and Subjective wellbeing are two widely researched areas in sociology in general and there are several studies undertaken in various contexts with many different dimensions of wellbeing in several countries. However, there are not many empirical studies which focus on the wellbeing of a particular section of society. Single parents are an important section of the society and their wellbeing needs attention, as they play a dual role (acting as both father and mother) in bringing up the children.

This research is also significant in the sense that it develops a structural model linking the dimensions of both Social wellbeing and Subjective wellbeing and empirically investigating the associations between these dimensions.

Finally, the significance of this research lies in the recommendations that will be made through the detailed analysis of the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait, which can be useful to the policy makers in the various ministries, particularly the Ministry of Social Welfare as it can serve as a guideline in improving the wellbeing of single parents.
1.11. Glossary of Terms

**Affective** - It refers to the aspects of the emotional component which involves how people ‘feel’ about their wellbeing (Huschka, 2008; Törnblom and Kazemi, 2012).

**Eudaimonia** - It refers to the ‘flourishing’ part of wellbeing (Deci and Ryan, 2008; OECD, 2013).

**Life evaluation** - It is the perception of an individual about his/her satisfaction with life (Blanchflower, 2009; Diener et al., 1985; OECD, 2013; Stiglitz et al., 2009).

**Social acceptance** - This takes place when a person accepts him/her to have the commonalities of the society (Keyes, 1998; Minnebo, 2005).

**Social actualization** - It is the idea of an individual about the capabilities of the society (Keyes, 1998; Zhang et al., 2010).

**Social coherence** - It is the desire of the individual to know the world and an idea of quality, soundness of life, organization and operation of the social world (Callaghan, 2008; Keyes, 1998; Key-Roberts, 2009; Larsen, 2013).

**Social contribution** - It refers to self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977) and the belief that one can be of some value to the society (Gecas, 1989; Keyes, 1998).

**Social integration** - It refers to the assessment of one’s relation with the society (Huschka, 2008; Keyes, 1998).

**Social wellbeing** - It is the self-perception of one’s circumstance and functioning in society and is a combination of social integration, social acceptance, social contribution, social coherence, and social actualization (Keyes, 1998; Zhang et al., 2010).

**Subjective wellbeing** - It is the state of knowing how well a person lives in the society (Dolan et al., 2011; Hicks et al., 2013; Lundblad and Archer, 2015; Waldron, 2010).

**Wellbeing** - It is the state of being comfortable, healthy and happy (Hicks et al., 2013; Lundblad and Archer, 2015).

1.12. Structure of Thesis

The thesis will comprise six chapters which will cover the following aspects of research.
Chapter 1 – Introduction
This chapter introduces the research topic. It includes the background to the research problem, the social issue and its importance, statement of the problem, research questions, aims and objectives of research, significance of the research, glossary of terms and structure of the thesis.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review
This chapter presents a detailed review of the literature related to the topic. The theories of sociology and the models which are of relevance to the wellbeing of single parents are reviewed in this chapter. The chronological order of the research is narrated in tabular form for ease of understanding of the different streams of research with the focal theme of issues related to the wellbeing of single parents. The research on single parents, in the global context is discussed in this chapter. The research gap to be filled is presented at the end of the chapter to set the direction for the research.

Chapter 3 – The Research Methodology
This chapter explains the methodology used in this research in detail. For the type of research questions to be addressed, the obvious choice is empirical research with a mainly quantitative approach, and hence, these methods are explained in detail. The nature of research and the variables involved therein are highlighted in this chapter. The methods used in this research are listed with the reasons why they have been specifically chosen. Sample selection and its justification is also given in this chapter. The research instruments used, and the procedure of developing them are also listed. The research design and the multivariate analysis involved is explained. The systematic procedure for performing reliability, validity and practicality test for the measurement instrument is described. The practices incorporated in developing the questionnaire, data collection strategies, statistical procedures, data analysis and limitations of the methods are discussed. The statistical software used in the research are listed.
Chapter 4 – Results and Analysis

This chapter presents the results obtained through the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the primary and secondary data collected in the research. While the qualitative analysis is in the form of the descriptive explanations derived through the interpretation of the information obtained, the quantitative analysis involves descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Qualitative research involves the summarization of the respondents’ responses to qualitative questions in the questionnaire.

Chapter 5 – Research Findings and Conclusions

This chapter reports the findings of the research and discusses the implications of the research in the form of reforms which may be brought in Kuwait to empower single parents and enable them to improve their wellbeing. The limitations of the study are alsobriefed and scope for future work is listed. The chapter ends with the conclusions that can be drawn through the research.

1.13. Summary

In this chapter first of all, single parent family has been defined as it has different connotations based on the context. Through the earlier definitions a starting point to the research in terms of the single parent family could be developed. Why single parenthood is a social issue and its importance was highlighted by referring to the existing research in the field. It was found that the social context to the research is important, as it provides the basis for setting the scope of the research and hence a detailed discussion on single parenting as a social issue and the importance of a study on the single parents’ wellbeing was reported. A clear statement of the problem was provided in terms of the answers which need to be found regarding single parent wellbeing. The statement of the problem led to the development of the specific research questions which will be addressed in this research. The aims of the research and the objectives that have to be accomplished were reported. The significance of the research could be through the study of issues related to the problems faced by single parents and how their lives could be improved through a study on their wellbeing. The chapter provided a glossary of terms and framed the structure of the entire thesis so that the reader will have an idea about the salient points in each of the chapters.
Chapter 2
Literature Review

This chapter presents the literature review on wellbeing in general, and social and subjective wellbeing in particular. Theories of wellbeing relevant to this research are reviewed. There is a detailed review of research on single parent wellbeing which provides a strong grounding to the current project. The chapter concludes with the identification of the research gap which provides the research orientation.

2.1. Theories of Wellbeing

Researchers have used both sociological and socio-psychological theories in developing the conceptual framework of wellbeing. The prominent theories used by various researchers in the context of wellbeing are: Self-determination Theory; Rational Choice Theory; Goal Content Theory; Structural Functionalism Theory; Social Conflict Theory; Social Exchange Theory; Optimal Distinctiveness Theory; and Cognitive Evaluation Theory. These theories provide the foundation for this research in the development of the conceptual model and are hence reviewed in the following sections.

2.1.1. Self-determination Theory

According to Self-determination Theory (SDT) a person's autonomy, competence and relatedness (Figure 2.1) contribute to motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2015). Motivation is an important antecedent of hedonic and eudaimonic wellbeing (Diener, 2000). Hedonic wellbeing refers to a high level of positive affectivity characterized by satisfaction over important domains of life (Diener, 2000). Eudaimonic wellbeing refers to optimum activity that fulfils human potential (Ryan et al., 2008). Autonomy refers to the self-regulation and self-governed initiation of behavior leading to motivation. The social-contextual events that conduce toward feelings of competence during action can enhance intrinsic motivation for that action (Deci & Ryan, 2015). Relatedness refers to feelings of belonging or intimate attachment to society. Motivation could be towards any outcome including one’s wellbeing. SDT is basically a theory of motivation and it draws attention to the demographic as well as socioeconomic status of the people whose wellbeing is being studied.
SDT deals with two aspects of human beings: first is the causes of human behavior which projects people into action; and second is how the behavior of people is reflected in the different phases of their lives (Deci & Ryan, 2015). Thus, SDT has more of a psychological orientation in the context of sociology and is considered more as socio-psychological theory. SDT involves “human perceptions, cognitions, emotions, and needs as predictors of regulatory, behavioral, developmental, and experiential outcomes” (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 486). This conceptualization is very much relevant in the context of this research because the state of wellbeing of single parents is based on some of these predictors which constitute people’s behavioral patterns. It is important to note that STD in turn, is based on Operant Theory (Skinner cited in Deci & Ryan, 2015) according to which the reinforcing variables: food, money, and shelter; strengthen the association between contingency and behavior.

All three components of motivation - autonomy, competence and relatedness could be affected by socio-demographic factors in many different forms. This is because motivation is an internal characteristics of a person but it is subject to external stimuli. Wellbeing has two components namely, initiation and maintenance. The former may be under the control of the single parent based on his/her background, but the latter can be immensely benefitted through the positive inputs from society. Moreover, SDT postulates that humans are fundamentally proactive beings whose functioning can be facilitated or impeded by the social context (Ryan & Deci, 2001). So, in this context, SDT provides the fundamental framework for the development of the conceptual model of this research.
SDT has its base in the empirical grounding exclusively dealing with the understanding of goal-directed-behavior and adaptability of human beings. Researchers have applied SDT to the study of goal-directed-behavior in education, parenting, career building, healthcare, and wellbeing (Lepper et al., 1973; Patrick& Williams, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2002, Ryan & Deci, 2017). SDT has special relevance to the research on wellbeing in general because the very premise of the theory is that the engagement of an individual or proactive attitude, or on the other hand passive and alienated attitude, has bearing on the social conditions in which individuals are living (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Research has found that wellbeing is not just a function of hedonic intentions of joy or happiness, but instead a derivative of eudaimonia, or ‘flourishing’ (Ryan, 2009). Because autonomy is facilitated by reflective awareness, SDT stresses the role of mindfulness in self-regulation and wellness. Ryan and Deci (2000) through their research evidence, claim that society provides conditions that fosters human potential as well as undermines it. The study on both of these extremes is vital, not merely because it adds to the body of knowledge of human behavior, but also because it helps in designing social environments which promote the wellbeing of people. SDT is a significant theory towards wellbeing research because it makes an attempt to investigate the inherent growth tendencies of people and the innate psychological needs for self-motivation and desire for wellbeing. It essentially seeks the conditions for the wellbeing of an individual. The three needs stated by SDT – competence, relatedness, and autonomy build the foundation for social wellbeing which is a research construct in this study.

Among the three antecedents theorized in SDT, relatedness has a distinctly different role to play in the wellbeing study of single parents. According to the premises of SDT, relatedness will be dominant in the infancy stage of an individual when a child feels comfortable due to the relatedness to its mother (Ryan & Deci, 2000). SDT postulates that similar dynamics extend over the life span. According to SDT, intrinsic motivation can be strengthened by a sense of security and relatedness.

The distinguishing feature of SDT is that it not only examines the positive developmental grounds provided by society for the wellbeing of an individual, but also studies the social environments which are detrimental to the wellbeing of the individual. SDT fundamentally
believes in intrinsic motivation as the single positive potential of a human being which has the ability to make the individual pursue his/her dreams and keep them active, make them be curious about knowing their environment, master the skills they are attracted towards, and be playful and active all the time even without any expectation in either in cash or kind (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Yet, research has shown that society can create unfavorable circumstances that can make an individual lose motivation (e.g., Yadav & BaniAta, 2013; Abu-Jarour, 2014). Vansteenkiste et al., (2010) have found that SDT postulates five core principles or theories which are relevant to the study of wellbeing. These include: Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET); Organismic Integration Theory; Causality Orientation Theory; and Psychological Needs Theory.

2.1.1.1. Cognitive Evaluation Theory

Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) is a sub-set of Self Determination Theory (SDT). While SDT identifies Competence, Autonomy and Relatedness to be the three driving forces behind motivation, CET is more focused towards ‘motivation’ of an individual. Motivation is that force which drives human beings to think in a particular way, makes one act accordingly and develops over a period of time in a systematic manner (Deci and Ryan, 2008). Deci and Ryan (2008) through CET postulate that ‘intrinsic motivation’ of an individual, which is performing a task purely for inner satisfaction rather than for external rewards and recognitions, contributes to enhanced performance, increased perseverance, and advanced growth. Ryan and Deci (2000) define intrinsic motivation as performing an activity solely for inherent satisfaction and developed the CET to address the social and environmental factors which facilitate an individual’s internal motivation.

While SDT identifies competence as a contributing factor for motivation, CET postulates that competence is developed through successful encounters and positive feelings about the activities performed during the accomplishment of the tasks (Deci & Ryan, 1985). It is also found by Deci and Ryan (1985) that criticism or control may undermine the desire to develop competence. Optimal challenges that a person encounters is considered to foster competence, as it gives a sense of intrinsic satisfaction on the successful accomplishment of the task. Autonomy is another factor proposed in the SDT which is essential to promote motivation. Deci and Ryan (1985) postulated that in addition to competence for intrinsic
motivation to be strengthened, individuals also need to have autonomy in the tasks or activities they perform. The freedom bestowed by having choices and opportunities for self-direction enhances intrinsic motivation. Research has shown that when outcome achievement is affiliated to a reward, it adversely affects autonomy and decreases intrinsic motivation (Rigby et al., 1992; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Another aspect connected with autonomy in performing a task is an individual’s relatedness to their society. Researchers have observed in various contexts including educational settings and community services that individuals with stronger feelings of relatedness are more intrinsically motivated (Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Vallerand et al., 2008). The claim of CET is that reward may adversely affect the intrinsic motivation of an individual. According to Ryan and Deci (2000) reward can have basically two types of effect. First, when reward acts as control over the performance of an individual, it may affect the creativity and natural way of accomplishing the tasks by the individual, and decrease intrinsic motivation. Second, the informational forms of rewards which support the competence of an individual may strengthen intrinsic motivation.

CET has a strong bearing on the wellbeing study because intrinsic motivation may have positive effects on the wellbeing of an individual. Several researchers have linked CET to the grounding theory of wellbeing (Diener, 1984; Diener et al., 2003; Veenhoven, 1984). The wellbeing of an individual has close ties with his/her success in personal and professional life. Research has shown that competence, autonomy, and relatedness can produce successful outcomes through intrinsic motivation (Ryan, 2009 and Ryan & Deci, 2017). Competence promotes effectiveness and enhanced capability; autonomy makes an individual feel independent and enhances self-determination; while relatedness makes an individual feel connected to their society and generates a feeling of supportiveness (Deci & Ryan, 1985). The cognitive theory despite its claim is considered to produce poor results under empirical testing and because it is more abstract, there are unobservable aspects associated with it (Foxall, 1990). There is also a criticism that in the experiments of Deci and Ryan on the CET, tangibles were delivered only once after the experimentation treatment and participants were told precisely when rewards were available for the performance of the target activities, whereas praise was delivered multiple times immediately following target behavior which could have produced the results to support the
hypothesis of CET (Carton, 1996). So, generalization of the theory is questionable and demands more empirical studies under different settings.

CET has special orientation towards the social factors which can either create or destroy intrinsic motivation and subsequently the wellbeing of the members of a society. However, the critique on CET is that people can be intrinsically motivated only towards those activities which they consider to have an intrinsic value to them (Ryan & Deci, 2000) and if are not internally inclined to pursue the activity for its own sake they cannot be intrinsically motivated.

CET hypothesizes that the value outcomes of an individual can be enhanced through external stimulus in the form of motivation (Boal & Cummings, 1981). Thus, it is imperative that society has bearing on how single parents perform in their work or home. The simple logic of CET is that positive feedback makes an individual perform better, and negative feedback lowers performance, which applies to all walks of life. Wellbeing is a multidimensional construct, and one of its determinants is feeling satisfied with job performance at the workplace or home. Thus, CET has a bearing on the development of the conceptual model of this research. Almost all the dimensions of social wellbeing have their base in CET.

2.1.1.2. Organismic Integration Theory
The second theory on which SDT is based is Organismic Integration Theory (OIR) (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). OIR postulates that extrinsic motivation (motivation through external rewards in the form of money, promotion, recognition, fame etc.) may decrease feelings of wellbeing because sometimes the conditions imposed by superiors, such as employers or managers, may detract from an individual’s autonomous decision making. On the other hand, OIR also suggests that individuals may still feel a sense of autonomy even when they are extrinsically motivated (Vansteenkiste et al., 2006).

2.1.1.3. Causality Orientation Theory.
The third theory that provides a basis for SDT is Causality Orientation Theory (COT) (Ryan & Connell, 1989). COT gives importance to individual differences in motivations. Some people may demonstrate autonomy orientation some, whole others may demonstrate
control orientation. While the former may undertake tasks based on their intrinsic motivation, some may be more propelled to action by extrinsic motivation.

2.1.1.4. Psychological Needs Theory

The fourth theory providing a basis to SDT is Psychological Needs Theory (PNT) (Ryan & Deci, 2000). PNT purports that tasks that enable the fulfilment of autonomy, relatedness and competence can be intrinsically motivating. In fact Deci et al., (2001) and Reis at al., (2000) have related need fulfillment to subjective wellbeing.

In summation of the aforementioned four sub-theories of SDT, the CET postulates that intrinsic motivation of an individual can drive inner satisfaction, OIR postulates that extrinsic motivation may decrease feelings of wellbeing, COT brings out the individual differences in people in their motivational levels, PNT postulates that tasks that enable the fulfilment of autonomy, relatedness and competence can be intrinsically motivating. Thus, the state of wellbeing of an individual is based on the internal reaction of an individual for the external circumstances to which he/she is subjected and the social and subjective wellbeing may interact to provide an overall state of wellbeing to the individual. The conceptual model of this research has been developed based on these building blocks derived from the established theories.

2.1.2. Rational Choice Theory

Rational Choice Theory (RCT) (Sugden, 1991) endorses the view that the rational action of people originates from traditional action (habitual action), affective (emotional) action, and various forms of value-focused action (Figure 2.2).
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According to Rational Choice Theory (RCT), the attitude and behavior formation and the subsequent action an individual takes on an issue is governed by traditional action. The tradition followed in a country, or ethnicity will be reflected in the judgement of an individual regarding family values. For instance, a traditionally conditioned person may tend to respect a person with intact marriage much more than the one who is divorced. The rational choice of an individual according to RCT is also based on the emotional state of an individual which may again produce a differential attitude towards single parents due to variations in the emotional state of the individuals. Finally, RCT strongly endorses the value-focused action on a rational choice. So, the attitude of an individual which is formed through the religious and ethnic background may define the value system of an individual and his/her wellbeing. It has been mentioned before that in Kuwait, or any Arab culture-based marriage is not a religious sacrament, but a social function. People have their views on whether a marriage should be continued even at the cost of unpleasantness to any one of the spouses or even both, just to keep up with the expectations of the society. Thus, RCT explains the possibility that the perceptions of the people about the wellbeing of single parents due to divorce need not be the same. As society does not perceive all single parents with uniformity, societal attitude towards single parents may also vary accordingly and have an impact on their social wellbeing.

RCT conceptually deals with three aspects: it gives a normative model of human behavior; it gives an empirical model of human behavior; and it provides a structure of decision making (Oppenheimer, 2008). It also provides a linkage between the choices of an individual to his/her preferences giving relevance to the purposeful behavior. It demonstrates the purposeful behavior based on values, thus rationalizing the decision making. In short, it explains the interconnected components of emotion and thinking logically ending in a rational choice. The wellbeing of an individual, which is the central theme of this research, is the combination of external and internal components. External components are the constraints offered by the circumstances and the societal members on a person, and the internal component is the ability of the person to handle the situation and still be in a state of wellbeing. It is the rational choice of the individual, based on the values to which he/she is attached, that will make the individual develop a state of mind of wellbeing.
It is also important to observe that RCT is considered to be governed by individualism, and that social reality is expressed by cultural values, practices and norms and is mainly based on the previous actions of individuals (Krstic & Krstic, 2015). RCT works on the constraints that the external environment imposes on an individual and the consequences of the choices made by the individual (Rule, 1997). During the initial stages of RCT development, ‘family’ was excluded from the domain of its applicability because it focused more on motivational factors based on love and hate rather than benefit issues based on cost (Hechter & Kanazawa, 1997). However, Becker (1981), through his research on applicability of RCT decision making, demonstrated its relevance in the context of the sociological aspects of family. Moen and Wethington (1992) in the context of the adaptive strategies of family, applied RCT and showed that the decisions of the family on leading their lives were under a given set of constraints and that the decisions made by them can be categorized as rational choices. Thereafter, RCT has been widely applied in explaining the behavior of the members of the family under various circumstances, for example: in multi-level analysis of fertility (Smith, 1989); in the impact of legal changes in marriages (Hoem, 1991); in community effects on adolescent sexual activities (Brewster, 1994); on uncertainty reduction in parenthood (Friedman et al., 1994); and in divorce and separation (South and Lloyd, 1995). South and Lloyd’s (1995) research on individual characteristics of spouses is now one of the theories of sociology in use in the context of marital relationships and wellbeing studies.

Some researchers have categorically rejected RCT and claim that people often act irrationally and reject rational choice as well as methodological individualism (e.g., Kiser and Hechter, 1998). Another set of researchers discard RCT claiming it is merely a ‘post hoc re-description’ of findings from other theories (Skocpol, 1979).

2.1.3. Goal Content Theory

Goal Content Theory (GCT) propagates that an individual’s relatedness to the community and close relationships, personal growth, and contributing to one's community provide a higher level of need satisfaction and ensures wellbeing in comparison to material wealth (Niemiec et al. 2009). GCT has a bearing on this research in the sense that single parents in Kuwait will strive to fulfil their relatedness to society in order to meet their need
satisfaction. It is in this context that the social wellbeing of an individual is accounted for in many different forms. It may be in the form of the five dimensions specified by Keyes (1998) (which will be discussed later in detail). These dimensions define the wellbeing of an individual in the social context in terms of non-material needs. Material needs are essential for survival and their importance in wellbeing cannot be underestimated, however in addition to this, need relatedness to society has an important bearing on wellbeing, as propagated by GCT.

The objective of developing GCT was to theorize on how the content of a goal can affect an individual’s well-being and behavior (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Gunnell et al., 2014). In fact Deci and Ryan (2000) have investigated the expectations of an individual through behavioral participation. There is research evidence that intrinsic goals persuasion can affect individual’s psychological need satisfaction (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010) and extrinsic goal satisfaction can affect psychological need fulfillment (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The content of the goal, according to GCT, plays an important role in influencing behavior and wellbeing. Researchers have shown that intrinsic goals can lead to self-determined motivation (Sebire et al., 2011), psychological need fulfillment (Thøgersen-Ntoumani et al., 2010) and wellbeing (Gillison et al., 2006).

According to the GCT goals can also have intrinsic orientation and extrinsic orientation. Deci and Ryan (2000) have linked the goals having intrinsic orientation to psychological need satisfaction and Vansteenkiste et al., (2006) have aligned it with the organismic principle of SDT. Kasser and Ryan (1996) have categorized aspirations such as contribution to the growth of community, affiliation, individual growth and development, dignity etc., as intrinsic goals. Individuals with intrinsic goal orientation have a high self-esteem, live with dignity and pride, have philanthropic tendencies, and cannot be fulfilled through the materialistic aspects of life. Goals which have external orientation such as recognition, fame, and monetary benefits have been categorized as extrinsic goals (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Individuals with extrinsic goal orientation can be identified by their desire to amass wealth, to seek power and fame, and by trying to be attractive in their appearance etc.
The focal theme of this research is the ‘wellbeing’ of an individual. In this context of GCT, researchers have found an association of goal orientation with wellbeing and have established that the higher the intrinsic goal orientation, the higher the wellbeing of the individual. It is also suggested that extrinsic goal orientation could adversely affect the wellbeing of an individual (e.g., Black & Deci, 2000; Kasser & Ryan, 1996; Levesque et al., 2004). Ryan and Deci (2000) argue that an individual’s intrinsic goal orientation provides direct satisfaction of basic psychological needs, and hence contributes to the wellbeing of the individual. In direct contrast, an extrinsic goal orientation has an ‘outward’ orientation of the desire to ‘have’ more than what is basically required and this can have an adverse effect on an individual’s wellbeing (Williams et al., 2000). There is research evidence that suggests an individual’s extrinsic goal orientation may lead to comparison with others (Patrick et al., 2004) and a tendency to seek external recognition (Kasser et al., 2004), which may result in poorer wellbeing compared with those having an intrinsic goal orientation.

There is another stream of research in the establishment of the relationship between goal content and wellbeing which is in terms of the ‘values’ of an individual. ‘Values’ have the ability to categorize the desirable life goals of an individual based on their relative importance and research shows that they act more as guiding principles (De Witte, 2004; Rohan, 2000; Vansteenkiste et al., 2008). There are several models describing the multidimensional aspects of values and the associated goals (Grouzet et al., 2005; Nuttin & Lens, 1985; Schwartz, 1994). Research has been conducted to study the intervening effect of life goals on the well-being of individuals, which has resulted in conflicting perspectives. Researchers who have based their research on Self-determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000) have found that the optimal functioning and wellbeing of an individual is affected by the goals they pursue (Kasser, 2002; Vansteenkiste et al., 2006). In direct contrast, some researchers claim that there is no such relationship (Bianco et al., 2003; Sagiv & Schwartz, 2000). So, there is no common consensus regarding the interactions between values, goals and wellbeing.

Research on GCT has been challenged in terms of ‘goal motive’ by several researchers (Sheldon & Kasser, 1995; Sheldon et al., 2004) in the context of wellbeing. The argument
is that - while goal content could be extrinsic or intrinsic, goal motive could be controlled or autonomous (Vansteenkiste et al., 2006). There is a possibility that the goal motive of an individual may have its role to play on the goal content which may alter the state of wellbeing. The observation through several independent studies was that the intrinsic or extrinsic goal content and the autonomous or controlled goal motive produced significant independent variance on the wellbeing of the people who were studied (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Sheldon & Kasser, 1995; Sheldon et al., 2004). More elaborately, people could have extrinsic goal content coupled with controlled or autonomous goal motive and intrinsic goal content coupled with controlled or autonomous goal motive. The wellbeing under these four combinations can be distinctly different based on which aspect of goals is dominant in an individual. Carver and Baird (1998) found that it is the ‘controlled goal motive’ rather than the ‘extrinsic goal content’ that has adverse effects on well-being. In direct contrast to this observation Sheldon et al., (2004) empirically showed that goal content and goal motive each have an independent impact on wellbeing. However, there is clear evidence that attainment of intrinsic goals improves wellbeing, but attainment of extrinsic goals does not improve wellbeing (Hofer & Chasiotis, 2003; Ryan et al., 2009; Sheldon et al., 2010). Social wellbeing is one of the research constructs of this research, and hence, the aforementioned findings have bearing on the establishment of the relationships of this construct with the subjective wellbeing of single parents.

2.1.4. Structural Functionalism Theory

According to Structural Functionalism Theory (SFT), form of consensus, social order, structure, and function of the society are interconnected in many different ways (Macionis, 2005). Society runs mainly through mutual consensus about certain aspects as acceptable ways of leading life. This implied that the members of a society will have a consensus about the way we dress, communicate, socialize, work, transact, etc. Families will tend to lead their life on a certain mutually acceptable way of life. Any deviation from the norm set by the society could be considered as unacceptable behavior. Marriage and divorce is a sensitive issue which is witnessed by a group of people as a social event. So, in general, it is expected that once a couple gets married they will lead a happy life and any deviation may not be socially acceptable particularly in a conservative society like Kuwait which is a religious and culturally sensitive community. But at the same time, marriage is not
considered to be a religious sacrament (Ibsen Al Faruqi, 1985, cited in Alqashan & Alkandari, 2010), so an individual has the right to stay with the spouse, or if things are not congenial, they may also prefer to separate. However, this may have repercussions on the social structure and people may not welcome the separation of married couples. So, there is a possibility that the social wellbeing of single parents may be affected by the behavior and attitude of the members of the society towards them, which needs to be further explored.

SFT addresses societal functional aspects which includes norms, culture, customs, ethnicities and institutions. Any part of the society, according to SFT, is considered to be an ‘organ’ which is responsible for the functioning of the society (Sharifzyanova et al. 2015). The whole idea is to form a stable and cohesive system where the individual organs are synergizing their efforts to meet the common goals (Macionis, 2011). The conceptualization of SFT has been linked to the biological evolution of mechanisms of adaptation (Giddens, 2009). According to this conceptualization, the way an organism as a biological entity has to adapt to the external environment and evolve over a period of time, reflects how society has its own structure which is formulated by its members and developed over a period of time to define a ‘way of life’ which includes the societal norms and functionalities. Similar to the way many different organs function to sustain life as a whole in an organism, society will also have its individual components in the form of communities, groups and families acting together to in a manner which will maintain the solidarity of the society. All the social and cultural aspects may be considered to have lives of their own (Holy, 1996).

Even though SFT has provided a sound theoretical perspective on the evolution of the society and the role of individuals in terms of conformance, the theory has been contested by empiricism and it could not sustain grounds mainly for not being able to account for ‘social change’ and ‘structural conflicts’ (Barnes, 1995; Slattery, 1993). The argument raised by many researchers is that no society is purely traditional nor modern, but in essence, a mixture of both and following certain norms laid by the ancestors so the very functional behavior is questionable (e.g., Server, 2012). This argument is relevant in the present scenario of globalization where multi-culturalism is becoming a norm and most countries have become liberal in terms of the cultural, social and ethical norms. More
fundamentally, SFT has an inclination towards a qualitative way of looking at the influence of structure on the day-to-day activities of the members of the society rather than quantitatively assessing the factors which would be responsible for a particular type of behavior. SFT may fail in a society where individual agency has a higher value than the structure based functionality of the individuals. SFT was developed before the IT revolution and thus the theory has not considered the networking of people with similar interests, who may not follow the structure of the society.

The fundamental assumption of SFT is that the social system is the predecessor in the causality with parts of the society and they are functionally interrelated (Barnes, 1995). This assumption is questionable because there is no empirical proof for this generalization. Further, SFT assumes that all social phenomena have functions for the larger social system and these phenomena may be functional to the entire system or part of it. There could be functional alternatives, or there could be multiple consequences from a phenomenon, and most importantly, dysfunction results in a sort of tension in the society when change is imminent (Barnes, 1995). The logical question that arises is, ‘if the phenomenon can produce an influence on part of the system how can it be a cause for the societal change?’ If there are functional alternatives, ‘how can we conclude that a particular phenomenon has caused a change?’ If dysfunction causes tension and results in change, ‘Have all the dysfunctions resulted in a change in the society?’ SFT theory does not provide a convincing answer to these questions and there is a lack of empirical studies to support or disprove the causality between the ‘phenomena’ and the ‘function’. A major criticism of SFT is that it fails to account for the inequalities existing between various classes of a society that cause tension and conflict. Finally, the review of literature indicates that SFT is more of an idealistic model.

2.1.5. Social Conflict Theory

Social Conflict Theory (SCT) claims that any society has class conflicts and social order is only through the domination of one group over another and that potential conflicts will always be present in a society (Doda, 2005). SCT is based on Marxist’s social theory, according to which the interaction between the social classes is more ‘conflict oriented’ than ‘consensus oriented’ and ultimately the most powerful group keeps
exploiting groups with less power (Cohen, 2008). The assumption in SCT is that the higher class due to money power will control policy making through their domination in education, politics, legal system, various institutions etc. The treatment an individual may receive from the society thus depends upon the class to which he/she belongs (Yakkaldevi, 2014).

SCT is fundamentally a macro level analysis of the society and views society as an arena of inequality that generates conflict and imminent change. Since the 19th C things have changed and despite the inequality of class, systematic policies have been developed which keep on evolving to meet the societal needs. SCT has not clearly explained the concept of ‘shared values’, which are instrumental in uniting people on a common goal and help them realize their inter-dependency.

The society, as such, is a mixture of people from many different classes in which this particular groups of single parents also exists. Ideally speaking, societal members should treat all groups equally, but there are exceptions, and the dominating group may always oppress the other, and there could be a class conflict as suggested by the SCT. This research is about the wellbeing of single parents, who form a special class in society which is susceptible to domination from other groups. More elaborately, in the context of family life, marriages can form two distinct groups (or classes) of people, that is, those with an intact marriage (two parent family) and those who are separated, either due to divorce or death (single parent family). Strictly speaking, the social class as such is on economic terms (income generating resources or assets of economic value) and people who belong to a particular class tend to have similar economic rewards (Oldfield et al., 2006).

2.1.6. Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory (SET) subscribes to the view that people maximize their benefits in any transaction (Bertera, 2007), so when there is no scope to maximize the benefit, the transaction may be terminated. In simpler terms, people decide to be with each other based on what they expect to gain or lose. The expectations of the societal members may be that marriages must last, particularly in a conservative country like Kuwait. However, according to SET, it is a difficult proposition as people have different levels of expectation and dysfunctional marriages are bound to occur.
Among the theories discussed previously, SET is applicable at two levels in the context of this research. It is in terms of the social exchange between the partners in the marital relationship and between the single parent and the society. In terms of the first case, SET draws from behavioral psychology, sociology, and economics and it has the potential to explain the formation or breaking of the marital relationship. Nakonezny and Denton (2008) attribute the cost factor in marriage to be the behaviors which act as deterrents to building relationships, while the rewards are the joy, contentment, and fulfilment found in marriage. Hence, SET can be applied to the marital exchange relationship in which rewards and costs are associated with the transaction between the married partners. Exchange in the form of tangibles and intangibles according to SET is the basis for making or destroying relationships. In terms of the exchange between the single parent and the members of the society, again there could be a building of the relationship if the society considers the exchange to be mutually beneficial in terms of the tangibles and intangibles. The relationship may deteriorate if they find single parents to be from a group which do not contribute to the economic or any other form of benefit to the society. Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) claim SET to be the most powerful theory to explain workplace behavior. They found that social exchanges comprise actions contingent to the rewarding reactions of other and on the long run such exchanges could be mutually beneficial and ensure wellbeing of the society. The context of this research is the social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing of single parents in the workplace setting. SET claims that social exchange leads to a series of interactions between the members which generates obligations, and are interdependent and contingent on the actions of others. These interactions have the potential to develop high quality relationships (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). It is these relationships which are built between the single parents and the society that affects the wellbeing of the single parents. If the interactions are encouraging and motivating they may generate positive feelings in single parents, but if interactions are not positive, the wellbeing of single parents may be adversely affected.

The dimensional constructs of SET are not completely identified. SET is based on laws such as the ‘law of reciprocity’ (Molm et al., 2000). There is confusion about the interpretation of the term ‘reciprocity’ which could be referring to transaction, or it could be a belief, or even a moral norm. Exchange could be in terms of ‘negotiated rules’.
Negotiations are usually in economic terms. Negotiation may often lead to win-lose or lose-win situations to the two parties, which may in turn affect the wellbeing of the individuals involved in the transactions. The social exchange is seen more like a ‘black box’, as there is no proper interpretation or observation of social exchange taking place in practice (Croppanzano & Mitchell, 2005). SET has been strongly challenged by the concept of altruism, according to which people try to benefit others even with no economic gain (Nikiforakis & Engelmann, 2011).

