VALIDATING SOCIAL WELL-BEING SCALE IN PAKISTAN: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GENDER AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Dr. Qaisar Khalid Mahmood
Assistant Professor,
Department of Gender Studies,
University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
Qaisar.dgs@pu.edu.pk

Dr. Mian Muhammad Ahmad Iqbal
Lecturer Sociology,
Government College University Lahore, Pakistan
iqbal_muhammadahmad@yahoo.com

Mian Muhammad Ahsan Iqbal
MPhill Sociology,
Minhaj University Lahore
mahsaniqbal89@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
This research was AIMED to validate Keyes's (1998) social well-being scale in Pakistan and to analyze the role of gender and socio-demographic profile in predicting social well-being of youth. We recruited a total of 852 respondents from public sector universities in Punjab, Pakistan, using a multistage sampling technique for data collection. Data were analyzed using SPSS version 23 and Amos version 20. Findings revealed that Cronbach's alpha for the total social well-being scale was good ($\alpha=0.90$). Results showed that the convergent and discriminant validity of all the dimensions of the social well-being scale was within an acceptable range. Similarly, the results of conformity factor analysis revealed that fit indices were also within the acceptable limit. The results of the independent t-test revealed that male participants (t=3.085, P=.002**), married participants (t=-2.270, P=.023*), and participants who belonged to the nuclear family system (t=-3.995, P=.001**) had a greater level of social well-being. The findings confirm that a new 24-item social well-being scale is valid in Pakistan and needs further empirical and theoretical support. This validated scale may be used in further research by academicians, young researchers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), economic organizations, and government bodies to make well-being policies.
Keywords: Social well-being, Convergent and Discriminant Validity, Confirmity Factor Analysis, Fit indices, Well-being policies,

Introduction

Research in well-being has gained the attention of intellectuals in the discipline of sociology and psychology during the recent decades (Seligman, 2011; Stratham & Chase, 2010; Keyes, Schmotkin & Ryff, 2002; Kahneman, Diener & Schwarz, 1999; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). Previous literature summarized well-being to three aspects: eudaimonic well-being (Psychological well-being; Ryff 1989), hedonic well-being (Subjective well-being; Diener 1994), and social well-being (Keyes 1998). Empirical and theoretical pieces of evidence have suggested that social well-being is exactly distinct from eudemonic and hedonic well-being (Hill et al. 2012; Keyes 2005; Gallagher et al. 2009).

Social well-being refers to the feelings of wellness in the context of fulfilling the expectations of others in different paradigms of life. However, it is a position in which important needs of society are accomplished, people live together peacefully and get a chance to participate in the development of

society. Keyes (1998) argued that social well-being is an assessment of one's functioning and place in the community. Breslow (1972) concluded that social well-being is a valuable construct in the domains of physical and mental health. Furthermore, Lyubomirsky et al. (2005) observed that people with a higher level of social well-being had a greater level of life satisfaction to marriage, health and income.

Social well-being of youth is an important indicator of social and personal development. For example, prior literature revealed that social well-being promotes roles efficacy, social functioning, quality of social ties with relatives and members of society (Sharbatiyan, 2012), social participation (Cicognani et al. 2001; Berkman et al., 2000), ability to overcome social problems successfully (Fathi, 2013), academic achievements (Javadi-Pashaki & Darvishpour 2018) and positive thinking (Keyes, 1998).

With these factors in mind, the aim of this research is twofold: to validate the Keyes (1998) social well-being scale and to predict the association between socio-demographic characteristics and social well-being of youth. It is important to probe whether the structure of social well-being could be replicated in different cultural backgrounds (Li, Ding & Kong., 2015). Up to date, most of these studies about social well-being were done with a western sample from an individualist culture. Therefore, further investigation of validation of social well-being scale in Pakistan will make a meaningful contribution to literature.

Theoretical Background

Well-being is a multi-dimensional construct and is operationalized in various contexts with different understandings and meanings. It concentrates on the quality of life and deals with the material, spiritual, psychological and social range of human experiences (Chambers, 2005). The literature revealed that well-being domains are harder to capture because they are context-oriented. In this research, we particularly focused on Keyes's (1998) multidimensional model of social well-being. Keyes (2005) suggested five dimensions of social well-being which cover the social and emotional components of well-being.

