



RESEARCH PAPER

Influence of Single Parenting on Self-Efficacy of Adolescents: A Comparative Study of Broken and Intact Households

Dr. Asma Seemi Malik*¹ Dr. Nayab Javed² Amjad Mahmood³

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Lahore College for Women University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, asmaseemi3@gmail.com
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Gender Studies, University of Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Assistant Professor, Punjab College of Information Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

DOI

[http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022\(6-III\)32](http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022(6-III)32)

ABSTRACT

This research is a cross-sectional quantitative research design to examine how the social progress of the adolescents especially their self-efficacy was more strongly associated with single parents or intact families and to investigate in what way the absenteeism of either of the two parentages can affect the age, education, family size, and birth order. Adolescents of sole and intact domestic setup, both men, and women (N=320, 160 young from sole parents and 160 young from dual parentage) were involved in the survey asking about their self-efficacy. The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) by Schwarzer and Jerusalem was utilized to gather data. Information was scrutinized using SPSS. An important change was evident in the self-efficacy of adolescents having both parents over youngsters with sole parents. A relationship not very strong was visible amid age, schooling, and self-efficacy. For the order of birth, it was seen that adolescents having both parents remained more statistically related than teenagers having only parents. The results approved a sturdy household arrangement to strengthen intact families working by stressing the combined domestic relations that exclusively help boost both marital and paternal and maternal grandparents and grandchild relationships. The sociologists and teachers occupied with step-parentages must pay attention to both endorsing pessimistic approaches like passionate dealings, robust matrimonial bondage, and self-assurance in marriages.

Keywords

Adolescents, Age, Education, Relationship, Self-Efficacy, Single-Parenting

Introduction

The important social group of the family plays a significant role in the character-building of children. Their social, psychological, or cognitive development and family socialization all performed this role. The self-efficacy of adolescents has a direct relationship with family structure. Parents designed the domestic environment by exposing their children to new experiences and challenges in life, becoming positive role models, and setting up achievable goals and potentials (Schunk & Meece, 2006). If liberal families set some standard negative outcomes for their children, then adolescents in this setup often have low self-efficacy (Bandura, 1995). Within the family, children acquire, nurture, interrelate and mingle (Falana, Bada, & Ayodele, 2012).

While realizing the importance of parents, Agnafors et al. (2019) believed that it is a prerequisite for mothers and fathers to give extra devotion and supervision to adolescents because their future is reliant on the socialization and road map shown to them. It is the responsibility of parents to provide devotion to the overall progress of their offspring by encouraging their physical, emotional, mental, ethical, social, and professional growth. It will help them to bring up their offspring as expected by society (Ali & Soomar, 2019).

When unavoidable circumstances result in the breakup of a home, it is typically hard for every member of the family to deal with such a situation; though, offspring are the great sufferer in these circumstances. It has a tremendous impact on children. If a family is stable, it helped the offspring to excel in life but when the home breaks, children were destabilized, lost their childhood, and developed negativity towards every aspect of their life. The child lost all care, attention, and unlimited devotion from their parents (Frazer, 2004). There are several reasons for the breakup of family structure, due to which all responsibilities come into the hand of single parents. One of the major reasons is divorce. Another reason is the death of one of the spouses, unintended pregnancy, and forced marriages (Mabuza et al., 2014). These all reasons led to the phenomenon of single parenting.

Single parenting is defined as the situation within which one or both parents are absent for the rearing, and nurturing of children, one person is fulfilling the responsibilities of two people (Mabuza et al., 2014). In other words, it is defined as a family that is comprised of one parent either mother or father with their dependent children (Chanda & Pujar, 2018). Numerous social issues arise in the domestic setting due to either parent's absence (David, 2011).

Literature Review

Single Parenting impact on Adolescents

According to Amato & Cheadle (2005) children are affected differently by the divorce of parents, they are affected based on gender, age group, and phases of development. Divorce falls apart their whole world, their safety, permanency, and steadiness; they felt abandoned, angry, and helpless. According to Alami et al. (2014), the structure of a broken family affected the adolescents' personality development, efficacy, and resilience. Due to single parents, children showed feelings of lowliness, dejection, nervousness, annoyance, hatred, blame, humiliation, and hopelessness about the future (Ali & Soomar, 2019).