2.1.7. Optimal Distinctiveness Theory

Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (Brewer, 1993) relates psychological state of mind and wellbeing in the context of group behavior. This theory is basically an extension of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and Self-categorization Theory (Turner et al., 1987). Both these theories propagate the concept that individual behavior is formed through the interaction of an individual with acquaintances. For establishing social identity a person often takes the stand of an interchangeable identity trait that suits the majority of the people in the group. One way to identify this is through the prototypical behavior of an individual who is associated with a particular group (Brewer, 1993). Optimal distinctiveness theory is categorized as a social psychological theory which deals with the study of behavior of people while in a group and when out of the group. The group can be either a formal group or informal group with which an individual is associated. The theory asserts that people have their own individual behavior, beliefs, and convictions and a desire to act autonomously, but at the same time know the group requirements and norms to which they need to adhere if they want to identify with that group (Brewer, 1993). If one motive is stronger, then the other will naturally become weaker. It all depends upon which motive of the individual is stronger among the two. If the individual wants to identify with the group then such an individual may sacrifice his inner motives and go by the group’s requirements. On the contrary, if the individual wants a distinct identity in the group, then he/she may not completely adhere to the group desires. So, any human being would continuously look for an optimal balance between these two motives.

Optimal Distinctiveness Theory models three interdependent aspects: psychological needs, group dynamics, and wellbeing. Fundamentally it is based on Social Identity Theory (Tajfel
& Turner, 1986) which postulates that the individual concept is fundamentally the derivative of group membership which is essentially from social interactions. At some stage in life people find that their social identity becomes important and develop an interchangeable self-identity with the associated group, or in other words, transforms into a prototypical model of the social group to which they belong.

According to Brewer (1993) humans have two distinctly different social needs: assimilation and differentiation (Figure 2.3). The former is the desire to be a part of the group and the latter is the desire to be unique or distinctive. As these two desires are opposing, a dichotomy is induced in the individual which affects his/her subjective wellbeing. This is because if the society responds positively to their desire for assimilation they may feel part of the society, and if not, they may feel neglected. At the same time, if the desire for differentiation is higher and it is not met, the individual may feel there is nothing which can give him/her a unique identity in the society and this again may adversely affect the subjective wellbeing of an individual.

![Figure 2.3: Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (Brewer, 1993)](attachment:fig2_3.png)
2.2. Research on Wellbeing

Eid and Larsen (2008) have pointed out that wellbeing in general is not very widely discussed either in sociological textbooks or journals. The reasons for this may be practical, conceptual, and theoretical. The practical reason cited by Eid and Larson (2008) is the bearing of sociology more on ‘what’ people do under various circumstances than ‘how’ they feel because the very nature of sociology is to deal with the social behavior of individuals and wellbeing might just be a subset of this, or more precisely, sociology deals with collective issue, whereas wellbeing is more of an individual issue. Conceptually, sociology deals more with social equality and social cohesion, so how individuals of a particular section of society feel is not very important to sociologists (Eid & Larson, 2008). In terms of the underpinning theory, wellbeing is considered more of a ‘state of mind’ which occurs as a result of social comparison. At the same time, in the very early stages of research in sociology, researchers noted that the causation between single parent families and social problems is not very well established (Swisher, 1997). However, Veenhoven (2006) argues that as research on job satisfaction, marital satisfaction, life satisfaction are studied in the context of work, family and ageing respectively, wellbeing has to be studied in the context of different sections of the society. There have been some recent studies on subjective and psychological wellbeing in the context of sociology (e.g., Lim, 2016) and thus the field is expanding.

After the realization that ‘income’ and ‘happiness’ are independent of each other, research is being conducted on ‘wellbeing’ which is also referred to as ‘life satisfaction’. Several countries have taken the initiative to study the wellbeing of its society and even taken measures to maximize Gross National Happiness (GNH) along with Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Samman, 2008).

Joshanloo (2013) has undertaken a study on ‘happiness' and claims that the past three decades of research in this line has the focus on Western Countries, which makes generalization across nations difficult. So, through a qualitative comparison of the two regions regarding happiness, it is envisaged that an empirical study is carried out. The research clearly indicates that the wellbeing study in the Islam-dominated region would have a distinctly different perspective. Joshanloo (2013) considers only two aspects of
wellbeing: hedonic (pleasure and positive feelings) and eudaimonic (good spiritedness), which acts as a limitation of the study. According to Western psychology, well-being is analogous to subjective wellbeing which need not necessarily be true (Diener, 1984; Ryan and Deci, 2001). There are other aspects such as social virtues which are important to be considered in wellbeing studies (Keyes, 1998; Waterman, 2008). Eudaimonism in Western thought is a way of defining happiness in the context of how an ideal self should be (Bunnin and Yu 2004). The virtue ethics based eudaimonia is contrasted by the deontological approach which has more of a discipline orientation (Macaro, 2006). Further, Joshanloo (2013) claims that construing happiness has an emphasis on rationality and individualism in the Western context, which may not be true in the Islamic states.

Joshanloo (2013) has not undertaken the discussion of well-being in relation to a single person which includes association with others, goal pursuit, life satisfaction, etc. So, the measurement of wellbeing through the standard Western scales of measurement may not be applicable in the Islamic way of defining terms like happiness or satisfaction. It is important to note that while contrasts between the Western and Islamic ways of wellbeing exist, there are similarities too. Joshanloo (2013) has emphasised the need to undertake an empirical study in the Islamic world despite the differences in Western and Islamic cultures.

Research on well-being has shown that people experience a state of wellbeing from many different factors (e.g., Field, 2009; Clark, 2010; Lundblad and Archer, 2015). An adequate income does play an important role in wellbeing, but it is no guarantee for the wellbeing of an individual (Easterlin et al., 2010; Field, 2009). Studies have also shown that people who are wealthy may be happier but an improvement in wealth need not necessarily result in an increase in happiness or wellbeing. Health, social connections, and community contribution are also found to contribute to wellbeing. Doing a good job to one’s own satisfaction and gaining societal recognition are another set of factors which contribute to wellbeing. New skills, knowledge and attitude building is also considered to contribute to wellbeing. People value the freedom to choose and participate in activities that make them happy, which contributes to their wellbeing (Field, 2009). Wellbeing has an internal and external dimension because it is more of a dynamic state in which the individual should be able to
build potential continuously and apply it in the workplace to contribute productively and creativity. People should also be able to build good interpersonal relationships and simultaneously meet personal goals as well as social goals so as to lead a purposeful life in which one can contribute to the growth of the society (UK Government Office for Science, 2008).

Having reviewed the multidimensional nature of the term ‘wellbeing’, it is essential to narrow down to the specifics while undertaking a research on wellbeing in the context of single parents. Research constructs such as social wellbeing, subjective wellbeing, objective wellbeing, psychological wellbeing, physical wellbeing etc., play a dominant role in defining the wellbeing of single parents in general. However, in the context of this research - social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing will be of specific relevance as the very objective is to study the social impact on the wellbeing of single parents so that certain policy recommendations to improve wellbeing can be made based on the empirical observations. Literature shows that these two research constructs are interrelated. Social wellbeing is affected by relationships with other members of the society, while subjective wellbeing is evident in visible indicators such as satisfaction and happiness and often referred to as the quality of life the individual leads (Alqashan & Alkandari, 2010; Chanfreau et al., 2008; Clark, 2010; Gough & McGregor, 2007; Hicks et al., 2013; Lundblad and Archer, 2015; Waldron, 2010). The next section examines these two interrelated research constructs of wellbeing.

2.2.1. Subjective Wellbeing

The relevance of subjective wellbeing to sociology has been growing at a fast pace during the past two decades. Research has provided evidence of a number of social correlates of subjective wellbeing which do not merely represent either economic or psychological aspects of wellbeing but look for dimensions beyond that (Diener et al., 2003; Helliwell & Putnam, 2004; Kroll, 2011). Subjective wellbeing is the outcome of the social system and is an important component of its functioning and that makes it an important area for research in sociology. There are other streams of reasoning in which it is delineated that individualism provides the very foundation of happiness and satisfaction, which are the essentials of subjective wellbeing (Glatzer, 2000). Several studies have provided empirical
evidence that social capital is positively related to subjective wellbeing (e.g., Bjornskov, 2008; Helliwell & Putnam, 2004; Kroll, 2010). Subjective wellbeing in the context of parenting has also been the subject area of researchers. For instance, Kroll (2010) has studied the mediating role of parental status and gender between social capital and subjective wellbeing.

It is observed through contemporary research that subjective wellbeing is defined differently by researchers based on the context of their research. This causes problems for generalizing issues of subjective wellbeing. Two such definitions which are of relevance to this research are as follows.

According to Veenhoven, (1984) subjective wellbeing is the same as overall happiness or life satisfaction.

Diener, Suh, and Oishi, (1997, p. 25) considers subjective wellbeing more elaborately:

“Thus a person is said to have high subjective well-being if she or he experiences life satisfaction and frequent joy, and only infrequently experiences unpleasant emotions such as sadness or anger. Contrariwise, a person is said to have low subjective well-being if she or he is dissatisfied with life, experiences little joy and affection and frequently feels negative emotions such as anger or anxiety”.

Diener, Oishi, and Lucas (2003, p. 403) consider, “Subjective well-being (SWB) is people’s emotional and cognitive evaluations of their lives, includes what lay people call happiness, peace, fulfillment, and life satisfaction”.

The study of subjective well-being could be a scientific analysis of the perception of people about how they evaluate their lives. It could be longitudinal or even cross sectional depending upon the purpose of research. Evaluation may be on the emotional response to events people are subjected to, the moods of people at different situations, the judgments about satisfaction, contentment, accomplishments, fulfillment, and happiness in personal and professional life (Argyle,2001; Diener et al., 2003). As mentioned earlier, subjective wellbeing is a dynamic state as not only emotions, moods, happiness etc., may change over a period of time, but an individual’s self-evaluation may also change (Diener et al., 2003). Further, the relationships of the individuals with the society may also change from time to
time to add more complexity to the measurement of subjective wellbeing. With all these complexities, the study of subjective wellbeing has still attracted mainly sociologists and the history of research on this area goes back to the early sixties where subjective wellbeing was studied under several streams. A group of researchers studied subjective wellbeing for the association of demographic factors such as income, marital status, age group, gender, education etc., (Bradburn, 1969; Campbell et al., 1976). Jahoda (1958) studied subjective wellbeing in terms of life satisfaction. Another group of researchers considered the sociopsychology of subjective wellbeing in terms of happiness (Wessman & Ricks, 1966) and adaptation to newer standards of living (Brickman & Campbell, 1971). There is evidence for the application of systematic procedures through experiments, narratives by individuals, and questionnaire surveys by these early stage researchers in subjective wellbeing. Attempts were also made to combine these studies and give a holistic meaning to subjective wellbeing (Diener et al., 2003).

As mentioned before - moods, emotions, and self-evaluative judgments about mental state of being are time variant parameters and it may necessitate the measurement of these fluctuations and check if the differences exist over a period of time. Early research has shown that the positive and negative state of mind and satisfaction in life show some interdependence (Lucas et al., 2002). There is research evidence that subjective wellbeing has been studied with reference to a single aspect of well-being and their outcomes cannot be generalized as that of wellbeing, due to the lack of holistic approach (Diener et al., 2003).

It is interesting to note that subjective wellbeing is contrasted by *objective wellbeing*, which indicates the meeting of basic human needs (Dolan et al., 2011), which is beyond the scope of this research. Huschka (2008) conducted research exclusively on subjective wellbeing targeting the measurement and finding of the determinants of the subjective well-being and his work is of relevance to this study. The role of the governments in enhancing subjective well-being was also explored by Huschka. Subjective wellbeing was addressed as ‘general subjective wellbeing’, as it considered the generic aspects of wellbeing. ‘Subjective wellbeing' was interpreted as the ‘perceived quality of life' in the research. This study was not on the single parents' wellbeing, but on the wellbeing of the general public, however,
the measurement issues considered in the research and the quantitative procedures were of relevance to the study of wellbeing on an individual basis. The independent variables of the study were the different sources or conditions in which the respondents were living and the dependent variable was general subjective wellbeing. The respondents included the people with voting rights in Belgium from Ghent, Bruges, and Antwerp. Data collection was through face-to-face interviews with 1873 respondents.

Huschka (2008) grounded his work on “Resource Theory (RT)” (Schulz, 1995) and the main determinant of general subjective wellbeing was looking for sources of lower or higher subjective wellbeing. Based on the approach specified by the theory, the resources were classified into two groups: the first group focusing on satisfaction aspects of life and the second group listing all the rest of the characteristics of the respondents. RT incorporates cognitive, affective and behavioral components of the live experiences of people and using resources in intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual dimensions (Törnblom and Kazemi, 2012). There was an alternative approach for studying wellbeing using Multiple Discrepancies Theory (Schulz, 1995), which is based on the comparative study to decide about wellbeing in life. However, Huschka (2008) relies more on the resources concept for defining subjective wellbeing.

The exogenous variables of study in the research by Huschka (2008) included socio-demographic variables (sex, age, professional status, job status, education, civil status, social status, monthly income, and religious beliefs), characteristics which define attitude towards others. The research has considered how the citizens in urban areas perceive their wellbeing. The study also considers policy issues as the independent variables influencing wellbeing.

The research by Huschka (2008) is undoubtedly an addition to the body of knowledge in the field of wellbeing in general and subjective wellbeing in particular. Nevertheless, it is not free from limitations and inadequacies in defining the terms in an absolute sense. First of all, the author has not made the point clear why another variable called ‘general subjective wellbeing’ has been introduced when ‘subjective wellbeing’ itself is a very well defined term widely accepted by the research community. In fact, subjective wellbeing by definition is a generic term for how a person perceives the state of happiness, satisfaction,
quality of life, self-efficacy, etc. Huschka accepts the fact that subjective wellbeing is a multidimensional construct and defines it as a combination of cognitive and affective aspects. Huschka also considers that cognitive aspects refer to the rational or intellectual aspects of wellbeing through which people ‘think’, and the affective aspects refer to the emotional component which involves how people ‘feel' about their wellbeing. With these dual aspects, Huschka has not been successful in placing ‘satisfaction' and ‘happiness' into either the thinking or feeling domain despite the fact that they constitute subjective wellbeing. So, the researcher makes use of the SWLS Scale of Diener et al., (1985) and Bradburn’s (1969) NPA scale. There is no justification for the use of these scales in the research when other scales are available for the measurement of subjective wellbeing (e.g. Psychological Well-Being Scale, Bradburn’s (1969) Positive Affect (PA) and Negative Affect (NA) Scales, etc.). Further, Huschka has placed Satisfaction with life scale, general life satisfaction scale, and happiness scale under the cognition dimensions. But satisfaction and happiness cannot be ruled out completely from the affective component and the researcher has not provided any rational explanation for such a classification of scales.

Huschka (2008) accepts the fact that the positive and negative affect are relatively independent of each other in the context of wellbeing. Despite the fact that this conclusion is of immense significance, no explanation has been given for having identified the independent nature of the indicators. The research by Huschka is intended to seek answers as to whether better policies can improve perceived quality of life, as indicated in the title and defined in the research questions. The finding through the research is that there is a strong correlation between ‘security feeling' in urban areas and ‘subjective wellbeing' and thus governments should consider paying attention to people’s feelings of security. First of all, the point is obvious that any citizen of a country would like to feel safe for his/her wellbeing in the country. So, giving this as the outcome of the research runs short of expectation in research on subjective wellbeing. Secondly, the correlation could be spurious and cannot be the basis unless there is a causation proved between the two variables: feeling safe/secure and general subjective wellbeing. Finally, such a conclusion should emerge from quantitative research through hypothesis testing based on existing theory and the testing of it, which is missing in the research by Huschka. Thus, there is a need to further investigate the relationships between the predictors and the subjective wellbeing.
The endeavor to identify a complete set of dimensions of parental wellbeing has been a continuous process of the pioneering work in the early 1980s. Musick et al., (2014) studied the multi-dimensional nature of parents’ wellbeing in the context of sociology. Their definition of wellbeing was regarding the time available for the parent in performing various activities in day to day life. Wellbeing was measured based on time spent on various activities by the parents, which included the time they spent with their children.

First of all, many researchers have questioned whether a study on wellbeing is a topic in Sociology or Psychology or Social Psychology (Michael & Larsen, 2008). Because of the multidimensional nature of wellbeing, it can belong to all three disciplines. Musick et al., (2014) focused on how ‘activities', as opposed to 'status' of parenthood, affected happiness, sadness, stress and fatigues.

The research by Musick et al., (2014) was based on questionnaire survey (N = 23,382) with data drawn from American Time Use Survey (ATUS). The study was regarding the happiness and wellbeing measurement of fathers and mothers on their subjective wellbeing regarding the time spent with their children. The finding of the study was that parental wellbeing was more linked to positive feelings when they were with the children than when they were with others or alone. The study also examined the socio-demographic impact (which included age, gender, income, social status, type of employment, residential location, religious group, and income group) on parental wellbeing and found that parenthood was affected by socio-demographic factors positively regarding social advantage. They also observed that the association of various demographic-factors varied significantly among the fathers and mothers with mothers being more affected.

Meier et al., (2016) have extended the earlier work by Musick et al., (2014) with research using three consecutive years’ data from American Time Use Survey (ATUS). The affective component of motherhood concerning parenting was studied for its variance based on demographic factors: work and parent status. The sample was drawn from ATUS, and the data was collected from the Subjective Wellbeing Module about how they felt while performing three day to day activities which were randomly chosen. Sample size was 34,565 men and women aged 15 and older. In the research by Meier et al., (2016) the parenting activities of mothers in the age group of 21–55 years were considered with
children under 18 in the household. Multiple regression models were used for testing the association between the variables. The feelings of the mother during the three activities was assessed by five specific questions (e.g., how happy did you feel while performing the activity?) Likert-type 6-point scale was used to measure the intensity of emotion with 0 representing ‘not at all’ and six representing ‘very high’. The first control variable in the research was socio-demographic characteristics (age in years, race/ethnicity, and qualification). The second control variable was family income (measured in the ranges from low, middle, to high). The third variable was about sleep and leisure.

The study by Musick et al., (2014) had the context of USA and generalization of the results to the rest of the world is questionable. Specifically, the researchers have attempted to associate mothering experiences with emotional wellbeing. The researchers had started with the premise that parents will be more relaxed when their children were at home than with others based on the studies by Hansen (2012), Stanca (2012) and others. The concept of single parenting has been viewed by Meier and his group of researchers from many different perspectives. They consider the increase in single parenthood since the 1970s (Child Trends, 2015). Meier et al., (2016) claim that single parents are less happy compared to the intact parents. It was observed that parental engagement with children was better with intact parents compared to single parents.

Meier et al., (2016) make no mention of the theoretical background to their research. It could be because most of the theories of emotional wellbeing apply to the work undertaken by Meier et al., (2016). Further, when it comes to the study of wellbeing with a holistic approach, it will be a multidisciplinary subject drawing theories from sociology as well as psychology (Veenhoven, 2008 in Eid & Larson, 2008). However, the theory which could be most applicable to the research by Meier et al., (2016) is Multiple Discrepancy Theory (MDT). In fact, the fundamental concept of subjective well-being suggests that we compare self-perceptions against a reference. It has been established that the degree of satisfaction a person can get is also based on the set level of expectations (see Wilson, 1967; Michalos, 1985). An expectation higher than the available options of comforts leads to dissatisfaction, on the contrary, if the available options provide better comforts in life than the expected it
leads to satisfaction. This concept of MDS has been the basis of the research by Meier et al., (2016).

One very positive aspect of the research by Meier et al., (2016) is the ability of the researchers in identifying the ‘potential confounders’. The presence of extraneous variables in research can cause confounded relationships and the confounders identified in the research include: sleep and leisure constraints, solo care or parenting, education, income, race and ethnicity, family income, etc. Each one of these variables may have their association with emotional wellbeing which can introduce the confounded relationship. Further, the findings of the study by Meier et al., (2016) included: working class was under greater stress compared to non-working class; partnered mothers were happier, and partnered mothers were emotionally more stable.

Eiffe et al., (2016) performed analysis to explain the variations in subjective wellbeing through multiple regression method. The research included three analytical models: socio-demographic variables, objective variables, and additional variables. The socio-demographic variables considered in the study were – age, sex, income, educational attainment, household type, labor market status, citizenship, and degree of urbanization. The study experimented on the potential drivers of wellbeing when the rest of the variables were controlled. The research was extended even for the sub-groups of salient variables such as gender and age. Further, national level variables such as inequality, level of economic development were also considered for their association with subjective wellbeing of individuals.

The research by Eiffe et al., (2016) used positivist research paradigm and the methodology used in the research was survey questionnaire. The respondents were the citizens of European Union and Non-European countries and the sample size was 140,000 respondents from 125 countries. The results indicated that all the socio-demographic variables were associated with wellbeing. Subjective wellbeing was less in single parents in terms of the household they belong to. The study revealed that non-European citizenship reduced the subjective wellbeing among people. Income and employment had positive association on subjective wellbeing, however increase in income did not show increase in subjective wellbeing. Supportive relationships have a positive significant association on subjective wellbeing.
wellbeing of people. To be precise, the study revealed that those who did not have a healthy supportive relationship were having 70% of the subjective wellbeing of those with healthy supportive relationships. The study has found that living single has a negative impact on the subjective wellbeing. Self-employment had a negative association with subjective wellbeing for men and positive association for women. Unemployment had a higher level of negative impact on the subjective wellbeing of men than on women. Retirement had negative effect on the subjective wellbeing of men and positive effect on women. Educational attainment was found to be important for subjective wellbeing of male than for female. In general it is imperative that for most items for which a strong overall association between subjective well-being and the outcome is known (income, living conditions, health, social relations, etc.), the results are similar (in terms of sign and significance) for both the genders.

The research on subjective wellbeing by Eiffe et al., (2016) has considered several aspects under the evaluative component, but the research completely ignores the affective component of subjective wellbeing. The positive affect and negative affect components of subjective wellbeing are important as they represent the pleasant and unpleasant feelings of people. In research on single parents this component of subjective wellbeing cannot be ignored, as it has a major bearing on the subjective wellbeing of the single parents. This is because by its very definition subjective wellbeing is a state of wellness of a human being in the society (Hicks et al., 2013; Lundblad & Archer, 2015). Eudaimonia, which refers to the ‘flourishing’ part of wellbeing (Deci & Ryan, 2006; OECD, 2013) is not given due importance by Eiffe and his team. With specific reference to the dimensions of subjective wellbeing the research by Eiffe et al., (2016) has done justice to a great extent. However, the outcome of the research cannot be generalized completely in terms of the state of subjective wellbeing of the participants as the research does not consider the term subjective wellbeing holistically. Further, the research has considered only select demographic factors and ignored the effect of work experience, ethnicity, and this acts as a limitation of the study.
2.2.2. Social Wellbeing

Social wellbeing is viewed more as a social wellness in the context of single parents who are the focus of this research. The concept of social wellbeing in this research has a broader multifaceted meaning. It is in fact considered as a psychosocial aspect of an individual borrowing from the concept of Zhang et al., (2010) that social wellbeing will make people see their wellbeing in terms of the wellbeing of the members of the society.

Srivastava and Mishra (2007) found that the human capacity to cope was derivative of social environment. Caplan (1974) provided evidence to the point that supportive family and friends may be crucial in crisis handling of an individual. According to the principles of community mental health practice, humans have no control over some stressors however, social supports can facilitate coping of stress (Silverman & Murrow, 1976). Buehler (1988) studied the social and emotional aspects of the wellbeing of divorced residential parents in Middle Eastern countries which included Kuwait. The sample included one hundred forty-one divorced females and thirty-six divorced male parents based on purposive sampling. A questionnaire survey was used to collect the data and information.

Buehler's study derived its conceptual model from Spanier and Furstenberg's (1982) Theory of Wellbeing which considered wellbeing as a multi-dimensional construct that encompassed happiness, adjustment, satisfaction and stress based on the social and psychological theories. The behavioral theories also laid the foundation to the study as it involved social adjustments. The main finding of the research, by Buehler, was that there was a significant difference between the father's and mother's wellbeing. In addition to the aforementioned theoretical background mentioned by Buehler to his research, it can also be observed that the research has its foundation in The Structural-functionalist Theory (SFT) (Doda, 2005). The SFT provides the basis for defining social wellbeing as used in this research. According to SFT relationships are established on the part of the society and how they are functional (having beneficial consequences to the individual and the society). In the context of the research by Buehler (1988), social wellbeing is measured in terms of the societal involvement with the individual and his/her participation in the societal activities.

The main strength of the research by Buehler (1988) lies in its methodological approach to research. First of all, the author has undertaken a thorough literature review and provided
evidence for the earlier findings that divorced parents had reported lower levels of wellbeing than the married adults. The researcher has also provided evidence to the fact that there has been a gender difference in the wellbeing of the single parents. Men have reported the lower level of wellbeing than women following separation from the spouse. The author also found the contradiction that despite the lower level of wellbeing, divorced men had lower stress levels than divorced women. The author has pointed out that the speculation based on earlier studies is difficult because the earlier studies had not included parameters such as socioeconomic status which are important and cannot be eliminated from the study. Having said so, the author has considered these aspects in his study which is the strength of the paper by Buehler (1988). The author has confirmed the sample representativeness for household size, education level, and income through comparison with previous years' population report. So, the chance of confounded relationship has been eliminated to a considerable extent.

The main shortcoming of the research by Buehler (1988) is that the dimensions chosen for measuring wellbeing of single parents are limited to health, life satisfaction, and family wellbeing. These dimensions seem to be incomplete in defining the wellbeing of the single parents. Further, the researcher has not investigated on the association of socio-demographic or socio-economic factors on the wellbeing of single parents. This opens up scope for research which is based on the selection of the dimensions of wellbeing through the available models of wellbeing.

Social wellbeing is a multidimensional construct (Huppert & So, 2009; Vittersø et al., 2010) and hence the measurement issues are quite complex. Jeffrey et al., (2015) considered the six dimensions: evaluative wellbeing, emotional wellbeing, functioning, vitality, community wellbeing, and supportive relationships to measure social wellbeing in 29 European countries with a sample size of 54,600. Evaluative wellbeing referred to overall estimation of an individual on happiness and satisfaction with life. Emotional wellbeing was the positive feeling about joyfulness and freedom from anxiety or stress. Functioning referred to autonomy, competence, engagement, purpose of life fulfillment, and being an optimist. Vitality included the feeling of freshness, having sound sleep, and feeling energetic in facing the challenges of life. Community wellbeing referred to an individual’s
feelings about the community in which they live and the trust on members of the society and feeling belongingness the community. Supportive relationships referred to the feeling that there are people to approach in case of emergency or crisis and experiencing companionship.

Apart from confirming the multi-dimensional nature of the research construct - social wellbeing, the research found that there was no consistency in the response of people from different countries for the various dimensions. Jeffrey et al., (2015) attribute these differences to cultural, historical and political contexts. In addition, they have also emphasized that there is a need to explore other dimensions of social wellbeing.

The study by Jeffrey et al., (2015) has revealed the fact that incomes and social wellbeing are positively correlated. The size of the social wellbeing gap between high and low income households varied considerably throughout Europe. The larger the inequality in income, the larger was the inequality in social wellbeing. The recommendation to the policy makers was to provide extra support on households in lower income groups. Another key finding of the study was that increasing the income equally between the countries was no guarantee for the equal amount of increase in social wellbeing. Surprisingly, the study indicated that in South Eastern Europe the social wellbeing decreased with the increase in income.

2.3. Research on Wellbeing of Single Parents

There is a large number of research articles on wellbeing in a broad sense, but not many of them are focused on the wellbeing of single parents. Even those which are available deal with specific dimensions of wellbeing, further they are in the context of western countries. The following research undertaken on single parent wellbeing are important in the context of this research as they provide inputs to the selection of dimensions of study and they provide general procedure for undertaking a systematic research on single parent wellbeing.

Kotwal and Prabhakar (2009) conducted an extensive study in India on the problems faced by single mothers and their coping mechanisms to encounter those problems. The approach was on the negative side of the wellbeing of the single parents due to the societal attitudes and the study revealed that the single mothers felt lonely, helpless, hopeless, and lacked confidence. The research was based on non-probability based sampling and adopted the
technique of snow ball sampling for data collection. The sample size was 50 single mothers and interview schedule was the tool used to collect the data. In terms of the social sphere of the single mothers, they totally avoided the social gathering and even their dressing styles were affected, they had poor eating habits, and they were subject to depression. The inferiority complex had led to such an extent that they even avoided the public meetings. The research also showed that it was hard to maintain the discipline of the children due to the absence of the male member in the home. The problems even extended to loneliness, traumatic and depression and the female single parents even found it difficult to handle the responsibility of childcare and to establish a routine for their children.

The research revealed that in case of the women as the identity was through their husbands the single parenthood made them feel rootlessness and lack identity. The feeling of guilt, shame, resentment, anger and anxiety about future was quite dominant. Majority of the respondents (62%) were depressed and suffered from traumatic grief due to singlehood. Only a small portion of the respondents were ready to face the future (4%). The rest of the single mothers had considered it to be a matter beyond their control and had coped with life as it was their fate. Hopelessness and loneliness were the majority feeling among the single mother. The major coping mechanism was spending time with their children followed by getting involved with household duties and pursuing a professional career. Watching TV, listening to music, and meditating were the other coping mechanisms. Crying and letting out the pent-up emotions was also one of the coping mechanism. One of the important observations was that the single mothers had concluded that they had little place among the married couples. At the most some women were socializing with other women, but generally avoided mixing with men. Disciplining the children was a major problem faced by the single mothers and they felt that they lacked knowledge in career counselling and guiding them towards their future. Due to nuclear family set up they had nobody to interact with and had to rely on their own decisions regarding the upbringing of their children. They found that their multiple roles such as playing the role of father, family provider as well as the home maker were highly demanding. Among the stressors financial problems was considered to be the prominent one. Single mothers were continuously under tension and lack of identity and lack of confidence made them very weak. Economic hardship, worry
about the future of children and their own future life caused a lot of stress to the single parents.

The research by Kotwal and Prabhakar (2009) is an extensive study on the wellbeing of single mothers. The theoretical foundation for this research is basically from the Social Psychology. The base theory used in this paper is the Hedonic Treadmill Theory (HTT) which is the bottom up approach and it believes that the positive or negative external events can affect wellbeing (Diener, 2000). The negative feelings of the society depress the single parents as found in this paper. The paper to some extent is based on the Psychoanalytic Theory as it studies the behavior of the single mothers through the determinants of behavior which includes the structure of the personality and the defense mechanism of the individuals. The various external conditions under which the single mothers survive through the various coping mechanisms (talking to relatives, meditation, weeping, maintaining a busy schedule, spending time with children, reading, watching TV etc.) has been extensively studied in this paper. The scope of the research is limited to single mothers and two major limitations of the study is that it studies only the wellbeing of mothers and it does not deal with the wellbeing of the single fathers and further, there is no comparison across the gender.

2.4. The Research Gap

The literature review has been undertaken on three threads: theoretical background, research on wellbeing and research on wellbeing of single parents. The review of various theories connected to wellbeing in general revealed that several theories may be used to conceptualize wellbeing. The review of research on wellbeing indicates that wellbeing is a multi-dimensional construct and any research on wellbeing should focus on specific dimensions which are of relevance to the characteristics of the sample being studied. The multi-dimensional nature of the research construct – ‘wellbeing’ has been brought out meaningfully by the earlier researchers and it is evident that wellbeing is a multidisciplinary study which draws from two well-established disciplines Sociology and Psychology and may be considered to belong to Social-psychology. The research on single parents revealed the fact that two parent families are preferred over single parents when it comes to childrearing. It was also revealed that single parenthood caused stress on single
parents. It was also revealed that all of the single parental background had no association with their wellbeing. The happiness of the parents has been the focal dimension of wellbeing in the research literature. It was also shown by the researchers that wellbeing varied significantly between fathers and mothers in the western context, but no evidence for such an outcome has been established in Arab countries like Kuwait. There has been extensive research on positive and negative aspects of wellbeing. These studies have proved empirically that time spent with the children by the parents has a bearing on their wellbeing predominantly among the mothers. Time spent with children has even been a coping mechanism against stress in the case of divorced mothers.

Researchers have also found that the wellbeing of single parents also has a cultural impact, and thus, the wellbeing of single parents in the Western countries and an Arab country like Kuwait could be different. The researchers have endorsed that single parenthood is a social issue and the study was a compelling necessity, particularly in the Arab context. It was evident from the literature review that both the theories of sociology and social-psychology influenced the research on the wellbeing of single parents. In addition to these general derivatives of the literature review following are the specific research gaps which need to be addressed.

The first research gap in the existing literature is that there are relatively few quantitative analyses which deal with the wellbeing of single parents in the context of Kuwait. The second gap is that the dimensionality of wellbeing has not been fixed by researchers even though the researchers have classified wellbeing as a multi-dimensional construct. Third, there is little evidence for the detailed empirical study on the perceptions of single parents about their wellbeing in Kuwait. Fourth, the studies have identified the factors that are associated with wellbeing, but there is no detailed quantitative study to assess the ‘social wellbeing' and ‘subjective wellbeing’ of single parents. Finally, there is a dearth of studies in Kuwait on the study of the impact of background factors of single parents on their wellbeing.

Thus, it is evident that the following issues related to the single parents in Kuwait have not been addressed by the existing literature:

1. The role played by background factors on the wellbeing of single parents.
2. Interrelationships between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing.
3. Measures to strengthen social and the subjective wellbeing.