Following Keyes (1998), the dimensions of SWB can be described as follows:

- *Social Integration-* this refers to the feelings of belonging and acceptance in society (Keyes, 2006). It is an appraisal of a person about his association with the other members of society and family in terms of which he assumes himself as a part (Shasti & Falamaki, 2014; Keyes, 1998).
- *Social Acceptance –* this deals with social trust, accepting the view of community and people, and the belief in the kindness of the residents (Keyes, 2006). Similarly, social acceptance is a social kinship that deals with the personal acceptance and empowers the opinion of the others in a group or community through the character and qualities (DeWall & Bushman, 2011)
- *Social Contribution-* this refers to the feelings of an individual who portrays his life as valuable and his efforts are admired by the others in the community (Keyes, 2006). The concept, social well-being deals with the influence of resident's sense and involvement in the community because it is a manipulation of self in the context of society (Prati et al, 2015).
- *Social Coherence-* this refers to the people's understanding and knowledge about the community (Keyes, 2006). However, this is a belief and complying sense of security relates to one's intentions about the external and internal environment which is manageable and predictable (Antonovsky, 1987).

CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

- • *Social Actualization-* this relates to the hopefulness, positive potential and future growth of society (Keyes, 1998). Furthermore, social actualization also deals with the belief that society has the ability to change for positive development (Salehi et al. 2017).

Measures

In order to see the effect of socio-demographic variables, the survey included questions related to gender, marital status, place of residence and type of family.

Social Well-being

Originally, Keyes's (1998) social well-being scale consists of 33 items that is measured on a five point likert scale (1= strongly disagree to 2= strongly agree). After preliminary data screening in this research analysis, 8 items are excluded due to the low factor loadings and to achieve the fitness indices (See Appendix 1). The included 24 items in scale showed excellent internal consistency (α=0.90).
The social well-being scale is a multidimensional scale that covers social actualization (Sact), social coherence (Scoh), social integration (Sent), Social contribution (Scon), social acceptance (Sacc). Of the 7 items (Sact1 to Sact7) of social actualization, 6 items (Sact1 to Sact6) were retained. The items included the following: "I believe that society has stopped making progress"; "Society is not improving for people like me"; "I don't think social institutions like law and government make your life better"; "I see society as continually evolving"; "I think our society is a productive place for people to live in"; and "For me, there's no such thing as social progress". The item excluded (Sact7) the following: "I think the world is becoming a better place for everyone". The final 6 items of Sact showed excellent internal consistency (α=0.83). Of the 6 items (Scoh1 to Scoh6) of social coherence, 5 items (Scoh1, Scoh2, Scoh3, Scoh4, Scoh6) were retained. The retained items included the following: "The world is too complex for me"; "Scientists are the only people who can understand how the world works"; "I cannot make sense of what's going on in the world"; "Most cultures are so strange that I cannot understand them"; and "I find it hard to predict what will happen next in society". The item excluded (Scoh5) the following: "I think it's worthwhile to understand the world I live in". The Cronbach alpha of this dimension of social well-being was excellent (α=0.82). Of the 7 items of social integration (Sent1 to Sent7), 5 items (Sent2, Sent3, Sent4, Sent5 and Sent7) were retained. The retained items included the following: "I feel like I am an important part of my community"; "If I had something to say, I believe people in my community would listen to me"; "I feel close to other people in my community"; "I see my community as a source of comfort"; and "I believe other people in society value me as a person". The items excluded (Sent1 and Sent6) the following: "I do not feel, I belong to anything I would call a community"; and "If I had something to say, I don't think, my community would take me seriously". The Cronbach alpha of these retained 5 items of Sent was excellent (α=0.80). Of the 5 items of social contribution (Scon1 to Scon7), 4 items (Scon2, Scon3, Scon4 and Scon5) were retained. The retained items included the following: "I think I have something valuable to give the world"; "My daily activities do not produce anything worthwhile for the community"; "I do not have the time or energy to give anything to my community"; and "I think that my work provides an important product for society". The item excluded (Scon1) the following: "My behavior has the same impact on other people in community". The Cronbach alpha of retained 4 items of Scon was good (α=0.77). Of the 7 items (Sacc1 to Sacc7) of social acceptance, 4 items (Sacc1, Sacc3, Sacc4, Sacc6)

were retained. The items included the following: "I think that other people are unreliable"; "I believe that people are self-centered"; "I feel that people are not trustworthy"; and "I believe that people are more and more dishonest these days". The item excluded (Sacc2, Sacc5 and Sacc7) the following: "I believe that people are kind; "I think that people live only for themselves"; and "I think that people care about other people's problem". The Cronbach alpha of retained 4 items of Sacc was good (α=0.79).