According to Cavanagh and Fomby (2012), children and adolescents of single parents suffered trauma, and poor self-concept, they suffered from feelings of awkwardness, misperception, emotional stress, and unhappiness (Mello et al., 2016). Richer and Lemola (2017) believed that such children failed to show any warmth or discipline, and showed issues of hostility, hyperactivity, and violence. Due to the loss of love and warmth, children of adolescents of single parents showed feelings of anxiety and uncertainty.

Over the last 3 decades, the divorce rate is increasing at a high rate in Pakistan, as per the study of Ramzan et. al. (2018) about 19000 cases of divorce have been logged in a single province of the country. Increased financial and emotive responsiveness among women is the foremost motive for such a surge, besides that, there are some peripheral influences, such as others' interfering in matrimonial matters, and spousal, emotional, and bodily exploitation. It can now be assessed that the bulk of adolescents

from sole parents is suggestively high in Pakistan. For this purpose, it is imperative to recognize how such a majority of youth coming from broken households are properly adjusted to society and to learn about their resilience, self-esteem, and self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy and Single Parenting

There is a linkage between self-esteem and self-efficacy (Bramante, 2015). To properly understand the social development of an individual, self-efficacy helps to identify it. According to Malik, Mahmood, and Abbas (2022), the social development of the young is greatly affected by divorce, young adults showed lower resilience due to single parenting. The social demographic factors of children and parents also influenced the resilience, self-efficacy, and self-esteem of children due to single parenting (Malik, Javed & Mahmood, 2022) According to Hagedoorn and Molleman (2006), self-efficacy is the assessment of children about their ability to maintain and arrange interactive linkage with others. Self-efficacy is an active paradigm that alters during the social development of children (Davis-Kean et al., 2008). It is reported that if adolescents encountered any new social, physical, or mental experiences and challenges, these become the predominant influence on their self-efficacy (Schunk & Meece, 2006). The determinant of age, gender, and values are the factors linked with self-efficacy. It means the linkage development of a child with people in their surroundings at the social level (Gardener, 2011). Such self-efficacy in childhood affects the later stage of adolescents. The daily growth and ability of youth to achieve success in life are greatly affected by the loss of one of their parents. Such abilities exhibited self-efficacy.

The encouragement and backing by parents help a lot to fortify the self-efficacy of youth and they may try to complete various tasks in life. If something happened in the surrounding of an individual's such as the absence of moral and financial backing (by parents) often led to variation in their emotional and intellectual ability to do any chore. These serious changes often weakened the psychological ability of a child (Conger & Donnellan, 2007). It was considered important by Schunk and Meece (2006) that the verbal reassurance and advice by parents help develop children's self-efficacy, which is missing in such children who have a single parent. Positive and constructive communication by parents plays a vital part in the proper upbringing of children. Offspring are only involved or don't involve in certain activities as their parents encouraged or discouraged them to do so (Yamamoto & Holloway, 2010). Such encouragement from parents helps boost the child's confidence to achieve goals in life. The distressing attitude and actions of parents greatly disturbed the self-efficacy of children.

One of the previous studies also tried to establish a connection between child self-efficacy and the role of parents (Schunk & Meece, 2006). The homely environment greatly touched the self-efficacy of the child in various ways. This environment is the master creation of parents within which children practice new experiences and challenges, roles to act constructively, and reality-based aims and opportunities. The self-efficacy of the child is shaped by the perception and expectations of parents about their children. Parents expressed hopes about their children through oral feedback and how they encouraged or discouraged their child to do some act (Yamamoto & Holloway, 2010).). In this way, parents may give strength to the self-efficacy of their child that works better in the advanced phases of teens and youth.

