

Impact of single parenting on the development of young adults: a comparative study of intact and non-intact families in Lahore, Pakistan

Asma Seemi Malik^{*1} | Amjad Mahmood^{2, 3} | Rizwan Abbas⁴

1. Department of Sociology, Lahore College for Women University, Pakistan.

2. Department of Statistics, National College of Business Administration & Economics, Lahore, Pakistan.

3. Punjab College of Information Technology, Lahore, Pakistan.

4. Department of Sociology, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, Ghent University, Belgium.

*Corresponding Author Emails: asmaseemi3@gmail.com | asma.seemi@lcwu.edu.pk

Received: February 5, 2022

Accepted: May 15, 2022

Published: May 31, 2022

Abstract:

The study sought to investigate whether the social development of the young adults (in the form of resilience) is more closely related to single parents or the upbringing of both parents and how the nonappearance of 1 of the 2 parentages can affect these imperative aspects. Young adults from sole mother or father and intact households, both 320 boys and girls, 160 young adults from broken setups, and 160 young adults from happy families were selected through a convenient sampling technique from different educational institutes. This study adopted the quantitative research design and method of the survey to gather information. The structured Resilience Scale (RS) was used to gather data. A noteworthy variance was seen in young adults 'resilience with single and both parents. There was a significant difference found between age, and resilience and even between education and resilience. There was no important change visible in the order of birth between young adults with both parents, and single parents. The results have a major impact on clinicians and educators working with families who are concerned with nurturing positive, emotionally close-step relationships as well as maintaining sturdy matrimonial ties and beliefs among spouses in marriages.

Keywords: parenthood, single parenthood, resilience, young adult, difference in adults, separation of families, family, single-parent family, order of birth.

How to Cite: Malik, A. S., Mahmood, A., & Abbas, R. (2022). Impact of single parenting on the development of young adults: a comparative study of intact and non-intact families in Lahore, Pakistan. *Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS)*, 3(1), 283-299. <https://doi.org/10.47264/idea.jhsms/3.1.20>

Publisher's Note: IDEA PUBLISHERS (IDEA Publications Group) stands neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in the published maps and institutional affiliations.

Copyright: © 2022 The Author(s), published by IDEA PUBLISHERS (IDEA Publications Group).

Licensing: This is an Open Access article published under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)



1. Introduction

Single parents are common in Pakistan. In the past, the family courts recorded a thousand cases of separations of parents every day, which ultimately led to single parenthood. The separation affects the social development and behaviour of children and young adults. Family plays a decisive part in life. The socialization process works through family and plays a substantial part in the communal, psychological, physical, and moral development of children (Pérez *et al.*, 2016). Through this primary institution, young people learn, grow, interact and make contacts. The essential and important task of the family is to socialize and raise the youth according to the required expectations and standards (Xinwen *et al.*, 2018). It is the parent who, with unconditional love and affection, helps their offspring to walk the step of their life. But unresolved disputes between husband and wife often lead to divorce or separation, and sometimes sudden death of a spouse gives rise to the phenomenon of a lone parent. As a result of single parents, their love, warmth, and affection have separated and this has a straight effect on the overall personality of offspring and in later stages on young adults (Mabuza *et al.*, 2014).

Single parents cannot fully supervise and monitor their children with full devotion. The necessities and demands of children in sole mother or father families are not properly communicated as children in double parents' families (Amato *et al.*, 2015; Stack & Meredith, 2018). Many social glitches have their origins in the domestic setting due to the absence of one of the parents (Mendes & Bucher-Maluschke, 2017). Single parents also influence the social development, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and resilience of adolescents (Alami *et al.*, 2014; Malik *et al.*, 2022). One of the studies found that kids with single parents had the least confidence and self-esteem than the children who lived with both parents.

It is important to understand how single parent affects young adults' social development. The first understanding of social development is necessary, so social resources are related to society, and development means the process of growth that led to maturity. Put simply, we can say that the growth of society and the improvement of the living standards of its members are social development. Children have had adjustments problems due to their parent's divorce (Sillekens & Notten, 2020). The adult teens also faced drastic engagement problems that happened to be lower in their marriages or relationships, despite showing a little confidence in their capability to sustain a healthy nuptial partnership with the better half (D'Onofrio & Emery, 2019).

It has been argued that not all children or adults young from single parenting after divorce suffered the same consequences. Some of them remained positive and high performing in their life despite their parents splitting up. It has been observed that children exposed to risky and adverse surroundings develop positively despite such unfriendly experiences (Miller *et al.*, 2017). It is the child's fortitude that has helped through the divorce situations constructively or destructively, this ability or capacity of the child or young adult to deal with the argument is known as resilience (Sattler & Font, 2018).

Liu *et al.* (2017) believed that contacts among people and their communal setting are undercurrents of resilience. According to Olsson *et al.* (2015), the term resilience has been used in practice with diverse meanings such as rebound, leap, bounce to the ingenuity of individuals, flexibility, and resistance. It is the success of reconnecting with hardships and dangers. It is a process that leads to triumph in inspiring and aggressive situations (Sillekens & Notten, 2020).