Participants and Procedure

This research paper is a part of or PhD. dissertation. To get the fruitful results, data were equally collected from 852 respondents from 4 public sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan by using a multistage sampling technique. Data were collected from September 2019 to January 2020. This was the time before the Covid-19 outbreak. The participants were briefed about the objectives of the study and informed consent was also taken. A total of 1015 questionnaires were distributed, 915 were returned and 852 questionnaires were usable.

Statistical Analysis

SPSS software version 23 was used to perform the statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to report the important characteristics of this research, internal consistency (Cronbach alpha), interrelations, explanatory factor analysis (EFA) and comparative analysis. Similarly, Amos software version 20 was used to perform the conformity factor (CFA) and to check the fitness indices.

Results

Of the 852 participants, 587 (68.9%) were male and 265 (31.1%) were female. A vast majority of the respondents of this study 798 (93.3%) were married. Approximately, 443 (52%) of the respondents belonged to the urban area. Similarly, more than half, 442 (51.9%) of the respondents belonged to the nuclear family system.

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Profile of Youth

Demographics		Frequency	Percentage
Gender			
	Male	587	68.9
	Female	265	31.1
Marital status			
	Unmarried	798	93.7
	Married	54	6.3
Place of Residence			
	Rural	409	48
	Urban	443	52
Type of family			
	Joint	410	48.1
	Nuclear	442	51.9

CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Table 2 depicts the mean and standard deviation of five dimensions of social well-being. The findings shows that the participants of this study had a greater level of social actualization ($M = 20.917$, SD =5.221), followed by social coherence ($M = 17.335$, SD = 4.607), followed by social integration ($M = 17.248$, SD = 3.994) and followed by social contribution ($M = 14.480$, SD = 3.501). Similarly, the participants had the lowest level of social acceptance ($M = 13.626$, SD =3.793).

Table 2: Descriptive Analysis of the Important Dimension of Social Well-being

Dimensions of Social well-being	Mean	Std. Deviation
Social Actualization (Sact)	20.917	5.221
Social Coherence (Scoh)	17.335	4.607
Social integration (Sent)	17.248	3.994
Social Contribution (Scon)	14.480	3.501
Social Acceptance (Sacc)	13.626	3.793

Explanatory Factor Analysis

Explanatory factor analysis deals with the so-called factor loadings. In this research, primarily, a total of 24 items of the social well-being scale were retained. The literature indicates that the acceptable range of item loading is 0.40 or more (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2010). Table 3 shows that all items loadings were greater than 0.40, in the acceptable range. "Kyser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Advocacy" (0.90) and "Bertlett's Test of Sphericity" (X^2(df) =7283.393 (276), P=0.000) is also in the acceptable range.

Table 3: Factor Loadings

	1	2	3	4	5
Sact4	.761				
Sact2	.746				
Sact1	.708				
Sact3	.698				
Sact5	.679				
Sact6	.612				
Scoh2		.777			
Scoh1		.733			
Scoh6		.713			
Scoh4		.678			
Scoh3		.628			
Sent3			.734		
Sent2			.725		
Sent7			.716		

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458

CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

CONTEMPORARY
JOURNAL OF SOCIAL
SCIENCE REVIEW

CJSSR

Vol.02 No.04 (2024)

Sent4			.709		
Sent5			.658		
Scon3				.758	
Scon4				.728	
Scon5				.723	
Scon2				.658	
Sacc1					.807
Sacc3					.788
Sacc4					.724
Sacc6					.658
"Kyser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Advocacy" = 0.902, "Bertlett's Test of Sphericity", $X2(df) =7283.393$ (276), $P=0.000$					