Theoretical Framework

The emphasis of current research is on the dimension of social development: self-efficacy and how this dimension is influenced by the phenomena of single parenting. This research focused on the social cognitive theory by Bandura (1997). Bandura believed that four aspects as experiences of personal commands, indirect experiences, Verbal persuading, and reactions of bodily parts greatly affect the social development of the individual. These aspects are well described by Schunk and Meece (2006) as according to them, personal command experiences are the achievements of an individual on some previous tasks and are supposed to have a sturdy and reliable influence on self-efficacy. Indirect understandings happen when a certain behavior is acted upon by some other model or someone else. If somebody else did the act and try to copy or adapt the same strategy adopted by an individual in case of some error while performing some tasks. On the other hand, verbal persuading is a kind of encouragement from significant others like parents, mentors, and friends to do any task in case it brings success to the individual. While the final aspect of different bodily reactions for instance rapid heartbeat also influences self-efficacy by deterring an individual that he/she could not able to do the task with success (Schunk & Meece, 2006). By focusing on these four aspects, children and in their later stages as adolescents, try to model or copy the actions of others in their surroundings whom he or they viewed as nurturing such as parents and try to build their self-efficacy but due to the absence of any parent in their life, it has a strong influence on their self-efficacy, as they don't have any role model to replicate the activities in life.

Hypotheses

1. Adolescents from intact family setups have better self-efficacy than those from the sole parent
2. There is a positive relationship between age and self-efficacy of single-parent teenagers
3. There is a positive association between education and the self-efficacy of adolescents.
4. The self-efficacy of adolescents having single parents vary across birth order
5. Adolescents having one parent living in a combined family structure showed great self-efficacy than those living in the nuclear domestic setup.

Material and Methods

It was quantitative research with a cross-sectional approach. Statistics for the existing investigation were attained in the field survey by using a designed feedback form comprising one demographic page and one developed scale. Those individuals were targeted in sampling, who 1) Adolescents within the age bracket of 15-24 yrs. 2) either living in an intact family setup or a sole parent after divorce/separation/death of one parent. 3) Studied in colleges/universities 4) Resides in Lahore. 5) Can speak and know English. The questionnaire was done by eligible respondents independently with statements related to their self-efficacy. The GSE scale of Schwarzer et al. 1995 was utilized. GSE was scored on a 4-point Likert scale. Prospective respondents were approached face to face. The suitable participants agreed to the informed consent and were involved in the survey. They were provided some enticement for their time and patience in filling out the form.

Principled considerations of confidentiality and anonymity were kept during a survey.

Sample

This investigation has 320 participants. Half of the respondents were from sole parents and fifty percent were from intact family structures. The sample was collected by employing the purposive sampling technique. 160 belonged to single parenthood while another 160 were having dual parents.

The demographics included sex, age, education, income, marital status, residential background, family type, and their status of living in a broken or dual parent's family. All participants belonged to diverse age brackets 10-19 yrs. of age. The mainstream about 46.8 % was within 10-14, then 53.1 % within 15-19 yrs. The bulk of the sample about 56.8 % did their graduations, 18.1% were in intermediate, 14.3% were matric, and 16.8 % were under matric. 216 earn less than 40,000 per month, while 84 have more than 50,000, and only a small number earn more than 80,000. The household was separated into the joint and the nuclear setup, so 216 participants were living within big household domains while 104 were living separately from their blood relations. The bulk 50.6 % were living in cities and 49.4 % belonged to the countryside. How many offspring did they have, more than 35.6 % have more than 5 children, while 40 % were having 3-4 children, 15.6 % with 1 child, and a small percentage of less than 8.7 % have 1-2. The majority of the respondents more than 23.7% were in 2nd place among their siblings followed by 23.4 % as the elder. 18.1 % were at 4th and 18.7 % in 3rd order at birth in their families. A small percentage of 2.8 % is the youngest in the family at the 7th number. As far as guardianship is concerned, the bulk of respondents 152 respondents were living with both parents, while 96 were living as single parents with their mother. 36 were single parents living with their fathers and 36 have no live parents to live with.