Resilience is a skill that includes the elements of mental, and emotional adjustments, positive self-projection, and inspiration from surroundings. Research on resilience has consistently revealed that low-income setups and single parents are two major jeopardy influences that tend to have a detrimental effect on families and offspring (Bryant, 2015).

In Pakistan, the divorce rate has risen massively over the last three decades with around 18,901 divorce cases recorded in one province of the country (Ramzan *et al.*, 2018). The main reasons given for this surge were the increase in economic and emotional awareness among women and some external factors, such as: meddling in marriage matters, domestic violence, and emotional and physical abuse. It may be recognized that the number of children from single mothers and fathers in Pakistan is suggestively large. For such a goal, it is imperative to recognize how this vast number of young people from broken domestic setups are communally settled and strong, and how high the self-esteem and self-aware in this populace are.

The focus of this research was to investigate the impact of single parenting on the resilience and social development of young adults. A comparative study was done with young adults coming from intact and broken families. The impact of age, education, birth order, family system, and income were also seen on the resilience of young adults coming from two parents and single-parent families in the field.

1.1. Objectives of the study

The current research, after reviewing the literature, drafted the study objectives and hypotheses, which were supported by the analysis of the data.

- To research the resilience of young adults who belong to both single parents and double parents.
- To investigate the influence of age on the resilience of single-parent young adults.
- To explain the relationship between the family system and the resilience of single-parent young adults.
- To develop the link between birth order and resilience of young adults.
- To examine the link between education and resilience of young adults.
- To explore the link between the resilience of young adults of both family setups with income levels.

1.2. Hypotheses

- There will be a significant difference in the resilience of young adults with single parents and both parents.
- There will be a noteworthy association between stage of development and resilience, of single-parents- young adults.
- There will be an important affiliation between education and level of resilience, for sole-parent young adults.
- The resilience, of young adults with single parents, depends on the order of birth.
- Young adults with single mothers or fathers residing in a joint domestic setup will have significant differences in resilience from those who live in the nuclear setups.
- A difference existed between family income and resilience.

2. Literature review

2.1. Social development and single parenting due to divorce and separation

Van der Wal *et al.* (2019) said that social development helps all citizens to accelerate their dreams with self-esteem and confidence by eliminating all hurdles in life. According to Rowe *et al.* (2015), unidirectional connections between the person, domestic setup, and society (then and now) have a greater impact on child development. Single parents, especially children raised by single mothers, contained a profound effect on the welfare of youth. Children of single mothers suffered from a lack of supervision and suffered from family disputes and agony (Amato *et al.*, 2015) as children who lived in intact households with both parents. In the event of divorce, children from broken families lack psychological well-being and social adjustments (Bjarnason *et al.*, 2012), leading to insecure attachment at a later stage, and causing emotional distress among the youth. If this emotional stress and insecure attachment persist, it will cause further complications in skill development and satisfying the warm relationships that can affect life satisfaction (Lacey *et al.*, 2014, p. 06). For single parents due to divorce, young adults were more likely to be expected to show emotional and behavioural difficulties and fail to perform well in school in their childhood than children from long-standing relationships (Anderson, 2014). According to Abrihem (2014), there is a strong link between bad parenting and negative consequences for child development in single-parent families due to divorce.

According to Garriga and Pennoni (2020), single parenting can disturb the child's social development in numerous ways including physical, social, emotional, educational, moral, and spiritual aspects. The same child is observed to have divorce 2-3 times in their later stage in life than adults who socialized under both parents, young adults who belonged to both parents showed better life prospects (Amato *et al.*, 2015, p. 192). Many researchers believed that adults who encountered social and economic problems in life had more emotional, behavioural, and physical losses (Lacey *et al.*, 2014; Vezzetti, 2016). Since the main pressure of social development is on cognitive growth to enable relegations to improve their position in society with self-respect (Malik & Marwaha, 2021), these given studies stressed the fact that the social development of adults coming from single-parent families is moved by an absence of one of their parents.

2.2. The resilience of the offspring and single parenting

In the words of Reis and Menezes (2017), the resilience of young single parent adults is also a significant topic to investigate how they faced difficulties and hardships in life, as resilience helps to recover from a hardship or to get revenge. It prepares a person to act strong in the face of difficulty and to assert oneself during and after a disaster (American Psychological Association, 2014, p. 1). Resilience helps a person to face disasters, and traumatic and threatening situations with ease (Dias *et al.*, 2015, p. 10). Crisis in the family or stress in relationships are major stress factors for every individual. Only resilience can help and is only possible with family care, support and encouragement, otherwise, it cannot be achieved in single parents. This is only possible with the strong support of the family, as the family acts as a strong social and economic medium to improve personal life (Malik & Marwaha, 2021). The empirical literature on resilience showed that youngsters, who struggle due to distorted marital relationships between their parents often expressed stress in their life and did not perform well in their social and personal responsibilities. A young adult with a single parent constantly has

feelings of inferiority complex all the time. They are more aggressive and always show negativity towards their surroundings. Loss of moral support and love in the event of divorce or death resulted in low resilience and stress in young adults.