Having identified the research gap, the proposed research makes an attempt to undertake a quantitative study on the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait. The focus of the research is to study the perceptions of single parents concerning their social wellbeing and their subjective wellbeing. The research approach will be quantitative using survey method. The respondents will be the government employees from a range of government organizations. A conceptual model will be developed to study the wellbeing of single parents which will be empirically tested in this research. So, this empirical study would add to the existing literature on issues related to single parenthood in Kuwait.

2.5. Summary

This chapter has mainly focused on discussing various theories of wellbeing as it is the focal area of this research. It was found that autonomy, competence and relatedness of a person constituted the main factors of motivation of a person according to Self-Determination Theory which has given relevance to social and subjective wellbeing which is being studied in this research. The rational choice theory in summary indicated that traditional action, affective action and value focused action form the basis for any rational decision people make. This concept made the point that wellbeing is also a matter that is in the control of a person. A person’s association with the community can be of use when it comes to need satisfaction is the fundamental tenet of Goal Content Theory. This theory has provided the relevance of social wellbeing which is a research construct under investigation in this research. The existence of mutual consensus formed the basis of Structural Functionalism Theory so acceptability of a particular section of a society by the rest of the members of the society became relevant. Social Conflict Theory showed how domination of one group over the other exists in any society which leads to the existence of social conflicts. The tendency of people to maximize their personal benefits was revealed through the Social Exchange Theory. Optimal Distinctiveness Theory provided evidence for the linkage between psychological state of mind and individual wellbeing. Cognitive Evaluation Theory proved the importance of the motivational state of a human being and how it has an intrinsic and extrinsic component. These theories when critically reviewed led
to an understanding that wellbeing as such is a multidimensional construct and it can be measured in terms of its components. Two distinct components of wellbeing have been identified, which become the research constructs to be empirically related to each other as well as to the background factors of the single parents. The review of the theories also enabled the identification of the ‘research gap’ which needs to be filled through additional research. Thus, the chapter provides the foundation to the development of the conceptual model which is discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 3  
The Research Methodology

3.1. Overview
This chapter reports the research methodology used in this research. The conceptual model has been developed based on the research questions and the objectives and it aims to bring together research constructs. The literature which establishes the association between the background factors, subjective wellbeing and objective wellbeing have been discussed in this chapter. Drawing from these discussions the conceptual model has been developed and the individual dimensions of the conceptual model have been explained in this chapter. The research methodology adopted in this research has been detailed in this chapter. This research mainly used quantitative approach and each of the methods and the tools used in the research have been explained in detail. The systematic steps used in data collection, analysis of the results, and the drawing of the inferences and the implications have been reported in this chapter. The nature and philosophical paradigm of the research and the variables involved therein are highlighted. The choice of specific methods and justifications for the choice is given in this chapter. The procedure of sample selection and the systematic procedure adopted in questionnaire development has been listed. A brief profile of the organizations from which the sample was drawn has been presented. The research design and the multivariate analysis have been explained. The data collection strategies, statistical procedures, data analysis and limitations of these methods are discussed. Structural equation modelling which is the main tool used for the quantitative analysis has been explained in this chapter.

3.2. Wellbeing
Wellbeing is a term used to define the overall wellbeing regarding both cognitive and emotional aspects of wellbeing (Diener, 2000). Researchers have interchangeably used wellbeing with satisfaction and quality of life (Huebner et al., 2002; Karatzias et al., 2002). Campbell et al (1976) defined the ‘quality of life' as a general sense of wellbeing. In this research ‘wellbeing' is conceptualized to comprise the two dimensions of social and subjective wellbeing.
3.2.1. Social wellbeing

The multi-dimensionality of the research construct ‘Social Wellbeing' has been recognized by a group of researchers (Alqashan, 2009; Alqashan and Alkandari, 2010; Aljalabnah, 2006; Kern et al., 2014; Kotwal and Prabhakar, 2009). The theoretical models which provide the basis for the development of the research construct social wellbeing in this study are Spanier and Furstenberg’s (1982) Theory of Wellbeing. The Theory of wellbeing propagated that the social adjustment of an individual leads to their wellbeing and it forms the basis for the development of the factors which define his dimension. The detailed review of the research construct Social Wellbeing was undertaken in Chapter 2 – Literature review. In this chapter the focus is on the dimensionality of it. Keyes (1998) has provided the well-established five dimensions of social wellbeing. The five factors which constitute social wellbeing are - social integration, social contribution, social coherence, social actualization, and social acceptance which are discussed in the following paragraphs.

**Social integration:** Keyes (1998) considers this dimension as the one in which a person is related to the society. A person is integrated with the society when he has a sense of being a part of it.

**Social acceptance:** Social acceptance takes place when a person accepts him/her to have the characteristics of the society in general (Keyes, 1998). It is indicated by the trust a person has in his/her society and the extent to which he/she feels comfortable with the members of the society. This also involves the ability to accept the members of the society.

**Social contribution:** This is the belief that one can be of some value to the society (Keyes, 1998). It may be considered to be like self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977) and accomplishment of objectives (Gecas, 1989). It is to have a sense of responsibility and personal obligations towards the society (Keyes, 1998).

**Social coherence:** This is the willingness of an individual to know about the social world he/she lives in (Keyes, 1998). Healthy people can easily understand the world in which they live. Social coherence dispels the delusion of being in a perfect world and makes people more adaptable to changing circumstances in the real world.
Social actualization: This is the ability to evaluate the capabilities of the society (Keyes, 1998). It makes people certain about the future possibilities of the society. It makes them consider that they are the beneficiaries of social growth. It is the faith people have on their custodians e.g., politicians. It is also the faith that society can control its own destiny.

3.2.2. Subjective Wellbeing

Resource Theory (Schulz, 1995) forms the basis for the conceptualization of subjective wellbeing in this research. The reason for choosing this theory as the base is the very nature of subjective wellbeing, which depends upon the good or poor state of mind based on the utilization of the resources available. The grounding of the state of wellbeing is in the access to resources, and the wellbeing is in fact controlled by it. Following are the three factors associated with subjective wellbeing.

Life Evaluation: This measure is about the perception of an individual about his/her 'life as a whole' (OECD, 2013). It is also referred to as a person's judgement about life satisfaction (Blanchflower, 2009; Stiglitz et al., 2009). It captures the cognitive dimension of subjective wellbeing by asking individuals to make a personal judgment about the quality of their life in general (Diener et al., 1985). Life satisfaction correlates negatively or positively with various objective, indirect, or composite measures of well-being, such as hypertension, high blood pressure, the frequency of smiling, stress levels, or the Better Life Index (Blanchflower, 2009; OECD, 2013).

Affect: Affect is about the feelings of a person and has two distinct components - optimistic and pessimistic view (OECD, 2013). The former captures positive emotions and the latter captures negative emotions. Optimistic views and the positive state based emotions are strongly correlated with each other, whereas the pessimistic emotions may be multi-dimensional, e.g., anger, fear and sadness are negative emotions which may not all appear at the same time.

Eudaimonia: Eudaimonia refers to the ‘flourishing' part of wellbeing (Deci & Ryan, 2006; OECD, 2013). Eudaimonia is not just a person's state, but it may drive the potential. Huppert et al., (2009) in the context of measuring eudaimonia has identified several key...
dimensions associated with the function aspects which include: learning, goal-directedness, tenacity, etc.

The above discussed dimensions describe the constructs of Social wellbeing and Subjective wellbeing in the context of this research. An empirical investigation will be conducted to study the association of the research constructs established in this chapter with specific reference to single parents in Kuwait.

3.3. The Conceptual Model

In the context of this research, there are two relationships between variables that are of specific interest to the wellbeing of single parents which leads to the development of the conceptual model. These are, first, the association of background factors of single parents with their wellbeing, and second, the association between the social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing of single parents. In a broad sense, the literature review indicated an association between the ‘background factors’ of people and their ‘wellbeing’, however empirical investigations of this association have not previously been conducted with reference to single parents in Kuwait. The background factors selected by earlier researchers vary from case to case and it could be demographic, socio-demographic or socio-economic factors. The association between the research constructs is discussed in the following paragraphs.

3.3.1. Association of Background Factors and Wellbeing

Gutierrez et al., (2005) conducted research on nursing professionals with a sample size of 236 using sampling survey with NEO Five Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1999) and Affect-Balance Scale Wellbeing (Bradburn, 1969). Seven hospitals were randomly chosen for sample collection and the supervisors were contacted to administer questionnaires and two weeks duration was given for completing the questionnaire. Telephone follow up was carried out to obtain the desired sample size. Multivariate analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship of demographic variables with subjective wellbeing. The analysis indicated that the demographic variables of gender, age, and relationship status were differentially associated with the elements of subjective wellbeing. Regression analysis indicated that personality, which was a background factor in the study, was the
strongest predictor of subjective wellbeing ($\beta = 0.18$). Subjective wellbeing was gender sensitive, and women scored less than men on subjective wellbeing. Age had an impact on subjective wellbeing ($\beta = 0.11$) in the sense that it varied with age. However, there was no conclusive evidence as to whether subjective wellbeing improved or decreased with age. In general gender, age, and relationship status were differentially associated with different dimensions of subjective wellbeing and the study explained that the differential association was because of the intermediate variable ‘personality’ which was associated differently with these demographic variables. The conclusion of the study was that demographic variables had an impact on subjective wellbeing.

Social wellbeing is a measure of how well a single parent integrates with the society, and accepts being a part of the society he/she lives in. Social wellbeing also relies on people feeling of some value to the society, being able to establish coherence with the society, and being able to evaluate the potential of the society. On the other hand, subjective wellbeing is partly dependent on social wellbeing as well as aspects of life which make the individual feel satisfied, happy and generate the possibility of flourishing.

Patulny (2014) conducted a research study exclusively to investigate the gender gap in terms of the subjective wellbeing of American men and women. The secondary data from the Princeton Time and Affect Survey (Kahneman and Krueger, 2006) was used in this research. Sociology of subjective wellbeing or how people felt about the time they spent in their day-to-day activities were considered as the theme of the research. In the conceptualization of the research model, the affective component of subjective wellbeing was viewed from several angles and identifiable feelings, changes in observable expressions on how well they can cope with cultural and social changes. Patulny (2014) considered these as social emotions as they are formed when people deal with a section of the society. The conceptualization of the model was through several aspects associated with affect including temper (Kemper, 1990), exhilaration or enthusiasm (Collins, 1990), indignity or embarrassment (Scheff, 1998), and togetherness (Ilouz, 2008). The enjoyment derived from peoples’ occupations was studied, and also, it was observed whether people were angry, annoyed or tired (Van Kleef & Côté, 2007) which had bearing on their wellbeing. To study the dynamics involved in the emotional states of the participants in
detail the emotional states were categorised into positive and negative affect types and categorized into commonly and least commonly observed types. These emotional states were observed during the time spent in performing activities which included: contracted time (paid work and education), committed time (unpaid work, child care, adult care, volunteer, religious activities), necessary time (personal and travel), and leisure time (out of home leisure, sports and exercise, in home leisure, media and computing, TV watching). It was found that unhappy episodes were higher in women in comparison to men in education, paid work, travel, sleep, unpaid domestic work, watching TV, in-home free time leisure, childcare, and media and computing, whereas episodes of unhappiness in men were higher during personal care, sports and exercise, adult care, religious activities, voluntary services, and out-home free time leisure. It was revealed through the study that the largest gender gap existed in education. The study has made two important observations, first – it has identified gender inequality in wellbeing, and second – in terms of emotion and affect, American women experience more unhappiness than men. The research also emphasizes that emotional wellbeing cannot be fully understood without understanding the social context.

Weaver et al., (2015) investigated the association of subjective wellbeing with age, gender and two important background factors viz., income and health in the context of twelve European and US countries. Inequalities in terms of income and health have been measured and then compared to the indicators of subjective wellbeing of the people. The target group was the population aged 50 and above because the context of the study was social and economic consequences of ageing and this age group was of critical importance in Europe and the US. The study found distinct contributions of income and health to people’s subjective wellbeing.

The core of the research methodology lies in the decomposition of the ‘concentration indices’ of income and health which has been formulated in such a way that it would indicate the individual contribution of these indices on the various dimensions of subjective wellbeing such as satisfaction in life and happiness. While the rest of the studies have focused on the general association of the background factors on subjective wellbeing, the research by Weaver et al., (2015) has looked into the association of the inequalities and
their relative association with the background factors so that how the inequalities may differentially influence subjective wellbeing could be identified, if such a difference in subjective wellbeing exists. Another distinct feature of the study by Weaver et al., (2015) is that while there are many studies which have focused on the assessment of subjective wellbeing of a population in a country or a group of countries (e.g., Diener et al., 2010; Eurofound, 2013) this research was focused on the distribution of subjective wellbeing based on inequalities in the background factors.

Weaver et al., (2015) based their study on the data through: ‘Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe’ and ‘Health and Retirement Study’, the former representing the European countries and the latter, the USA. The respondent age group was 50 years of age and above. It was a longitudinal survey with two groups of respondents being added over a period of two years. The questionnaire was based on an 11-point Likert scale with a response of higher rating representing closer agreement with the scale. The background factor - Income referred to the ‘disposable income of the individual’. As two different countries were involved in the analysis, to account for the differences in the cost of living ‘purchasing power parity’ was adopted. In the measurement of health as a component of subjective wellbeing, a ‘health index’ was used (0 – worst health and 10 – best health) as the basis for comparison. Self-assessment of health was regressed on a set of health variables so that both the subjective and objective aspects of health were captured (Lindeboom& Kerkhofs, 2009).

The concentration index which was used to relate socioeconomic conditions with cumulative distribution of subjective wellbeing was estimated on a comparative basis of the two variables leading towards an index. The concentration index value of zero indicated that subjective wellbeing was independent of the person’s socioeconomic class. If the value of the concentration index was negative, it was an indication of people from poor socioeconomic backgrounds having high subjective wellbeing, and if the value was positive it indicated that the people from rich socioeconomic backgrounds had high subjective wellbeing.

The study by Weaver et al., (2015) indicated that individual income was significantly related to the socioeconomic background of people and when there was an increase in
income there was a corresponding increase in subjective wellbeing. Similarly, the study also revealed that better health led to better subjective wellbeing. The socioeconomic differences in subjective wellbeing were statistically much lower in the USA in comparison to European countries. Individual income was highly and significantly associated with subjective wellbeing in most of the countries. It was found that on an average an increase in one percent in income would result in an increase of 1.6 percent of subjective wellbeing, however high income had limited influence on the increase of subjective wellbeing. An increase of one percent of health increased subjective wellbeing by 2.5 percent according to the study. Even though the significance of association of age and gender with subjective wellbeing differed in different regions in the two countries, it was found that people with higher levels of subjective wellbeing lived longer and coped well with age related disabilities.

Vaznoniene (2016) conducted a study in Lithuania to investigate the influence of socio-demographic factors on the subjective wellbeing of an elderly population. The social issue that was focussed upon was the growing population of elderly people and the imminent changes in the social structure, distribution and consumption of various services mainly healthcare services and promotion of wellbeing. The conceptual model was built upon the various studies on the influence of background factors on wellbeing (Kuliesis & Pareigiene, 2014; Orlova, 2013; Vaznoniene, 2014). A quantitative approach with questionnaire survey method was adopted with a sample size of 602 based on simple random sampling. The questionnaire was based on earlier research on subjective wellbeing (Diener & Diener, 2000; Veenhoven, 2009) and there were seven distinct dimensions describing elderly wellbeing. Dimensions of wellbeing were oriented on evaluation of wellbeing and satisfaction in life. A non-probability based convenience sampling technique was adopted for data collection. During the data collection 650 questionnaires were distributed and 602 usable questionnaires were obtained which were used for the analysis. The socio-demographic factors considered in the analysis were gender, age, education, social status, marital status, and place of dwelling.

The CHI-SquareAutomatic Interaction Detector Algorithm (also called Decision Tree Algorithm) was used for classifying the data according to groups and forecast dependent
variables based on independent variables. The analysis grouped the respondents with similar responses together. The sample comprised about 70% female and the rest male with an average age of about 70 years. The study revealed that in terms of age, subjective wellbeing was highest in the age group of 60 to 69 years. Overall about 56% claimed that their subjective wellbeing was about average while 26% expressed that it was very poor. There was no significant gender difference in terms of subjective wellbeing. An important observation was that feelings about retirement had negative influence on subjective wellbeing. Education, social status, place of dwelling had no significant influence on the subjective wellbeing of an individual. Wellbeing of the disabled was significantly influenced by marital status, and single/divorced women proved to have lower subjective wellbeing in comparison to single/divorced men. This study has highlighted the importance of studying the impact of demographic variables on subjective wellbeing. Based on the study, Vaznoniene (2016) made several suggestions to the government on policy enhancement which includes initiatives such as giving a higher priority to social activities, opening of community centres, improved medical assistance, subsidized medicine for the elderly, and more religious and spiritual activities to keep the elderly engaged.

All the above research studies established a link between background factors and wellbeing of people. However, correlation study between the two is still in progress around the globe. In addition to the above referred research, there has been a general awareness internationally on the study of the impact of background factors of individuals on their wellbeing. For instance, a group of researchers (e.g., Ferrer-i-Carbonell, 2013; Graham, 2008; Blanchflower& Oswald, 2002) have found that income and health are the major determinants of subjective wellbeing. The study of the effect of income on subjective wellbeing has resulted in ‘Easterlin paradox’ (Easterlin & Angelescu, 2009), which states that in a country under consideration subjective wellbeing does not increase with an increase in income, however, at the individual level there is a small positive correlation between the two. This paradox was explored further and one explanation is that it is the role played by ‘relative income’ which creates such a difference between micro and macro levels. According to the World Bank (2014) report, the subjective wellbeing of people is mainly associated with socioeconomic status and the health of the individual. This conclusion is very well supported by the empirical studies undertaken by a group of
researchers (e.g., Bleichrodt et al., 2012; Gakidou et al., 2000; Schwarze & Härpfer, 2007; Van Oorti et al., 2009). Despite these associations and correlations between the various background factors and subjective wellbeing of individuals, this conclusion is considered to be inconsistent (Di Tella & MacCulloch, 2006; Weaver et al., 2015). Thus, there is a need to explore the relationship further, and in the context of the current research on single parents, this association will be conceptually linked. It is anticipated that the outcomes will lead to policy enhancement and benefit this section of the Kuwaiti society.

The influence of background factors on the wellbeing of single parents have been studied using different factors such as demographic, socio-demographic and socio-economic, but in the proposed research select background factors which are of significance in the context of single parents in Kuwait have been chosen which are detailed below.

**Gender:** Gender sensitivity is an important aspect in a conservative society such as Kuwait as emphasized by many researchers (Hasanov et al., 2013). Women, in particular, have been given importance in Kuwaiti society, and gender sensitivity is ranked as first in the Global Gender Gap Report (GGGR, 2014). Further, Kuwait has relatively higher female labour market in comparison to the other Arab countries (see Hasanov et al., 2013). As there are almost equal numbers of male and female workers, it is important to study if the perceived wellbeing of single parents differs according to gender. Having studied the impact of gender on the wellbeing of the people in general, and single parents in a couple of studies discussed in the preceding chapter (e.g., Kemper, 1990; Gutierrez et al., 2005; Patulny, 2014; Weaver et al., 2015; Vaznoniene, 2016), it has been considered as a background factor which would be associated with wellbeing of single parents. Researchers have investigated on the reasons which could result in the difference in the wellbeing of people based on their gender and it includes difference in leisure times, level of involvement in household activities, ability to manage work-life balance, level of attachment with relatives, nature of relationship with friends, social interaction, and ability to handle stress (Aguiar & Hurst, 2007; Fisher & Robinson, 2010; Kan et al., 2011).

**Age:** It is also important to study if this perception varies with age. Wellbeing measured in terms of happiness and satisfaction in several European, American, Asian, and the Latin American survey indicated that wellbeing was higher at a younger age and decreased later.
in the U-pattern with the mid-point at middle age and then increased with older age (Blanchflower & Oswald, 2008). The respondents selected in this research are classified into five groups regarding their age. Several research studies have endorsed the relevance of age in the condition of well-being (e.g., Gutierrez et al., 2005; Ulloa et al., 2013). Owing to the multi-dimensionality of well-being researchers have made an attempt to find the lifetime pattern of changes in well-being. There are various perspectives on this, for instance, economist based on Life Cycle Theory opine that economic performance of an individual can only be a means to the end, but economic superiority need not necessarily guarantee well-being (Ulloa et al., 2013). Psychologists base their argument mainly on Set Point Theory and claim that well-being is related to some extent on the genetic inheritance and should remain by and large same irrespective of age (Lucas, 2007). Gerontologists claim that with age as the self-sufficiency of the individuals gets reduced well-being also gets reduced to some extent (Walker, 2005). While there have been agreements and disagreements on the relationship of age with well-being three type of relationships have been established to relate age with happiness. The first one is U-shaped relationship according to which well-being will be at its minimum in 30s and early 50s of an individual. The second is inverted U-shaped relationship which is relatively less accepted according to which well-being increases up to the age of 60 years and thereafter drops down (Mroczek & Spiro, 2005). The third is a linear relationship according to which well-being can either increase or decrease with age (Myers & Diener, 1996). However, there are views which differ from each other and there are research studies which claim that the relationships may vary depending on the country of residence (Deaton, 2008). In this research, age has been categorized into five groups as: less than 25 years, 25 to 35 years, 35 years to 45 years, 45 years to 55 years, and above 55 years. While there is no concrete justification for the range selection the focus is to provide a wide range so that if there is variance in terms of age it can be identified.

**Marital Status:** Research has shown that marital status can have a positive or negative influence on well-being (Shapiro & Keyes, 2008; Soulsby & Bennett, 2015). The single parent marital status could be divorced, widowed, or unmarried and it is important to find if the influence varies among these three groups. Single parent can have different status: separated/divorced, widowed, or premarital birth of child/children, female headed homeless
family, noncustodial parent, grandparent as single parent etc. This is one of the important background factors of single parent which could have an impact on their wellbeing. In the context of Kuwait the prominent statuses are unmarried parents, divorced and widowed and hence these three have been considered for analysis.

**Qualification:** Qualification also makes the individual perceive things differently (Feinstein et al., 2005) and there could be a possibility of the differential perception of the wellbeing of the single parents based on their qualification, and hence it is also included as a background factor. In this study diploma, undergraduate, postgraduate, PhD and other classes (e.g. certificates) have been used as the groups. Influence of education on wellbeing is a very widely researched area. Michalos (2007) has given three aspects to be given importance while the association of education and wellbeing - definition and operationalization of education, influence, and happiness. He refers to the highest level of formal education, influence in the form of positive correlation and happiness as one’s evaluation of life satisfaction in terms of single-item or multi-item indexes. Three distinct scenarios were considered with the three variables: association of variables with minimum education, happiness and influence; moderate education, happiness and influence; high education, happiness and influence. Through the outcome of the study Machalos (2007) claims that there is very little association between these education and wellbeing in terms of happiness. In the context of this research four levels of education have been considered as the main levels and all the rest were considered as a separate category. The four levels were: Diploma, Undergraduate, Postgraduate, and Doctorate. These categories have been considered for their distinct identities in the society as the educational levels as well as their identities in workplace to suit to the different work-positions.

**Income:** There are studies which have found that income can have either positive or negative influence on the wellbeing of an individual and this aspect will be tested in the context of single parents in Kuwait (Akay & Martinsson, 2009; Kaplan et al., 2008). The association of income and wellbeing is a topic of research ever since the concept of wellbeing was introduced. Ferrer-i-Carbonell (2005) used the data from the German Panel and conducted research to associate income to wellbeing. The hypothesis was to compare the influence of one’s income on wellbeing which was supported by the data. However, the
Easterlin effect discussed in literature review claims that increase in average income does not increase average wellbeing (Stevenson & Wolfers, 2013).

**Work Experience:** There are studies on the influence work-life-balance on wellbeing, but no evidence for the studies on the association of work experience of individuals on the wellbeing. This is important in the context of single parents as it would be pertinent to know if the state of wellbeing is independent of the work experience. Whether work can improve the state of wellbeing is an area of research interest. In the context of this research where the wellbeing is being investigated, it would be interesting to know the impact of some years of experience on wellbeing. Four classes of work experience have been considered in this research. This research is on the study of wellbeing of single parents who are employed. Thus, their experience in workplace is considered as one of the background factors that would impact the wellbeing. Influence of work experience on wellbeing of people is relatively less explored area (Ryan et al., 2010). Work-life balance has been a very active area of research and many researchers has found its bearing on wellbeing (Allan et al., 2007). With experience in the workplace the duties and responsibilities of the employees increase in most of the cases and this can affect the wellbeing either positively or negatively (Ryan et al., 2010).

### 3.3.2. Association of Social wellbeing and Subjective Wellbeing

The second linkage, as mentioned before, is between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. The research construct subjective wellbeing has undergone transformations at several stages and the research on understanding it is still in progress (Iolanda et al., 2008). In the formative stage of definition, subjective wellbeing was considered simply as the subjective appreciation a person has towards his/her life, and an experience from within and not an outwardly appearance (Diener et al., 1999). It was associated with a number of antecedents which included welfare, economic indicators, health, life satisfaction, work satisfaction, relationships satisfaction etc., (Iolanda et al., 2008). However, researchers have recognised that subjective wellbeing is context based and the antecedents need to be specified based on the external environment in which the particular section is being studied. It is in this context, that the association of social wellbeing with subjective wellbeing of single parents will become relevant. So, the association of social wellbeing with subjective
wellbeing needs to be studied in a general context before conceptualizing a model for single parents.

Parsfield et al., (2015) have found that social connectedness plays a vital role in subjective wellbeing. Through a questionnaire survey of 2840 people in European countries they found that those who had well connected relationships and identified as a part of the society had a higher level of subjective wellbeing. On the contrary, those who were disassociated with the society had lower subjective wellbeing. The direct outcome of the study was that direct investment in community capital which would support social relationships through government interventions had produced clearly measurable social values such as better subjective wellbeing of the people and improved empowerment. People who responded with high scores to the items measuring connectedness to society recorded high scores on various dimensions of wellbeing. The study revealed that the people who had no information about social support systems in their neighborhood had relatively lower subjective wellbeing.

The first case study discussed by Parsfield et al., (2015) was based on research conducted in seven randomly chosen cities in England. The data was collected for five consecutive years to undertake focused research on subjective wellbeing and design interventions so as to build community capital. The study revealed that single-living households had lower subjective wellbeing and on the contrary, higher association with neighborhood had a higher level of wellbeing. Life satisfaction, as a dimension of subjective wellbeing, was dependent on a person’s number of friends. The higher the number of people to spend time with, the higher was subjective wellbeing. The most important observation of the case study was that single parents reported a lower level of wellbeing and the single parents who had better social network were relatively better off than those without social networking. The study also revealed that about 60 percent of single parents had no provision for socializing and had reported poor wellbeing. In one of the seven cities, there was a social networking concept called ‘Social Mirror’ which was an application to mobiles, tablets and PCs providing information on local services and activities available. The idea of Social Mirror was to enhance the social connectedness of people. The survey on this application revealed that 77 percent of its users had higher levels of subjective wellbeing than the non-
users of the app. The survey indicated that those who reported that the Social Mirror was quite useful in meeting their social needs had higher scores on subjective wellbeing and those who expressed that the application had little benefit and they did not feel like using it recorded lower levels of subjective wellbeing. The conclusion of this study was that subjective wellbeing is a multidimensional construct and it is not only a holistic concept, but also, it depends upon an individual’s ability to know about ‘self’ and experiences with life. Subjective wellbeing is associated with social wellbeing because of its holistic nature and perception based assessment of self, which is most of the time in relation to their counterparts in the society.

Parsfield et al., (2015) align their conclusion with the findings of Holt-Lunstad et al., (2010) according to which loneliness is the opposite of socialization and it is worse than bad habits like smoking or alcoholism and can lead to ill health due to poor subjective wellbeing.

According to Parsfield et al., (2015) the linkage between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing is through the fundamental concepts of social sciences, which claim that ‘man is a social animal’. By their very nature, human beings benefit from meaningful contact with others. However, the causation between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing is not yet established (Helliwell & Putnam, 2004). There are several approaches researchers have tried to establish causation between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing, two prominent ones being biological and neuroscience based approaches. These approaches have indicated that factors such as chemical or hormonal responses based on the social and psychological factors to which a human being is subjected can lead to reduced subjective wellbeing (Cacioppo & Patrick, 2008; Norton & Luhrmann, 2007). Irrespective of the agreements and disagreements on the association between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing, the concept beyond dispute is the centrality of social relationships upholding the subjective wellbeing of human beings (Aked et al., 2008). Parsfield et al., (2015) have claimed that among all the variables considered in the analysis with a sample size of 2840, the highest association was between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. The people who claimed that they enjoyed their neighborhood had a 20 percent higher level of subjective wellbeing in comparison to those who claimed to have not enjoyed the company
of their neighborhood. The study revealed that people who claimed that they have least contact with people and keep to themselves with minimum public contact are the ones who have recorded the least score on the dimensions of subjective wellbeing. In direct contrast, those who claimed to have levels of socializing recorded the highest subjective wellbeing score. It was observed that social wellbeing was like a buffer to absorb the sadness or failure in life and those who did not have this were found to have recorded lower subjective wellbeing. One important observation in this study to support the association between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing is that people who were mentioned a greater number of times in the list of social networks of others reported higher levels of subjective wellbeing.

Zhang (2010) studied the influence of social wellbeing on two dimensions of subjective wellbeing – mental and physical wellbeing. Four dimensions of social wellbeing were considered in the analysis which included: Integration, contribution, actualization and Coherence. Questionnaire survey method was used to measure subjective wellbeing parameters such as calmness and peacefulness, depression, energy state, carefulness, and accomplishment. A Likert five-point scale was used for measurement with the higher the rating the higher the agreement with the specific item of measurement. All the items were factor analyzed into a single scale of measurement of subjective wellbeing against the four dimensions of social wellbeing. The reliability of the scale was 0.72, which is considered as moderately high in terms of internal consistency of the response to data. The study revealed that those with higher levels of social wellbeing also had higher levels of subjective wellbeing. The study also revealed the intervening effect of age, gender, education, and neighborhood on social and subjective wellbeing.

The initial notion that economic wealth would lead to a higher level of subjective wellbeing was disproved by a group of researchers and this prompted researchers to seek the antecedents of subjective wellbeing. For instance, Easterlin and Angelescu (2009) collected data from 37 developed, underdeveloped and transitional countries and found that in the case of people who are poor or below the poverty line the increase in income contributed to an improvement in subjective wellbeing. However, this was not the case in developing or developed countries. This outcome of cross-sectional research was in concurrence with
longitudinal research by some of the earlier researchers on subjective wellbeing (e.g., Clark et al., 2006; Kusago, 2007). Furthermore, not only economic wealth but even objective wellbeing was proved to be unrelated as an antecedent to subjective wellbeing (e.g., Kusago, 2007). Researchers then began to formulate other research constructs which could be antecedents to subjective wellbeing. Among the variables which were explored, such as environmental wellbeing and spiritual wellbeing, social wellbeing emerged as a new paradigm (Kittiprapas, 2009). This concept started with the premise that in order for society to progress higher aspects in terms of quality of life beyond economic aspects had to be considered. This led to the research construct ‘social wellbeing’. Moreover, this concept is very well supported by several social theories which deal with group interest and self-interest of human beings.

Sheldon and Bettencourt (2002) conducted research to test the Optimal Distinctiveness Theory and Self-determination Theory. These two theories have been discussed in detail in Chapter 2- Literature Review. The sample size included 144 introductory psychology students of the University of Missouri. Through the questionnaire survey method they were asked to respond to the questionnaire by considering themselves as a part of the campus group, friendship group, social group or any group to which they were affiliated. The Cronbach Alpha was found to be 0.8 which indicated moderately high internal consistency of the data. The questions related to their social and subjective wellbeing included: their feelings about how they were related or isolated from the group they belonged to; and their autonomy with reference to the group. The idea was to evaluate the association between the posited needs, that is, if autonomy and relatedness were correlated as suggested by Optimal Distinctiveness Theory. The analysis also helped to identify if the social variables were related to the subjective wellbeing of people. The study results indicated that by and large autonomy, relatedness and group inclusion were related concepts. It was interesting to note that the results supported Self Determination Theory but not Optimum Distinctiveness Theory. Sheldon and Bettencourt (2002) argue that an organismic approach considers that wellbeing is attained through personal thriving, psychologists consider that wellbeing is attained through personal development, while sociologists consider that wellbeing is attained through social wellbeing. According to Sheldon and Bettencourt (2002) the research outcome delineates the aforementioned association.
There has been focused research on studying the social influence on subjective wellbeing since the 1990s. For instance, Rahn et al., (1996) studied subjectivity and mass communication and interpersonal relationships in formal and informal interactions. Based on this concept Baltatescu (2007) examined the relationships between: identities at individual and collective levels; private self and collective self; and personal and collective self-esteem. This work is based on the total determination of subjectivity and theorizes that like language, social norms are ideologically framed in the minds of people, thus subjective wellbeing is socially constructed. The assumption here is, there is nothing called an individual self, but what is formed is a socially constructed subjectivity which keeps changing. This view is opposed by structural constructivism (Rosenau, 1992) according to which the society runs through mutual consensus. This is more of organismic approach and the structure, norm, and practices of the society conditions the individual minds while at the same time the human mind evolves and contributes to modifications in the structure of the society and this process will be under continuous development.

Baltatescu (2007) developed a theoretical model for associating the communication through social interaction on the subjective wellbeing. The model was built based on the concept that positive and negative states of mind which have bearing on the subjective wellbeing were developed through the membership of people within a specific community (Rahn et al., 1996). It is assumed that the social and political groups with which people are associated will constitute emotional reactions in the mind which may have positive or negative consequences. Baltatescu (2007) illustrates this experience by taking the example of the national soccer team coach who exclaimed that he felt proud of the work he had done despite the fact that his team had lost in the final of the World Cup. This is indicative of the modified evaluation of outcome in order to protect the positive self-esteem. However, Baltatescu (2007) considers the social norm as the expectation from the society on the behavioral pattern of the individuals and hence may be considered as a form of regulatory effect. He associates feelings such as shame and social pressure associated with social norms which can influence subjective wellbeing. For instance, if the social norm is to support the family through a well-paid job, and a youngster by any chance is unemployed then it may have a negative influence on the subjective wellbeing of that person. According to the model hypothesized by Baltatescu (2007), subjective wellbeing has affective and
cognitive components. The former is conditioned through the moods of a person which is in accordance to the public mood, also the latter is controlled by the social norms, but is based on the judging ability of an individual. So, it is imperative that both the affective and cognitive components have association with the social wellbeing of an individual. Even though the proposed model by Baltatescu (2007) is derived through well-established theories, there is no empirical proof for the association between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing hypothesized by him.