Sact = Social Actualization, Scoh = Social Coherence, Sent = Social Integration, Scon = Social Contribution, Sacc = Social Acceptance

Conformity Factor Analysis

Conformity factor analysis deals with convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity refers to the extent to which two measures are supposed to be related to each another, also appear related after the analysis. Factor loadings, composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE) are the most frequently used measures to determine convergent validity (Hair et al., 2010). AVE refers to the degree of common variance among the indicators of a latent variable (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). The cutoff value for AVE is greater than 0.50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2010). Table 4 shows the AVE values of all dimensions of social well-being ranges from 0.50 to 0.52, indicating a sufficient convergent validity. Similarly, composite reliability (CR) refers to the extent of the items to reliably indicate the underlying constructs (Hair et al., 2010). The recommended CR value is >0.70 (Fornell &Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2010). Table 4 shows that the CR values for all constructs range between 0.80 and 0.85 which is exceeding the recommended values. Similarly, the recommended Cronbach alpha value is ≥.70 (Hair et al., 2010). Table 4 shows that Cronbach alpha values of all dimensions of social well-being range between 0.79 and 0.83, these values are also within the recommended limit.

Furthermore, the discriminant validity of the social well-being model is checked. The most popular approach to check the discriminant validity is the Fornell & Larcker (1981) approach. In this approach square root of AVE is calculated for the individual item of the construct. For the significance of discriminant validity, the square root of AVE for each factor should be greater than the correlation involving the constructs (Hair et al., 2010). It can be seen in Table 4 that highlighted values (square root of AVE) are greater than the rest of the values in respective rows and columns, as suggested by Fornell and Larcker, (1981), indicating the significance of discriminant validity.

Table 4: Convergent and discriminant validity

	Convergent Validity	Discriminant Validity

Dimensions of Social Well-being	AVE	CR	Alpha α	Sact	Scoh	Sent	Scon	Sacc
Sact	0.50	0.85	.83	**.70**				
Scoh	0.51	0.83	.82	.279**	**.71**			
Sent	0.50	0.83	.80	.392**	.338**	**.70**		
Scon	0.52	0.80	.77	.370**	.416**	.451**	**.72**	
Sacc	0.52	0.81	.79	.264**	578**	.315**	.346**	**.72**

Sact = Social Actualization, Scoh = Social Coherence, Sent = Social Integration, Scon = Social Contribution, Sacc = Social Acceptance, AVE= Average Variance Extracted, CR = Composite Rebility

The CFA also estimates fit indices of the desired model. The results show in Table 5 that the fit indices are all within the acceptable range (TLI =0.93, CFI=0.94, AGFI=0.92, GFI=0.94, RMSEA=0.047 & X^2 = 696.99). Table 5 also shows a sufficient Cronbach alpha value of the total social well-being scale (0.90).

Table 5: Fit Indices

Testing	Values	Cutoff Values
Tuker-Lewis index (TLI)	0.93	> .90
Comparative fit index (CFI)	0.94	> .90
Adjusted goodness of fit (AGFI)	0.92	> .90
Goodness of fit (GFI)	0.94	> .90
Root mean square of approximation (RMSEA)	0.047	< .08
X^2(df)	696.99(242)	Non-significant
Cronbach Alpha value of total social well-being	0.90	>0.70

Results of *t* test are presented in Table 6. The findings reveal that there is a statistically mean difference between male (*M* = 84.662) and female (*M* = 81.275) participants. The male participants had a higher level of social well-being than the female participants. There is also a statistically mean difference between unmarried (*M* = 83.308) and married (*M* = 88.308) participants. The married participants had a higher level of social well-being compared to the unmarried participants. Similarly, the findings reveal that there is a statistically mean difference between participants who had belongings with joint (*M* = 81.819) and nuclear (*M* = 85.279) family systems. The participants who belonged to the nuclear family system had higher level of social well-being than those who belonged to the joint family system. The findings also show that rural and urban residents had an equal level of social well-being.