Longitudinal as well as cross-sectional research by Thomas and Högnäs (2015) found that there was a relationship between factors of family care, endorsed resilience, and the social development of the child. Another study on single and double parents illustrated that children from intact families have a much better attitude towards life than children from broken homes (Mendes & Bucher-Maluschke, 2017, p. 04). The protective factor that lowers the risks to children and adolescents of single parents with financial constraints happened to be the element of nurture and a healthy home environment. Another study on the factor of resilience suggested that the permanent family paradigm, or resilience, shouldn't be the only sure trait, but just one of the factors that can reduce hostile effects to encouraging results (Allen *et al.*, 2016).

The reviewed literature stressed on aspect of social development of individuals and the environment in society, for instance, Rowe *et al.* (2015) believed that family patterns greatly influence child development. Amato *et al.* (2015) opined that in single mother setup, children faced agony all the time. Bjarnason *et al.* (2012) pinpointed children coming from single parents suffered from psychological trauma and adjustment issues, complications in skill development, and which can affect life satisfaction (Lacey *et al.*, 2014), negative consequences of single parenting (Abrhiem, 2014). Garriga and Pennoni (2020), Lacey *et al.*, (2014), Vezzetti, (2016) said that single parenting disturbed the child's physical, social, emotional, educational, moral, and spiritual development, Thomas and Högnäs (2015) believed children from single parents showed bad attitude.

There is not a single study found that had stressed the influence of age, education, household system, and order of birth on the resilience of young adults coming from single families, few studies focused on the social development of young adults, as the majority of the empirical studied the impact of single parents especially single mother on the social development of children. The income level of single parents might impact the resilience of young adults, but it was not even investigated in the older literature. There was a knowledge gap in the reviewed literature, to fill in that gap, the current research was done to examine the impact of broken families on the resilience of young adults, and it also tried to establish the consequence of age, education, domestic income, and system, offspring number on the resilience of young adults coming from non-intact domestic setups. Moreover, a comparative quantitative analysis was conducted between intact and broken family structures on the resilience of young adults. One of the latest studies studied the self-esteem of adolescents coming from broken families and established no association between age, education, and self-esteem. But self-esteem appeared to be higher among adolescents with 5-7 brothers and sisters (Malik *et al.*, 2022) even adolescents of broken families in joint domestic setup showed better self-esteem.

3. Theoretical framework

Since the current research focus was young adults, the young adult is an individual aged 20 to 40 years. According to Erikson's (1958; 1963), psychosocial development theory, the young adult stage occurred between the age of 18 to 40 yrs. In this stage, the main conflict developed over intimacy, and love associations with other people.

One cannot deny the importance of social development, which is well seen in one of the prominent social development Theories by Vygotsky (1978). However, this theory has recently been revised and restructured by Frank (2013) in his book *Social Development Theory*. This theory postulated that processes such as socialization, social interaction, and social behaviour strongly influenced the perception and cognition of young adults. The theory of social development is based on three main areas; A child's cognitive development is influenced by social interaction with people around them. A child's cognition matures socially and individually. They learned through social interactions within the social phase and learned about themselves on an individual level. A second area that is more knowledgeable, is another phase in which the importance of parents for the spiritual and mental growth of youngsters by developing their language and intelligence. Vygotsky (1930) well supported that young people learn skills from their social phase in life that strongly influenced their thinking and behaviour. The final stage is the proximal development zone, which focuses on the child's improved potential to do specific tasks on their own without any assistance from others. Vygotsky's theory stressed the role of society in the social development of the individual.

To address resilience, the theoretical framework is based on the ecological system theory of Bronfenbrenner (1994), who observed that an individual breathes in unified environments and multiple levels of ecology that move the growth of people indirect ways and through connections. The ecological approach believed that there is a strong interaction between inner and outer forces (Ungar, 2013), that affect people's behavior and manners (Masten, 2015). There are multifaced influences that make up early life experiences in children that influence and interact with the child (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), and even affect their resilience level. Bronfenbrenner observed past individual growth, taking into account the broader manipulating reasons and the setting (or environment) of expansion.

According to Ungar (2013), a person's ability to show resilience is only possible because of the level of interaction that occurred between the environment and personality of the individual. For instance, Bowes *et al.* (2012) believed that when a child lived in a healthy and loving domestic situation that resulted in maximum resilience in case of crisis.

According to Bronfenbrenner (1977), the teenager milieu is cuddled up in the arrangement of assemblies that are strung together. He ordered them based on the influence they have on youth. i.e., these systems have been referred to as micro, meso, Exo, macro, and Chrono. These systems are interrelated, one system affecting the children's growth in unification with another. In the microsystem are the objects that are directly affected by the child's primary ecology, such as parentages, relatives, instructors, and buddies. In this classification, the youngster can be affected by his fellow human beings, which is very personal and crucial to nurturing unsupportive the development of the child. If this bond with parents is strong, it has a constructive role in children's lives, but in the case of distant, broken families, it has a negative impact. Mesosystem showed the influence of siblings on friends and parents on teachers, if this interaction is healthy, then the child's development is good or vice versa. In the ecosystem, formal and informal factors play an indirect role in child growth like parents working and personal environment. The macrosystem involves elements of culture such as the work of parents, education, money, poverty, and housing units within which a child develops. The last is the chronosystem which depicts the changes in the child's surroundings over time that have influenced the growth of an infantile child who starts schooling but due to divorce of parents or death of one parent results in shifting into a new setup. The absence of this backing in the

episode of demise or divorce resulted in lower life performance and resilience (Amato *et al.*, 2011). Resilient children, adolescents, and young adults can be well protected from all stressors in life with the support of internal or external mechanisms in their character and their protecting parent shield (MacPhee *et al.*, 2015). For instance, an orphan who is supported by friends and social circle can produce positive behaviour, but the same support will not produce protective behaviour in children from broken families.