Research on wellbeing has adequate evidence to strongly suggest that the background factors do influence wellbeing (Barry & Friedli, 2008; Gutierrez et al. 2005). However, little evidence has been established for this fact in the context of the wellbeing of single parents. Thus, the proposed research intends to investigate if the specific background factors which include: gender, age, marital status, qualification, income and work experience have an impact on the social and subjective wellbeing. Further, the research also attempts to investigate the association between the social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. The proposed research will be conducted in Kuwait, and the population selected for the study is mainly the working class, and the impact of the aforementioned background factors on the wellbeing of the single parents is being investigated. Figure 3.1 depicts the conceptual model of the wellbeing of single parents as derived from the aforementioned associations between background factors and wellbeing in generic terms. The individual factors and dimensions under each research construct are discussed in the following paragraphs.
3.4. Type of Research and the Variables

The philosophy adopted in this research is *positivism* (Levin, 1988). The research approach adopted is *quantitative* as it suits very well to the justification of the objective viewpoint that is essential in this research. The quantitative approach is strategized through the *survey* that is widely adopted in this kind of sociological researches as it enables the researcher to collect data. The *instrument* used for data collection is *the questionnaire*. The quantitative technique adopted in this research is the statistical analysis. First generation statistical technique is used for the calculation of *descriptive statistics* – percentage, mean, standard deviation, Kurtosis and Skewness (measures of normality of data) and *inferential statistics* – t-test and ANOVA. Second generation statistical analysis called Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) (Hair et al., 2010) is also used which involves *measurement model* – which is undertaken to test the reliability and validity of the data and the instrument used.
and the *structural model* – which undertakes the regression analysis to test the association between variables. The results of the analysis are then used to draw inferences.

This is basically an empirical research in which the study results lead to drawing of inferences and implications. The *independent variables* in this research are the background factors of the single parents and the *dependent variables* are social and subjective wellbeing.

Following are the variables of study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Factors (BGF)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social Wellbeing (SOW)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subjective Wellbeing (SBW)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (GEN)</td>
<td>Social integration (SCI)</td>
<td>Life evaluation (LFE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (AGE)</td>
<td>Social contribution (SCN)</td>
<td>Affective (AFF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (MRS)</td>
<td>Social coherence (SCH)</td>
<td>Eudaimonia (EUD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification (QLF)</td>
<td>Social acceptance (SAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (INC)</td>
<td>Social actualisation (SOA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience (WRK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exogenous Variable**

The exogenous variables are the *background factors* of the single parents:

\[ BGF = f (GEN, AGE, MRS, QLF, INC, WRK) \] \[ [1] \]

**Endogenous Variables**

There are two endogenous variables in this research, namely *social wellbeing* and *subjective wellbeing*.

\[ SOW = f (SCI, SCN, SCH, SAC, SOA) \] \[ [2] \]
3.5. The Research Design, Methods and Tools

This research makes an attempt to quantitatively explore the determinants of single parent wellbeing in the context of Kuwait. The research design is descriptive and adopts survey sample method of data collection. The perceptions of the respondents on wellbeing elicited through the questionnaire sample survey form the basis for drawing of the inferences and arriving at the conclusion. The statistical tools used include SPSS IBM 19® for the t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the second generation statistical tool and SmartPLS Version 2 for Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) which uses Partial Least Square Technique.

3.5.1. The Research Framework

This research was carried out in eight distinct phases (Figure 3.2). The activities in each of the phases have been narrated in the following paragraphs.

Phase I – Problem Description

This was the first phase of research in which the research problem was described in terms of the variables of study. This research was identified as an empirical study on the impact of background factors of the single parents in Kuwait on their wellbeing and the testing of the relationships between their social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. This was the main aim of this research and it was important because the identification of the relationships between the research constructs and their dimensions would help in making suggestions to the government so as to improve the wellbeing of the single parents.

Phase II – Purpose of Research

The second phase was to define the purpose of the research, which is often put in terms of meaningful research questions so that while the questions are answered the purpose stands to be accomplished. The literature review indicated that there was no research undertaken on the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait despite the fact that their number was increasing and it is an active area of research. Further, there was no empirical evidence available to support the relationship between the background factors and wellbeing of
single parents even though the two have been shown to be related in many other contexts through the research undertaken in Western Countries.

Phases

I  Problem Description

II  Purpose

III  Research Background

IV  Research Premise

V  Research Design

VI  Execution

VII  Analysis

VIII  Report Writing

EXPLORING THE INFLUENCE OF THE BACKGROUND FACTORS ON WELLBEING OF SINGLE PARENTS IN KUWAIT: A STRUCTURAL-EQUATION MODELING APPROACH

Research Questions

Literature Review Models and Theories

Building Conceptual Model

Research Methodology

Primary Data Collection

Descriptive Statistics & Inferential Statistics

Results, Findings, & Implications

Conclusion

Figure 3.2: The Research Framework
So, the main purpose of this research was to establish the empirical evidence for these relationships. In addition, the purpose of this research was to make suggestions to improve the wellbeing of single parents based on the study results.

**Phase III – Research Background**
This phase of research was focused on the detailed study of the past and contemporary research on single parents in the global context as well as in the context of this research. Eight theories which had bearing on wellbeing were revisited and reviewed in the context of this study. The relevance of these theories to the present research was discussed. The research on the two main research constructs: social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing were critically reviewed to identify the research gap. The main research gap identified was the lack of empirical evidence to support the theoretical models in terms of the relationship between the background factors of wellbeing and the two forms of wellbeing particularly in the context of Kuwait.

**Phase IV – Research Premise**
In the fourth phase of research the conceptual model was developed to test the theoretical knowledge available in the context of single parents’ wellbeing. The fundamental research premise in this research is that the theory claims relationship between the background factors with the wellbeing and also relationship between the social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. The definitions were appropriately chosen for each of the research construct such that it fixed the premises and the scope of the study. These definitions formed the basis for the entire research from the formation of the relationships between the research constructs to the testing of these relationships under practical conditions of single parents in Kuwait.

**Phase V – Research Design**
The research design was based on the *pragmatic research paradigm* which is basically oriented towards the linking of the theory and practice (Creswell, 2008). As mentioned before, this research is an empirical study that explores the relationships between the research constructs on quantitative terms. Data has been collected in both primary and secondary forms. While the former is used for both qualitative and quantitative analysis, the latter is used for qualitative analysis. The sample size chosen is 391 based on *stratified simple random sampling* with two strata (Male = 118 and Female = 273). The descriptive
Statistics involved the calculations of: Kurtosis, Skewness, mean, and standard deviation for the descriptive statistics. The inferential statistics involved the application of second generation statistical technique of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). The SEM approach comprised measurement model and the analysis model for the quantitative analysis.

**Phase VI – Execution**

Execution of this research necessitated two types of data to be collected. First, the primary data through the questionnaire served to the single parents working in three different Ministries of Kuwait. These ministries were specifically chosen to have a wide spread of sample from the least to the most number of employees. The secondary data was collected through journals, statistical bureau, periodicals, newspapers, and text books. While the primary data was used to test the relationships between the variables, secondary data was used for justification of the findings through quantitative analysis. Standard formula was used to fix the sample size. For SEM analysis according to the principles a sample size of 200 was adequate based on the general principles. To have a fair representative sample, in this research the sample size was estimated through the standard formula and a sample size of 391 has been used. The research was undertaken with the approval of the University of Newcastle Human Research Ethics Committee (Appendix 1).

**Phase VII – Analysis**

Analysis of the results of the empirical study, mainly quantitative analysis, comprised descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics included the calculation of mean, standard deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis measurement, percentage calculations and the perception study of the respondents on the dimensions of the various constructs as mentioned before and the analysis of the same. The inferential statistics was mainly through the Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) using Partial Least Square Method (PLSM). The SEM had two distinct models: the measurement model and the structural model (Hair et al., 2010). While the former dealt mainly with the descriptive statistics, the latter dealt with the relationship testing. Qualitative analysis was in the form of discussions and categorization of the response under the specific dimensions of study, based on the information provided by the respondents for the open-ended qualitative
questions in the questionnaire. These responses have also contributed to the suggestions for policy implementation in the Ministry of Social Welfare, Kuwait.

**Phase VIII – Interpretation, Implications and Contribution**

The quantitative analysis necessitated the reliability and validity tests to ensure two aspects: first the data was to be proved to be dependable, and second, the questionnaire measured what it was intended to measure. The path coefficients and t-statistic were the indicators of the relationships between variables of study. The interpretations were based on the analysis of the results obtained through statistical data. The interpretations thus obtained formed the basis for discussions on the issues related to single parents. Further, these results have been the basis for the drawing of the suggestions to enhance the wellbeing of single parents. This final stage ended with writing of the thesis.

**3.6. The Metric**

The metric used in this research was a self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to study the perceptions of the single parents about their wellbeing. Research questions were so designed to provide the necessary data required to test various relationships established through the conceptual mode. The reason for using questionnaire method of data collection is that it is a time tested and relatively systematic and standardized method of collecting data. Moreover, the Likert 5-point type of measurement provides a yard stick of measurement in the form of an ordinal scale. Questionnaire method is known for its ability to study the perceptions of sampling population and provides comprehensive means for simple counting to statistical description of the data and the inferential analysis (Creswell, 2008). Finally, this method is cost effective as well as convenient and easy option to administer in this kind of research.

The indicators of measurement used in the questionnaire are based on the theoretical models which define the boundaries and extents of the various dimensions of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. These indicators were selected from the readily available scales with established reliability and validity. Among various scales used for the development of the questionnaire, the three main scales and their features are briefly explained in the following paragraphs. As the items were from previously developed scales,
there was no need to undertake exploratory factor analysis. Instead, confirmatory factor analysis will be conducted to confirm that the items used in the scale measure what they were intended to measure. Also, the systematic procedure of content, construct, and criterion validity will be adopted to make sure that the questionnaire has proved validity.

There are no scales available which are exactly tailor-made to suit the measurement aspects of this research. Two aspects were involved in the design of the questionnaire. First, the standard scales available to measure each dimension of Subjective and Social wellbeing were identified. Second, the items available in the standard form were crosschecked with the theoretical definition of these dimensions and the items were picked based on their relevance. As the context in which the questionnaire was used was Kuwait, the local conditions have been considered while selecting the items in such a way that as far as possible the item is retained in the original form, but some questions which could be asked in the Western context are not appropriate in the context of Kuwait with particular reference to religious groups, so they have been intentionally eliminated. Following is a description of the original scales and their reliability indices and the context of development.

Social Support Scale (Minnebo, 2005): This scale was used to measure social acceptance in the context of how negatively perceived social support can cause distress using structural equation modelling. The instrument was a 12 item ordinal scale. The scale had internal consistency as measured through Alpha Cronbach was 0.65 and was validated for construct, criterion and item validation.

Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWBS) (Diener et al., 2009): This is a scale of positive and negative feeling. The testing was based on 573 college students on wellbeing measurement. The alpha was 0.7 and factor loading varied from 0.58 to 0.76 and had good correlation with other similar scales.

Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scales (RPWB) (Ryff& Keyes, 1995): This is a 42 item scale had six dimensions of wellbeing. The questionnaire was tested on a sample of adults above 25 years of age with a sample size of 1,108. Some of the dimensions had measures of the dimensions of Social wellbeing. The correlation between the items was 0.7 to 0.89.
Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWL) (Diener, et al., 1985): Among all the dimensions of wellbeing this scale had a specific focus on the satisfaction with life with five items measuring satisfaction. The scale was tested for 176 graduates and two months later 76 of these were re-administered the same questionnaire to test consistency. The scale correlates moderately to highly with other scales of subjective wellbeing. The factor loadings varied from 0.6 to 0.84 and inter-item correlations varied from 0.6 to 0.8 indicating moderate acceptance.

Positive Affect (PA) and Negative Affect (NA) Scales (Bradburn, 1969): This is a 10-item scale developed to measure the affective component of subjective wellbeing. The scale was first tested by the author in the USA with a sample size of 938 men and 1,211 women and found a Cronbach Alpha measure of reliability 0.7. The scale has been very widely used by researchers for its robustness.

Appendix 2 gives the questionnaire and Appendix 3 gives the details of the items used in the questionnaire in the proposed research and the scales from which they were derived. The reliability measures and validity aspects have been considered to ensure that the data is dependable and the instrument did measure what it was designed for. The scale developed for measurement was subjected to the standard procedure of testing for construct, content, and criterion validity.

The questionnaire has three distinct components: the first collecting the background factors, the second the quantitative data through the Likert 5-point scale, and the third the open-ended questions eliciting the qualitative data. The quantitative part of the questionnaire was based on five-point Likert-type scale, measuring the degree to which the respondents believed the individual statements under each dimensions in the questionnaire to be true (5–strongly agree, 4 – Moderately agree, 3 – Neutral, 2 – Moderately agree, and 1 – Strongly disagree). The questionnaire was available both on personal mode as well as electronic mode. The respondents provided the qualitative data by writing descriptive answers to the open-ended questions in the qualitative section of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire thus developed was subjected to the pilot test with about 10% of the sample size estimation. Care was taken to see that the questions were uniformly understood
by all respondents belonging to the two strata in the sample. As the scales were used in several contexts before, to retain the original reliability no modifications have been made.

3.6.1. Development of the Questionnaire

The standard procedure of skimming through the available scales and metrics, consulting with the experts in the field, qualified respondents, and mainly through the literature was adopted in the questionnaire development (Chilisa, 2011). There were three distinct components in the questionnaire and they are dealt with separately in the following sections.

3.6.1.1. Background Factors

Selecting the background factors that affect a dependent variable is relative to the context of the study. There have been several research studies which have linked background factors to the wellbeing of the people and they have been discussed in detail earlier in this chapter – The Conceptual Model. From these discussions several background factors could be identified which include - gender, age, relationship status, contract time, committed time, necessary time, leisure, income, health, ageing, economic conditions, social structure, and healthcare services. In the interest of this research and under the local conditions of data collection the following background factors have been considered for the analysis.

Gender – The gender of the single parents considered in this research are male and female.

Age – Research on the association of age with wellbeing has been undertaken with many different categories of age. There has not been a standard classification in this category which can be used as a reference. In the interest of this research five groups have been considered under the age group of less than 25 years, between 25 to 35 years, between 35 to 45 years, between 45 to 55 years, and above 55 years.

Marital Status – Marital status of single parents could be many, depending upon the country in which the research is undertaken. Having observed the status of single parents in Kuwait, the classifications considered in this research are: unmarried, divorced and widowed.
**Educational Qualification** – *Educational qualification* of single parents could be many. Having observed the qualifications of employees in the Ministries in Kuwait the categories considered in this research are: Diploma, Undergraduate, Post Graduate, PhD, and Others which may include certificate, 12th Grade, stenographer etc.

**Income** - Studies on wellbeing has been mainly in three categories of *income* group: low-income group, mid-income group and high-income group. Similar categorization has been adopted in this research. In the context of Kuwait monthly income of less than 1000 KWD (about 4185 Australian Dollar) has been considered to be low, and a range of 1000 to 2000 KWD ((about 4185 Australian Dollar to 8370 Australian Dollar) has been considered to be mid-income group and above 2000 KWD (About 8370 Australian Dollar) is considered to be high-income group.

**Work Experience** – There has been no study dealing exclusively on the influence of experience on wellbeing as such but the relationship between work-life balance and wellbeing has been explored by a good number of researchers. In the context of this research four distinct categories have been identified for *work experience*: less than two years, between two to five years, between five to ten years, and above ten years. While these categories do not have specific reasons for their selection generally those in the first category will be just exposed to work culture and those in the next two categories will reach two different levels of work position cadres and those in the last categories will be mature employees. This classification will give a good understanding on whether wellbeing differs across these groups.

**3.6.1.2. Social Wellbeing**

There is evidence for extensive research on social wellbeing which has been discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. Here, the purpose is to construct the metric as required in the context of this research. In terms of questionnaire development, the dimension, meaning, literature support, and the sample item which has been chosen from the standard questionnaire have been given in Table 3.1. Care has been taken to ensure that the indicators of measurement truly represent the dimension despite the fact that these indicators are tested and validated through earlier researchers.
Table 3.1: The Dimension, Contributing Authors, Meaning, and the Sample Item – Social Wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Author, Year</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social integration</td>
<td>Keyes (1998), Beresneviucute (2003), Scheff (2007), Huschka (2008), Rubin (2012), Steptoe et al., (2013),</td>
<td>The assessment of one’s relation with the society. It is reflected as a sense of being a part of society and the commonness of a person with the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>I don't often get invited to do things with others. <em>(Negatively worded)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social acceptance</td>
<td>Keyes (1998), Helliwell &amp; Putnam (2004), Albanesi et al., (2006), Klar &amp; Kasser (2009)</td>
<td>A person imbibing into his/her personality the characteristics of the society. It can be recognized through the acceptance of the society’s lifestyle.</td>
<td>Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me <em>(Negatively worded)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social contribution</td>
<td>Bandura, (1977), Keyes (1998), Gecas, (1989), Oakley &amp; Sinfield (2001).</td>
<td>The realization of one’s value to the society. It can be measured through the responsibilities and obligations of an individual towards the society.</td>
<td>I am engaged and interested in my daily activities I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social coherence</td>
<td>McAdams &amp; Aubin (1992), Keyes (1998), Callaghan, (2008) Key-Roberts (2009), Larsen (2013).</td>
<td>The desire to know the society where an individual lives. It can be known in terms of the understanding of the person about the practical realities of the society.</td>
<td>I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social actualization</td>
<td>Keyes (1998), Boskovic &amp; Jengic (2008), Gallagher et al., (2009), Zhang et al., (2010).</td>
<td>The perception of an individual about the abilities of the society. It can be determined through</td>
<td>I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.1.3. Subjective Wellbeing

Subjective wellbeing is a very well researched area and has been discussed in the preceding chapters. Table 3.2 gives the salient features of the various dimensions of subjective wellbeing.

Table 3.2: The Dimension, Contributing Authors, Meaning, Literature Support, and the Sample Item –Social Wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Author, Year</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sample Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eudaimonia</td>
<td>Deci and Ryan(2006), Ryff &amp; Singer (2008), Henderson &amp;Knight (2012), OECD(2013).</td>
<td>It is the prosperous part of subjective wellbeing. It can be determined by how an individual has made progress in life.</td>
<td>When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Affect</td>
<td>Huschka(2008), Törnblom and Kazemi(2012)</td>
<td>It is an individual’s feeling about wellbeing. It can be determined by the way how one experiences the emotional states of life.</td>
<td>I feel lonely or remote from other people <em>(Negatively worded).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Life evaluation</td>
<td>Diener et al., (1985), Stiglitz et al., (2009), Blanchflower(2009), OECD (2013).</td>
<td>It is about one’s satisfaction in life. It may be measured by how an individual feels about his life goals being realized.</td>
<td>In most ways my life is close to my ideal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7. Statistical Methods and the Instruments

3.7.1. Identification of the Sample and Rationale for its selection

The purpose of this research was to undertake a study of the impact of select background factors on the wellbeing of the single parents as well as investigate the association between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing with specific context to the working single parents in Kuwait. So, the data collection was oriented towards those respondents who could provide us with the relevant information and the salient features are as follows.

**Sample Description:** Considering the aforementioned objectives, the single parents have been considered from the following Ministries: Education& Higher Education, Social Affairs and Labour, and Finance. One of the criteria for a good sample selection is a fair distribution of the sample across the population (Creswell, 2008). The ministries in Kuwait can be classified based on several parameters such as the relative importance, capital turnover, sanctions from the government etc. However, in the context of this research, it is the number of employees that is important and these three ministries in Kuwait considered for data collection are the best representative sources as The Ministry Education& Higher Education represents one of the larger groups in terms of number of employees, The Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour is the medium groups in terms of number of employees, and The Ministry of Finance is the smaller groups in terms of number of employees. The organizational profile of the ministries from which the sample is drawn is given in the following section.

**Organizational Profile:** Established in the year 1952, The Ministry of Education & Higher Education is one of the largest ministries in Kuwait in terms of the number of employees as well as budget allotment of over 4 Billion USD and it primarily caters to the educational needs of Kuwaiti citizens. The ministry is involved in providing scholarships to the students for primary and secondary education, and at higher educational level it provides scholarships for Kuwaiti students to study in leading universities of USA, UK and also other reputed universities of the world. The ministry has been successful in achieving over 94% literacy in the country. Its responsibility also includes the involvement of women in various programmes of the ministry. The ministry is actively involved in the development
of education sector in Kuwait. It has been responsible for providing all forms of government education including higher education for free to the national students of Kuwait. The ministry is completely responsible for the development of educational plans of the country, building of the policies and strategies for manpower development, training and development of the staff of ministries, and providing an integrated education system to the whole country (Ministry of Education and Higher Education, 2017).

The Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour, Kuwait was established in 1954 with the sole purpose of providing social welfare to all the citizens of the country. It is engaged in providing social services to the needy. It gives special consideration for the individuals with special needs. The ministry also has the responsibility to alleviate the problem of unemployment. Training the national manpower also comes under the domain of this ministry. The ministry is also involved in the settlement of labour complaints. The ministry releases periodicals on social issues, thus providing the necessary information to the citizens of the country. Women empowerment is also an agenda item in the activities of the ministry and it is engaged in conducting training programmes exclusively to women (Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour, 2017).

The Ministry of Finance, Kuwait formed in the year 1962 mainly deals with the land purchase and infrastructure development projects. The other major responsibility of the ministry is the regulation of Stock Market of Kuwait. The ministry is responsible for the preparation of annual fiscal budget. The ministry performs certain important functions such as providing subsidies for health services, pension schemes, education, public housing, and support for the unemployed. Commercialization and privatization activities are also under the domain of Finance Ministry. The ministry is responsible for all major fiscal policy functions and manages fiscal risks, and designs the debt strategy of the country. Supervision of all the banks and other financial institutions is undertaken by the Finance Ministry. The transactional functions which include processing of budgetary payments, government securities management, collections of taxes and revenues are also under the purview of the Ministry of Finance (Ministry of Finance Kuwait, 2017).

**Sample Size:** Sample size is estimated according to *Stratified Proportionate Simple Random Sampling* technique (Creswell, 2008). As generalization was to be made based on
the study results, it was necessary to adopt this probability based sampling technique. The two strata chosen are the male and female single parents. The number of single parents in Kuwait from 2012 to 2016 (Central Statistical Bureau Kuwait, 2017) is given in Appendix 4. In the interest of this research, the latest data available as of 2016 has been considered for sample size estimation (Table 3.3). Single parents could be of many different categories, but this research is focused on single parents under the category of divorced and widowed because these two are the major categories in Kuwait. The data of unmarried single parents was not found in the Central Statistical Bureau.

Table 3.3: Numerical distribution of single parent Kuwaiti employees in the Government Sector as on 30-06-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>15,273</td>
<td>20,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,265</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,783</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the second generation statistical analysis of Structural Equation Modelling used in this research, sample size is not an issue as long as the minimum sample size criterion of 200 is satisfied. The software has the technique of bootstrapping through which extrapolation into any sample size is possible. However, the approach of specifying the precision of estimation desired first, and then determining the sample size necessary to ensure it was adopted(Kothari, 2010), according to which, the sample size necessary is about 187 (Equation 1). However, to get a better sample distribution the sample size chosen in this research is 391. Comparison of wellbeing between gender was required, and hence stratification has been undertaken, according to which 95 male and 296 female single parents have been considered proportionately.

The sample size estimation is based on the 2% defect in sample (based on pilot study) and an acceptable error of 2%.

\[
N = \frac{z^2 \cdot p \cdot q \cdot N_P}{e^2 \left( N_P - 1 \right) + z^2 \cdot p \cdot q} \tag{1}
\]
where, \( p = \) Proportion of defectives in the universe  
(Based on the pilot study, a 2% defect is assumed).

\[ q = (1 - p). \]
\[ z = 1.96 \] (as per table of scores in a normal distribution within a selected range of \( z \) for a confidence level of 95%).

\[ e = \text{Acceptable Error (an error of 2% of the true value is assumed).} \]

\[ N_p = \text{population} = 21783 \]

\[ N = \text{Sample size} = 187 \] (Minimum required).

**Sample size adopted** = 391.

**Male single parents** = \( (5265/21783) \times 391 = 95. \)**  
**Female single parent** = \( 391 - 95 = 296. \)

However, in the actual sample 118 responses have been obtained from Male and 273 from Female single parents. There are several conditions under which the optimum size of the sample in a social sciences research is estimated which includes: the nature of the empirical study, time and resources available, size of questionnaire, size of universe, nature of classes proposed etc. However, an ideal sample size is based on experience and good judgment, rather than relying on a strict mathematical formula (Creswell, 2008). Social sciences research need not necessarily have to involve samples size of above 1000. According to Denscombe, (2008), research involving a number between 30 and 250 cases is adequate as long as principle of randomization and non-biased sample is considered.

**Method of Data Collection:** In this research randomization is ensured by giving every single parent an equal chance of being picked as the sample. In the three ministries chosen, 600 questionnaires in English and 600 questionnaires in Arabic language (Appendix 9) were handed over to the HR Managers who distributed it to the employees with a request to respond to the questionnaire. Arabic translation was necessary as all the single parents were not very conversant in English. The translation was undertaken by a professional English to Arabic translator and after translation the content was validates by three Arabic speaking Professors in Kuwait University who were in the department of Social Sciences to ensure that the terminologies conveyed the same meaning even after translation. A box was placed marked as “Survey Questionnaire” outside the office of the manager where newspapers, magazines, general instruction manuals and reports of the Ministry are usually displayed and employees visit the place during their free time. The questionnaires were given in the
first week of March, 2017 to the HR Managers. In the third week of March the box was opened and it was found that only a total of 160 filled questionnaires were obtained. The process was repeated during the months of April and May and by the mid-week of May, 2017 a sample size of 403 was reached. However, only 391 filled questionnaires were usable as the remaining were either incomplete or erroneous with missing information. Thus, every employee who is a single parent had equal opportunity of being surveyed.

**Rationale for the Sample Selection:** The first rationale for the selection of the three ministries is that they represent the three distinctly different ministries of Kuwait in terms of functionality and number of employees. Second, this research is on the wellbeing of single parents of employed class and the single parents of this group are available in these ministries. Wellbeing of employed single parents is much different from those who are unemployed owing to the fact that social interaction of the employed single parents and that of the non-employed are different. Thus, it is a rational choice to go to the major employment source of single parents which is ministries of Kuwait. Third, the rationale for the selection of Kuwait as the place of study is that there is no evidence for such a work in Kuwaiti context despite the fact that the number of single parents is on the rise in Kuwait. Further, as the sample is from Kuwait, the generalizations made through this work may be applicable for the rest of the Arab countries in the neighboring region. Finally, the sampling frame and the unit of analysis, which is essentially single parent, meets the requirements of the study to the full.

**Data Collection Process:** Having identified the research constructs, the research instrument was developed as discussed in the previous sections. The questionnaire was translated from English into Arabic so that the respondents were free to choose a language. The survey questionnaire was then subjected to a pilot test for a sample size of 31 to make sure the questionnaire is easy enough to understand and free from jargons and can be filled in about half an hour. In addition to the confidentiality statement, the following section was added as per the suggestion so that the single parents can be screened to fill the questionnaire:

- Are you a single parent (divorcee, widow/widower or an unmarried mother/father)?
• No – thank you for your interest but this questionnaire is only for single parents. Please do not complete it.
• Yes – thank you for your interest, you are eligible to complete the questionnaire.
• Once you have completed it, please return to the sealed container in your workplace.

The questionnaire was then used for the primary data collection for the sample size of 391. The data thus collected was subjected to analysis which included descriptive statistics & inferential statistics using IBM SPSS 19, LISREL package for Goodness of Fit calculations, and SE package SmartPLS 2.0 for constructing the measurement and structural model. The results obtained through these three software packages have been analysed and the inferences were drawn. This entire process of data collection is depicted in Figure 3.3.

![Figure 3.3: The Data Collection Process](image)

### 3.7.2. Statistical Analysis

This research involves mixed methods approach and mainly depends on the quantitative analysis in the form of statistical analysis which includes descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics includes: demographics, skewness and kurtosis,
percentages, ranking, overall perceptions etc., whereas, the inferential statistics provides the basis for drawing inferences and conclusions mainly through hypotheses testing. These are explained in the following sections.

3.7.2.1. Descriptive Statistics

**Skewness and Kurtosis:** Normality of the data is checked through Skewness and Kurtosis. Strictly speaking, Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) does not demand normality criteria of the data as it is the second generation statistical analysis, however other calculations undertaken in this research require it (Hair et al., 2010). If the Skewness is less than zero (left skewed) most values will be scattered on the right of the mean, with extreme values to the left. If Skewness is equal to zero the mean equals median and the distribution is symmetrical around the mean and this refers to the ideal situation. If skewness is more than zero (right skewed) most values will be scattered on the left of the mean, with extreme values to the right. In case of the Kurtosis, if the value is above 3, it is called Leptokurtic distribution, sharper than a normal distribution, with values concentrated around the mean and thicker tails (Field, 2013). This means high probability for extreme values. If the Kurtosis is less than 3, it is called Platykurtic distribution, flatter than a normal distribution with a wider peak. If the Kurtosis equals 3, it is called Mesokurtic distribution and represents normal distribution (Field, 2013). Both the Skewness and Kurtosis have been computed in this research and are used to describe the normality of data.

**Overall Perceptions:** To obtain the general understanding of the perception of the single parents, the overall perceptions have been estimated for each of the dimensions of the research constructs. The Likert 5-point scale was rated for each of the items in the questionnaire by the respondents on five distinct categories of ordinal scale. Response 1 was considered as ‘Bad’, 2 as ‘Poor’, 3 as ‘Average’, 4 as ‘Good’ and 5 was considered as ‘Very good’, based on the average of the total responses received. The average response was converted into percentage response in each category so as to obtain the overall perception on each of the constructs and was represented both in the tabular as well as in the form of histograms. The results were used to describe the general perception of the respondents on the individual dimensions of the Social wellbeing and Subjective wellbeing.
3.7.2.2. Inferential Statistics

The inferential statistical techniques used in this research included both the conventional statistical analysis in the form of t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for studying the association of Background Factors of single parents on Wellbeing. The second generation statistical technique of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) using Partial Least Square Method (PLSM) to study the association of the dimensions of Social Wellbeing on those of Subjective Wellbeing. These methods have been explained below.

**The t-test and ANOVA**

The t-test is based on the t-distribution. The t-tests are tests for statistical significance that are used with interval and ratio level data. T-tests can be used to test whether there are differences between two groups on the same variable. In this research t-test is used to find if there is a significant gender difference on the dimensions and overall scores of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. One way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) has been used to find if the social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing varies significantly with reference to the background factors with more than two groups of comparison.

**Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)**

In this research, the second generation statistical analysis has been used as there was a need to undertake factor analysis and multiple regressions simultaneously at the macro level. Strictly speaking when SEM is used the Regression analysis discussed in the previous section is not required. SEM is used to perform the macro analysis of the data and thus performs the simultaneous analysis of all the dimensions of a research construct, whereas the first generation statistics deal with the micro-analysis of the data where each of the dimensions of a research construct is analysed. Linear relationship is generally assumed in SEM, but it is possible to build non-linear relations if required in the form of polynomial function. SEM demands at least two indicators for a dimension (Kline, 2005), but in this research more number of indicators have been maintained owing to the importance of these indicators. In this research confirmatory factor analysis will suffice as the items used for measurement have proved reliability as they have been used by other researchers in many different contexts of measuring wellbeing.
The SEM performs path analysis which is just an extension of multiple regression. The difference is that multiple regressions are undertaken simultaneously between the variables of interest. The purpose of path analysis is to address mediation and moderation between the latent variables. Path model is also referred to as causal model as it can establish causation between the two variables of interest (Kline, 2005). Thus, the SEM basically tests the association between exogenous (single or a group of independent variables) and endogenous variables (single or a group of independent variables). In this research all the dimensions of Social Wellbeing constitute the exogenous variables and the dimensions of Subjective Wellbeing constitute the dependent variable.

The SEM works on the principle of multiple regression and the association between any two variables is expressed mathematically by the following equation,

\[ Y = X\beta + e \] \[1\]

Where,

- \( X \) = Independent variable
- \( Y \) = Dependent variable;
- \( e \) = error
- \( \beta \) = Coefficient

Measurement model forms the first part of the analysis in SEM which is derived from psychometric theories (Kline, 2005). The latent variables are not directly measurable e.g. Social wellbeing or Subjective wellbeing, but are indicated through observable variables which can be measured, say through ordinal scale as in the present case. These indicators are the individual items in the questionnaire to which the respondents indicate their degree of agreement. SEM uses factor reduction as the process through which the number of indicators of measurement is reduced through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). These techniques are used to examine if the number of indicators in the latent constructs are adequate to measure that variable.

In this research, to verify the reliability of the latent variables in the model, internal consistency reliability measure, item reliability measure and composite reliability measures were computed. As per the standards set, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient and the
composite reliability should be above 0.6 and 0.7 respectively for the acceptable level of reliability, however higher values indicate better reliability of the data (Gliem & Gliem, 2003 and Yanuar et al., 2015). To test for discriminant validity, the square root of Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for each construct was compared with the correlation between the construct and the other constructs. For acceptable discriminant validity between each pair of construct, all the AVE square roots should be greater than the correlation between the constructs. The result of item reliability (IR) measured as standardized Factor Loading (FL) should be usually greater than 0.4 if the item has to be included in the questionnaire (Matsunaga, 2010).