Measure

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy was one of the measures to get information about the adolescent's self-development with a single parent and both parents. The GSE scale comprised 10 items to measure self-efficacy. The Likert Scale measures these statements on the 4-point scores ranging from 1, not at all true, 2 hardly true, 3 moderately true, and 4 exactly true. The respondents were asked to reply on items such as "I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough", "If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want", and "It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals", "I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events", "Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations", "I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort", "I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities", "When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions", "If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution", and "I can usually handle whatever comes my way". The mean difference was calculated utilizing the t and one-way ANOVA tests. Internal consistency of the scale was .76 to .90, with the mainstream as increasing as .80s (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). A correlation of at least .80 is suggested for at least one type of reliability (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995).

Covariates

To further scrutinize the association between variables, numerous socio-demographic data were encompassed in the analysis. Like age, education of adolescents, Salary, household type, residential circumstances, Birth Order, Guardianship status, and Gender

Data Analysis

The collected data were examined, entered, and cleaned by SPSS 20. One-Way ANOVA, independent samples t-test and Pearson correlation Coefficient were run to test the hypotheses. To quantify the mean difference, one-way ANOVA was used while for separate variables, an independent t-test was utilized. For the investigative relationship, Pearson Correlation was used.

Results and Discussion

Table 1
Demographics of the Participants (N=320)

| <i>Variables</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>%</i> |
|-------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 1. Gender | | |
| Male | 160 | 50 |
| Female | 160 | 50 |
| 2. Age | | |
| 10-14 | 150 | 46.8 |
| 15-19 | 170 | 53.1 |
| 3. Education | | |
| under matriculation | 54 | 16.8 |
| Matriculation | 46 | 14.3 |
| Intermediate | 58 | 18.1 |
| Graduation | 162 | 50.6 |
| 5. Monthly Income | | |
| 10,000-40,000 | 216 | 67.5 |
| 41,000-80,000 | 84 | 26.2 |
| 81,000-10,0000 | 20 | 6.2 |
| 6. Family system | | |
| Joint system | 216 | 67.5 |
| Nuclear system | 104 | 32.5 |
| 7. Number of Siblings | | |
| Only child | 50 | 15.6 |
| 1 to 2 | 28 | 8.7 |
| 3 to 4 | 128 | 40 |
| 5 and more | 114 | 35.6 |
| 8. Birth Order | | |
| First | 75 | 23.4 |
| Second | 76 | 23.7 |
| Third | 60 | 18.7 |
| Fourth | 58 | 18.1 |
| Fifth | 24 | 7.5 |
| Sixth | 18 | 5.6 |
| Seventh | 9 | 2.8 |
| 9. Guardianship Status | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----|------|
| A single parent (mother) | 96 | 28.7 |
| The single parent (father) | 36 | 11.3 |
| Both parents dead | 36 | 11.3 |
| Living with both parents | 152 | 48.7 |

Table 2
Descriptive of the Scales along with reliability as Cronbach alpha value (N=320)

| Scales | N | Minimum | Maximum | M | S.D | Reliability level |
|--------|-----|---------|---------|-------|-------|-------------------|
| GSE | 320 | 13.0 | 40.0 | 27.42 | 4.479 | .93 |

Table 3
Comparison of self-efficacy among adolescents having only a parent and both Parenthoods

| Variables | Adolescents single parenthood (n=160) | | Adolescents both parents (n=160) | | t (320) | p | 95% CI | |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|------|----------------------------------|------|---------|------|--------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | | | LL | UL |
| GSE | 26.51 | 3.95 | 28.38 | 4.80 | -2.69 | .001 | -4.76 | 1.68 |

$p > .05$;

Table 3 showed the outcomes as there was a noteworthy variance found between self-efficacy and adolescents having sole and both parents. Adolescents having dual parents ($M=28.38$, $SD=4.80$) showed better self-efficacy than adolescents having one parent ($M=26.51$, $SD=3.95$) remained significant at $p < .01$, as shown in Table 3.

Table 4
Association of age with self-efficacy of adolescents having sole parents (N=320)

| Age | GSE |
|-----|------|
| | .073 |
| | .515 |
| | 320 |

$p > .05$

Table 4 shows the connection between age and self-efficacy, of adolescents with only or both parents. As noted in table 4, there was a non-significant weak positive relationship between age and self-efficacy at $r = .073$, $p = .515$.