The social development theory of Vygotsky (1930; 1978) and the ecological system theory of Bronfenbrenner (1994) were the rationale theoretical framework of the current study. For children who suffered the trauma of their parent's separation, their cognitive system was greatly affected because of the loss of social interaction with their parents. They are unable to learn about themselves as an individual. The non-intact family environment greatly affects the live performance of young adults as there was a change in the income, family system, education, and occupation of parents. These changes resulted in the low resilience of young adults.

4. Method and design

The present study used a cross-sectional quantitative research design. The facts for the present investigation were collected in the field survey by a structured inquiry form containing demographic and other statements about resilience. The participants were 18-39 years, either lived with both mother and mother or single father/mother after split-up, separation, the demise of one parent, studied, lived in Lahore. The respondents were selected from educational institutions because samples within the age bracket 18-39 yrs. were in abundance there, and even employed youth can also be found who were earning and studying at the same time. The researchers conducted the field survey in September-October, 2021 within two months.

The questionnaire was independently filled out by eligible respondents with statements about their resilience. To resilience, the researchers used a 6-item Resilience Scale (RS) developed by Smith and others in 2008. A five-point Likert scale with items 2, 4, and 6 is coded the other way around, with the mean of all items indicating the degree of resilience (Smith *et al.*, 2008). Potential participants were face to face met in the study. Eligible respondents signed the agreement procedure and took part in the survey. Participants were given an incentive for their time and patience in completing the questionnaires. Ethical considerations regarding confidentiality and anonymity were upheld during a survey.

4.1. Sample

The investigation sample of the current study consists of participants. Half of the participants were young adults from single mother or father setups and the other half of young adults from intact domestic setups. It was a conveniently selected sample. Half of the sample 160 came from sole parents and 160 from intact family setups.

4.2. Measure

4.2.1. Self-resilience

Self-resilience was the measure of obtaining information about the self-development of young

adults with a single parent and both parents. To quantify bounciness, the RS scale by Smith et al. was employed. It is a 6 items scale that is measured on a five-point scale. Respondents were asked to respond to items such as “I tend to bounce back quickly after hard times”, “I have a hard time making it through stressful events”, “It does not take me long to recover from a stressful event”, “It is hard for me to snap back when something bad happens,” “I frequently arise through problematic periods with slight distress”, “I tend to take a long time to get over set-backs in my life”. The mean difference was estimated for a young adult with a single parent and both parents using the bivariate test described in the data analysis subsection. Kyriazos *et al.* (2018), showed RS Cronbach’s Alpha as .93.

4.2.2. Covariates

To further examine the relationship between young adults and single parents and double parents, several socio-demographic covariates were included in the analysis. The covariate included (a). age, education, income level, (measure ranging from 15000 to 120000 (e). Family system, (Nuclear, Joint) (f). Residential background, (Urban, rural) (g). Size of the family, (continuous variable), (h). Order of birth, (continuous variable), (i). Guardianship status, (continuous variable (j). Gender (0=male, 1=female).

4.3. Data analysis

The quantitative data gathered during the survey were evaluated using SPSS 20. The data were entered, adjusted, and then analysed. Univariate and bivariate analyses were performed to test the hypotheses of this study. To measure the mean difference for a continuous variable, one-way ANOVA was used while for discrete variables, an independent t-test was used. To examine an association or relationship between variables, Pearson Correlation was used. It was analysed to show the resilience level of a young adult from a single or double parent. Then association was tried to develop between age and resilience, and a relationship was calculated between education and resilience. The association between birth order and system of families (joint family, nuclear family) with resilience was also developed.

5. Results and discussion

5.1. Findings of the study

The socio-economic features like gender, stages of development, instruction level, salary, household area, household type, and order of birth. All participants belonged to diverse age clusters from 18-37 years. of age. The mainstream of the respondents approx. 57.5% were between 18 and 22, then 31.9% within 23-27, then 6.3% between 28-32 yrs. and a very small number within 33-37 yrs. of age. The majority of the sample around 25.8% graduated, 14.5% had a higher doctorate, 11.7% were post-graduate, 5.7% were undergraduate, and a small percentage of respondents only 5% had their matriculation. The majority of the participants 194 earned less than 30000/ month, while 110 had less than 60000, only a small proportion earned more than 40000 but less than 80000. The household arrangement was separated into two kinds i.e., joint and nuclear households, so 216 respondents survived in the big households while 104 lived with paternal or maternal grandparents and relations. The bulk 50.6% were inmates of cities and 49.4% resided in villages. As for the figure for children, more than 51 percent have 5 offspring, whereas 40 percent have 3 to 4, a small proportion of 9% has 1 to 2

kids. The majority of the participants more than 27 percent were in the second number with their brothers and sisters, trailed by 22.2 percent as the eldest of all children. 19.6 percent were in the fourth and 15.8% in the third order of birth in their families. A trivial 1.9 percent are the younger fellow in the family at 7th place.