Table 6: Comparison of social well-being on the basis of socio-demographic characteristics of the youth

Constructs		N	Mean	t-value	P-value
Gender					
	Male	587	84.662	3.085	.002**
	Female	265	81.275		
Marital Status					
	Unmarried	798	83.308	-2.270	.023*
	Married	54	88.055		
Place of Residence					
	Rural	409	83.295	-.589	.556^{NS}
	Urban	443	83.898		
Type of Family					
	Joint	410	81.819	-3.395	0.001**
	Nuclear	442	85.269		

Discussion

Social well-being is an achievement (Keyes, 1998), and this achievement is neglected in Pakistan due to the poor regional policies and structural flaws (Ismail, 2016). To gain the attention of researchers and policymakers an attempt was made to validate the social well-being scale in Pakistan. Our findings show that the new 24 items social well-being scale is valid in Pakistan. Cronbach alpha for the total scale is good ($\alpha=0.90$). This value is in line with the Italian ($\alpha=0.90$) sample and is greater than that reported for American ($\alpha=0.88$), Iranian ($\alpha=0.88$) (Cicognani, Pirini, Keyes, Joshanloo, Rostami, & Nosratabadi., 2008) and Chinese sample (Li et al., 2015). Our new version of the social well-being scale has good convergent and discriminant validity. We recommend repeat and longitudinal studies across the country and the rest of the world to facilitate well-being policies.

The findings of this study depict that social well-being was more strongly associated with being male compare to being female. The finding is consistent with the prior literature (Keyes 1998; Chraif & Dumitru, 2015; Swami et al., 2018; Matud et al., 2019; Abdullahi et al, 2020). This difference in well-being may be due to the division of gender roles in society (Karasawa et al., 2011). Being female may experience low social well-being due to the less frequent permission and mobility related to social interactions.

The findings show that social well-being was more strongly associated with being married. This finding is consistent with Revension et al. (2016) who found that women are more likely to provide emotional support to their husbands. Reczek et al. (2014) reported that marital relationships provide support, boost the self-esteem that helps the individuals to adopt coping strategies to curb out the stress in life.

Surprisingly, the findings show that social well-being was more strongly associated with people belong to the nuclear family system. This finding is inconsistent with Gul et al. (2017) who found that joint family is more strongly associated with the well-being of individuals. Thomas et al (2017) revealed that diversity of family system provides the resources to families to reduce caregiving burdens and benefit health and well-being.

Finally, the finding of this study shows that level of social well-being was the same in rural and urban residents. This finding is inconsistent with Mouratidis. (2017), who depicted that social well-being

was highly associated with urban residents than rural residents. Krefis et al. (2018) revealed that urban areas provide easy access to basic survival facilities to the individuals such as health care and employment that are opposed in rural areas.

Limitations

This research has various limitations. Firstly, this research is limited to the youth enrolled in public sector universities. The scope of this research can be enhanced by addressing youth out from universities. Secondly, the research is limited to a few socio-economic variables. It is also recommended that further studies should include more socio-demographic variables such as age, qualification, monthly household income and the number of family members.

Conclusion

This study concludes that 24 items social well-being scale is valid in Pakistan and needs further empirical and theoretical support. This new scale must be used in further researches by academicians, young researchers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and government bodies to make well-being policies. The results of the independent t test reveal that male, married participants and participants who belonged to the nuclear family system had a greater level of social well-being. Whereas, people from rural and urban areas have a similar level of social well-being.

References

Abdullahi, A. M., Orji, R., Rabiu, A. M., & Kawu, A. A. (2020). Personality and subjective well being: Towards personalized persuasive interventions for health and well-Being. *Online journal of public health informatics,* 12(1). doi: 10.5210/ojphi.v12i1.10335.

Antonovsky, A. (1987). *Unraveling the mystery of health: How people manage stress and stay well*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass

Berkman, L. F., Glass, T., Seeman, I., & Brisette, T. E. (2000). From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new millennium. *Social Science and Medicine*, 51, 843–857. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00065-4

Breslow, L. (1972). A quantitative approach to the World Health Organization definition of health: physical, mental and social well-being. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 1:347–55. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/1.4.347

Chambers, R. (2005). *Ideas for development*. London: Earth scan.