Table 5
Association of education with self-efficacy of adolescents having single parents (N=320)

| Education | GSE |
|-----------|-------|
| | -.144 |
| | .199 |
| | 320 |

$p > .05$

Table 5 presented the connotation between education and self-efficacy. Outcomes discovered that there was a non-significant weak negative association existed between education and self-efficacy of the adolescents having one parent, $r = -.144$, $n = 320$, $p = .199$.

Table 6
Comparison of self-efficacy, and sibling birth order of adolescents having single parents and those Having Both Parents Alive (N=320)

| Outcomes | df | SS | MS | F | P |
|----------|----|--------|--------|-----|-----|
| GSE | 3 | 2430.1 | 2340.2 | .38 | .40 |

Table 6 showed a mean difference between sibling birth order, self-efficacy, and outcomes showed a nonsignificant self-efficacy $F(3, 320) = .38, p = .40$ of adolescents having sole parents across birth order.

Table 7
Comparison of self-efficacy, among adolescents having single parents living in the joint and nuclear family system (N=320)

| Variable | Joint Family System (n=216) | | Nuclear Family System (n=104) | | t | P | 95% CL | |
|----------|-----------------------------|------|-------------------------------|------|-------|-----|--------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | | | LL | UL |
| GSE | 26.03 | 4.06 | 27.73 | 4.06 | -1.77 | .08 | -5.65 | 2.79 |

$p > .05$

Table 7 showed a mean difference between family system, self-efficacy, and outcomes showed a significant difference between self-efficacy and combined family arrangement as $M = 26.03, SD = 4.06$, and nuclear household as $M = 27.73, SD = 4.26, t = -1.77, p = .08$.

Table 8
Comparison of self-efficacy, and socioeconomics of adolescents having single parents and those Having Both Parents Alive (N=320)

| Outcomes | df | SS | MS | F | P |
|----------|----|--------|--------|-----|-----|
| GSE | 6 | 2430.1 | 2340.2 | .72 | .50 |

Table 8 showed a mean difference between socio-economic classes, self-efficacy, and outcomes showed a non-significant difference in self-efficacy $F(6, 320) = .72, p = .50$ of adolescents having sole parents across different socioeconomic classes.

Discussion

Although researchers and psychologists dealing with family issues specifically with fragmented relations, normally believed that all subsystems are significant for the whole working of the family institute, any disruption in such domain overall can influence the normal functioning of the family. But surprisingly few past researches existed to explore these phenomena. The current investigation addressed the gap to explore the level of self-efficacy among adolescents having single parents and intact family setups with double parents. Furthermore, the outcomes of research might corroborate a family institute approach to discourse on a stronger non fragmented household or sole parentage concept by focusing on the intimate therapy of parentages in matrimonial arrangements and parent-child relationships.

This research hypothesizes that the self-efficacy of adolescents having both parents alive will be significantly different from those living with a single parent. Results discovered that adolescents in intact households showed greater self-efficacy than an adult with a single parent. This result highlighted the standing of both parents in taming self-efficacy in children. Both parentages played an imperative role in inspiring and reassuring their children to attain better educational grades and career

goals by indoctrinating self-belief in them. This result endorsed an old investigation that established low self-efficacy in adolescents from broken families as equated to adults from intact families (Puffer et al., 2015). Schunk and Meece (2006) also supported that the homely setting momentarily affected the self-efficacy of the child by successfully dealing with new experiences and challenges in life, acting beneficially in real-world goals and breaks.

The result of the hypothesis that there is an important association between age and self-efficacy of adolescents in sole-parent and unbroken relations, initiated that self-efficacy slightly rises with age in adolescents with single parents. It may be because of the perfection in the teaching, knowledge, social contact, and backing with age for the adolescents in wrecked setups. According to Kuyucu (2007), no difference was detected in the self-efficacy level among children of divorce concerning gender and age.