Table-1: Demographics of the participants (N=320)

Description	Variables	F	%
1. Gender	Male	160	50
	Female	160	50
2. Age	18-22	184	57.5
	23-27	102	31.9
	28-32	20	6.3
	33-37	14	4.4
	under matriculation	14	4.4
3. Education	matriculation	16	5
	intermediate	18	5.7
	graduation	82	25.8
	Post-graduation	142	11.7
	PhD	46	14.5
4. Monthly Income	0-10,000	54	16.9
	11,000-20,000	68	21.3
	21,000-30,000	72	22.5
	31,000-40,000	74	23.1
	41,000-50,000	22	6.9
	51,000-60,000	14	4.1
	61,000-70,000	10	3.1
	71,000-80,000	4	1.3
	81,000-90,000	-	-
	91,000-100,000	-	-
6. Family system	Above 100,000	2	.6
	Joint system	216	67.5
7. Residence	Nuclear system	104	32.5
	Urban	162	50.6
8. Number of Siblings	Rural	158	49.4
	Only child	-	-
9. Birth Order	1 to 2	28	8.8
	3 to 4	128	40
	5 and more	164	51.2
	First	70	22.2
	Second	86	27.2
	Third	50	15.8
	Fourth	62	19.6
	Fifth	24	7.6
	Sixth	18	5.7
	Seventh	6	1.9

Table-2: Expression of the scale with Cronbach alpha value

Scales	N	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD	Reliability level
RS	320	10.0	26.0	17.17	2.930	0.80

Table-3 shows the mean difference between the resilience level of young adults from broken or intact families with $M=18.4, 19.3$, $SD=3.98, 4.43$, $t=1.73$, $p=.08$. As noted in table-3, there was a significant difference found in resilience between youth from the broken or the intact households. The resilience of a young adult with both parents is better than that of a young adult with a broken family.

Table-3: Comparison of resilience among young grownups having sole parents and those within intact families (N=320)

Variables	Young Adult single parenthood (n=160)		Young Adults with both parents (n=160)		t (320)	p	95% CI	
	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL
RS	18.4	3.98	19.3	4.43	1.73	.08	-5.53	3.32

$p>.05$;

Table-4 shows the relationship between age and the resilience of young adults who resided with sole mothers or fathers or with both parentages. As noted in table-4, a statistically significant difference was found between age and resilience, as $F(3, 320) = 1.34$, $p=.001$. The result shows that age influences the resilience of young adults. In retrospect, it was found that young adults within the age group (33-37) showed more resilience than other age groups.

Table-4: Comparison between age and resilience of young adults having single parents (N=320)

Age	df	SS	MS	F	P
RS	3	980.1	326.7	1.34	.001

$p>.05$

Table-5 exhibited the association between instruction and resilience. The outcomes displayed that there was a significant positive association existed between education and resilience, $r = 0.170$, $n = 320$, $p = 0.001$. With more education, resilience is also enhanced.

Table-5: Association of teaching with the resilience of young adults having sole parents (N=320)

	BRS
	.170
Education	.001
	320
BRS	—

$p>.05$

Table-6 showed a mean difference between birth order and resilience, and outcomes showed a non-significant difference in birth order and resilience with $F(6, 320) = 1.27$, $p=0.45$, for young adults with single parents in the entire order of birth. Young adults show the same resilience in every order of birth.

Table-6: Comparison of resilience and birth order of young adults from intact and non-intact domestic setups (N=320)

Birth order	df	SS	MS	F	P
BRS	6	980.1	163.3	1.27	0.45

Table-7 exhibited a mean-variance amongst the household arrangement and resilience. The outcomes presented a non-significant alteration among the resilience and the joint household structure with $M=16.74$, $SD=2.40$, and nuclear family $M=16.64$, $SD=2.44$, $t=0.832$, $p=.41$. The result shows that the resilience of young adults coming from both family structures showed the same level of resilience.

Table-7: Comparison of resilience, among young adults having single parents living in the joint and nuclear family system (N=320)

Variable	Joint Domestic System (n=216)		Nuclear Domestic System (n=104)		t	p	95% CL	
	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL
RS	16.74	2.40	16.64	2.44	0.832	0.41	-3.67	4.76

$p>.05$

Table-8 showed a mean difference between income level and resilience. The outcomes showed a non-significant difference in resilience $F(3, 320)=1.85$, $p=0.34$, across different socioeconomic classes. The young adults in both family systems showed the same resilience.