Structural model of SEM forms the inferential part of the analysis and indicates the association between the exogenous and the endogenous variables of study. This is used for testing the association at the macro level of the latent variables, and in this research the association between the dimensions of the two research constructs. The factor loadings after reduction, path coefficients, $R^2$ value which is an indication of goodness-of-fit and the $t$-values were estimated in the structural model. The path coefficients indicate the strength of the relationships between the latent variables. The values of path coefficients can vary from zero to one. Higher the path coefficient value better will be the relationship. The percentage influence of the exogenous variables on the endogenous variables as expressed by $R^2$, again the higher the $R^2$ the better will be the goodness-of-fit of the model (cut off 0.1). The structural model also gives the $t$-values of the relationships which gives the statistical significance of the relationship between the latent variables.

### 3.8. Software Package for SEM

There are many packages used in SEM analysis; SmartPls®, AMOS®, MPLUS, LISREL® etc. There is no clear explanation why a specific package has to be used in a given context. In this research two packages were considered - SmartPls® & AMOS®. AMOS® uses Covariance Based (CB) method, whereas SmartPLS is Variance Based (VB) using Partial least Square Method (PLSM) (Davcik, 2011). The CB method fundamentally works based on the covariance matrices, which explains the relationships between the indicators of measurement and the research constructs, and attempts to confirm the theoretical rationale behind the construction of the model (Hair et al., 2010). In terms of theoretical background,
the CB method is theory driven while VB method is data driven (Davcik, 2011). CB method is confirmatory in terms of its relation to theory, whereas VB method is more predictive in nature. The latent variables of CB method are factors, whereas those of VB method are components or dimensions. Model parameters differ in two streams. The variance-based SEM is working with component weights that maximize variance, whereas the covariance-based SEM is based on factors that tend to explain covariance in the model (cf. Fornell & Bookstein, 1982). The preferred input data is covariance or correlation matrix and should be preferably normally distributed in CB method but in VB method it is raw observed data and it is soft modelling and normality of data is not required. Assessment of model fit is through Goodness-of-Fit method in CB and it is based on predictive ability through \( R^2 \) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

Theoretically, for CB the data should be normally distributed for PLSM data need not be under Normal Distribution. In this research the normality of the data is confirmed only through Skewness and Kurtosis and may be considered to be normally distributed but not with certainty as there are a few outliers, the research on single parents has to be more of data driven as it is making an attempt to study their wellbeing in terms of their perception, it is required to be predictive of association between the dimensions of research, input is purely raw observed data, latent variables are not factors but dimensions, unobservable variables need to be determinate through \( R^2 \), so SmartPLS\textsuperscript{®} would naturally be a better choice. Further, CB based method is suitable for large sample sizes, whereas in VB method represented by SmartPLS as such has no sample size restriction but sample size above 200 is preferred. In terms of accuracy of results provided by the two software packages SmartPLS is more accurate in terms of measurement model and structural model. (Mohamad & Afthanorhan, 2013). Considering all these factors SmartPLS\textsuperscript{®} has been chosen to be the software package in this research.

3.9. Limitations of the Methods
As mentioned before this is an empirical study and the basis for the generalization of the results is the testing of the associations through the statistical methods. Statistical methods have certain inherent limitations, for instance, the tests such as t-test or ANOVA are only useful aids for decision-making and cannot be the sole basis for conclusions regarding the
planning or design of a new system or theory (Good & Lunneborg, 2006). Hence, the findings through statistical analysis should be substantiated through other means which may include secondary data and the practical experiences of the respondents.

The interpretations made in this research, are purely based on the perceptions of the single parents about their wellbeing. In principle, statistical tests do not explain the reasons as to why do the statistical differences exist, which acts as the limitation of the methods. The SEM used in this research has its own set of limitations. As the latent variables do not exactly fit to normal distribution, the standard errors and estimates of fit may not be accurate (Lee et al., 2004).

3.10. Summary

This chapter explored in greater depth the concepts which were discussed in the previous chapter – Literature Review. The theories which deal with wellbeing and the sociological aspects of wellbeing when critically examined revealed that three related research constructs emerge in the ‘wellbeing’ of people. These relationships were discussed by the researchers in a general context, however there was no holistic model which was available to link all three research constructs: Background factors, Social wellbeing and Subjective wellbeing and it was intended to be studied in this research. In addition, there was no evidence of empirical investigation on these research constructs in the context of single parents. The central idea of this project is to study the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait and also identify the associations between the dimensions so that suggestions can be made to improve their wellbeing in the form of recommendations to the government. This understanding has led to the development of the conceptual model which has been explained in this chapter.

This research has a positivism based philosophy and adopts a quantitative approach to research. The exogenous and endogenous variables identified in this research present the scope of this research in terms of the dimensions of wellbeing of single parents. Naturalistic observation through survey sample has emerged as the tool for data collection. The questionnaire development has followed the systematic steps leading to the identification of the indicators of measurement. Out of the various background factors used as the control variables in previous research six relevant background factors were selected for this
research. Each of the dimensions of Social Wellbeing and Subjective Wellbeing has been described and a sample item from the questionnaire that forms its indicator has been presented. The choice of the statistical tools have been rationalized and justified. The descriptive statistics and the inferential statistics used in this research have been found to be appropriate for this research as they provide the appropriate data analysis and permit the interpretation so as to draw inferences that can lead to the accomplishment of the objectives of research.

---000---
Chapter IV
Results and Analysis

4.1. Overview

The results obtained through the processing of the data and the subsequent analysis has been detailed in this chapter. To start with, this chapter reports the reliability measures used in this research which covers the stability aspects, internal consistency, and then the validity measures which includes face validity, known group validity, content validity, convergent and discriminant validity. Inter-dimension comparison has been carried out as a part of descriptive statistics. The association between the research variables has been analyzed, including the association between the background factors and wellbeing measures as well as the association between social and subjective wellbeing. Finally, the gender based differences in the two measures of wellbeing have been analyzed.

4.2. Demographics

The majority of the respondents (n = 391) are female (69.8%) in this research (Table 4.1). The majority of the respondents are in the age group of 25-35 years (44.5%) followed by the age group of 35-45 years (28.6%). In terms of the Single parent status, the majority of the respondents are divorced (53.2 %) followed by wodowed (37.3%). Educational qualification wise, the majority are Graduates (58.6%) followed by Diploma holders (22%). In terms of monthly income, the majority are from the mid-income group of the category 1000 – 2000 KWD (Approx. 3300 to 6600 USD) (48.8%) closely followed by Lower income group of less than 1000 KWD (44%). Finally, Work experience wise, the majority of the respondents have more than 10 years of experience (42.2%). So in summary, the respondents are distributed across each of their characteristics and the majority are from a group which is competent enough to provide the required information as they are mature, adequately qualified, well-experienced, and are in the mid to upper mid category of their employment tenure.
Table 4.1: Demographic Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 35 years</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 45 years</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 55 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 55 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single parent Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income per month</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000 KWD</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-2000 KWD</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2000 KWD</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than two years</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 5 years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. **Skewness and Normality**

For the 56 indicators of the eight latent variables in the questionnaire as defined by the hypothetical model, the average of the response for the sample size of 391 on the Likert 5-point scale was 3.76 with a Standard Deviation of 1.07 (Appendix 5), thus demonstrating a central tendency from average to good level of perception on the various dimensions of the study. However, the location and variability of the data as the descriptive statistics is best expressed by the Skewness and Kurtosis. In the present case the data is left skewed (as most of the scores are towards the high end of the distribution) distribution and the values are within the limit of -1 to +1, except for a very few outliers which marginally fall out. Hence, the data is approximately symmetrically distributed around a score of 4.

4.4. **Overall Perceptions of Wellbeing**

The overall perceptions of the individual dimensions of *social wellbeing* and *subjective wellbeing* will provide descriptive statistical information, which will provide an idea about how the respondents have perceived the individual items in each of the dimensions. Negative wording has been used in many of the indicators to ensure authentic response from the single parents, however for the scoring purpose their responses have been reversed so that the mean values represent the degree of agreement in the actual Likert 5-point scale as if all the indicators were worded positively.

4.4.1. **Social Wellbeing**

4.4.1.1. **Social Integration**

Social integration (SCI) had eight indicators of measurement. In general, SCI has been perceived well by the respondents on the overall basis (Mean = 3.4; Std. Dev. = 1.2). More than 50 percent of the respondents claim ‘good’ to ‘very good’ perception of SCI. About 20 percent consider it to be ‘average’. Only about 9.6 percent have expressed that the SCI score is ‘bad’ and the remaining 13.5 percent claim it to be ‘poor’ (Table 4.2 and Figure 4.1).
Table 4.2: Descriptive statistics of SCI (Social Integration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Bad (1) (%)</th>
<th>Poor (2) (%)</th>
<th>Avg. (3) (%)</th>
<th>Good (4) (%)</th>
<th>V. Good (5) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If I wanted to go on a trip for a day I have hard time finding</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone to go with me. (Negatively worded but scores is for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that there is no one to share my most private worries</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and fears with. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If I were sick, I could easily find someone to help me with my</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily chores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I don't often get invited to do things with others. (Negatively</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is someone I can turn to for advice about handling</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems with my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If I decide one afternoon that I would like to go to a movie</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that evening, I could easily find someone to go with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When I need suggestions on how to deal with a personal problem,</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know someone I can turn to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. If I had to go out of town for a few weeks, it would be difficult to find someone who would look after my house or apartment (the plants, pets, garden, etc.). (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: Descriptive statistics of SCI

4.4.1.2. Social Contribution

Social contribution (SCN) had six indicators of measurement. In general, SCI has been perceived very well by the respondents on the overall basis (Mean about 4; Std. = 0.9). In fact, SCN seems to be the dimension which is very highly ranked by the single parents in terms of their wellbeing. More than 77 percent of the respondents claim ‘good’ to ‘very good’ perception of SCI. About 16 percent consider it to be ‘average’. Only about 1.9 percent have expressed that the SCI score is ‘bad’ and another 4.6 percent claim it to be ‘poor’ (Table 4.3 and Figure 4.2).
Table 4.3: Descriptive statistics of SCN (Social Contribution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Bad (1) (%)</th>
<th>Poor (2) (%)</th>
<th>Avg. (3) (%)</th>
<th>Good (4) (%)</th>
<th>V. Good (5) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I lead a purposeful and meaningful life.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My social relationships are supportive and rewarding.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am engaged and interested in my daily activities I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am a good person and live a good life I am optimistic about my future.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People respect me.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1.3. Social Coherence

Social coherence (SCH) had nine indicators of measurement. In general, SCH has been perceived very well by the respondents on the overall basis (Mean = 3.7; Std. = 1.1). About 63 percent of the respondents claim ‘good’ to ‘very good’ perception of SCH. Twenty one percent consider it to be ‘average’. Only 5.7 percent have expressed that the SCH score is ‘bad’ and another 9.8 percent claim it to be ‘poor’ (Table 4.4 and Figure 4.3).

Table 4.4: Descriptive statistics of SCH (Social Coherence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Bad (1) (%)</th>
<th>Poor (2) (%)</th>
<th>Avg. (3) (%)</th>
<th>Good (4) (%)</th>
<th>V. Good (5) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1.4. Social Actualization

Social actualization (SAC) had eight indicators of measurement. In general, SAC has been perceived very well by the respondents on the overall basis (Mean = 3.6 Std. = 1.1). About 60 percent of the respondents claim ‘good’ to ‘very good’ perception of SAC. About twenty percent consider it to be ‘average’. Only 7.6 percent have expressed that the SAC score is ‘bad’ and another 12 percent claim it to be ‘poor’ (Table 4.5 and Figure 4.4).

Table 4.5: Descriptive statistics of SAC (Social Actualization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Bad (1) (%)</th>
<th>Poor (2) (%)</th>
<th>Avg. (3) (%)</th>
<th>Good (4) (%)</th>
<th>V. Good (5) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I do not fit very well with the people and the community around me.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3: Descriptive statistics of SCH
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The demands of everyday life often get me down. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I don’t have a good sense of what it is I’m trying to accomplish in life. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I like most aspects of my personality.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.4:** Descriptive statistics of SAC
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4.4.1.5. Social Acceptance

Social acceptance (SOA) had seven indicators of measurement. In general, SOA has been perceived very well by the respondents on the overall basis (Mean = 3.9 Std. = 1.1). About 68.7 percent of the respondents claim ‘good’ to ‘very good’ perception of SOA. About 17 percent consider it to be ‘average’. Only 5.5 percent have expressed that the SOA score is ‘bad’ and another 8.4 percent claim it to be ‘poor’ (Table 4.6 and Figure 4.5).

Table 4.6: Descriptive statistics of SOA (Social Acceptance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Bad (1)(%)</th>
<th>Poor (2)(%)</th>
<th>Avg. (3)(%)</th>
<th>Good (4)(%)</th>
<th>V. Good (5)(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most people see me as loving and affectionate.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I tend to worry about what other people think of me. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5: Descriptive statistics of SOA

4.4.2. Subjective Wellbeing

4.4.2.1. Life Evaluation

Life evaluation (LFE) had five indicators of measurement. In general, LFE has been perceived very well by the respondents on the overall basis (Mean = 3.5; Std. = 1). About 52 percent of the respondents claim ‘good’ to ‘very good’ perception of LFE. About 30
percent consider it to be ‘average’. Only 5.2 percent have expressed that the LFE score is ‘bad’ and another 13.2 percent claim it to be ‘poor’ (Table 4.7 and Figure 4.6).

Table 4.7: Descriptive statistics of LFE (Life Evaluation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Bad (1) (%)</th>
<th>Poor (2) (%)</th>
<th>Avg. (3) (%)</th>
<th>Good (4) (%)</th>
<th>V. Good (5) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am satisfied with my life.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2.2. Affect

Affect (AFF) had seven indicators of measurement. In general, AFF has been perceived very well by the respondents on the overall basis (Mean = 3.9; Std. = 1). About 68 percent of the respondents claim ‘good’ to ‘very good’ perception of AFF. About 20 percent consider it to be ‘average’. Only 4.6 percent have expressed that the AFF score is ‘bad’ and another 8 percent claim it to be ‘poor’ (Table 4.8 and Figure 4.7).

Table 4.8: Descriptive statistics of AFF (Affect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Bad (1) (%)</th>
<th>Poor (2) (%)</th>
<th>Avg. (3) (%)</th>
<th>Good (4) (%)</th>
<th>V. Good (5) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am depressed or very unhappy in life. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel lonely or remote from other people. (Negatively worded but</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am pleased about having accomplished something.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I often feel on top of the world.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I am pleased that things go my way.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel proud because someone complimented me on something I had done.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I feel upset because someone criticized me. (Negatively worded but scores is for positive).</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7: Descriptive statistics of AFF

4.4.2.3. Eudaimonia

Eudaimonia (EUD) had six indicators of measurement. In general, EUD has been perceived very well by the respondents on the overall basis (Mean = 4.0; Std. Dev. = 0.9). EUD
seems to be the highly ranked dimension of *subjective wellbeing*. About 75 percent of the respondents claim ‘good’ to ‘very good’ perception of EUD. About 19 percent consider it to be ‘average’. Only 2.1 percent have expressed that the EUD score is ‘bad’ and another 4.5 percent claim it to be ‘poor’ (Table 4.9 and Figure 4.8).

Table 4.9: Descriptive statistics of EUD (Eudaimonia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Bad (1) (%)</th>
<th>Poor (2) (%)</th>
<th>Avg. (3) (%)</th>
<th>Good (4) (%)</th>
<th>V. Good (5) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people (autonomy).</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5. Reliability Measures

Reliability refers to the ability of the questionnaire to replicate the results, or in brief the reproducibility of the measurement (Yusoff & Esa, 2011; Wong et al., 2012). Failure to meet the desired level of reliability may indicate the instability of the attribute being measured or even the divergence between the observers (Cooper & Schindler, 2006). In this research - Stability and Internal consistency (Wong et al., 2012) have been considered as the measures of reliability of the data.

4.5.1. Stability

It refers to the degree to which the data provided by an individual remains consistent over a period of time under repeated measures (Drost, 2011; Singh et al., 2011). Two aspects specified by researchers have to be considered during this process: testing effect (Engel & Schutt, 2013) – which means the characteristic being measured does not change during the time period. The other one is Memory Effect (Pedisic et al., 2014) – the respondent should indicate his/her response without recollecting what was mentioned during the filling of the questionnaire the first time. In this research it is assumed that, all the characteristics being measured have stability for quite a few years, as the society does not change its
perspectives about single parents overnight and the state of wellbeing remains the same relatively for a long period of time. For testing the Stability aspect of reliability, the filled questionnaire of two single parents was randomly chosen and the test-retest process was carried out after three weeks. The first data from the two single parents was obtained on 4th March 2017, and the same single parents were requested to fill the questionnaire again on 25th March 2017. The duration after which the data has to be checked has not been specified in literature, however 3-4 weeks is quite commonly used period for stability check (Bränström et al., 2002). The 56-item data obtained in both the cases was subjected to correlation test. It has been observed that the Pearson correlation was above 0.7 in both the cases (Also relationship is significant at p = 0.01), which indicated that the questionnaire was stable in its ability to collect data (Table 4.10 & 4.11).

Table 4.10: Test Pretest Correlations – Respondent 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Test1</th>
<th>Test2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.737**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11: Test Pretest Correlations – Respondent 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Test3</th>
<th>Test4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.927**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2. Internal Consistency

*Internal Consistency* is another measure of reliability of the data. It refers to the degree to which the items in the questionnaire are measuring the same thing (Anderson et al., 2002). Split-half method and the Alpha Cronbach is the most commonly used method of testing the *internal consistency* (Liang, 2014). The response is divided into two halves and one half is compared with the other or even and odd numbered items are compared for the similarity of response. The initial reliability indicators of measurement were weak, and hence
Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted and a set of 56 questions (Appendix 2) were reduced to 24 questions (Appendix 6) by eliminating the items with lower Factor Loadings. In section 3.6 (Chapter 3) a detailed explanation on the scales from which these items have been chosen and their reliability values have been given. After factor reduction it was found that the value of Alpha Cronbach was 0.6 and above (both before and after factor reduction (apart from social coherence), indicating that the reliability of the majority of the scales has not been reduced) which ensured adequate internal consistency of the data (Table 4.12 & 4.13). Composite Reliability is also a measure of the reliability that is sometimes even preferred over the Alpha Cronbach, as this coefficient considers the combination of all true scores covariances related to the constructs and divides the sum by the total variance (Raykov, 2004). Composite reliability values in this research are 0.8 and above (both before and after factor reduction) which are indicative of adequate reliability (Costello & Osborne, 2005).

Communality is also another way of expressing the reliability of measurement through the sum of the squares for all the factor loadings for a variable, which indicates the proportion of variation explained in each variable by the factors identified. It is an R squared for how well the factors predict each variable. The cut-off is 0.1 and it can be observed that post factor reduction very high communality is achieved, which indicates that the measurement model is a good fit (Schreiber et al., 2006). R-square is also a measure of the proportion of variance caused by a variable, or in other words, the percentage influence of a variable on the dependent variable is estimated through the R-square value. In the present case post factor reduction, it can be observed that about 40 percent to 50 percent of influence on the endogenous variables has been explained by the model. This is a relatively high value of dependence indicator, as the cut-off is about 10 percent. Thus, moderately high reliability of measurement has been ensured by different measures of reliability.

Table 4.12: Reliability Values before CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudaimonia</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>Communality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life evaluation</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social acceptance</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social coherence</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contribution</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social actualization</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: Reliability Values after CFA

4.6. Validity Measures

*Validity* refers to the ability of the instrument to measure what was intended to be measured (Bolarinwa, 2015). It is not adequate if the data that has been collected is reliable, but it is also important to ensure that the instrument of measurement is validated. Several methods have been adopted to validate the measurement and are discussed in the subsequent paragraphs.

4.6.1. Face Validity

Typically this validity is a form of representative validity to check how well the questionnaire is grounded with the underpinning theory behind the research construct being measured (Bolarinwa, 2015). *Face Validity* is also considered to be *construct validity* by several researchers which refers to the ability of the instrument to reflect the theoretical trait...
of the construct (DeVon et al., 2007). The questionnaire used has not been developed for the purpose of this research, but the available scales with established reliability and validity have been adopted. However, there have been two issues related to its face validity. First, the questionnaires were developed in many different contexts of wellbeing measurement. Second, the available questionnaires contributed only to specific dimensions of the research constructs under investigation. So, there was a need to re-establish the face validity of the questionnaire. Three subject experts were approached from two universities in Kuwait through prior telephonic appointment. The research construct - Wellbeing with the two sub-components: Social wellbeing and Subjective wellbeing with their dimensions were presented to the experts. Seven background factors: Gender, Age, Marital status, Qualification, Income, and Work experience were also presented with the categories. Then the measurement instrument in the form of the questionnaire was subjected to their investigation. Following were the specific suggestions by the three subject experts:

Expert 1 – The background factors could have included the religious background, however in the context of Kuwait it can be eliminated as it would be a sensitive issue to discuss. In the dimension Social Integration the item – “There is someone I can turn to for advice about handling problems with my family” was questionable. It should be rephrased as, “There is someone I can turn to in the family for advice about handling problems”. Under the dimensions Eudaimonia the item – “I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people (autonomy)“. This was quite relevant in western context but in a country like Kuwait the ability to do so was questionable. The expert has agreed that the items chosen have theoretical grounding and exhibit cohesiveness.

Expert 2 – As the questionnaire is a derivative of standard questionnaire re-establishment of face validity is not a must, but it may help in refinement. The item – “I am pleased that things go my way”, is a good measure of the dimension ‘Affect’ in a general context of wellbeing but in case of single parents it is questionable because the very fact that the marriage did not work may be an indicator that the things did not go their way in life. It could be changed to – “I am pleased that things go my way most of the times”. Items are the sub-set of the dimensions of study and they are representing the dimensions very well.
Expert 3 – The choice of the dimensions to represent the research construct is relevant in the context of single parents. Items like – “I am satisfied with life” may not be answered truthfully in most of the cases. This is because even if a person is not satisfied with life, he/she may not express to the public. So, the expert emphasized that for meaningful outcome the respondents should be requested to answer the questionnaire without comparing to the ideal situation. They need to be made sure about confidentiality and must express their true feelings. Rephrasing the item as – “Relatively, I am satisfied with my life” would be more meaningful. Background factors may include Social class (lower, middle and upper).

The inputs by the subject experts were brief and specific to the point, but by and large they agreed with the representation of the items in terms of the theoretical foundation of the dimension under investigation. No change of the questions has been made to the questionnaire so that the originality is retained to ensure the reliability and validity. Many researchers feel that Face Validity does not make major contribution to the validity of the questionnaire (e.g., Engel & Schutt, 2013). However, there are also researchers who feel that it is widely used particularly when the questionnaire is newly developed (e.g., Sangoseni et al., 2013).

4.6.2. Known Group Validity

In Known Group Validity (KGV) test, a group on which the validity is already tested is compared with the outcome of construct where the validity is not yet established (Engel & Schutt, 2013; Singh et al., 2011). For an acceptable KGV, the attribute under comparison must have a higher acceptability value than the one obtained by earlier researchers in a diversified setting, when the same research construct or dimension was measured. To serve the purpose, the wellbeing study undertaken by a group of researchers on various settings in different contexts (Bradburn’s, 1969; Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Diener, et al., 1985; Minnebo, 2005; Diener et al., 2009) was compared with the results obtained in the case of wellbeing of single parents. The average reliability measure of earlier research on wellbeing in terms of Alpha Cronbach was 0.7 and in the case of the single parent wellbeing it was 0.9. The average inter-item correlation in the earlier studies was found to be 0.7 and in the present
case it is 0.6 to 0.8 for the various dimensions. Thus, the questionnaire is having the desired level of KGV.

4.6.3. Content Validity

It refers to the degree to which the questions in the questionnaire reflect the generalized content of the dimension under investigation (Bolarinwa, 2015). One way of establishing content validity is through the validity achieved through other researchers listed in the metric development section. In this research the metrics used are the derivatives of standard scales with proved validity scores which include: Social Support Scale (Minnebo, 2005) with Alpha Cronbach above 0.6, Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB) (Diener et al., 2009) with factor loading varied from 0.58 to 0.76 with good correlation with other similar scales, Ryff’s Psychological Well-Being Scales (PWB) (Ryff & Keyes, 1995) with correlation between the items as 0.7 to 0.89, Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWL) (Diener, et al., 1985) with factor loadings varied from 0.6 to 0.84 and inter-item correlations varied from 0.6 to 0.8 indicating moderate acceptance, Positive Affect (PA) and Negative Affect (NA) Scales (Bradburn’s, 1969) with the Cronbach Alpha measure of reliability above 0.6. All these scales were having acceptable content validity. Thus, the questionnaire developed in this research, which is a combination of the aforementioned scales has an established content validity as they have been retained as they are with no change in wording.

4.6.4. Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Convergent validity refers to the different measures yielding acceptable results in terms of the validity (Schimmack, 2010; Anderson & Sellbom, 2015). Discriminant validity is the evidence that a dimension or a research construct used in the questionnaire is different from other closely related dimensions or constructs (DeVellis, 2012). This test makes use of a measure called Average Variance Extracted (AVE), which is compared with the Inter-item correlations of the dimensions used in the questionnaire. The AVE values (Table 4.14) for all reflective constructs of wellbeing dimensions ranged from 0.5 to 0.7 (cut-off 0.30) after CFA, thus proving adequate variance captured by the construct. Further, after factor reduction the square root of AVE for each construct in the model, as indicated in the diagonal of the correlation of constructs matrix, was larger than the corresponding off-
diagonal correlations of the construct to their latent variables. Thus, the instrument used in this research has the desired convergent and discriminant validity.

Table 4.1: Inter-item correlations and comparison with AVE (after CFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AFF</th>
<th>EUD</th>
<th>LFE</th>
<th>SAC</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>SCN</th>
<th>SOA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: AFF = Affect; EUD = Eudaimonia; LFE = Life evaluation; SAC = Social actualization; SCH = Social coherence; SCI = Social integration; SCN = Social contribution; SOA = Social acceptance

4.7. Association between the Research Variables

The conceptual model under investigation in this research is given in Chapter 3 - Figure 3.1. There are two stages of analysis. In the first stage, the association between the background factors with the dimensions of Social, and Subjective well-being of the single parents are tested. In the second stage, the association between the Social and Subjective wellbeing are tested.

4.7.1. The Association between the Background Factors and Wellbeing

The association between the background factors of the single parents and the dimensions of wellbeing has been tested using t-tests and the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The following is the outcome of the t-tests and ANOVA and the details have been obtained.

For each of the demographic variables there are multiple dimensions being tested. In social wellbeing there are 6 tests (5 subscales and the overall score) and in subjective wellbeing there are 4 tests (3 subscales and overall score). The chance of increased false positive tests (Type 1 errors) is increased in this situation due to multiple tests. Therefore, to reduce this
likelihood a Bonferroni adjustment to the significance level has been used. For social wellbeing this is .05/6 = .0083, for subjective .05/4 = .0125. If the p values for the t-tests and various ANOVA tests are not less than or equal to these values then relationships are not taken to be statistically significant.

**The Association of Gender on Social and Subjective Wellbeing**

The Research Question 4 was to make policy recommendations to enhance the wellbeing of single parents and it was essential to know the conditions of wellbeing of single parents with respect to their gender. Thus, the overall social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing of 118 male and 273 female single parents were compared through an independent samples t-test to study if they differed in their perceptions on overall social wellbeing and overall subjective wellbeing. The t-test indicates (Table 4.15) that there is a significant difference in the total score of social wellbeing (SOW) of the single parents in terms of gender, but there is no significant difference between them in terms of overall subjective wellbeing (SBW). In terms of the individual dimensions, females scored significantly higher than males on the three social wellbeing dimensions of Social Coherence (SCH), Social actualization (SAC), and Social acceptance (SOA) and on the subjective wellbeing dimension of Affect (AFF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.15: Independent Samples t-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Association of Qualification on Subjective Wellbeing

The ANOVAs indicated that age, marital status, income and work experience of the single parents had no impact on overall social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing or on any of the dimensions. However, subjective wellbeing of the single parents differed significantly with respect to qualifications (sig. 0.001) on an overall basis and in terms of its dimension life evaluation (sig. = 0.000). It is observed that in terms of life evaluation the undergraduate single parents had the highest level followed by post graduates, diploma holders, PhDs, and other qualification holders (Table 4.17). On the overall basis of subjective wellbeing undergraduate single parents had the highest level followed by PhDs, post graduates, diploma holders, and other qualification holders.

Table 4.16: ANOVA of the Qualification and Subjective Wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Between Groups</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFE</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBW</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.17: Mean and Standard deviation of Qualification and Subjective wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Life evaluation</th>
<th>Subjective wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.2. Association between Dimensions of Social and Subjective Wellbeing

To test the correlation between the Social and Subjective wellbeing Pearson correlation was used. The results indicate that the two research constructs are very well correlated and the correlation is significant at 1% ($r = 0.71$; sig. = 0.000). One of the research questions to be addressed in this research was to investigate the influence of social wellbeing on subjective wellbeing of the single parents as well as the interrelationships between their dimensions. This has necessitated the establishment of a Structural Equation Model (SEM) (see Figure 4.9) and the subsequent testing of 15 hypothesized relationships.
The Structural Model is shown in Figure 4.9. The SEM analysis mainly includes two parts: Measurement Model and Structural Model - these two aspects are dealt with in the following sections.

**Measurement Model**

Measurement model includes the *Confirmatory Factor Analysis* (CFA) in which the original questionnaire with a total 56 indicators (Appendix 2) of latent variables was reduced to a total of 24 items (Appendix 6) through CFA. To verify the reliability of the latent variables in the model, *internal consistency reliability measure*, *item reliability measure*, and *composite reliability* measures were calculated, which have been already discussed. The result of *Item Reliability* (IR) measured as standardized *Confirmatory Factor Loading* (CFL) for the initial questionnaire and the final questionnaire after eliminating the factors with lower values of loading are given in Tables 4.18 and 4.19. The CFA has yielded a factor loading ranging from 0.7 to 0.9, which is a moderately high degree of item reliability (cut-off 0.5). There were many factors with factor loadings greater
than 0.5 however, according to the principles of SEM minimum two indicators are required to represent a latent variable and in the present case the three indicators with the highest factor loading were retained.

Table 4.18: Factor Loading Before Factor Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFF</th>
<th>EUD</th>
<th>LFE</th>
<th>SAC</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>SCN</th>
<th>SOA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFF1</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF3</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF5</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF6</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF7</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFF1</td>
<td>AFF2</td>
<td>AFF3</td>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>SCI2</td>
<td>SCI3</td>
<td>SCI4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF1</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** AFF = Affect; EUD = Eudaimonia; LFE = Life evaluation; SAC = Social actualization; SCH = Social coherence; SCI = Social integration; SCN = Social contribution; SOA = Social acceptance

**Table 4.19:** Factor Loading After Factor Reduction
Structural Model

The path coefficients and t-values of the structural model are indicated in the Figures 4.10 to 4.12 and Table 4.20. The path coefficients indicate the strength of the relationships between the paired variables and t-values indicate the statistical significance of the relationship. The structural model indicates that among the 15 hypothesized relationships 10 relationships have been found to be statistically significant.
Figure 4.10 Path Coefficients before Factor Reduction

Legend: AFF = Affect; EUD = Eudaimonia; LFE = Life evaluation; SAC = Social acceptance; SCH = Social coherence; SCI = Social integration; SCN = Social contribution; SOA = Social actualization
Figure 4.11: Path Coefficients after reduction

Legend: AFF = Affect; EUD = Eudaimonia; LFE = Life evaluation; SAC = Social acceptance; SCH = Social coherence; SCI = Social integration; SCN = Social contribution; SOA = Social actualization
Figure 4.12: Structural Model (t-values)

Legend: AFF = Affect; EUD = Eudaimonia; LFE = Life evaluation; SAC = Social acceptance; SCH = Social coherence; SCI = Social integration; SCN = Social contribution; SOA = Social actualization
Table 4.2: Significance of relationships between Dimensions

|                  | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | Standard Error (STERR) | T Statistics (|O/STERR|) | Statistical Significance |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| SAC -> AFF       | 0.16                | 0.17            | 0.06                      | 0.06                   | 2.93***         | Significant              |
| SAC -> EUD       | 0.39                | 0.39            | 0.06                      | 0.06                   | 6.69***         | Significant              |
| SAC -> LFE       | 0.23                | 0.24            | 0.06                      | 0.06                   | 4.11***         | Significant              |
| SCH -> AFF       | 0.07                | 0.08            | 0.06                      | 0.06                   | 1.12            | Non-significant          |
| SCH -> EUD       | 0.07                | 0.07            | 0.05                      | 0.05                   | 1.32            | Non-significant          |
| SCH -> LFE       | -0.002              | 0.003           | 0.05                      | 0.05                   | 0.04            | Non-significant          |
| SCI -> AFF       | 0.22                | 0.22            | 0.05                      | 0.05                   | 4.65**          | Significant              |
| SCI -> EUD       | 0.04                | 0.04            | 0.05                      | 0.05                   | 0.91            | Non-significant          |
| SCI -> LFE       | 0.06                | 0.06            | 0.04                      | 0.04                   | 1.32            | Non-significant          |
| SCN -> AFF       | 0.19                | 0.19            | 0.06                      | 0.06                   | 2.94***         | Significant              |
| SCN -> EUD       | 0.16                | 0.17            | 0.07                      | 0.07                   | 2.38**          | Significant              |
| SCN -> LFE       | 0.42                | 0.42            | 0.06                      | 0.06                   | 6.5***          | Significant              |
| SOA -> AFF       | 0.13                | 0.13            | 0.07                      | 0.07                   | 1.89*           | Significant              |
| SOA -> EUD       | 0.19                | 0.19            | 0.06                      | 0.06                   | 3.06***         | Significant              |
| SOA -> LFE       | 0.13                | 0.13            | 0.06                      | 0.06                   | 2.16**          | Significant              |

>2.58**(Significant at 1%); 1.96 – 2.58**(Significant at 5%); 1.64 – 1.96* (Significant at 10%)

Legend: AFF = Affect; EUD = Eudaimonia; LFE = Life evaluation; SAC = Social acceptance; SCH = Social coherence; SCI = Social integration; SCN = Social contribution; SOA = Social actualization

4.8. Qualitative Response of the Respondents

Even though this research was primarily quantitative in nature it also provided scope for the expression of single parents in qualitative terms to some extent. Among the 391 respondents, nine responses from male and twelve qualitative responses from female were
picked as they were complete and informative. Rest of the responses were either repetition of the earlier response or incomplete so not considered in analysis. There were two open-ended questions in the questionnaire which elicited their views about being a single parent in Kuwait. Firstly, they were asked to express if they were comfortable as single parents and they were treated without any kind of bias by the relatives, friends, colleagues and by and large by the society they lived in. There was a mixed reaction to this generic question from the single parents. Qualitative responses were translated from Arabic to English using professional translator. The reactions of the single parents were separated and categorized into themes of the research. To the extent possible, contrasting responses have been picked under the same category to identify diversified views expressed by the participants. Even though a systematic thematic analysis is not undertaken, these responses have been very useful in making suggestions to the policy makers in the government of Kuwait. Some very relevant selected responses have been presented in the following paragraphs. The following responses represent the extremes of reported affect. The gender and ID code for each participant is indicated after each quote (M= Male and F= Female).