Chraif, M., & Dumitru, D. (2015). Gender differences on wellbeing and quality of life at young students at psychology. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180, 1579-1583. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.310

Cicognani, E., Albanesi, C., & Berti, P. (2001). Dimensioni del benessere sociale: applicazione diunostrumento di misurazione. *Psicologia della Salute*, 1, 105–122. https://www.francoangeli.it/Riviste/Scheda_rivista.aspx?IDarticolo=17121

Cicognani, E., Pirini, C., Keyes, C., Joshanloo, M., Rostami, R., & Nosratabadi, M. (2008). Social participation, sense of community and social wellbeing: A study on American, Italian and Iranian university students. *Social Indicators Research*, 89(1), 97-112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9222-3

DeWall, C. N., & Bushman, B. J. (2011). Social acceptance and rejection: The sweet and the bitter. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 256-260 https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411417545

Diener, E. (1994). Assessing subjective well-being: Progress and opportunities. *Social Indicators Research,* 31(2), 103–157. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2354-4_3

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276–302. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276

Fathi, M., Ajamnejad, R., & Khakrangin, M. (2013). Factors contributing to social health among teachers of Maraghe city. *Social Welfare Quarterly,* 12(47), 225-243.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104

Gallagher, M. W., Lopez, S. J., & Preacher, K. J. (2009). The hierarchical structure of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 77(4), 1025–1050. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467 6494.2009.00573.x

Gul N, Shah A, Alvi SM, Kazmi F, Ghani N. (2017). Family system's role in the psychological well being of the children. *Khyber Med Univ J* , 9(1), 29-32. https://www.kmuj.kmu.edu.pk/article/view/16202

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis (5th ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A Global Perspective (7th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Hill, P. L., Turiano, N. A., Mroczek, D. K., & Roberts, B. W. (2012). Examining concurrent and longitudinal relations between personality traits and social well-being in adulthood. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(6), 698–705. *https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550611433888*

Ismail, Z. H. (2016*). Political economy of social development in Pakistan*. Social policy and development Centre (SPDC) Karachi, Pakistan. Report no 98. Retrieved from; http://www.spdc.org.pk/Data/Publication/PDF/RR-98.pdf

Javadi-Pashaki, N., & Darvishpour, A. (2018). What are the predictor variables of social well being among the medical science students?. *Journal of education and health promotion*, 7,20. http://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_89_17

Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.). (1999). *Well-being: Foundations of hedonic psychology*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Karasawa, M., Curhan, K. B., Markus, H. R., Kitayama, S. S., Love, G. D., Radler, B. T., & Ryff, C. D. (2011). Cultural perspectives on aging and well-being: A comparison of Japan and the United States. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 73(1), 73-98. https://doi.org/10.2190/AG.73.1.d

Keyes, C. (2006). Subjective well-being in mental health and human development research worldwide: an introduction. *Soc. Indic. Res.* 77, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-00555503

Keyes, C. L. (2005). Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the complete state model of health. *Journal Consult and Clinical Psychology*, 73(3), 539–548. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.3.539

Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social psychology quarterly*, 121-140. https://doi.org/10.2307/2787065

Keyes, C., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. (2002). Optimizing Well-Being: The Empirical Encounter of Two Traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 1007–1022. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.1007

Krefis, A. C., Augustin, M., Schlünzen, K. H., Oßenbrügge, J., & Augustin, J. (2018). How does the urban environment affect health and well-being? A systematic review. *Urban Science*, 2(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci2010021

Li, M., Yang, D., Ding, C., & Kong, F. (2015). Validation of the social well-being scale in a Chinese sample and invariance across gender. *Social Indicators Research,* 121(2), 607 618. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0639-1

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 803855. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033 2909.131.6.803

Matud, M. P., López-Curbelo, M., & Fortes, D. (2019). Gender and Psychological Well Being. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(19), 3531. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16193531

Mouratidis, K. (2018). Built environment and social well-being: How does urban form affect social life and personal relationships? *Cities*, 74, 7–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2017.10.020

Prati, G., Albanesi, C., & Pietrantoni, L. (2015). The Reciprocal Relationship between Sense of Community and Social Well-Being: A Cross-Lagged Panel Analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, 127(3), 1321–1332. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-1012-8

Reczek C., Thomeer M. B., Lodge A. C., Umberson D., & Underhill M (2014). Diet and exercisein parenthood: A social control perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76, 1047 1062. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12135