Table-8: Comparison of resilience, and income level of young adults of intact and non-intact domestic arrangement (N=320)

Income Level	df	SS	MS	F	P
RS	3	980.1	326.7	1.85	.34

5.2. Discussion

Even though different investigators belonging to any school of thought while perusing household issues, specifically divided relatives, normally believed that all trivial arrangements are important for the complete operation of the domestic institution, slight disruption in this domain affected the usual working of the entire household setups. But surprisingly, few researchers have attempted to research this phenomenon in the past. The current investigation addressed this gap by exploring the resilience of young adults with single parents and families with double parents. Furthermore, the research outcomes could corroborate the tactics by domestic institutions to discourse and even minimize the perception of the fragmented household or solitary parentage by focusing on the domestic psychotherapy of fathers and mothers in marriage edifices and parents, children contacts. The quantifiable examination gave the subsequent outcomes:

The first hypothesis of this study was to find out the fact that young adults with single parents are more resilient than those living with both parents alive'. The outcomes revealed a significant difference in the resilience of young adults growing up with both parents as compared to single-parent households. This finding suggests the possibility that resilience may not depend on the status of either parents or a single adult, it might be because single parent adults and those having both parents may share similarities in their socioeconomic class and the emotional support system. Some other family members or loved ones can replace the support that young adults with single parents lack due to the absence of one of their parents. This can help them maintain resilience similar to that of young adults with intact parents. This finding contrasts with an earlier study by Huynh (2017) who found that replacing the social

support system for orphaned young adults helps maintain resilience in them compared to non-orphans. This outcome is supported by Anderson (2014), who believed that young adults from single parents showed more aggression, negativity, strain, and low resilience than youth coming from intact families. Ecological system theory believed that there are multifaced influences that make up early life experiences in children that affect and interact with the child (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) and even affect their resilience level.

The outcome of the hypothesis that there is a significant association between age and resilience, of young adults in single and intact families may refer to improvement in the education, experience, social exposure, and social support with increasing age for the young adults in a broken setup. However, it was also shown that resilience among young adults with single parents decreases slightly with age. This may be due to the psycho-neurotic variations that occur over time as one matures since resilience is a psycho-neurotic wonder (Reis & Menezes, 2017).

The third proposition of this research is to measure the association amid education and levels of resilience of the adult from a broken and intact family setup. A significant correlation was found between the resilience and the educational status of a young adult from a single parent. Resilience has been found to increase with education as coping mechanisms are improved in more educated people than less educated people (Cahill *et al.*, 2016). So, if young adults could get more education despite an intact family setup, they should be more resilient. The macrosystem function of ecological theory supports that the cultural factor of education also influences resilience (Bronfenbrenner, 1977).

Another hypothesis of the inquiry, resilience, of young adults with a lone parent, which varies depending on the order of birth was tested. However, the results revealed no difference in the resilience of young adults with single parents across the order of birth. The reason could be that the orphans' resilience has been increased through social support (Liu, Reed, & Girard, 2017). This indicates that there is no sibling support for young adults with single parents that showed a poor resilience level. According to Kalmijn and Leopold (2019), though sibling interaction improved after the demise of a parent or separation of parents, these contacts were for a shorter duration. Even siblings in case of a parent's death showed a low level of interaction as compared to siblings whose parents were intact. It was contrary to Spitze and Trent (2018) study that warmth contacts were seen more among siblings with one or both parents and support each other's more than among those siblings with deceased.

The hypothesis of this study, 'resilience, of young adults with single parents, varies according to income level was tested. The results revealed that no difference was found between the resilience, of young adults having single parents across different income levels. This suggests that young adults' resilience with single parents may not be related to their monthly income. This may be because the components of resilience are independent of their monthly income. After all, they are more individualistic. Personality type is the utmost relevant influence to consider here. This investigation is maintained by the previous study of Whetten *et al.* (2014), who believed that any substantial progress in the existing circumstances of bereaved, failed to bring any improvement in wellbeing. The macrosystem function of ecological theory supports the fact that cultural factors of socioeconomic classes also influence resilience (Bronfenbrenner, 1977).

The last query of this research, ‘Young adults with single parentage in the joint domestic arrangement show greater resilience other than individuals in the nuclear household was determined by comparison with resilience. Results revealed no difference in the resilience of young adults with sole parentage or intact household. The finding of one of the previous research may indicate the presence of social backing of buddies, age groups, or others in presence of nuclear domestic arrangement, groups or dear ones are usually the replacement of communal backing for bereaving, this is vital to maintain resilience, self-efficacy, and self-esteem in case of absence of a family framework for orphans (Yendork & Somhlaba, 2015). The ecological approach believed that there is a strong interaction between internal and external forces (Ungar, 2013), that affect people’s behaviour and manners (Masten, 2015).

6. Conclusion

It was concluded that the status of being young in a lone-parent family is a neglected area of interest in empirical data. Resilience was also not discussed. These are the important participant of culture, and it is a curiosity to study how their position has exaggerated their communal growth from infant to youth. It turned out that the resilience was the same for both. A frail connotation was established between age and resilience in a young adult from a single family. The impact of education on resilience and found that resilience increases with education. Perhaps it’s because educated young adults embrace more coping strategies. The order of birth and income level of single-parent adults do not impact resilience. It was concluded that social support is an influential attribute of communal progress as it encourages belongingness, affection, and upkeep to ease anxiety. It also facilitated empowering young adults from broken setups. The conclusions approve the method of a sturdy domestic arrangement to fortify the operative of whole relatives by stressing the combined and stretched household connections. Such arrangements only back to strengthening the marital, relationship between grandparents and grandchildren. A holistic approach to ecological systems theory, which comprehends all the systems in which children and their families are involved, accurately reflects the active flora of real family relationships.