**Social Integration**

Positive responses:

1. “I have been comfortable with my acquaintances and during the picnics, religious celebrations, communes, and cultural programmes I have been invited by my friends and relatives. I have never felt that I have been isolated as a single parent on any occasion.” (M16)

2. “I am used to seeking advice from senior members of my family and it has continued even after being a single parent. My uncle has been very cooperative to me particularly on issues related to my daughter in connection to her schooling.” (M32)

3. “I can remember situation when my son was ill and I could never expect that my relatives would be of such an immense support to me from bringing home the doctor to staying in shifts in the hospital till the day of my son’s discharge from the hospital. I was under the impression that after separation from my husband I will have to face the situation single handed but my relatives and to that extent even some of my neighbors proved to be of immense help to me. This incident made me stay connected to my society forever.” (F85)
4. “After the death of my husband I had to do all the household related work all alone. There was a situation when I had to sell my car and buy a new one. I had done some inquiry with my colleagues about the purchase. While I did not have any financial problems I wanted to make sure that I would get a good deal. When I discussed the issue with my neighbor who had recently bought a car, she personally came with me to the showroom and helped me with the purchase including the paperwork and I found it was very helpful to me. Single parenthood was considered by me to be very difficult initially with three children but I find a few of my neighbors very helpful to me.”(F88)

5. “Even though there were no explicit forms of avoidance by the female members of the society, I could notice that the female members would maintain a sort of distance specially after getting out of the marital relationships”.(M294)

6. “One of the most pleasurable events in my life has been the festivals in my country. The feast of Ramadan’s breaking fast (Eid-Ul-Fitr) was as exciting post-divorce as it was before. I was a bit apprehensive that after my divorce from my husband I would be left alone with my daughter. But there were no difference observed either in the receiving of the presents by my daughter, or wishing and greetings of the family, or the get together on a hearty meal. The celebrations of Birthday of the Prophet (Al Mawlid Annabaoui), The Muslim New Year (Hegira’s commemoration) were also as enjoyable after my divorce to the same extent as before.”(F92)

Low state of wellbeing:

7. “When I was with my wife before the divorce the neighbours used to invite me for their family functions often. But after divorce I find that except for a few many have started avoiding me and my two children. At times it is a bit painful, but I am slowly getting used to it and find our own ways of being happy through our outings and social activities with select group.”(M94)

8. “One incident I can never forget is that one of my very close friends did not invite me to accompany his family on a world tour and he chose only the friends with intact marriage. We grew with each other since childhood playing, partying and travelling together but I never thought my single parenthood status would make me lose this companionship.”(M295)
9. “My single parenthood has made my relatives and friends avoid me in their social get together and outings. I cannot understand why this should make a difference to them.” (M299)

10. “I find our Kuwaiti society is yet to adapt to the changes in lifestyles and family structures. My observation is that single parenthood is not acceptable by the society.” (F283)

The above responses are in connection to the dimension social integration of social wellbeing. In all the first six cases the response has been quite positive and the last four responses which is indicative that there is a form of avoidance from the select group. The quantitative analysis had indicated that social integration was a dimension of concern. It is reflected in some of these responses.

Social Contribution
Positive responses:

1. “I am a goal oriented person and being a single parent has not affected my pursuit of excellence. I have a larger picture of life and as my personal life was affecting my wellbeing I had no choice other than a separation from my wife. After separation I have taken custody of my son and admitted him in a good school and I am focusing on my profession. If I come across a person whose tastes match that of mine I may even consider remarriage”. (M303)

2. “I have a big group of friends who are associated with me all the time and actually I have not felt that I am a single parent when I have mingled with my group. We go out on picnics regularly and discuss our mutual problems and also share quite a good number of social responsibilities. That makes my life interesting and meaningful to me”. (F311)

3. “I hold some key responsibilities in the society and that keeps me busy all the time. At times I find very little time to deal with my daily routines, but by keeping me busy all the time I achieve certain goals and never feel lonely as a single parent”. (M237)

4. “I believe that the best way to be happy is through sharing the agonies of others. I am liked by my relatives and friends for my helping nature and they too reciprocate it to me at my difficult times. My daughter who is now doing her schooling in 6th
Standard has many friends too and she is being guided well by my friends and relatives. For me society is give and take and it is rewarding that way.” (F321)

The above qualitative response of the respondents can be grouped under social contribution. It is imperative that single parents are associated with the society in the developmental activities and that keeps them busy as well provide a sense of fulfillment in life. There were no negative remarks (low states of wellbeing) associated with this dimension. It is reflected in the quantitative analysis also with a high mean score on social contribution.

Social Coherence

Positive response

1. “I am a lady with a positive outlook towards my life. I consider myself to be a winner and I live in a society which needs my contribution for its development. I hold a key position in the Ministry in Kuwait. I regularly deal with activities which make me have a larger picture of life which would be enjoyable to be and my two daughters as well as develop the society I live in. My international exposure has equipped me with a set of skills and competencies which enables me to be a contributing member of the society. With this outlook towards life my single parent status has not affected me in any ways towards the pursuits of my goals in life”. (F334).

2. “My life is enjoyable because I grow with the society. I am into community service in a very active manner. I have been a voluntary member of a social group involved in many developmental activities including healthcare centre and home for the aged. My involvement with this group gives me a lot of inner peace and a sense of accomplishment. It feels nice when the society gets benefitted by our services. My single parent status has never been a hindrance to me in my regular activities and I am finding that my elder son is also assisting me in my day to day activities and showing a lot of interest in emulating me. (F335)

3. “During the initial part of my single parenthood I used to be a bit down in my spirits. With three children to look after I was finding work-life balance a bit difficult. But in a year or so I got accustomed to this routine. I am a trainer in soft-
skills and career guidance and that keeps me busy after my working hours. It feels nice to guide young minds in the pursuit of a worthy goal. Through this kind of engagement I have now found my life interesting and rewarding.” (M340).

4. “Single parent life is a bit difficult if not for good friends. In that sense I consider myself very lucky because I have a very good set of friends. Some of them have been associated with me since my childhood. We have similar background of being an elite class of family and enjoy luxuries of life. But at the same time we are very much connected to the society in many different activities and we are involved in many social welfare activities. During the Eid-Ul-Fitr we sponsor many free food activities for the poor and needy and we be a part of them for several days and enjoy their company thoroughly. Being connected to the society has many different benefits and it makes me feel we are one big family and the issue of being single parent will never be in my mind.” (F382)

All the above responses refer to the social coherence of social wellbeing as expressed by the single parents. The single parents have expressed their social coherence in many different ways such as: being a contributing part of the society, growing as a part of the society, contributing to the society through the competencies, the desire to help the public etc. These responses substantiate the quantitative findings.

Social Actualization

Positive responses:

1. “I am a person who has been always looking for future possibilities and never bother about what happened in the past. I have my responsibilities about my son and I can see a bright future for him too for the kind of opportunities which are available in Kuwait. So, with this future orientation I am not concerned much about my being a single parent as it was my choice to separate from my husband through a divorce. I feel independent and I can make single handedly decisions about my son and my son also feels very comfortable with me and we have lots of fun going out, meeting relatives and we do a lot of travelling. The society by and large has been very supportive to me as ladies are respected in our society and usually people are ready to help if we need assistance. I feel I am in a good society which has a
rich culture and being single parent has never bothered me in any ways as I couldn’t have been as happy as I am now.” (F384)

2. “Being a single parent is quite a responsibility, as particularly after the divorce there will be a feeling whether it was right or wrong to get separated from the husband. I have a son and a daughter to look after and their good future is my responsibility. I want both of them to get into a professional career even though I am not clear about which profession they should pursue, as I wish to listen to their interests as they grow. Kuwait has bright future for its citizens as the country is making progress and has the potential to grow further in the future. Actually speaking, I enjoy the responsibility part of single parenting. In olden days issues like divorce were not welcome in the society but now things have changed a lot and people are more open and supportive of human right to live with pride and dignity. At least I am confident that by the time my children grow they will have umpteen opportunities to pursue their dream career. Schooling has improved a lot from past to the present and with the job in hand I must be able to make my children join their dream professional course. I enjoy my job as well as my duty towards my children and single parenting as I said before is a double responsibility in comparison to two parents, but it is quite interesting and has its own advantages such as one can decide everything without taking the opinion of the spouse.” (F389)

Low state of wellbeing:

3. “I am a bit nervous as a single parent because the confidence level in me has come down after I became a widower. With three children to look after as I am the only bread winner in the house I have a great responsibility to shoulder. My relatives have not been there for me since my childhood as the family bondage was not very strong and everyone seemed to be busy in his or her own world. I am not sure whether I can provide the right kind of future to my children. Things were very nice when both I and my wife were working and it was a happy family. She was very supportive with my household responsibilities even though she was also working being a post graduate. It was she who was taking care of the children and helping them with their homework and assisting them in the daily chores. But now I am
more dependent on the servant who cannot provide mother’s love to the children and as the servants keep changing jobs the children have to get used to new faces. I am unable to focus on my job properly because of the responsibilities I have at home. I feel my efficiency is reducing because of the extra pressure of rearing the children and providing to their day-to-day needs. I grew with lots of hope and ambition for my future but all of a sudden after the demise of my wife it appears as if my dreams have crumbled and I feel lonely. I am not sure if the society is capable of providing assistance to me or people like me who are in need of moral support. I tried some community help but it did not work very well. I find single parenting difficult and do hope some help will come from the community or government or non-government agencies which will provide good assistance to me as well as help my children build their academic career.” (M388)

The first two responses speak quite positively about social actualization which is a dimension of social wellbeing and the third appears to be negative about this dimension or in other words weak in social actualization. Actually there were not many responses under this category. The first two have realized their potential as well as have realized the potential of the society they live in. They have projected quite a positive image about the future for them as well as their dependents. The point to be observed is that the marital status of the third respondent is widowhood whereas the first two is separation from the spouse. This could be a reason for the difference in their levels of wellbeing. But the point is clear that there is a lot the government can do as there are needy single parents who can be assisted to perform better in their responsibilities both in personal and professional life.

**Social Acceptance**

Positive responses:

1. “I find the society cares about me and that makes my single parenting much easier as well as enjoyable despite the fact that I am a female, and in my opinion Arab world was male dominated in the past. In Kuwait the bondage with the community to which I belong is so strong that they make me feel that there are people always to help me and assist me in whatever situation I am in. In fact, the togetherness is established in the weekly prayers and we feel that we are connected through a
common religion and the bondage can grow only stronger day by day. My divorce was unavoidable as there was a serious mismatch between our expectations from each other and we found we could never compromise on our lifestyle just to please others and hence got separated. Initially, I was a bit apprehensive about whether society would accept me as a single parent. But, I was surprised to see my relatives and friends dealing with me same as before as if nothing had happened. I was of the opinion that in a relatively conservative society like Kuwait, divorce would not be accepted, but I was proved wrong. As I have had my post-graduation in the UK, I was exposed to a multi-cultural environment and was relatively broad minded and very open to new ideas and believed in independent way of living in the society. But soon I have realized that the society too has changed over the past and I feel a lot of commonness with my society which is today accepting people as they are and men and women are treated equal and there are ample job opportunities for the women who can be independent. All these issues are very important in the context of single parenting. This is because single parenting depends a lot on the society in which we live. If single parents are looked differently by the public then they may be isolated and affected psychologically. But I have never experienced that kind of differential treatment from anyone except on some rare occasions when I had to visit my relatives who were very elderly and the moment they came to know for the first time that I was a single parent they acted as if I was from a different community. But it was understandable to me that they were from olden school of thought and their traditional lifestyle had made them behave so. In the company of people of relatively my age I never found such feelings expressed and the marital status never came in our relationship as a friend or a relative. We have lots of festivities, cultural programmes, get together, dinner parties, celebrations, and religious gathering during which we mix with each other very freely and I often feel I am an inseparable part of the Kuwaiti society. I am having a sense of belonging to the society and I would not have been happier than what I am today amidst of this society anywhere else. The reason is that I am accepted as I am without any prejudice”.(F390)
2. “I was down in my spirit after the death of my husband. I thought my world has come to an end. But my two children made me feel stronger as they were dependent on me. To my greatest surprise help came from my close relatives. Even though I was financially well off with a job in the Ministry, I was down emotionally but they kept me at my good spirits through their regular visits. They never expressed that they were coming to me because I was down in my spirits or weak, but had exhibited a sort of togetherness and support that I never felt I was alone.” (F381)

Low state of wellbeing:

3. “I have found that society has a gender bias about single parents. When it comes to a lady the society offers a helping hand and views them with a desire to provide support but towards men as single parents they are not very receptive. I could not observe the same kind of togetherness with the society after becoming a single parent through divorce. I have observed that some of the female members of my own relatives started avoided talking to me as I was separated from their friend who was my former wife. There are occasions in which I was made to feel as if I have committed a mistake by divorcing despite the fact that it took place on mutual consent. I found that the number of invitations to the parties and get together have decreased considerably after my divorce. Initially I was of the opinion that it was my perception that I was being isolated from the society due to my single parenthood but over a period of time I have observed that there is a sort of avoidance expressed by some of my friends and relatives. I must state that it is not from all the people but a select few members of the society. The above observation makes me sometimes feel that I don’t belong to this society as it expects me to conform to certain standards such as no matter how much you are uncomfortable with your wife for the sake of the society you must adjust and be together. This is not acceptable to me and I feel I am isolated from the society. But this kind of feeling is not with all the members of the society but a sizable section of the society. I do have very good friends and relatives who are still same as before to me but some are not. It is very difficult to arrive at a concrete conclusion on this, but yes I have observed that a set of people avoid indulging me in social functions
because of my single parenthood. But, a good news is that my children are freely mixing with their counterparts and happy like any other children. That makes me think again and again if it is my own feeling that makes me isolated or actually this kind of behaviour exists in the society.” (M130)

The above three responses, though contradictory, can be related to social acceptance, a dimension of social wellbeing. The first two comments from females have exhibited a high level of social acceptance while the third one, a male, has a poor level of social acceptance reflecting the gender based perception of social wellbeing which has been revealed in the inferential statistics of this research.

**Life Evaluation**

Positive response:

1. “I am a single parent and have a 3 year old daughter through an unwedded relationship. It was my decision not to get married to the biological father of my kid as there was no compatibility between us. My parents have abandoned me as they considered it to be degrading to them for their daughter having a kid through premarital sex. So, I am on my own and to be frank I have a very comfortable and happy life with my daughter who keeps me busy all the time. I have a very satisfying job and I have two post-graduate qualifications both earned abroad. I am making good progress in my professional career. I am liked by my colleagues and they are all very cooperative with me the way I am with them. We have a very successful team and I should say it is an ideal working environment. I have a nanny who looks after my kid when I go to work and she is very helpful and very professional and committed. As a single parent there have been times I have been singled out by my relatives but friends are very cordial. I don’t mix much with my family members as they have been degraded by my decision as perceived by them. When I introspect my past I feel I have made the right choice because it is good for me to be single and live my life to the full than compromise all my happiness and be with a man whom I cannot tolerate for a superiority complex. I feel that I have fulfilled most of my dreams I have had in this life. My daughter is a gift to me from God and she is such a sweet baby that she makes me feel every day that life is beautiful. In my
opinion single parenting is not a curse but a pleasant responsibility because the baby did not ask us to be brought to planet earth, instead it is we who decided to bring it. Having brought it to life it is our duty to see that it enjoys its stay with us. I have a dream for my child. Every day I feel that it is growing physically and intellectually. This stage in its life is very important and I enjoy making its childhood a happy one. I never feel that I am doing things as a set of responsibilities to be discharged but it goes as a part of my daily chores. I enjoy seeing the way she tries to walk, involve in small activities, learn to speak, recognize people and so on. I consider single parenting a blessing in one way because unlike two parents, a single parent can get all the time he or she wants with the kid. I do believe that it is important for the society to be unbiased towards a particular group of minority such as single parents. But at the same time, people should have the courage to face the society and live life on their terms and be happy in their own predetermined ways. If you ask me, in conclusion I would say that single parenting for me has been a pleasant experience, and maybe my success in my profession and a clear growth pattern of the past and hopeful progression in the future makes me feel confident about my life.”(F138)

Low state of wellbeing:

2. “I got a divorce from my wife and on mutual consent one of my sons is with me and the other with her. She is now remarried but I am a single parent. My professional career is very good, but personal life is not going the way as I expected. Divorce is an instant decision and had we reconciled probably we could have stayed together. But now there is no point speaking of the past but face life as it comes. I feel society has prejudice over single parents and we are not treated the same way as intact parents are treated. In many family get together I observed that I was not involved in activities the way intact parents were involved. I strongly feel the society should change because our happiness is also dependent on how the society treats us. Life in isolation can be miserable, but at the same time life with a non-cooperative society is also equally miserable. I had so many dreams for my future but I could not achieve them because of my failure at home. I often keep asking myself what
went wrong in my life. I am unable to figure out exactly what went wrong but things did not work the way I intended. Leading life as a single parent in a conservative society like Kuwait is a challenge. My close friends have abandoned me after my separation from my wife. My son doesn’t listen to me when I try to advise him and I don’t find anybody to guide him. I find the same society which was very friendly with me when my marriage was intact to be hostile towards me. In fact I am glad that there is a research going on in this area and I am expressing what I felt as a single parent. Single parents are not treated equally in this country or in Arab world in general as per my opinion and a transformation should take place in the society. When there are countries in the world who have accepted gay and lesbian marriages why not accept single parents is the question which keeps bothering me. According to me there must be open discussions in media and awareness programmes to be conducted across the country to make the people more open to new lifestyles and develop mentality of accepting people as they are.” (M362)

The above two responses can be grouped under the life evaluation dimension of subjective wellbeing. The single unwed mother exhibits a high level of wellbeing in terms of life evaluation while the divorced father has a very low level of life evaluation.

Affect

Positive response:

1. “If I compare my life while my marriage was intact and now as a single parent I feel it is much better emotionally as I have a lot of support and time for myself and my child. As a working woman, I have my daily routine and I am fully engaged throughout my day. It is a blessing that my mother is with me and during my absence she takes care of the kid. It also provides me a very good moral support. I have always discussed my day to day problems with my mother since my childhood and she has been very supportive to me in whatever I do in life. It was her encouragement which made me get my UK based post-graduate degree which has elevated my work position. I love my work and I have a good number of colleagues who appreciate my work. My colleagues consider me as a very supportive co-worker as I assist them as and when required because they too are kind and
cooperative to me. Emotionally I am a very stable person and I do not get upset on trivial issues and always divert all my energy to solve the problems I come across in life rather than complaining about the situation I am in. My basic education has given me a very good support for developing myself as a confident person who can face the challenges of the society. Single parenthood has been difficult for many of my friends as they have confided in me, but it is not so for me as I take it as a challenge. Bringing up a son who is now 8 years old the way I wish is a chance which not everyone gets. He is the best thing happened in my life and he is growing up to be a smart kid who is computer savvy and keeps himself abreast of latest trends in electronics. I want to make him pursue a course in electronics as he is very much interested in it. My mother accompanies me when I go out with him if she is free and we do a lot of shopping and sometimes go to watch children movies and enjoy it with my son. I get an opportunity to meet with the parents of my son’s classmates during which we exchange a lot of pleasantries and sometimes they ask for my suggestion by seeing my son’s academic performance. I consider emotional stability to be very important in this world as intelligence alone cannot resolve the problems that we encounter. Whether it is a job loss or separation from a beloved it is the emotional strength which keeps us going with life. Sometimes, I feel as if I am ‘heartless’, as presence or absence of my husband had not made much of a difference to me but I feel being emotionally attached to someone more than required would only bring unhappiness. I do have sentiments and like companionship but not at the cost of losing my individuality and hence I have enjoyed my life as a single parent. I don’t have much of a comment about the behavior or attitude of the society towards us, the single parents. It is natural that they suspect our morality the moment they know that a lady is without her husband at a prime age in life. But that’s just their perception and we have no control over it. But we do have control over our response to it. So as I do not expect the society to accept my single parenthood or disapprove it does not make much of a difference to me as long as I am a law abiding citizen who is useful to the society. I do have a set of activities which I am involved with for the betterment of the society. I am an active member of a charitable society which runs an orphanage. There are about 30
orphans who are looked after by our Trust and we are actively involved in building the career of those children”. (F372)

Low state of wellbeing:

2. “It took a long time for me to reconcile with my situation of single parenthood. I was emotionally broken down when I had to separate from my wife. I had three children. Except for the daughter, two sons came under my custody. I used to think a lot about my daughter and missed her after separation. I actually moved into a sort of depression and to add insult to injury it was appearing as if I was an outcast in the society being a single parent. Controlling my two sons who were in 4th and 5th grade was not very easy as they were very demanding and I had to accompany them in all their outdoor activities and it was very tiring to me after a day’s tough work. As my elder brother who had health issues was staying with us in our ancestral house that was an additional responsibility on me. A couple of times I thought of remarriage but could not find an appropriate alliance and that further depressed me. I am feeling lonely and it appears as if I exist only to look after my two children and there is no thrill in this kind of single parenthood. I find that I am not very welcome in social gathering and the treatment I receive from friends and relatives is now different as I am a single parent. I don’t know how long I must continue this way. I am really fed up with my life. I am looking forward to association with a group of similar interest working on an exciting project which will keep me busy. I like socialization and looking for avenues to socialize with people from many different walks of life. If I continue the way I am right now I may succumb to an emotional breakdown.” (M14)

In the above responses the single mother’s response shows a high state of subjective wellbeing in terms of affect. The single father’s response is in direct contrast and he appears to be in the lowest emotional state thus low level of subjective wellbeing.

Eudaimonia

Positive response:
1. “Life as a single parent is not very enjoyable with a society like in Kuwait which believes mainly in group living. In the Western culture, as I have observed during my higher studies, individual priorities are above the group priorities but in Arab world it is the opposite. This makes the single parents singled out in the group. No doubt marriage is not considered to be a religious activity in Kuwait, but it is considered solemn and there are moral values attached to it. People like me who don’t stick to a marriage are not considered to be morally upright even though it is not expressed explicitly by anyone. So, to some extent one needs to have an independent thinking and courage to stand out from the rest and separate from the spouse when things don’t work out between them. In that context I have chosen to be one such person who considers his own happiness above the group happiness even though actually I didn’t mean to hurt anyone in any way by my separation. My problem was different from others as my wife was one of my distant relatives and a set of relatives from her side stopped liking me after separation. But I consider my success to be important and the failure in my personal life would have hindered my professional growth so I had no choice. I look for a very good future to me as I have a very clear career path and I am sure to meet my life goals. Since my childhood I have been a confident person and I have built my career with lots of effort and when I came to know that my personal life came in between I had to say good bye to it. As I don’t give much of an importance to what the society thinks about me but I am professionally competent and morally upright so I am sure I shall succeed no matter what resistance I may have to face from the society. “(M16)

2. “It is difficult to express how I feel about being a single parent because there are many complex issues associated with each other when you choose a life of solitude in comparison to that of togetherness with a companion. But my goal in life throughout has been happiness and happiness alone. I have neither gone in search of wealth nor power but my goal in life was to be a happy lady. Mine was a love marriage and initially there was a sort of opposition from my parents as they had not liked the background of my ex-husband. But as I was deeply in love with that person they had no choice than to listen to me. But I never expected that the marriage would last only for three and a half year and I ended as a single parent. I
had to listen to my parents’ yelling as they had warned me in the beginning itself. But I had to quiet them by saying that my happiness was my priority and at that time it was my choice and even at the time of divorce it is again my choice. As I had a pretty decent job in my hand I told them that if my presence in their home made them sad I would move out to an apartment and immediately they stopped arguing with me about the past and allowed me to continue my journey of pursuit of happiness. I am happy with my parents and my daughter and after coming home from my very rewarding job I take her out and I have many friends who come out for parties with me. I have never felt after being single parent my friends or relatives have abandoned me and in fact I found they give me more attention and see to it that they respect my views and do not offend me in any ways. Basically, I am known as a happy go lucky kind of a person. My friends and relatives treat me in a way that suits my personality. I go with gifts to my friends particularly during festivities and I too receive lots of gifts from them. Life is all about giving and taking and it need not necessarily be materialistic things. I am confident my life would continue this way and as I don’t take things seriously but enjoy facing challenges in life as a single parent is quite a thrill to me. I hope my daughter also will follow my foot-steps. “(F22)

Eudaimonia is basically about pleasant things of life and feeling happy about life. Both the above responses are representing *eudaimonia* a dimension of subjective wellbeing. There have been no negative responses found.

The second question was in elicitation of the suggestion of the single parents to improve their wellbeing. The suggestions received by the single parents have been grouped under various headings as follows:

**Policy measures:**

- Preference in employment.
- Low cost housing for single parents.
- Financial assistance for emergency purpose.
- Study loans for single parents and their children.
- Unemployment insurance for single parents.
- Provide a representative seat in government office.
- Social security measures.
- Reform social structures.
- Establish local welfare organizations.
- Welfare benefits to single parents.

**Education:**

- Children education insurance.
- Educational grants to single parents.
- Provide more educational opportunities.
- Building more play homes for children at subsidized rates.
- Building more schools.
- Subsidized transport for schooling.
- Childcare centres.

**Social networking:**

- Provide more forums for social networking.
- Information Technology training centres.
- Open forums to discuss problems of single parenting.
- Helpline for single parents.
- Career guidance/advancement programs for single parents.
- Specialized professional training.
- Community centres.
- Culture promotion centres.
- Empowerment programmes.

**Support for children**

- Children health insurance.
- Student counselling.
- Sports and games centres.
- Fitness and recreation centres.

**Medical Care**

- Counselling centres for single parents.
- Disease prevention and health promotion centres.
- Family nursing systems.
- Medical assistance and more dispensaries.
- Medical insurance schemes.

4.9. **Summary**

This chapter has presented the results of the quantitative and qualitative analyses. The questionnaire was subjected to ‘stability’ and ‘internal consistency’ tests and the results obtained indicated that the questionnaire was stable as the correlation of the test and retest was above 0.7 and the data collected using the questionnaire has the desired level of internal consistency as indicated by Alpha Cronbach (0.6 and above). Another measure of reliability i.e., Composite reliability was found to be 0.8 and above for the variables of study, which indicated the high level of reliability. The measurement was also subjected to validation tests. Face validity was tested in consultation with three experts in the field. Known group validity was tested through comparison with the attributes of the earlier researchers. Content validity was justified through the validity scores of the standard scales, which were used in research in the development of the questionnaire. Convergent and discriminant validity was confirmed through the square root of the ‘average variance accepted’ score, which was higher than the inter-item correlation of all the rest of the variables in the group. The descriptive statistics also included the overall perception analysis of the dimensions of wellbeing and inter-dimension comparison which revealed that the dimensions of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing were closely associated with each other as experienced by the single parents.

Having confirmed the reliability and validity of measurement, associations between background factors and wellbeing were investigated. The analyses showed that social wellbeing was gender sensitive with females reporting higher overall social wellbeing than males. Females also scored higher than males on the three social wellbeing dimensions of
Social coherence, Social actualization and Social acceptance. While females did not report higher overall subjective wellbeing they did score higher than males on the dimension – ‘affect’. None of the other background variables had a significant influence on either social or subjective wellbeing apart from the effect of qualifications on overall subjective wellbeing and on life evaluation on a dimension basis. However, the qualitative data suggested that single mothers were coping better than single fathers in most dimensions of both social and subjective wellbeing.

---000---
Chapter V
Research Findings and Conclusions

5.1. Overview
In this chapter, the research findings, implications, and conclusions of the research are presented. The findings reported are mainly through the empirical study which comprises quantitative analysis of survey data and it is corroborated with the earlier research studies. The implications drawn from the study leading to the suggestions for the policy makers in Kuwait Government for the betterment of the single parents in terms of their wellbeing have been presented in this chapter. The contributions made by this research and the conclusions of the study have been highlighted. The limitations of the study and scope for further research are also listed.

5.2. Research Findings and the Implications
The review of literature on variables connected to the wellbeing of single parents and the quantitative analysis of selected background variables in the form of descriptive and inferential statistics have resulted in several findings, which have led to the implications as discussed below.

1. The literature review revealed that wellbeing was a multi-dimensional construct that had interdisciplinary research approaches in its study, the dominant one being Social-psychology. Earlier research provided support to the point that single parents tend to experience a lower state of wellbeing in comparison to that experienced by two parents who share the parental and household responsibilities. There were studies which disassociated parental background with their wellbeing, but cultural influence was observed in some studies. The research on the influence of social determinants on stress and fatigue aspects of wellbeing was inconclusive. There were not many studies which had considered the components of wellbeing and performed the empirical analysis at the dimensional level of these components. Further, the empirical evidence for the relationship between the components of wellbeing in the context of single parents was not available. It was observed that the majority of single parents in Kuwait were employed and hence they formed the frame of analysis. In the context of Arab countries
in general, and Kuwait in particular, single parent wellbeing was considered to be a social issue by researchers and focused research in this field was recommended. More specifically, there was a research gap to be filled in terms of the role played by the background factors on the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait. There was a need to establish empirical evidence for the impact of social wellbeing on the subjective wellbeing of single parents. Even though these two research constructs were theoretically associated there was no empirical evidence to support the association. There was also a need to identify the possible measures to strengthen the social and subjective wellbeing of single parents. The identification of this research gap led to the development of a conceptual research model, which formed the basis for this study. So, the first finding of this research is the conceptual model which links the background factors of single parents to their wellbeing and then establishes the relationships between social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing at their dimensional level.

2. This research has identified the specific background factors which had a possible role to play in the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait. These background factors included: gender, age, marital status, qualification, income, and work-experience. It was found that the two dominant components of wellbeing were social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. At the dimensional level social wellbeing had five variables: social integration, social contribution, social coherence, social actualization, and social acceptance; and subjective wellbeing had three components: life evaluation, affect and eudaimonia. So, the research on single parent wellbeing in Kuwait was focused on these variables.

3. The research has developed and tested a metric of measuring single parent wellbeing which was the derivative of the indicators of earlier instruments used by a group of researchers in various contexts. The metric is in the form of a questionnaire with 56 indicators of measurement measuring the background factors, social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. Through Confirmatory Factor analysis these 56 items were reduced to 24 items and these items were found to be effective in measuring the eight dimensions of the two research constructs of interest to this research.

4. The findings through the descriptive statistics have provided general information about the data pertaining to the wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait. The demographics
study revealed that the majority of the respondents in the sample (N = 391) were female, belonging to the age group of 25 to 35 years, were unmarried single parents, with a graduate degree, with an average salary of less than 2000 KWD (Approximately 6600 USD) and had more than 10 years of work experience. The data had a left-side Skewness ensuring relatively higher level of agreement with the indicators of the study on the overall basis. The Skewness of data proved the normality condition, which was the requirement for the statistical analysis using the first generation statistical techniques but not the necessary condition for the second generation statistical technique.

5. The findings through the average statistics was that the single parents in Kuwait had a wellbeing score of above ‘average’ (Mean = 3.4; Std. Dev. = 0.7) in the 5-point Likert scale. It was revealed in the descriptive statistics that among the dimensions of social wellbeing, the dimension social contribution was found to be the top ranked dimension followed by social actualization and social coherence. Social integration had the least rank followed by social acceptance. Among the dimensions of subjective wellbeing, descriptive statics indicates that eudaimonia is highly ranked followed by affect. Life evaluation is the least ranked dimension of subjective wellbeing.

6. The reliability measures were found to be adequate in terms of all its sub-components. The stability aspect of reliability through test re-test criterion after three weeks yielded a correlation of 0.7 and 0.9 (significant at 1%) for the two respondents, thus confirming the stability criterion. Internal consistency aspect of reliability which was initially weak for 56 items was improved through factor reduction through confirmatory factor analysis and with 24 items the factor loadings were very high from 0.7 to 0.9 and apart from the dimension of social coherence, the Alpha Cronbach measure was 0.6 to 0.8, which was quite adequate in proving its internal consistency. Composite reliability further strengthened the reliability of the data with a value of 0.8 and above. Communality scores above 0.5 were indicative of adequate reliability. In the second generation statistical analysis such as Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), the true goodness of fit is ensured through R^2 and in this research 40 to 50 percent of dependence of endogenous variables on exogenous variables has been achieved which proves the high reliability of the data and fitness of the structural model. In the validity
measures, *face validity*, which is mainly judgmental, was tested through three subject experts who studied the relevance of indicators to the dimensions of study and accepted the ability of the scale to measure what it was intended to measure owning to its derivation through standard scales of measuring the dimensions of social and subjective wellbeing. In terms of *known group validity*, the group of questionnaires to which the questionnaire used in this research belonged to had inter-item correlation between the dimensions in the range of 0.6 to 0.8 and in this research also the range is 0.3 to 0.7. Considering that this research is the first attempt to establish the relationships between the dimensions of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing the known group validity may be considered adequate. Finally, to ensure the *convergent and discriminant validity* of the of the measures the *average variance extracted* have been determined for each of the dimensions and its square root value has been compared with the inter-item correlation values of the dimension with the rest of the dimensions and it was found that the value is larger than the compared values, thus the measurement was found to have the desired *convergent and discriminant validity*

7. Social wellbeing of single parents was found to be gender sensitive, which is indicative of the fact that men and women experience social wellbeing differently. Female single parents scored higher than male single parents on overall social wellbeing and three of the five dimensions of social wellbeing (social actualization, social coherence and social acceptance) as well as in the dimension of affect in subjective wellbeing. In other words, male single parents had lower levels of wellbeing on four of the eight wellbeing dimensions.