Revenson T. A., Griva K., Luszczynska A., Morrison V., Panagopoulou E., Vilchinsky N., & Hagedoorn M (2016). Gender and caregiving: The costs of caregiving for women. *In Caregiving in the Illness Context (pp. 48–63)*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 57, 1069 1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Salehi, A., Marzban, M., Sourosh, M., Sharif, F., Nejabat, M., & Imanieh, M. H. (2017). Social Well Being and Related Factors in Students of School of Nursing and Midwifery. *International journal of community based nursing and midwifery*, 5(1), 82-90. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_89_17

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011*). Flourish a new understanding of happiness and well-being and how to achieve them.* London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Sharbatiyan M. (2012). The semantic components reflecting the link between social capital and the rate social health of the benefit of students of Payam Noor University, Mashhad. *Social Youth Study* 2, 149–74. http://ssyj.baboliau.ac.ir/article_536037.html

Shasti, S, & Falamaki, M. (2014). Relation between Iranian Life Style & Housing Form Based on The Short-Term Society» & Geostrategic and Geopolitical Theory. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 6(3), 117-137. 10.7508/ISIH.2014.23.005

Stratham, J., & Chase, E. (2010). *Childhood wellbeing: A brief overview*. Loughborough: Childhood Wellbeing Research Centre.

Swami, V., Weis, L., Barron, D., & Furnham, A. (2018). Positive body image is positively associated with hedonic (emotional) and eudaimonic (psychological and social) well-being in British adults. *The Journal of social psychology*, 158(5), 541-552. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2017.1392278

Thomas, P. A., Liu, H., & Umberson, D. (2017). Family relationships and well-being. *Innovationin aging*, 1(3), igx025. doi:10.1093/geroni/igx025

Appendix 1

Social well-being Dimensions	Items	Cronbach Alpha of Retained Items (α)
Social Actualization (Sact)	1. Sact1: I believe that society has stopped making progress" 2. Sact2: Society is not improving for people like me"	0.83

	3. Sact3: I don't think social institutions like law and government make your life better"; 4. Sact4: "I see society as continually evolving" 5. Sact5: I think our society is a productive place for people to live in. 6. Sact6: "For me, there's no such thing as social progress". 7. Sact7: "I think the world is becoming a better place for everyone" (Excluded)	
Social Coherence (Scoh)	1. Scoh1: "The world is too complex for me" 2. Scoh2: "Scientists are the only people who can understand how the world works" 3. Scoh3: "I cannot make sense of what's going on in the world" 4. Scoh4: "Most cultures are so strange that I cannot understand them" 5. Scoh5: "I think it's worthwhile to understand the world I live in" (Excluded) 6. Scoh6: "I find it hard to predict what will happen next in society"	0.82
Social Integration (Sint)	1. Sent1: "I do not feel, I belong to anything i would call a community" (Excluded) 2. Sent2: "I feel like i am an important part of my community" 3. Sent3: "If I had something to say, I believe people in my community would listen to me 4. Sent4: "I feel close to other people in my community" 5. Sent5: "I see my community as a source of comfort" 6. Sent6: "If I had something to say, I don't think, my community would take me seriously" (Excluded) 7. Sent7: "I believe other people in society value me as a person"	0.80
Social Contribution (Scon)	1. Scon1: "My behavior has the same impact on other people in my community" (Excluded) 2. Scon2: "I think I have something valuable to give the world" 3. Scon3: "My daily activities do not produce anything worthwhile for my community" 4. Scon4: "I do not have the time or energy to give anything to my community"	0.77

	5. Scon5: "I think that my work provides an important product for society"	
Social Acceptance (Sacc)	1. Sacc1: "I think that other people are unreliable" 2. Sacc2: "I believe that people are kind" (Excluded) 3. Sacc3: "I believe that people are self-centered" 4. Sacc4: "I feel that people are not trustworthy" 5. Sacc5: "I think that people live only for themselves" (Excluded) 6. Sacc6: "I believe that people are more and more dishonest these days" 7. Sacc7: "I think that people care about other people's problem" (Excluded)	0.79

Note: Items were measured on 5 point likert scale (1= strongly disagree to 2= strongly agree)