6.1. Limitations of the study

Similar to previous studies, some limitations are also a part of the current study. The small size of the sample can’t be widespread to the complete populace. The respondents in the investigation were diverse. The participants included young adults from broken and intact domestic arrangements in the combined and nuclear system, although their socioeconomic status was also recorded. After all, it was not longitudinal research, and the design does make contact for a shorter time with respondents. This investigation only quantifies data, a mixed-method approach will be fruitful for upcoming exploration. In new studies, it could be rational to understand gender changes while concentrating on the social growth of children from broken parentage. The psychological and social challenges of young adults from single-parent families can also be researched in the future.

The focus of clinicians, therapists, and educators dealing with the conduct of children, youths, and young adults from intact domestic arrangements should endorse optimism, the warm linkage between parents and children, and strong nuptial bond awareness for couples after marriage.

6.2. Recommendations

- Current research recommended that the community services must respond to the needs of adult children for individual growth and care for the copying abilities of the children.
- Besides, interventions should address to improve better parenting practices which is the most important aspect of child adjustment to their surrounding environment.
- Flexible and different support groups should be developed for children and young adults coming from broken families by raising awareness about the effect of divorce, separation of parents on the social development, and well-being of children.
- Strategies should be identified to address the economic hardships of a guardian or custodian parents (especially single mothers) after parents' separation.
- Parenting support programs should be developed that could manage the impact of separations on children and even on separating spouses.

References

- Abrhiem, H. (2014). The role of parenting styles in the psychosocial development of adolescents. *Business and Management Review*, 3(11), 47-52. <http://www.businessjournalz.org/bmr>
- Alami, A., Khosravan, S., Sadegh Moghadam, L., Pakravan, F., & Hosseini, F. (2014). Adolescents' self-esteem in single and two-parent families. *International Journal of Community-Based Nursing and Midwifery*, 2(2), 69-76. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4201193/>
- Allen, C. R., Angeler, D. G., Cumming, G. S., Folke, C., Twidwell, D., & Uden, D. R. (2016). Quantifying spatial resilience. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 53, 625-635. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12634>
- Amato, P. R., Kane, J. B., James, S. (2011). Reconsidering the good divorce. *Family Relations*, 60(12), 511-524. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2011.00666.x>
- Amato, P. R., Patterson, S., & Beattie, B. (2015). Single-parent households and children educational achievement: A state-level analysis. *Social Science Research*, 53, 191-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.05.012>
- American Psychological Association. (2014). *The road to resilience*. <http://www.apa.org/helpcenter/road-resilience.aspx>.
- Anderson J. (2014). The impact of family structure on the health of children: effects of divorce. *The Linacre Quarterly*, 81(4), 378-387. <https://doi.org/10.1179/0024363914Z.0000000000087>
- Bjarnason, T., Bendtsen, P., Arnarsson, A. M., Borup, I., Iannotti, R. J., Lo'fstedt, P., Haapasalo, I., & Niclasen, B. (2012). Life satisfaction among children in different family structures: a comparative study of 36 Western societies. *Children & Society*, 26, 51-62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2010.00324.x>
- Bowes, J., Grace, R., & Hodge, K. (2012). *Children, families, and communities: Contexts and consequences*. Oxford University.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32(7), 513-531. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: experiments by design and nature*. Harvard University.

- Bryant, R. A. (2015). Dismantling and integrating the levels of resilience. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26(2), 170-173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2015.1013346>
- Cahill, H., Beadle, S., Hingham, L., Meakin, C., Farrelly, A., Crofts, J., & Smith, K. (2016). *Rights, Resilience & Respectful Relationships: Introduction*. Department of Education and Training, Victoria, Melbourne.
- Dias, R., Santos, R. L., Sousa, M. F., Nogueira, M. M., Torres, B., Belfort, T., & Dourado, M. C. (2015). The resilience of caregivers of people with dementia: a systematic review of biological and psychosocial determinants. *Trends in Psychiatry and Psychotherapy*, 37(1), 12-19. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2237-6089-2014-0032>
- D'Onofrio, B., & Emery, R. (2019). Parental divorce or separation and children's mental health. *World Psychiatry*, 18(1), 100-101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20590>
- Erikson, E. H. (1958). *Young man Luther: A study in psychoanalysis and history*. Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Youth: Change and challenge*. Basic Books.
- Frank, J. S. (2013). *Criminal justice today: An introductory text for the 21st Century*. Cram 101 Publishing.
- Garriga, A., & Pennoni, F. (2020). The causal effects of parental divorce and parental temporary separation on children's cognitive abilities and psychological well-being according to parental relationship quality. *Social Indicators Research*, 1-25. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-020-02428-2>
- Huynh, Hy. V. (2017). *Factors Affecting the Psychosocial Well-Being of Orphan and Separated Children in Five Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Which is More Important, Quality or Form of Care?* All Dissertations. 1908. http://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_dissertations/1908
- Kalmijn, M., & Leopold, T. (2019). Changing sibling relationships after parents' death: The role of solidarity and kin keeping. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81, 99-114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12509>
- Kyriazos, T., Stalikas, A., Prassa, K., Galanakis, M., Yotsidi, V., and Lakioti, A. (2018) Psychometric evidence of the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) and modeling distinctiveness of resilience from depression and stress. *Psychology*, 9, 1828. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2018.97107>
- Lacey, R.E., Bartley, M., Pikhart, H., Stafford, M., & Cable, N. (2014). Parental separation and adult psychological distress: an investigation of material and relational mechanisms. *BMC Public Health*, 14, 272. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-272>
- Liu, J. J. W., Reed, M., & Girard, T. A. (2017). Advancing resilience: an integrative, multi-system model of resilience. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 111, 111-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.02.007>
- Mabuza, N., Thwala, S., & Okeke, C. (2014). Single parenting and its effects on the psychosocial development of children in Swaziland. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5, 2252. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n23p2252>
- MacPhee, D., Lunkenheimer, E., & Riggs, N. (2015). Resilience as regulation of developmental and family processes. *Family Relations*, 64(1), 153-175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12100>
- Malik, A.S., Javed, N., & Mahmood, A. (2022). Influence of sociodemographic factors on the social development and self-esteem of adolescents: a comparative study of single and two-parent households. *Journal of Management Practices, Humanities, and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.33152/jmphss-6.1>