There are no research studies undertaken on single parents with specific reference to the dimensions of wellbeing in the context of Kuwait. The finding of this research in connection to the gender sensitivity of single parents in Kuwait with respect to social wellbeing with female single parents feeling better than male single parents is in alignment with the findings of several earlier researchers in several other countries (e.g., Buehler, 1988; Meisenberg & Woodley, 2015; Vaznoniene, 2016). But, the finding contrasts with the results of a group of researchers (e.g., Blanchflower & Oswald, 2002; Ross, 2011; Stevenson & Wolfers, 2009; Patulny (2014) who had recorded lower wellbeing of female single parents in comparison to that of male single
parents. There is also research by Buehler (1988) according to which there was no difference in the social wellbeing of male and female single parents. However, the earlier researchers have opined that the study results should be compared over a period of time as the results keep fluctuating over time (Meisenberg & Woodley, 2015). However, in the context of the single point of data collection used in this research it is evident that female single parents were performing better than men in terms of social wellbeing in Kuwait.

Other studies have found that among the divorced parents, women are happier than men (Fine et al., 1986). In a recent study across 80 countries it was concluded that women are in general happier than men (Meisenberg & Woodley, 2015). As discussed in the literature review, in Kuwait, gender sensitivity is ranked as first in the Global Gender Gap Report (GGGR, 2014) and women have been given the due importance in education, employment and social activities and this could explains why female single parents have relatively a higher wellbeing in comparison to men.

Gender difference in social wellbeing is also an important issue to be considered by the policy makers of the government in Kuwait in the field of work-life balance. Single mothers usually spend more time with their children and the comments of the single mothers in this study indicate the women valued this extra time highly, so policies on work-life balance should be viewed differently in comparison to that of single male parents. In Kuwait, not much of work has yet been undertaken on work-life balance in comparison to the western countries. Doble & Supriya (2010) have found that men give higher importance to their professional career, whereas, women consider both professional career as well as household responsibilities as equally important. This difference in the orientation towards work and life can result in two different states of wellbeing. In one study where work-life balance was studied on comparative terms in Kuwait and United Kingdom it was found that the employees significantly differed in their perceptions about work-life balance and while the major concern of the employees in the UK was health, their counterparts in Kuwait were more concerned about career progression (Marafi, 2013). It is indicative of the fact that professional growth is valued over the wellbeing of Kuwaiti working professionals in general. In another study conducted on Kuwait it has been found that women had higher work-life balance issues
compared to men and it was associated with the traditional caretaking responsibilities undertaken by the women (Hyder et al., 2016). Under these circumstances due to the variation in the household duties of the male and female single parents their social wellbeing could differ with each other.

On the overall basis there was no significant difference in the quantitative analysis of overall subjective wellbeing based on the gender of single parents. This finding is in alignment with the research finding by some earlier researchers, but not in conformation with others. Meisenberg & Woodley (2015) observed that in most of the earlier studies only a small difference was found between males and females in general in terms of subjective wellbeing, however in some countries women had exhibited slightly higher subjective wellbeing than men. The difference in subjective wellbeing was associated with social and cultural factors and also non-agricultural employment of women. In the context of US it was observed that subjective wellbeing of women declined marginally since the seventies, but in mid-eighties it was higher than men, but it decreased in nineties which is indicative of the fact that gender sensitivity of subjective wellbeing is a time variant phenomenon (Herbst, 2011; Ross, 2011) and in direct contrast to this in Britain the subjective wellbeing has remained insensitive to gender difference from seventies to nineties (Blanchflower & Oswald, 2002). It was interesting to note that in African and many developing countries with a total of 80 countries being studied, subjective wellbeing of women was higher than that of men (Lima, 2011). But most of these studies were conducted with subjective wellbeing as the research construct and not specifically at its dimensional level as studied in this research. In the context of Kuwait, the reason for no gender based difference in subjective wellbeing as perceived by the single parents could be that the work association of the single parents makes them perceive issues of life satisfaction and eudaimonia equally, nevertheless they do differ significantly on emotional terms.

8. Single parents had no difference in their social and subjective wellbeing with respect to their age. Researchers have made attempts to find the changes in wellbeing in life-cycle in terms of age and found that there were different results and some were even contradictory (Ulloa et al., 2013). As discussed in the literature review, wellbeing as such is a multi-dimensional construct which has a rational as well as emotional
component and many argue that both these components can vary with age as people rationalize thoughts with age and change their emotional reactions to situations (Stiglitz et al., 2009). The result obtained in this research concurs with that obtained by Lucas (2007), which was based on Set-point Theory indicating that the state of wellbeing does vary slightly with sudden changes, but remains stable over a period of time. However, the result obtained is in direct contrast to some of the researches in which it was found that consequence of major changes such as divorce does induce change in wellbeing (Winter et al., 1999), path of wellbeing can never remain stable but does fluctuate (Heady, 2008), and emotional reactions can vary with time and can have influence on wellbeing (Hupert et al., 2005).

9. While there are not many studies dealing with the association of marital status with wellbeing Shapiro & Keyes (2008) had found that social wellbeing varied significantly in terms of marital status. The result obtained in this research indicates that the perceptions of single parents on their social and subjective wellbeing did not differ significantly with respect to marital status.

10. In terms of qualifications the single parents did not differ significantly with each other in terms of social wellbeing but they differed significantly in terms of overall subjective wellbeing and on the life evaluation dimension of subjective wellbeing. The undergraduates and the postgraduates were at the highest level of subjective wellbeing in terms of their life evaluation and the single parents with qualifications other than Diploma, graduate, undergraduate, and PhD had least level of subjective wellbeing.

11. It was found that there was no variance of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing in terms of income and work experience of single parents on the overall basis as well as at the dimensional level.

12. Through the SEM analysis it was revealed that there was a significant association between social acceptance and affect, eudaimonia and life evaluation. This implies that if the single parents have a higher level of trust on the society and experience a sense of comfort in the company of the members of the society their feeling or emotion would be positive, develop a sense of flourishing in life, and have a sense of satisfaction in life in terms of their subjective wellbeing.
13. It was also found through the study that *social integration* was associated with the dimension - *affect* of subjective wellbeing. This implies that if the single parents consider themselves as an integral part of the society their feeling about their wellbeing will automatically improve.

14. *Social contribution* is significantly associated with all the three dimensions of *subjective wellbeing*, which implies that the belief of the single parents that they can be of some value to the society would make them feel that they are satisfied with their life. The qualitative data also supported this finding, with both male and female respondents commenting on the importance of their work and being successful at their job.

15. The study revealed a strong association between *social actualization* and all the dimensions of *subjective wellbeing*, which implies that the belief of the single parents on the growth potential of the society (Rollero & De Piccoli, 2010) can help in promoting how people think about their wellbeing which includes both emotional reaction and cognitive judgements (Diener et al., 2009).

16. The qualitative response from the participants in the survey when grouped into the dimensions of study provided two important inputs to this research. First, the qualitative response on individual dimension to some extent justified the observations through descriptive statistics. Second, the concerns expressed by the respondents helped in making policy recommendations to the government to enhance the level of wellbeing of the single parents.

### 5.3. Policy Recommendations to the Government

Structural Functionalism Theory (SFT) postulates that consensus, social order, structure, and function of the society are interconnected in many different ways (Macionis, 2005). The government of Kuwait has to base the policy recommendations on SFT to form a healthy society. Establishing a common consensus among the members of the society is one of the primary functions of any government. In this connection, the government has to initiate several policy improvement measures and in the context of social welfare ‘wellbeing’ forms a major issue. The measurement of wellbeing of single parents can have a strong bearing on the interventions made by policy makers in the government with respect to educational, healthcare, employment, and political issues related to single-parent families. Wellbeing measures of the public have been used for policy recommendations in
many different countries under the domains of externalities, social capital, unemployment, taxation, and moral issues (Diener et al., 2009, Dolan, 2008). Externalities are the consequences of an economic activity that is experienced by the unrelated part of the public. These may include the cost and benefits to the public through the public goods and services such as better roads, parks, day care centres etc. (Diener et al., 2009). Social capital is very much essential for the growth and prosperity of a nation and trust forms the basic requirement in building the social capital which has bearing on the social actualization, a key dimension of social wellbeing. In this context, when the wellbeing of all the sections of the public is ensured, social capital will surely be higher. Issues like job loss are logically linked to lower wellbeing (Stiglitz et al., 2010). Tax is the source of income to the government but the right structure of taxation should ideally be based on the affordability of the public and wrong taxation may adversely affect wellbeing of the public. Moral issues include controversial viewpoints on prostitution, homogamy, abortion, drugs, gambling etc., which vary from person to person and depends upon the value system of an individual. Wellbeing of the public has bearing on all these issues as an individual’s tolerance to these issues is on relative terms. When government makes policy decisions on all these issues, it is the wellbeing of the general public which will be the reference point, thus each of the dimensions of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing may have a policy implication. The following policy recommendations have been made specifically to the Ministry of Social Welfare, Kuwait so that the wellbeing of the single parents may be improved based on the empirical study undertaken in this research.

1. It was revealed through the study that social contribution was the highly ranked dimension of social wellbeing of the single parents in Kuwait. It was very well justified through the qualitative response of the participants in the form of a strong desire to involve themselves in social activities which would benefit the people. For instance, one single parent had responded:

"…..At times it is a bit painful, but I am slowly getting used to it and find our own ways of being happy through our outings and social activities with select group." (M94)

This is an advantage to the government as the single parents consider themselves to be resourceful and can contribute to the growth of the society in areas of their
interest and choice. Government may initiate programs that will involve the single parents in promoting sustainability projects which includes social, economic, cultural and economic sustainability issues. As the desire of the single parents to contribute to the growth of the society is very high they may involve very actively in these programs. Their contribution could be through conducting awareness programs for the public and taking part in policy formulation based on their qualifications, experience and background. Societal transformation for the better is often characterized by redefined citizenship behavior, civic loyalty of the citizens, knowledge of the citizens on cultural heritage, participation in value changes to suit to modern requirements, and active participation of ‘special interest groups’ in private and public initiatives and the positive perception of social contribution by single parents can be of immense value to the government and appropriate policy decisions may have to be made to encourage them to further their desire to be of value to the society.

2. The descriptive statistics has also indicted a higher ranking of social actualization by the single parents. Thus, it is imperative that they are capable of evaluating the capabilities of the society and have a clear assessment about the future possibilities the society can offer for their growth and prosperity. This is indicated even in the qualitative response of single parents. For instance, one single parent had responded:

“At least I am confident that by the time my children grow they will have umpteen opportunities to pursue their dream career.”(F389)

These characteristics of the single parents could be of immense help to the government in building safe, healthy, and cohesive communities which can anticipate future challenges and prepare for it in advance. The government may consider building a team to identify talent, particularly among the single parents who can volunteer for activities that would strengthen the cohesiveness of the community. One of the most effective ways to strengthen the deprived communities in the society is through cooperation and development and strengthening of voluntary sectors which can establish links and social network between the communities so as to enable the societal members to come forward to develop the
social network through activities such as sports and games, fitness programs, environmental protection programs, development of arts and youth clubs, science exhibitions, talent building programs which brings the societal members together in sharing responsibilities and working for a common purpose. The single parents who have a high degree of social actualization could be of immense help in the design and development of these programs. It is the responsibility of the government to provide platforms for these activities and have clear policies in promoting these types of activities.

3. Single parents have also indicated relatively better social coherence which means their ability to know about the society where they live is relatively good and believe in forming a cohesive society. In the qualitative study the single parents have expressed their social coherence in many different ways such as: being a contributing part of the society, growing as a part of the society, contributing to the society through the competencies, the desire to help the public etc. For instance, one single parent had responded:

“My international exposure has equipped me with a set of skills and competencies which enables me to be a contributing member of the society.” (F334)

Goal Content Theory (GCT) has provided a strong theoretical linkage of relatedness to the community and close relationships, personal growth, and contributing to one's community to wellbeing in comparison to material wealth (Niemiec et al. 2009). So, the government policies need to be refined from time to time to meet the requirements of the society and should have measures to promote the relatedness between all the different sections of the society. Single parents may be involved in those activities which promote social coherence as it is one of their stronger dimensions of social wellbeing. Further, no society is free from cultural and ethnic diversity, particularly after the globalization and liberalization of the economy. This could also to some extent be a threat to social coherence due to mixed culture and increased differences. One of the ways to take advantage of this situation rather than creating differences is to have social interface between the diversified ethnic groups and promote cultural mix. Involving single parents in the task force would be of immense use to the government as they are strong protagonists of social coherence.
4. In the social wellbeing of the single parents, *social integration* has been a dimension of concern on relative terms with other dimensions. Social integration mainly refers to the commonness of the person with the neighborhood, or in other words, how well a person can gel well, get along, or connect with each other being a part of the society. If social integrations cannot be achieved in a country, the opposite may be the result which is *social conflict*. Social Conflict Theory (SCT) claims that any society has class conflicts and social order is only through the domination of one group over another and that potential conflicts will always be present in a society (Bartos & Wehr, 2002). In the case of single parents relatively speaking in terms of other dimensions, single parents have lesser mean score in this dimension which is indicative that they have experienced lack of commonness with the neighborhood. This perception of the single parents is expressed in their qualitative response. For instance, one single parent had responded:

“I find our Kuwaiti society is yet to adapt to the changes in lifestyles and family structures. My observation is that single parenthood is not acceptable by the society.” (F283)

This indicates that they have experienced situations where they are not considered to be a part of the group by their acquaintances. This dimension needs to be strengthened by appropriate policy measures. According to Rational Choice Theory (Sugden, 1991), the attitude and behavior formation and the subsequent action an individual takes on an issue is governed by traditional action. For social integration to take place, the changes should be induced at the attitudinal and behavioral level of an individual. In fact, a Council may have to be created by the government to look into the roots of social integration and their linkage with traditional values of Kuwait and the following specific aspects may be considered during the setting up of the welfare policies:

- Dignity of individual belonging to special group such as single parents has to be protected and their opinions need to be considered in the formation of policies.
- Equality of rights across the cross section of the society must be enforced.
• Quality services must be made available at affordable price for all the citizens.
• Freedom of an individual to pursue the development as felt appropriate must be honored and all the policies such as recruitment policies need to be completely unbiased.
• Special attention may be given to the vulnerable members of the society.
• Stigmatization of a particular group may be curbed through the measures taken by the council.
• Advice on sustainable fiscal policies may be proposed by considering the needs of the members of all the different sections of the society so that they may be reap the benefits.
• Possibility of involving single parents as a member in special task forces such as reviewing welfare measures has to be considered.
• The council may organize social connect programs so that general forums are created for people to connect to each other on many different occasions and discuss common societal problems.

5. Social acceptance is ranked the second least among the dimensions of social wellbeing by the single parents and some responses in qualitative research has substantiated this point. For instance one single parent had responded:

“There are occasions in which I was made to feel as if I have committed a mistake by divorcing despite the fact that it took place on mutual consent.” (M130)

Social acceptance is the individual’s ability to accept the society as his/her own and be a part of it, say more or less through a common lifestyle. It is a sense of belongingness of an individual to the society where he/she dwells. Single parents have not been comfortable in terms of this dimension which is indicative that they do not accept them to be a part of the society and fail to imbibe in their personality the characteristics of the society. Even though the low score in social acceptance does not qualify the single parents to be marginalized fully, it is an indicator of separateness experienced by them from the society. This emphasizes the need to initiate policy imperatives by the government so that the single parents develop social acceptance in par with their counterparts in the society. Human beings by
their very fundamental nature are driven by the desire to be motivated to form and maintain healthy social relationships with society and develop a sense of belongingness to it (Baumeister, 2005). Social acceptance is central to this desire and there are many activities performed by an individual which are aligned to this goal (DeWall et al., 2008). According to DeWall et al., (2008) wellbeing of human wellbeing – both physical and psychological, is a function of positive and lasting relationships with others which define the social acceptance. In fact, earlier research has provided support to the point that if social acceptance is not promoted it may lead to dejection and may end up in creating a group of people who may turn against to the society (Warburton et al., 2006). Social acceptance requires that the members of the society should develop abilities to accept differences and promote diversity in the community. It requires a wave of change and involves a lot of attitudinal issues involved with it. Governmental interventions in the form of well-designed Social networks are necessary to promote the social acceptance dimension of wellbeing of the single parents. According to Wasserman & Faust (1994), social network consists of a finite number of people who define relations between them. A member can be linked to any number of social networks as he/she wishes. The relationships need not necessarily be restricted to either traditional in terms of kith and kin, it need not have a territorial boundary, be limited to work associates, or even be restricted to specific recreational activities. The members of a network are free to define the relationship and promote the set of activities which are of mutual interest and benefit.

Building of social networks can be an effective way of strengthening social acceptance. It can benefit the society in general and single parents in particular in providing emotional support. Social acceptance has attitudinal component as mentioned before and emotional support will improve it. In the social networks when the single parents interact with the members of the society they will develop trust and it strengthens their feeling of belongingness of the society. While conventional families with two parents have their partner to share their feelings single parents will be left alone most of the time and social network can be of
immense help as they would develop a feeling that there are people who can listen to them and give opinions on issues which may bother them at home or at work.

Social networks can satisfy the informational needs of the single parents. Informational needs may include health, fitness, education, entertainment, financial planning, lifestyle, tourism, travel, religious activities, welfare, hobbies etc. Social network may enable the single parents to meet people who share common hobbies. Spending their free time on activities that are beneficial to them as well as their children would boost their self-esteem and enhance social acceptance.

Social networking can also have many health benefits as found by several researchers because they can act as anti-stressors and develop confidence among the members (e.g., Zilberberg, 2011). Through social networking people have combated several health issues such as obesity by finding various activities which are beneficial in reducing it (Christakis & Fowler, 2007). These benefits derived by the members of the social network may enhance their belongingness to the society and thus promote social acceptance.

Social network can promote community engagement which comprise knowing about the community’s culture, institutions run by the community, the capabilities and interests of the community, the assets of the community, community traditional healers, health needs of the community and also its challenges.

One more important benefit of social networking is that it can provide a forum for group discussions. All the social issues can be openly discussed on these social forums and individuals can air their opinion and many hard pressing issues can be resolved and if necessary identity of an individual can be protected so that there is no need for hesitation in expressing a problem in the public. Many a times social acceptance may be low because people might not have had an opportunity to express themselves and seek remedy for a social issue that is bothering them and social networking can fill this gap. Social networking will strengthen the sense of belonging of a person to a group or even several groups and it is an effective means to enhance social acceptance and successfully tried in several developed countries. Nevertheless, social networking is not popularized in Kuwait yet, and clear-cut
policies on this supported well with the IT infrastructure would be beneficial in enhancing social acceptance.

6. **Eudaimonia** is the most satisfied dimension of subjective wellbeing of single parents in Kuwait which implies that the single parents are satisfied in terms of the progress they have done in life. This was also observed in the qualitative response of the single parents. For instance, one single parent had responded:

“I look for a very good future to me as I have a very clear career path and I am sure to meet my life goals.”(M16)

Thus, from the basic definition of eudaimonia it is evident that single parents are good at developing themselves in accordance to their accepted principles in life. This can be a strategic asset to the country and they can be involved in training the young minds to pursue their dreams in life. While Self Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2015) identifies competence as a contributing factor for motivation. Cognitive Evaluation Theory (Deci and Ryan, 2008) claims that competence is developed through successful encounters and positive feelings about the activities performed during the accomplishment. So, there is a need for the government to create avenues, for the people in general and single parents in particular, to enhance their competence which is the effective way of promoting eudaimonia. This is because according to Ryan et al., (2008) eudaimonia is not just a state of wellbeing but also a way of thinking and acting conscientiously based on their encounters in life. In this point of view, single parents can also guide people in growing to their full potential. Eudaimonic people are found to benefit the community, environment and the whole society (Ryan et al., 2008), which means that single parents have their worth in the society.

Eudaimonia is multi-dimensional and eudaimonic people exhibit a wide range of characteristics which are beneficial to the society in many different ways. First of all eudaimonic people are considered to be happy-productive workers and contribute to the growth of the organization and the society (Daniel& Turban, 2016; Wright & Cropanzano, 2007). With very high rating on eudaimonia, single parents can be involved in the development programs to the public which deal with enhancing the involvement of people in doing things of importance, in discovering one’s true self,
working towards one’s goals, centering lives on core beliefs, doing the job for the love of doing it without trying merely to impress others, knowing one’s true potential, knowing what is good for one’s own self, finding purpose for life, working without any expectations just for the pleasure derived out of it, seeking purpose of life, finding meaning in working on important tasks which benefit self as well as the society, knowing one’s talent and putting it to its best use, finding a sense of fulfilment in doing something worthwhile, and ultimately seeking the meaning for existence.

Affect is the second highest rated dimension of subjective wellbeing of single parents. It is the feeling in the minds of the people about their wellbeing. Qualitative response was not fully in agreement with the quantitative finding as some of the responses were indicating a low level of emotional state. However, as majority of the single parents are high on the affect component of subjective wellbeing the state can been associated with better health, higher longevity, healthier habits, and positive living (De Neve et al., 2013). Research has also supported the point that people with high subjective wellbeing due to positive affect demonstrate better economic behavior in terms of saving, decision making and long term financial planning (Guven, 2012). Researchers have also found that those with high affect component of subjective wellbeing are likely to make better investment decisions in investments such as pay a lower premium currently to draw larger benefits in the future (Aspinwall, 1998). There is research evidence to the point that higher level of subjective wellbeing through a positive affect has three direct benefits: people live longer and healthier, will have better income through higher productivity in workplace and exhibit better organizational behavior, and have better social behavior (De Neve et al., 2013). A group of researchers have identified that higher subjective wellbeing through positive affect can lead to increased productivity (Oswald et al., 2012), better financial performance (Peterson et al., 2011), reduced absenteeism (Ashby et al., 2002), higher creativity (Jovanovic & Brdaric, 2012), better cooperation and collaboration (Judge et al., 2010), better income (De Neve & Oswald, 2012), and higher level of social networking (Aknin et al., 2013). All these aspects are linked to the tangible social benefits in the sense that they develop a
group of happy people who pursue their dreams and work on their capacity-building to meet the future challenges of the society and it can contribute to the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on the long run. Any government would be willing to have wellbeing of the citizens at the heart of the policy recommendations and generate conditions for the society that would enable the flourishing of everyone. The general rule for policy formation and evaluation in most of the governments is to base it on the GDP, but as GDP in turn is dependent on the wellbeing of the public it is time to set a center stage to base the policy design based on wellbeing. Promoting socialization and providing community centers and involving the single parents in voluntary activities would benefit the society as they have demonstrated positive affect. Earlier research has proved that absence of opportunities for social interaction would have a negative influence on wellbeing as it may induce loneliness in the people (Cacioppo et al., 2003). Research has also shown that volunteer work promotes social interaction (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010) and government must involve the single parents in constructive projects such as community housing, fitness programs, health and environmental awareness programs. There must be an opportunity for the general public to interact with single parents and imbibe in them the positive affect which the single parents have demonstrated.

7. Life evaluation is the least ranked dimension of subjective wellbeing, but that does not mean that the wellbeing as measured through this dimension is low as the mean score is 3.5 on a scale of 5. The qualitative response on life evaluation substantiates this revelation. For instance, one single parent had responded:

“So, I am at my own and to be frank I have a very comfortable and happy life with my daughter who keeps me busy all the time.” (F138)

It is important to note here that eudaimonia and affect are more of positive state of mind and it is concerned with the willingness of the person to stay motivated towards the dreams one has, whereas life satisfaction is concerned with what extent the individual has been actually successful in achieving those goals. It is based on the external circumstances in which the individual is operating. There is always a possibility that despite the sincere efforts exerted by an individual the results may
still be adverse due to the external conditions which are beyond the control of the individual. This demands intervention from the public and government in the form of social support in the realization of the dreams of the single parents.

Interventions by the government to enhance life satisfaction of single parents are anticipated owing to the poor rating of this dimension. According to Bradly & Corwyn (2004) life satisfaction is also a measure of the extent to which the basic needs are met and the individual feels to what extent his goals are attained. Thus, it is a very important component of wellbeing. It is the responsibility of the society to make sure that no section of the society is left behind in terms of life satisfaction. Those with high level of life satisfaction can continuously keep contributing to the growth and development of the society (Prasoon & Chaturvedi, 2016).

The government may form committees to study the problems encountered by single parents and specific areas may be looked into such as training programs, development plans, career advancement schemes, entrepreneurship promotion schemes, provision for participation in policy decisions, health benefit schemes, higher education schemes, etc. These committees have to study the practical realities through structured approaches and make recommendations to enhance the life satisfaction of single parents. Organismic Integration Theory (OIR) (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010) postulates that extrinsic motivation decreases the feeling of wellbeing. So, interventions may be made to promote intrinsic motivation to the single parents so that they find pleasure in accomplishing a task than doing it for the sake of an extrinsic reward so that on the long run they enhance their life satisfaction.

Finally, in the enhancement of life satisfaction of the single parents, the governmental policies should be aligned to the Self-determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), which mainly highlights the importance to be given to autonomy, competence and relatedness. Autonomy is the freedom available for a person to choose a life of his/her choice. This has two implications for policy implementation by the government: first, creating more number of opportunities in terms of employment, higher education, entrepreneurship, training and development, healthcare, etc.; second, providing more flexibility in statutory issues in terms of
taxation, ownership, business deals etc. To strengthen the competence of the single parents, again more flexible policies are required for training and development, higher education, and more professional courses including sponsorship to go abroad for higher studies. Related needs demands policies which encourage socialization of the public and ensure positive and synergistic relationships. Policies in urban planning should consider physical characteristics of living spaces with provision for community centers, discussion forums, public libraries, auditoriums, stadiums, playgrounds, town halls etc., which will encourage people to be associated with each other on topics of mutual interest. Community housing has been very successfully implemented in many different countries. In Kuwait more than 100,000 housing applications are kept pending with a minimum wait of over 10 years (Public Authority for Housing Welfare, 2017), which implies that policy refinement is required in general to satisfy the needs of the general public and particular sections of community such as single parents may be considered during the policy refinement. Simplification of the housing rules and regulation with more flexibility to different sections of the society would be beneficial in enhancing the life satisfaction of single parents to a great deal.

8. It was interesting to note that with respect to statistical significance the social wellbeing of single parents was gender sensitive with female parents scoring higher on overall social wellbeing and three of its dimensions. For instance, one of the single parent had expressed it directly in response to the qualitative question: “I have found that society has a gender bias about single parents……” (M130)

So, the policy implications should focus of equality of social wellbeing to both the genders. In Kuwait since the past few decades there have been policies to empower women in all walks of life and thus their wellbeing has improved in general. Substantial support in this direction has been given to women in terms of childcare, healthcare, housing, employment, social welfare, higher studies, (Al-Kazi, 2008; Baqader, 1979; Barakat, 1985; Zayed, 1998). So, the policy makers may focus more towards the gender equality in Kuwait in terms of welfare, employment and progress in life so that the gap in social wellbeing between the male and female single parents can be minimized.
Implications to the government based on gender difference in social wellbeing can also be in terms of work-life balance and in this context three important issues that may be considered more seriously are: introducing flexitime, increasing the provision of more part time, and introducing more childcare facilities. Flexitime has been very successfully introduced in many countries particularly post IT revolution as the employees can also work from home and only when physical presence is required they may attend to the office. Part time facilities will enable the employees to balance work-life much better as it will enable them to work only during their convenient time. Increased number of childcare facilities will make life much easier for both male and female single parents. Nurturing the children in childcare centres under professional supervision will be much better for the children compared to the nannies taking care of them at home. The parents can be more tension free if the child is at childcare and can focus better on their job and it also provides space for their socialization and hence improve social wellbeing.

While social wellbeing is in relation to the society, subjective wellbeing is more of an internal reflection of single parents as a result of the social influences on them. Affect as a dimension of subjective wellbeing is the ‘feeling’ component of wellbeing. Men and women differ significantly in terms of their feelings towards various aspects of life. There is a lot of debate in progress around the academic world on the gender difference in subjective wellbeing and according to ‘paradox of declining female happiness’ (Stevenson & Wolfers, 2008) men seem to be better than women on the affect component of wellbeing, which is contradicted in this research with respect to Kuwaiti single parents. It was revealed in this research that female single parents had significantly higher level of subjective wellbeing in terms of the dimension – affect. It is important to note that while the former finding was in the western context the context of this research is Kuwait. The reasons for the gender gap in affect component of subjective wellbeing could be many. According to Senik (2015) based on the survey using the databases of European Social Survey (ESS), World Values Survey (WVS), Gender and Generation Panel Survey (GGP), British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) and the German Socio-Economic Survey (GSOES) reason out that women have more diversified set of preferences than men,
they invest time on large set of activities, women have low expectations compared to men, main focus of women is not on paid work, women can be more depressed than men, less extravert than men, women have higher job satisfaction compared to men, and women can undertake multi-tasking better than men. While there is no detailed survey of this nature in the context of Kuwait, as already discussed before, particularly since the past decade there is a lot of importance given to female empowerment and hence that could have provided a lot of moral support for strengthening their emotional strength. All these differences have the potential to make the affect component of subjective wellbeing vary between men and women.

9. The results had indicated that there was no variation in wellbeing in terms of age, which implies that single parents may not need special attention by the government based on the age. In other words, policy makers in the government can have a general welfare measure to the single parents which need not differentiate them in terms of their age. Single parents of all age groups may be uniformly treated in terms policy recommendations.

10. In terms of marital status the unmarried and divorced categories of single parents can have a common policy recommendation. In fact the single parents have expressed that the networking has helped them to a great deal. For instance, a single parent responded to the qualitative question this way:

“I have a big group of friends who are associated with me all the time and actually I have not felt that I am a single parent when I have mingled with my group. We go out on picnics regularly and discuss our mutual problems and also share quite a good number of social responsibilities. That makes my life interesting and meaningful to me.”(F311)

11. Single parents had significant variance in their subjective wellbeing in terms of qualification. This demands a special attention on the part of policy makers in government to promote education across the cross section of the society. Special provision for single parents to enhance their qualifications through distance mode of education would also be an option, as they can pursue their studies while continuing in their professional career.
12. It was observed in this research that *social acceptance* was significantly associated with *affect, eudaimonia* and *life evaluation*. The implication of this finding is that if the single parents develop trust on their society and recognize as a part of it their emotional state of being will be positive (affect), the single parents would enhance their perceptions about flourishing in life (eudaimonia), and feel satisfied with their life (life evaluation). Drawing from this finding the policy makers in the government may conduct programmes that would build trust of the single parents on their society and make them identify themselves as a part of it. Social acceptance is basically an indication that others in the society have given indications that they wish to include a person in their group (Leary, 2010), which indicates that the policy makers in the government should create an environment where people positively associate with each other through various means. Maner et al., (2007) have recommended promotion of prosocial behaviour among the people to promote social acceptance. The social acceptance can be improved by organizing the social work services, providing training for social workers, workforce planning and deployment in social work, develop specific areas of social service which may include – educational services, community centres, mental health service, educational services, public health centres, welfare centres, family health centres, child-welfare centres, home for the aged, capacity building centres, encouraging government private partnership etc. In fact, single parents have expressed that social service has made them

“I hold some key responsibilities in the society and that keeps me busy all the time. At times I find very little time to deal with my daily routines but by keeping me busy all the time I achieve certain goals and never feel lonely as a single parent”.

*(M337)*

The development of these service centres of various forms would make the citizens of the country develop trust with the government and make them identify themselves as a part of the society with higher level of *social acceptance*, thus strengthening all the three dimensions of subjective wellbeing of single parents.

13. *Social integration* was found to be associated with the dimension - *affect* of subjective wellbeing. In fact there is a subtle difference between social acceptance
and social integration. While the former refers to the identification of the commonalities of the individual to the society (Minnebo, 2005) the latter refers to the relationship established with the society due to the commonness the individual has with the society (Huschka, 2008). Rollero & De Piccoli (2010) through their study found that neighborhood attachment and attachment to place improved social integration to a great deal as people would be helpful to each other particularly at the time of crisis. This point was mentioned in the qualitative response by one of the respondent in this way:

“I can remember situation when my son was ill and I could never expect that my relatives would be of such an immense support to me from bringing home the doctor to staying in shifts in the hospital till the day of my son’s discharge from the hospital. I was under the impression that after separation from my husband I will have to face the situation single handed but my relatives and to that extent even some of my neighbors proved to be of immense help to me. This incident made me stay connected to my society forever.” (F85)

For social integration to take place the policy makers in the government should create platforms where the citizens of the country from all the cross section of the society including the single parents, who are the focus of this study, to assemble on various cultural and social events so that they become the integral part of the society. The policy makers should design mechanisms to improve the social contacts, social participation, and take appropriate measures to build a positive social attitude of the citizens.

14. As social contribution was found to be significantly associated with all the three dimensions of subjective wellbeing the policy makers should focus on activities that would strengthen the opportunity for social contribution of single parents through organizing programmes on society and culture, environmental protection, traffic safety, education, international exchange programmes, healthcare and fitness programmes, sports promotion programmes, volunteer service etc., which would involve the single parent and enhance their social contribution by making them feel that their services are valued by the society. Many researchers have opined that place attachment can be a major contributor to the increase in social contribution, as
it gives a sense of belonging and involves an interplay of emotions and promotes freedom that will make people to take initiative to contribute to the social causes and develop a sense of adding value to the community (Chow & Healey, 2008; Fried, 2000; Rollero & De Piccoli, 2010). Place attachment will also be due to the local customs, festivities and tradition. It was expressed very well by a single parent through the response to qualitative research this way.