The next hypothesis of this study, there is a noteworthy association between education and self-efficacy of the adult from broken and intact family setups. Outcomes revealed that self-efficacy slightly decreases with education in adolescents having single parents. This may be due to the lack of parental support in academic performance and later in a selection of a career for the adolescents having single parents which leave them in self-doubt as their educational level rises. So, if adolescents might be able to attain more instruction in presence of a broken family structure, they ought to show more self-efficacy.

Another hypothesis of the inquiry, self-efficacy of adolescents having single parents vary across birth order was verified. Though, outcomes discovered no change in self-efficacy of adolescents having sole parents across birth orders. The cause may be because self-efficacy is increased with social support for orphans (Yendork&Somhlaba, 2015).

The seventh hypothesis of this study was to test the self-efficacy of adolescents having single parents who vary across socioeconomic classes. Outcomes discovered no variance between the self-efficacy of adolescents having sole parents across diverse socioeconomic classes. This indicates that for adolescents having single parents, their self-efficacy might not be dependent upon their monthly income. This may be because the constituents of self-efficacy might be independent of their monthly income for being more distinctive. Behavior is also one of the most pertinent factors to be considered here. This study is reinforced by previous research by Whetten et al. (2014) that initiate that because substantial perfections in the existing circumstances of orphans, it does not bring improvement in their wellbeing.

The last query of the current investigation was to investigate adolescents with the sole parent in nuclear households who showed low self-efficacy than those who resided in combined families. Results revealed differences in adolescents coming from intact setups and showed more self-efficacy. This finding may indicate the presence of an auxiliary component of social support like buddies/peers or others in the case of nuclear family structure as reported by one of the previous studies that friends or other near ones offer the alternative source for social backing for bereaves that is vital for upholding self-efficacy, in case of absence of family setting for orphans (Yendork & Somhlaba, 2015)

Conclusion

It was seen that there are few previous pieces of research to address the phenomena of being young and raised by a sole parent. Even it was not deliberated to see the self-efficacy, self-esteem, and resilience of adolescents coming from broken setups. These are the imperative contributor and affiliates of our social order, and it is of interest to study how their position impacted their social progress since their childhood and adolescents due to breakup in family structure.

It was initiated that the self-efficacy of the young from an only parent was inferior to the youth of intact families. There was a strong connection between age and self-efficacy, self-efficacy slightly increased as adolescents grew. The impact of education on variables found that self-efficacy decreased with education in adolescents of a single-parent family. Maybe it is due to the adoption of more coping strategies by educated adolescents. The marital and socioeconomic status of single-parent adults has no impact on their self-efficacy. It was concluded that social support was a strong feature of social progress as it provided the logic for belonging, passion, and maintenance to counter anxiety. It also helped the adolescents from the sole parental system to settle in life. The outcomes confirm that it boosts both marital, paternal, and maternal grandparents and grandchild associations.

Recommendations

There are some limitations as being seen while conducting this research. The small size of participants could not be widespread to the whole population. The participants who took part in the research are diverse. The sample was adolescents from the sole and dual relations within the combined and nuclear structure along their socioeconomic statuses were also taken but it was from a single area only. Lastly, this was cross-sectional learning, and the plan does not permit the development of connectedness with the data after some time. This is quantifiable research but a mixed method will be a prospect to connect a link between quantitative and qualitative data. In imminent research, it will be practical to perceive gender variances while focusing on the social progress of children from a sole parent. Even psychological social challenges faced by adolescents belonging to only parent households can be explored in the future.

The psychologist working in clinics with families and in educational institutions and dealing with the conduct of offspring, teenagers, and youths from fragmented relations should focus on endorsing optimistic, warmly close parent-child relationships and sturdy marital bondages and assurance in higher-order marriages.