- Malik, F., & Marwaha, R. (2021). Developmental stages of social-emotional development. *Children; Stat Pearls Publishing: Treasure Island, FL, USA*. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK534819/>
- Masten, A.S. (2015). Pathways to integrated resilience science. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26(2), 187-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2015.1012041>
- Mendes, J. A. A., & Bucher-Maluschke, J. S. N. F. (2017). Destructive divorce in the family life cycle and its implications: Criticisms of parental alienation. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 33, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102.3772e33423>
- Miller, P. A., Lloyd, C. A., & Beard, R. (2017). Preadolescents' coping goals and strategies in response to post-divorce interparental conflict. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4(3), 260-280. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000067>
- Olsson, L., Jerneck, A., Thoren, H., Persson, J. and O'Byrne, D. (2015). Why resilience is unappealing to social science: theoretical and empirical investigations of the scientific use of resilience. *Science Advances*, 1(4), e1400217.
- Pérez, J. C., Cumsille, P., and Martínez, M. L. (2016). Brief report: the agreement between parent and adolescent autonomy expectations and its relationship to adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Adolesc.* 53, 10-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95873-6_71
- Ramzan, S., Akhtar, S., Ahmad, S., Zafar, M.U., & Yousaf, H. (2018). divorce status and its major reasons in Pakistan. *Sociology and Anthropology*, 6(4), 386-391. <https://doi.org/10.13189/sa.2018.060405>
- Reis, L. A. dos, & Menezes, T. M. de O. (2017). Religiosity and spirituality as resilience strategies among long-living older adults in their daily lives. *Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem*, 70(4), 761-766. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7167-2016-0630>
- Sillekens, S., & Notten, N. (2020). Parental divorce and externalizing problem behaviour in adulthood. a study on lasting individual, family, and peer risk factors for externalizing problem behaviour when experiencing parental divorce. *Deviant Behaviour*, 41(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2018.1519131>
- Yendork, J. S., & Somhlaba, N.Z. (2015). Do social support, self-efficacy, and resilience influence the experience of stress in Ghanaian Orphans? an exploratory study. *Child Care in Practice*, 21, 140-159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13575279.2014.985286>
- Sattler, K.M.P., & Font, S.A. (2018). Resilience in young children involved with child protective services. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 75, 104-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.05.004>
- Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioural Medicine*, 15(3), 194-200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705500802222972>
- Spitze, G.D., & Trent, K. (2018). Changes in individual sibling relationships in response to life events. *Journal of Family Issues*, 39, 503-526. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X16653431>
- Stack, R. J., & Meredith, A. (2018). The impact of financial hardship on single parents: an exploration of the journey from social distress to seeking help. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 39(2), 233-242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-017-9551-6>
- Thomas, J., & Högnäs, R. S. (2015). The effect of parental divorce on the health of adult children. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, 6(3), 279-302. <https://doi.org/10.14301/lcs.v6i3.267>

- Ungar, M. (2013). Resilience after maltreatment: The importance of social services as facilitators of positive adaptation. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37(2-3), 110-115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2012.08.004>
- Van der Wal, R. C., Finkenauer, C., & Visser, M. M. (2019). Reconciling mixed findings on children's adjustment following high-conflict divorce. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 28(2), 468-478. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10826-018-1277-z?SearchParam>
- Vezzetti, V. C. (2016). New approaches to divorce with children: A problem of public health. *Health Psychology Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2055102916678105>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1930). *Mind and society*. http://www.cles.mlc.edu.tw/~cerntcu/099-curriculum/Edu_Psy/EP_03_New.pdf
- Whetten, K., Ostermann, J., Pence, B. W., Whetten, R. A., Messer, L. C., Ariely, S., O'Donnell, K., Wasonga, A. I., Vann, V., Itemba, D., and Eticha, M., (2014). Three-year change in the wellbeing of orphaned and separated children in institutional and family-based care settings in five low-and middle-income countries. *PloS One*, 9(8), e104872. <https://doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0104872>