“One of the most pleasurable events in my life has been the festivals in my country. The feast of Ramadan’s breaking fast (Eïd-Ul-Fitr) was as exciting post-divorce as it was before. I was a bit apprehensive that after my divorce from my husband I would be left alone with my daughter. But there were no difference observed either in the receiving of the presents by my daughter, or wishing and greetings of the family, or the get together on a hearty meal. The celebrations of Birthday of the Prophet (Al Mawlid Annabaoui), The Muslim New Year (Hegira’s commemoration) were also as enjoyable after my divorce to the same extent as before.” (F92)

So, the policy makers in Kuwait may consider activities such as enabling the single parents to be in their hometown rather than migrating to newer places. One way would be to promote housing schemes to reach all the classes of the society which would improve their social contribution, and hence enhance the subjective wellbeing.

15. As social actualization was strongly associated with all the dimensions of subjective wellbeing the implications to the policy makers of the Kuwaiti government is that initiatives must be taken to convince the single parents about the future the country can offer to its citizens in terms of employment, comforts, housing, education, career prospects, health benefits, clean living environment etc. The future benefit plans of the government for the public must be exhibited in the electronic and print media so that the citizens are aware of them. A sense of feeling that the single parents are living in an environment which is supportive and concerned about the growth of the individuals from all the sections of the society has to be generated by the government through policy initiatives. Single parents have dreams to be fulfilled for not only for themselves but for their children and hence they need to be
convinced about the future opportunities in the country to have a better subjective wellbeing. In fact it, was expressed by a single parent this way.

“At least I am confident that by the time my children grow they will have umpteen opportunities to pursue their dream career. Schooling has improved a lot from past to the present and with the job in hand I must be able to make my children join their dream professional course. I enjoy my job as well as my duty towards my children and single parenting as I said before is a double responsibility in comparison to two parents but it is quite interesting and has its own advantages such as one can decide everything without taking the opinion of the spouse.”(F389)

Psychological Needs Theory (PNT) (Ryan & Deci, 2000) purports that tasks that enable the fulfilment of autonomy, relatedness and competence can be intrinsically motivating and the government can introduce interventions which meet these needs of the single parents as well as the entire community so that the society may grow as a whole.

5.4. Limitations of the Study

Like any other research this research has its set of limitations. The research relies primarily on quantitative data and its analysis. The quantitative analysis is mainly through statistical procedures and all the limitations of statistical methods are applicable to this research. Some of the limitations of statistical techniques are that the tests are only useful aids for decision-making and they need to be substantiated through observations. Proper interpretation of statistical evidence is important for intelligent decisions. So, the interpretations made in this research need not necessarily be the best possible ones, however as they are substantiated through the work undertaken by earlier researchers this limitation is compensated to a certain extent.

It is also important to note that the statistical tests cannot explain the reasons as to why do the statistical differences exist, say between the means of the two samples. Results of significance tests are based on probabilities and as such cannot be expressed with full certainty. Statistical inferences based on the significance tests cannot be said to be entirely correct evidences concerning the truth of the association. As the second generation statistical tool is used in this research the sample size of just 200 may be adequate and in
this research a sample size is much larger, the analysis may be considered to be reliable, but still complete generalization may not be possible. The questionnaire used in this research has been derived through earlier research but the context of those researchers may not be single parent wellbeing in particular. The stability of the questionnaire is tested using two single parents randomly chosen, this could also be a limitation, and if necessary many more respondents may be considered to check stability of questionnaire. So, there could be a chance for error in the measurement of the data however small or negligible it is.

The mathematical foundation of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) lies on Partial Least Square Method (PLSM) which is a variance based approximation method, which limits the accuracy of the model. Assumption of linearity is also a limitation of SEM. Requirement of a minimum of 10 subjects per estimated parameter is also a limitation of SEM. Finally, none of the reliability measures are 100% accurate in predicting the actual values and the repeatability of the results and the consistency are always questionable. Despite these limitations, in the context of this research SEM has yielded results useful in addressing the research questions.

The limitations mentioned above also offer immense scope for refining this research and carrying it forward. First of all, this research has studied the wellbeing only in terms of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. Wellbeing as such is a term whose definition is dynamic and it will remain so. The research literature shows that wellbeing has been considered to be an even more important indicator than the economic indicators in terms of its significance to the progress of a country, as ‘wealth and wellness’ need not necessarily be associated factors. Defining ‘wellbeing’ as a research construct has also been quite problematic. Wellbeing has been considered by the researchers to be synonymous with life satisfaction, quality of life, emotional state, happiness etc. The wellbeing perceived in the past may not be the wellbeing today, and the perception today may not be true for tomorrow. This is because the expectations and perceptions of ‘quality of life’ changes from time to time, not only based on the facilities, comforts, and the luxuries people enjoy, but also based on their financial, physical, mental, social and spiritual needs which may vary with ‘time’ and ‘place’. The expectations of the same person about the quality of life in two different places and at two different stages of his/her life could be different. At
present, researchers have considered wellbeing to consist of a person’s physical, emotional, social, economic, cultural, and spiritual dimensions. Future researchers may further explore these components of wellbeing and study the status of wellbeing across the cross section of their societies to have a better understanding of the state of wellbeing of people. The background factors are also selected based on their relative importance. The major themes that have emerged in this research in terms of wellbeing of single parents are: state of being comfortable, healthy and happy; a person’s relationship with society; the commonalities a person finds with the society; a person’s perception about his/her usefulness to the society; desire to establish connectedness to the world; one’s ability to estimate the capabilities of the society; ability to foresee one’s flourishing; feeling happy and content; and the degree of satisfaction with the life the person has led.

Future researchers may explore wellbeing further and identify other research themes and research constructs that would define wellbeing in the context of different ‘time’ and ‘place’ with reference to a particular section of a society or even a country. There are also dimensional limitations with respect to each of the constructs used in this research. There is scope for including some more background factors which were extraneous to this study. This research has been carried out in Kuwait and the outcomes could be generalized to be applicable to other Arab countries, and future researchers may extend this study into other Arab nations.

5.5. Conclusions
A single parent carries the household duties single handed, which otherwise would be managed by the two parents when he/she may have to live either alone or with children. Even when the single parent is supported by other members of close family, the attention by them to the household activities may not be the way the two parents would generally provide. While on one side the responsibility increases, on the other side the single parent will fall into a section of the society which is a minority group. Earlier research has shown that studies have explored the financial status of single parents; emotional states of single parents; differential treatment by the members of the society; attitude of societal members towards single parents; economic, demographic, cultural and religious aspects related to single parenthood; influence of education on single parenthood etc. Most of these studies
have been in the Western context and not many of them have been in Middle Eastern countries. This research on single parents has been in the context of Kuwait with specific focus on the association of the background factors on the wellbeing of single parents and the association between the social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing of the single parents.

As the number of single parents in Kuwait is in increasing order this study happens to be timely. Through the literature review it was concluded that it was pertinent to undertake a study for empirically investigating the association of background factors of single parents on their wellbeing, and also investigate the association between their social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing. The literature review has identified the dimensions of each of these two research constructs and enabled the development of a metric in the form of Likert 5-point scale. The sample size of 391 based on stratified random sampling has been used for the quantitative analysis in this research, the strata being male and female single parents.

Through this research it could be concluded that the questionnaire used for this research had the required level of validity and the data had adequate reliability as per the standard procedures. Even though normality was not a necessary condition for Structural Equation Modelling, the data had fallen into the category of normality which was essential for some of the first generation statistical techniques. There was a limited number of studies on gender sensitivity of single parents with respect to their wellbeing, and the results in these studies had not provided conclusive evidence about whether wellbeing varied with gender. The statistical analysis undertaken in this study revealed that the social wellbeing of single parents was gender sensitive in except for the two dimensions of social integration and social contribution. Gender sensitivity was only exhibited in subjective wellbeing in the dimension affect. Age had no significant association with social wellbeing or subjective wellbeing. In terms of the marital status the single parents did not differ significantly in either their social or subjective wellbeing. In terms of the qualifications of the single parents they did not differ with each other on social wellbeing; but they did differ in the dimension - life evaluation of subjective wellbeing. Income and work experience did not cause any variance in social wellbeing or subjective wellbeing. When the associations were tested between the dimensions of social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing it was revealed that social acceptance, social contribution and social actualization had a significant
association with all the dimensions of subjective wellbeing. Social integration had an association with affect dimension of subjective wellbeing. Social coherence had no significant influence on any of the dimensions of subjective wellbeing. These revelations have led to the development of the policy implications to the government of Kuwait with particular reference to the Ministry of Social Welfare so that the interests of the single parents is protected by strengthening those specific dimensions of social wellbeing which had bearing on subjective wellbeing.

This research makes a significant contribution to the body of knowledge on the social issue of ‘single parent wellbeing’ in the context of Kuwait. The research has contributed a tested and validated metric for the measurement of both social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing in terms of their dimensions. While many earlier research had considered the these two research constructs to be unidimensional and used a generic metric for measurement of wellbeing, this research has explored the multi-dimensionality of these two research constructs and also identified the standard scales which were developed by earlier researchers on each of these dimensions to develop a comprehensive scale for measurement of the two associated components of wellbeing. The research has also identified the background factors which could possibly have association with the social wellbeing and subjective wellbeing of single parents. This research has conceptualized a model which would associate the background factors of the single parents to the social and subjective wellbeing with due consideration to the dimensions of the two research constructs. The research has empirically studied this model and provided quantitative evidence for the association between some variables of study. Based on these associations, implications have been drawn and policy recommendations have been made to the Ministry of Welfare, Kuwait. Thus, the outcome of this research would be useful for the policy makers in Kuwait in improving the wellbeing of single parents whose number is growing in the country since the past decade.

To conclude, the wellbeing of single parents is a social issue. Single parents discharge single handed responsibility on their child or children, which otherwise would have been the responsibility of two of the parents. This could result in the possibility of difference in state of wellbeing of single parents and intact parents. An ideal society should provide
means to establish equal wellbeing to all the people across the section of the society through well designed policy interventions and this research is a step in that direction.

--- 000 ---
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## QUESTIONNAIRE OF WELLBEING OF SINGLE PARENTS IN KUWAIT

### Confidentiality Statement

The data collected through the questionnaire shall be used purely for academic research purpose. The questionnaire is anonymous. No mention of the respondent or the organization to which he/she belongs shall be used anywhere.

**Are you a single parent (divorcee, widow/widower or an unmarried mother/father)?**

No – thank you for your interest but this questionnaire is only for single parents. Please do not complete it.

Yes – thank you for your interest, you are eligible to complete the questionnaire.

Once you have completed it, please return to the sealed container in your workplace.

### Socio-economic Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;25 years</td>
<td>25-35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>UG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (per month)</td>
<td>&lt;0 KWD</td>
<td>0-2000 KWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>2-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place a Tick mark (√) on ONE response for each item with reference to your life experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1–Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Social Wellbeing

#### 1. Social Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCI1</td>
<td>If I wanted to go on a trip for a day I have hard time finding someone to go with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI2</td>
<td>I feel that there is no one to share my most private worries and fears with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI3</td>
<td>If I were sick, I could easily find someone to help me with my daily chores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI4</td>
<td>I don't often get invited to do things with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI5</td>
<td>There is someone I can turn to for advice about handling problems with my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI6</td>
<td>If I decide one afternoon that I would like to go to a movie that evening, I could easily find someone to go with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI7</td>
<td>When I need suggestions on how to deal with a personal problem, I know someone I can turn to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI8</td>
<td>If I had to go out of town for a few weeks, it would be difficult to find someone who would look after my house or apartment (the plants, pets, garden, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Social Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCN1</td>
<td>I lead a purposeful and meaningful life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN2</td>
<td>My social relationships are supportive and rewarding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN3</td>
<td>I am engaged and interested in my daily activities I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN4</td>
<td>I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN5</td>
<td>I am a good person and live a good life I am optimistic about my future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN6</td>
<td>People respect me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Social Coherence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH1</td>
<td>In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH2</td>
<td>I am not interested in activities that will expand my</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
horizons.

SCH3  My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing.

SCH4  When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years.

SCH5  I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.

SCH6  I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.

SCH7  People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.

SCH8  I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.

SCH9  I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.

4. Social Actualization

SAC1  I do not fit very well with the people and the community around me.

SAC2  My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me.

SAC3  The demands of everyday life often get me down.

SAC4  I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.

SAC5  I don’t have a good sense of what it is I'm trying to accomplish in life.

SAC6  I like most aspects of my personality.

SAC7  I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities.

SAC8  I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.

5. Social Acceptance

SOA1  Most people see me as loving and affectionate.

SOA2  Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.

SOA3  I tend to worry about what other people think of me.

SOA4  I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns.

SOA5  I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.

SOA6  For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.

### B. Subjective Wellbeing

#### 1. Life Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LFE1</th>
<th>I am satisfied with my life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFE 2</td>
<td>So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE 3</td>
<td>In most ways my life is close to my ideal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE 4</td>
<td>The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE 5</td>
<td>If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFF1</th>
<th>I am depressed or very unhappy in life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFF2</td>
<td>I feel lonely or remote from other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF3</td>
<td>I am pleased about having accomplished something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF4</td>
<td>I often feel on top of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF5</td>
<td>I am pleased that things go my way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF6</td>
<td>I feel proud because someone complimented me on something I had done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF7</td>
<td>I feel upset because someone criticized me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Eudaimonia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EUD1</th>
<th>I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people (autonomy).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUD2</td>
<td>When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD3</td>
<td>I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD4</td>
<td>I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD5</td>
<td>In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD6</td>
<td>I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. My views about my wellbeing as a single parent. (This will help us understand how you feel about being a single parent e.g. comfortable, treated without any bias from others etc.)

2. My suggestions to improve the wellbeing of the single parents?

If answering this questionnaire has caused you any discomfort or stress and you would like professional support, please contact the support agencies mentioned in the information statement.
### Appendix 3: Mapping the items of the questionnaire items to the standard scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item in questionnaire</th>
<th>Scales used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCI1</td>
<td>If I wanted to go on a trip for a day I have hard time finding someone to go with me.</td>
<td>1. If I wanted to go on a trip for a day (for example, to the country or mountains), I would have a hard time finding someone to go with me. (SCI1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI2</td>
<td>I feel that there is no one to share my most private worries and fears with.</td>
<td>2. I feel that there is no one I can share my most private worries and fears with. 1. definitely false (SCI2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI3</td>
<td>If I were sick, I could easily find someone to help me with my daily chores.</td>
<td>3. If I were sick, I could easily find someone to help me with my daily chores. (SCI3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI4</td>
<td>I don't often get invited to do things with others.</td>
<td>4. I don't often get invited to do things with others. (SCI4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI5</td>
<td>There is someone I can turn to for advice about handling problems with my family.</td>
<td>5. There is someone I can turn to for advice about handling problems with my family. (SCI5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI6</td>
<td>If I decide one afternoon that I would like to go to a movie that evening, I could easily find someone to go with me.</td>
<td>6. If I decide one afternoon that I would like to go to a movie that evening, I could easily find someone to go with me (SCI6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI7</td>
<td>When I need suggestions on how to deal with a personal problem, I know someone I can turn to.</td>
<td>7. When I need suggestions on how to deal with a personal problem, I know someone I can turn to (SCI7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI8</td>
<td>If I had to go out of town for a few weeks, it would be difficult to find someone who would look after my house or apartment (the plants, pets, garden, etc.) (SCI8).</td>
<td>8. If I had to go out of town for a few weeks, it would be difficult to find someone who would look after my house or apartment (the plants, pets, garden, etc.) (SCI8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I wanted to have lunch with someone, I could easily find someone to join me.</td>
<td>9. If I wanted to have lunch with someone, I could easily find someone to join me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I was stranded 10 miles from</td>
<td>10. If I was stranded 10 miles from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
home, there is someone I could call who could come and get me.
11. If a family crisis arose, it would be difficult to find someone who could give me good advice about how to handle it.
12. If I needed some help in moving to a new house or apartment, I would have a hard time finding someone to help me.

**Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB)  Copyright by Ed Diener and Robert Biswas-Diener, January 2009. (6 Items)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCN1</th>
<th>1. I lead a purposeful and meaningful life. (SCN1)</th>
<th>1. I lead a purposeful and meaningful life. (SCN1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCN2</td>
<td>2. My social relationships are supportive and rewarding. (SCN2)</td>
<td>2. My social relationships are supportive and rewarding. (SCN2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN3</td>
<td>3. I am engaged and interested in my daily activities I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others (SCN3)</td>
<td>3. I am engaged and interested in my daily activities I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others (SCN3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN4</td>
<td>4. I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me (SCN4)</td>
<td>4. I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me (SCN4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN5</td>
<td>5. I am a good person and live a good life I am optimistic about my future (SCN5).</td>
<td>5. I am a good person and live a good life I am optimistic about my future (SCN5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN6</td>
<td>6. People respect me (SCN6).</td>
<td>6. People respect me (SCN6).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ryff’s Psychological Well-Being Scales (PWB), 42 Item version** (Some are phrased negatively)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH1</th>
<th>In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.</th>
<th>1. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live. (SCH1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH2</td>
<td>I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons.</td>
<td>2. I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons. (SCH2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH3</td>
<td>My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing.</td>
<td>3. My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing.(SCH3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH4</td>
<td>When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years.</td>
<td>4. When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years. (SCH4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH5</td>
<td>I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.</td>
<td>5. I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time. (SCH5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH6</td>
<td>I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.</td>
<td>6. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions (SCH6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH7</td>
<td>People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others</td>
<td>7. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others (SCH7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH8</td>
<td>I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.</td>
<td>8. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others (SCH8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH9</td>
<td>I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.</td>
<td>9. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me (SCH9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA1</td>
<td>Most people see me as loving and affectionate.</td>
<td>1. Most people see me as loving and affectionate. (SOA1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA2</td>
<td>Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.</td>
<td>2. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me. (SOA2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA3</td>
<td>I tend to worry about what other people think of me.</td>
<td>3. I tend to worry about what other people think of me. (SOA3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA4</td>
<td>I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns</td>
<td>4. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns. (SOA4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA5</td>
<td>I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.</td>
<td>5. I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends. (SOA5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA6</td>
<td>For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.</td>
<td>6. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth (SOA6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA7</td>
<td>I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what</td>
<td>7. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>EUD1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is important, not by the values of what others think is important.</td>
<td>I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people (autonomy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others think is important (SOA7).</td>
<td>1. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people (autonomy). (EUD1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC6</td>
<td>I like most aspects of my personality.</td>
<td>6. I like most aspects of my personality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC7</td>
<td>I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities.</td>
<td>7. I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC8</td>
<td>I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.</td>
<td>8. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future.
2. I feel like many of the people I know have gotten more out of life than I have.
3. I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.
4. I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things.
5. In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.
6. It's difficult for me to voice my own opinions on controversial matters.
7. I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me.
8. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.
9. My attitude about myself is probably not as positive as most people feel about themselves.
10. I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking.
11. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.
12. I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life.
13. When I compare myself to friends and acquaintances, it makes me feel good about who I am.
### Diener, et al.’s (1985) Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWL) (5 Items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFE1</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my life.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE 2</td>
<td>So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE 3</td>
<td>In most ways my life is close to my ideal.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE 4</td>
<td>The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE 5</td>
<td>If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bradburn’s (1969) Positive Affect (PA) and Negative Affect (NA) Scales (7 Items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFF1</td>
<td>I am depressed or very unhappy in life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF2</td>
<td>I feel lonely or remote from other people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF3</td>
<td>I am pleased about having accomplished something.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF4</td>
<td>I often feel on top of the world.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF5</td>
<td>I am pleased that things go my way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF6</td>
<td>I feel proud because someone complimented me on something I had done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF7</td>
<td>I feel upset because someone criticized me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Chronology of Kuwaiti employees in the Government Sector by marital status, and gender

Date: 30-06-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>19,875</td>
<td>27,029</td>
<td>46,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>15,273</td>
<td>20,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,740</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,547</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,287</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 30-06-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>18,966</td>
<td>24,807</td>
<td>43,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>14,824</td>
<td>19,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,108</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,893</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,001</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 30/6/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>19,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widowed</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 30/6/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>17,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 30/6/2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>18,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109,326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5: Skewness and Kurtosis of the Data (N = 391)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3453</td>
<td>1.21780</td>
<td>-.420</td>
<td>-.693</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2455</td>
<td>1.22205</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>-.855</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4578</td>
<td>1.29798</td>
<td>-.366</td>
<td>-1.022</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6010</td>
<td>1.15887</td>
<td>-.749</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6343</td>
<td>1.26156</td>
<td>-.579</td>
<td>-.716</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3043</td>
<td>1.26773</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>-.905</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.8235</td>
<td>1.10340</td>
<td>-.843</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1586</td>
<td>1.33221</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>-1.117</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9693</td>
<td>.99696</td>
<td>-.953</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9719</td>
<td>.99575</td>
<td>-.868</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.8210</td>
<td>1.03462</td>
<td>-.627</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1995</td>
<td>.92880</td>
<td>-1.198</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1918</td>
<td>.92350</td>
<td>-1.136</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.4655</td>
<td>.72197</td>
<td>-1.502</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0588</td>
<td>1.09503</td>
<td>-1.094</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4578</td>
<td>1.25172</td>
<td>-.546</td>
<td>-.697</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6292</td>
<td>1.10155</td>
<td>-.371</td>
<td>-.605</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4092</td>
<td>1.31902</td>
<td>-.557</td>
<td>-.877</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0793</td>
<td>.98780</td>
<td>-1.122</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.7545</td>
<td>1.07945</td>
<td>-.630</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1023</td>
<td>.92530</td>
<td>-.985</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1432</td>
<td>1.15246</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>-.760</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9054</td>
<td>1.07596</td>
<td>-.866</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6777</td>
<td>1.13837</td>
<td>-.727</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.7852</td>
<td>1.13449</td>
<td>-.884</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3069</td>
<td>1.18448</td>
<td>-.417</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.688</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0844</td>
<td>.98997</td>
<td>-1.174</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2634</td>
<td>1.24845</td>
<td>-.374</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.921</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0639</td>
<td>.93562</td>
<td>-.883</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.6292</td>
<td>1.16049</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.706</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.8875</td>
<td>1.10598</td>
<td>-.759</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.2737</td>
<td>.82543</td>
<td>-1.124</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3811</td>
<td>1.24470</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.895</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3862</td>
<td>1.27971</td>
<td>-.413</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.845</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4604</td>
<td>1.35413</td>
<td>-.473</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-1.033</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1330</td>
<td>.96221</td>
<td>-1.189</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.3197</td>
<td>.87565</td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0051</td>
<td>.94732</td>
<td>-.720</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0742</td>
<td>.96190</td>
<td>-.896</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.8670</td>
<td>.99626</td>
<td>-.591</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3811</td>
<td>.96373</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.424</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.6266</td>
<td>1.03958</td>
<td>-.430</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.313</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.6880</td>
<td>1.21311</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.665</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9693</td>
<td>1.09501</td>
<td>-1.023</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.8031</td>
<td>1.16116</td>
<td>-.786</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.4731</td>
<td>.77702</td>
<td>-1.608</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2532</td>
<td>1.17226</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.803</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.3964</td>
<td>.79672</td>
<td>-1.446</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>2.327</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.2685</td>
<td>.92930</td>
<td>-1.387</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.827</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.0818</td>
<td>1.17384</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.646</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9540</td>
<td>1.03425</td>
<td>-.928</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.7545</td>
<td>1.04566</td>
<td>-.577</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0946</td>
<td>.88795</td>
<td>-1.004</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0409</td>
<td>.91054</td>
<td>-.818</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1867</td>
<td>.91058</td>
<td>-1.238</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.1228</td>
<td>.90314</td>
<td>-1.021</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: The Survey Questionnaire (After Factor Reduction)

**QUESTIONNAIRE OF WELLBEING OF SINGLE PARENTS IN KUWAIT**

**Confidentiality Statement**
The data collected through the questionnaire shall be used purely for academic research purpose. The questionnaire is anonymous. No mention of the respondent or the organization to which he/she belongs shall be used anywhere.

**Are you a single parent (divorcee, widow/widower or an unmarried mother/father)?**
No – thank you for your interest but this questionnaire is only for single parents. Please do not complete it.

Yes – thank you for your interest, you are eligible to complete the questionnaire.

Once you have completed it, please return to the sealed container in your workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational qualification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income (per month)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place a Tick mark (√) on ONE response for each item with reference to your life experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-Strongly Agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### C. Social Wellbeing

#### 6. Social Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCI2</td>
<td>I feel that there is no one to share my most private worries and fears with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI5</td>
<td>There is someone I can turn to for advice about handling problems with my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI7</td>
<td>When I need suggestions on how to deal with a personal problem, I know someone I can turn to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Social Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCN1</td>
<td>I lead a purposeful and meaningful life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN2</td>
<td>My social relationships are supportive and rewarding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN5</td>
<td>I am a good person and live a good life. I am optimistic about my future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8. Social Coherence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCH5</td>
<td>I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH7</td>
<td>People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH9</td>
<td>I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9. Social Actualization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC4</td>
<td>I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC6</td>
<td>I like most aspects of my personality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC8</td>
<td>I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 10. Social Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOA1</td>
<td>Most people see me as loving and affectionate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA5</td>
<td>I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA6</td>
<td>For me, life has been a continuous process of learning,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
changing, and growth.

D. Subjective Wellbeing

4. Life Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LFE1</th>
<th>I am satisfied with my life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFE2</td>
<td>So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFE4</td>
<td>The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFF1</th>
<th>I am depressed or very unhappy in life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFF2</td>
<td>I feel lonely or remote from other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF3</td>
<td>I am pleased about having accomplished something.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Eudaimonia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EUD4</th>
<th>I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUD5</td>
<td>In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD6</td>
<td>I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. My views about my wellbeing as a single parent. (This will help us understand how you feel about being a single parent e.g. comfortable, treated without any bias from others etc.)

4. My suggestions to improve the wellbeing of the single parents?

If answering this questionnaire has caused you any discomfort or stress and you would like professional support, please contact the support agencies mentioned in the information statement.
## Appendix 7: Arabic version of the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>البيانات الشخصية</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الجنس: □ أنثى □ ذكر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>العمر: □ أقل من 25 سنة □ 25 - 35 سنة □ 35 - 45 سنة □ 45 - 55 سنة □ أكثر من 55 سنة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحالة الاجتماعية: □ غير متزوج/غير متزوجة □ مطلق/مطلقه □ أرملة/أرمل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المستوى التعليمي: □ البكالوريوس □ ماجستير □ الدكتوراه □ أخرى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الدخل الشهري: □ أقل من 1000 دينار □ 1000 - 2000 دينار □ أكثر من 2000 دينار</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الخبرة العملية: □ أقل من 2 سنة □ 2 - 5 سنوات □ 5 - 10 سنوات □ أكثر من 10 سنوات</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

المعلومات الديموغرافية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>بيانات الاستبيان</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>هذ الاستبيان هو جزء من دراسات الدكتور جواد القلاف في جامعة نيوكاسل، نيويورك، برفقة الدكتور تايلور، والدكتورة دالين.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الرجاء الحفاظ على بيان المعلومات التي تم توزيعها مع هذا الاستبيان.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إذا كان هناك أي سؤال أو استفسار، يمكن التواصل مع:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ در جواد القلاف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ مرشح براعظم عليا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ <a href="mailto:ann.taylor@newcastle.edu.au">ann.taylor@newcastle.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Jawed <a href="mailto:AAYYBAAlgallaf@newcastle.edu.au">AAYYBAAlgallaf@newcastle.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

بيان السيرة

البيانات التي يتم جمعها من خلال هذا الاستبيان فقط لغرض البحث العلمي. الاستبيان هو مجهول؛ أن يذكر اسم الشريك أو الجهة التي يعمل بها هل أنت المعلو الوحيد لأسلوبه (مطلقه/طلاق، أرملة/أرمل أو غير متزوجة/غير متزوج)؟ لا - شكرًا لك على اهتمامك ولكن هذا الاستبيان هو فقط للممثلين الوحيدين لأسرهم. من فضلك لا تستعمل هذا الاستبيان. نعم - شكرًا لك على أهتمامك، أنت مؤهل لاستكمال هذا الاستبيان. بمجرد الانتهاء من هذا الاستبيان، يرجى إرائه إلى المشرف المختص لجمع الاستبيانات في مكان عملك.
إذا أردت أن أذهب في رحلة يوم واحد، أحد صعوبة
الطور خلص على شخص يذهب مع

1
إذا كنت مريضا، أعد مهولة في الطور على شخص
يقوم بمساعدتي في المهام اليومية

2
 إذا لا أحصل غالبا على دعوة للمشاركة في عمل
أشياء مع الآخرين

3
 عندما وجود مشاكل أسرية، لدي شخص أن يوجه إليه
قلت القصاص

4
 إذا قررت بعد الظهر أن أذهب إلى السينما، أعد
مهولة في الطور على شخص يذهب مع

5
 عندما نحتاج إلى اقتراحات أو نصائح حول كيفية
التعامل مع مشكلة شخصية، أعرف شخص ما يمكن
أن يجدا إليه

6
 إذا اضطررت إلى الخروج من المدينة لبضعة
أسابيع، سيكون من الصعب العثور على شخص
يعني بنزول أو نزول (النباتات، الحيوانات الأليفة،
حديقة)، وما إلى ذلك

7
 إذا اشترى شخصيا، وأعيش حياة جيدة، ومتفائل بالمستقبل

8
 علاقاتي الاجتماعية دامعة ومجزية

9
 أشتكتي اليومية التي أمارسها تساهم بفاعلية في
إسعاد ورفاهية الآخرين

10
 أجد نفسي قادراً على أداء الأنشطة المهمة في

11
 أنا إنسان جيد، وأعيش حياة جيدة، ومتفائل بالمستقبل

12
 الناس يحلمون

13
 بشكل عام، أشعر بأنني المسؤول عن الوضع الذي
أعيش فيه

14
 أنا غير مهتم بالأنشطة التي من شأنها أن توعي من
ألفاق

15
 قراراتي لا تتأثر عادة بما يفعله الآخرون

16

17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا تطبق بشدة</th>
<th>لا تطبق حسب ما</th>
<th>تطبق</th>
<th>لا تطبق بشدة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>دلالة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- تطبيق إحساس بتأنثورة في مستوى الشخص
- لذا أحسنت بشدة مع مرور الوقت
- أنا أصلي إلى التأثر بتعاب الأئذاء السدودة
- الناس يسقوني ك شخص مطيع وعلى استعداد للتقاسم وقتيًّا مع الآخرين
- لم أشهد العديد من العلاقات الدافئة والمhargaة مع الآخرين
- أنا أعلم أنني يمكن أن أثق بأصدقائي، وأنهم يعرفون أنهم يمكن أن يقرا بي
- أنا لا أنسجم تماماً مع الناس والمجتمع من حولي
- شغف الحياة اليومية كثيراً ما تأخذني محبوباً
- يمكنني موسوعة إدارة العديد من المسؤوليات في حياتي اليومية
- ليس لدي شعر جيد لما أحاول تحقيقه في الحياة
- أحب معظم جوانب شخصيتي
- كثيراً ما أشعر بالإرهاق من مسؤولياتي
- استمتع وضع خطط المستقبل والعمل لجعلها واقعاً
- معظم الناس يرونني محبوباً وحنوناً
- الحفاظ على علاقات وثيقة بالنسبة لي، أمر صعب ومحيط
- أميل إلى التلقى حوصل ما يقاله الآخرون تجاهي
- كثيراً ما أشعر بالوحدة لقلة عدد الأصدقاء المقربين الذين يشاركوني اهتماماتي
- استمتع بمحادثات الشخصية والمتباذلة بين أفراد العائلة أو الأصدقاء
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا تطبق بشدة</th>
<th>لا تطبق</th>
<th>تطبق حسب ما ذكره</th>
<th>لا تطبق بشدة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أرى أن الحياة عملية مستمرة من التعلم والتبخير.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>والنمو.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أحكم بنفسك على ما اعتقد أنه مهم، وليس على القيم التي يراها الآخرون مهمة.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أنا راض عن حياتي حتى الآن حصلت على أشياء مهمة أريدها في الحياة.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>في معظم الأحوال، حياتي قريبة من المثالية.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ظروف حياتي متاحة إذا قدر الله لي أن أعيش حياة أطول، فسأرغب في أغير شيئاً فيها.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أنا مكتسب أو غير مكتسب في الحياة.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أشعر بالوحدة أو بعيد عن الناس.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أفرح حين أنجز شيئاً كبيراً ما أشعر بأنه على قمة العالم.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يسرني حين تسير الأمور في طريقي.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أشعر بالفخر لأن شخصاً آثر علي بشيء قمت به.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أشعر بالإحباط إذا التقتني أحد.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أنا ليس خائفًا من التعبير عن آرائي، عندما تكون معارضة لأراء معظم الناس.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عندما أنظر إلى قصة حياتي، أكن مسروراً بكيفة تحول الأمور.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أعتقد أنه من المهم أن يكون هناك تجارب جديدة.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أتخد بها طريقة تفكر في نفسي والعالم لدي وجه واضحة وغيض في الحياة.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بشكل عام، أشعر بالثقة والإيجابية حول نفسي لدي ثقة في آرائي، حتى لو كانت مخالفة لأراء عامة الناس.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. نود أيضاً تיטתك حول خبراتك ورفاهيتك كونك المعول الوحيد لاسرتك، فلا تتردد في إضافة أي شيء ترغب في إعلامنا به في هذا المربع وتسجّل تقدّم ورقة إضافية إذا كنت ترغب في ذلك.

2. اقتراحاتي لتحسين رفاهية معول الأسرة الوحيد.