References

- Agnafors, S., Bladh, M., Svedin, C.G., &Sydsjo. G., (2019). Mental health in young mothers, single mothers, and their children. *BMC Psychiatry*, 19(112), 1-7. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-019-2082-y>.
- Alami, A., Khosravan, S., SadeghMorhadam, L., Pakravan, F., &Hossen, F. (2014). Adolescents' self-esteem in single and two-parent families. *International Journal of community-based nursing and midwifery*, 2(2), 69-76.
- Ali, S.K., &Soomar, S.M., (2019). Single Parenting: Understanding Reasons and Consequences. *JOJ Nursing and Health care*, 10(2), 001- 003. <https://doi:10.19080/JOJNHC.2019.10.555781>.
- Amato, P. R., &Cheadle, J. (2005). The Long Reach of Divorce: Divorce and Child Well Being Across Three Generations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 201.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.
- Bramante, A. C. (2015). *Correlation between Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, Personality, Fear of Success, and Self-Defeating Behaviors of Performing Artists*. Doctoral Thesis, Walden University.
- Branden, N. (1995). *The Six Pillars of Self-Esteem-The Definitive Work on Self-Esteem by the Leading Pioneer in the Field*. Jossey Bass: San Francisco.
- Cavanagh, S. E., &Fomby, P. (2012). Family Instability, School Context, and the Academic Careers of Adolescents. *Sociology of Education*, 85(1), 81-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040711427312>
- Chanda, K., &Pujar, A., (2018). Stress and Psychological Wellbeing among Single parents. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Bioscience*, 6(4), 226-232. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2320-7051.6692>
- Conger, R. D., &Donnellan M. B. (2007). An interactionist perspective on the socioeconomic context of human development. *Annu Rev Psychol.*, 58, 175-99.
- Davis, K. E. (2011). *Review of Children of divorce: stories of loss and growth*. Columbia: Taylor and Francis.
- Davis-Kean, P.E., Huesmann, L.R., Jager, J., Collins, W.A., Bates, J.E., & Lansford, J.E. (2008). Changes in the relation of self-efficacy beliefs and behaviors across development. *Child Development*, 79, 1257-1269.
- Falana, B. A., Bada, F. O., &Ayodele, C. J. (2012). Single-parent Family Structure, Psychological, Social and Cognitive Development of Children in Ekiti State. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*. 2(2), 158-164. <https://doi:10.5539/jedp.v2n2p158>
- Frazer, W.J. (2004). Family structure, parental practices, and high school completion. *American Sociology Review*, (56), 309-320
- Gardner, D. M. (2011). *Parents' Influence on Child Social Self-Efficacy and Social Cognition*. Master's Theses, Marquette University.

- Hagedoorn, M., & Molleman, E. (2006). Facial disfigurement in patients with head and neck cancer: The role of social self-efficacy. *Health Psychology, 25*, 643-647.
- Kuyucu, Y. (2007). *The relationship between cognitive distortions and self-worth of adolescents raised in divorced families*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences; Izmir.
- 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*(23), 22-52
- Malik, A. S., Mahmood, A., & Abbas, R. (2022 a). 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>
- Malik, A.S., Javed, N., & Mahmood, A. (2022 b). 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>.
- Mello, L.D., Govindaraju, B.M., & Monteiro, M., (2016). A Study on the Challenges Faced by Single Parent on Teenager Care. *International Journal of Advanced Trends in Engineering and Technology, 1*(1), 54-59.
- 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:10.13189/sa.2018.060405>.
- Richter, D., & Lemola, S., (2017). Growing up with a single mother and life satisfaction in adulthood: A test of mediating and moderating factors. *PLoS ONE, 12*(6), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179639>
- Schunk, D. H., & Meece, J. L. (2006). Self-Efficacy Development in Adolescence. In F. Pajares, & T. Urdan (Eds.). *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, Measures in health psychology: *A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON
- 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.
- Yamamoto, Y., & Holloway, S.D. (2010). Parental Expectations and Children's Academic Performance in Sociocultural Context. *Educ. Psychol. Rev., 22*, 189-214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9121-z>
- Yendork, J. S., & Somhlaba, N. Z. (2015). Problems, Coping, and Efficacy: An Exploration of Subjective Distress in Orphans Placed in Ghanaian Orphanages. *Journal of Loss and Trauma, 20*(6), 509-525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15325024.2014.949160>