



## Role of Self-efficacy and Family Environment in Regulating Psychological Well Being of Adolescents

Mary Antony P. and Manikandan K.

Department of Psychology, University of Calicut, Calicut University P.O., Pin: 673 635, Kerala, INDIA

Available online at: [www.isca.in](http://www.isca.in)

Received 28<sup>th</sup> October 2015, revised 14<sup>th</sup> November 2015, accepted 30<sup>th</sup> November 2015

### Abstract

*The aim of the study was to understand the role of self-efficacy and family interactions and environment in regulating psychological wellbeing of adolescents. Self-efficacy is the beliefs that individuals hold about their own abilities to make plans for and execute tasks within a specific domain to effectively lead to specific goals. Family plays vital role in moulding individuals' personality. Family environment characterized by conflict, unhealthy relationships and poor parenting are closely associated with building up troublesome individuals. Psychological well-being is usually conceptualised as some combination of positive affective states such as happiness and functioning with optimal effectiveness in individual and social life. Adolescents have very special and distinct needs and be treated carefully which in turn helps in developing robust citizens for the country. The participants of the study consist of 200 adolescents and collected data using Self-efficacy Scale, Family Environment Scale, Psychological Well Being Scale and Personal Information sheet. Results revealed that there exist significant sex difference among adolescents in variables such as psychological wellbeing and sub dimensions of family environment organization and control. There exists significant religious difference for variables self-efficacy, psychological wellbeing and two dimensions of family environment namely intellectual cultural orientation and moral religious emphasis. In the case of family type neither nuclear nor joint have any significant difference between self-efficacy, psychological wellbeing and also on ten dimensions of family environment.*

**Keywords:** Adolescents, family environment, psychological well being, self-efficacy.

### Introduction

Every phases in a lifetime are relevant. Some among it are more imperative due to their immediate and long term effects. Adolescence is one such period where both the effects are vital. As part of that adolescents have vague idea regarding their status and also experience confusions about the roles that they are expected to play. At certain times adolescents are neither considered as children nor as adult by the society.

Generally there appears five major changes during adolescence which are closely related with each other. The first is changes in the levels of emotions which are much connected to psychological and physical changes. Second, changes linked with sexual maturity. Thirdly transformations and modifications in their roles, bodies, interests and so on. Fourthly alterations in behavior and interests in turn lead to changes in values. Fifth, adolescents experiences uncertainties towards those changes<sup>1</sup>.

Adolescents experience lot of problems as an outcome of identity crisis encountered by them. They fail to cope with the problems. Wide range of social changes appears during adolescents. Most important among it are influence of peers, setting new standards for selecting friends and forming new groups. Outlook and thoughts of adolescents are much depended on the common and widespread stereotypes. Adolescence is also considered as a time of unrealism. This is especially true of adolescent aspirations.

Wellbeing is a term that always appears to be difficult to explain by a single definition. For that reason itself wellbeing has been concern and interest of many researchers. Wellbeing is a state which is an essential prerequisite for the existence of human beings. Wide variety of factors influence and contribute to wellbeing. Wellbeing is a term that mostly has positive connotations. Wellbeing is a necessary feature for safeguarding and augmenting the lives of individuals and communities. Wellbeing is a condition of feeling good and functioning well in one's life. Prevention or absence of illness is not the only factor associated with wellbeing. Besides that various others related to wellbeing includes improved quality of life, greater productivity in employment, good and consistent social relationships, better educational attainments and so on. Wellbeing is much connected to life satisfaction that an individual feels about one self and their own lives.

It is necessary to understand the historical background before defining the term wellbeing. Hedonic and eudaimonic traditions are the two main approaches that are closely knitted with wellbeing. Hedonic tradition, bestows much emphasis for as happiness, positive affect, low negative affect, and satisfaction with life<sup>2-5</sup>. Whereas eudaimonic perspective, accentuates the positive psychological functioning and human development<sup>6-9</sup>. This supports the view that psychological wellbeing is a multidimensional construct<sup>10-12</sup>. Multiplicity of facts in turn forms perplexing and conflicting research base<sup>13</sup>.

Psychological wellbeing is a multidimensional concept. People experiencing psychological well being possess self esteem, positive attitudes and feelings and also will be able to manage their stress and negative thoughts. Psychological well-being is usually conceptualised as some combination of positive affective states such as happiness (the hedonic perspective) and functioning with optimal effectiveness in individual and social life (the eudaimonic perspective)<sup>14</sup>. Huppert "Psychological well-being is about lives going well"<sup>15</sup>. It is the combination of feeling good and functioning effectively." By definition therefore, people with high PWB report feeling happy, capable, well-supported, satisfied with life, and so on; Huppert's review also claims the consequences of PWB to include better physical health, mediated possibly by brain activation patterns, neurochemical effects and genetic factors.

Self-efficacy means beliefs that individuals hold about their own abilities to make plans for and execute tasks within a specific domain to effectively lead to specific goals. Albert Bandura is the initiator of the term self-efficacy. Bandura's thought regarding self-efficacy was entrenched within his social cognitive theories of personality. People with high self-efficacy be likely to have higher level of desire and higher obligation. Besides that they reinstate themselves after facing with failures better than those with poor self-efficacy. People with high self-efficacy are ready to confront very challenging and extreme situations instead of staying away from it.

People with high self-efficacy carry out tough and exigent tasks. Individuals with high self-efficacy are able to face stressful situations and also tackle those situations. Bandura attributes the development of self-efficacy to four forces: mastery, social learning, social persuasion, and emotional and physical states. Of the four, the most powerful for producing self-efficacy is mastery and the most powerful is undermining self-efficacy is social persuasion<sup>16</sup>. A number of structural conditions impact self-efficacy: social class, race, level of educations rural and urban backgrounds and gender all affect an individual global self-efficacy<sup>17</sup>.

Family plays vital role in moulding individuals' personality. One of the strongest socializing forces of society is family. Wide variety of factors in family helps in the overall development of children. Adequate parenting practices are a necessary aspect required for the positive growth of children. Emotional and cognitive development of children may get effected if they are experiencing maltreatment and violence at their own home. Divorce and parental psychopathology plays noteworthy part in creating antisocial personalities. Family structure to have a direct relationship to adolescent's self-efficacy<sup>18,19</sup>. Family environment characterized by conflict, unhealthy relationships and poor parenting are closely associated with building up troublesome individuals.

Modern society has become complex place where running healthy life has become one of the very pertinent and intricate errands. People are struggling lot to overcome hardships that hinder

harmonious living. There are chances that such instances moulds one's thought and perspectives about society. People with strong and optimistic family environment and high self-efficacy experience wellbeing.

**Objectives:** i. To know whether there exist any significant sex difference on self-efficacy, psychological wellbeing and family environment of adolescents. ii. To know whether there exist any significant religious difference on self-efficacy, psychological wellbeing and family environment of adolescents. iii. To know whether there exist any significant family type difference on self-efficacy, psychological wellbeing and family environment of adolescents. iv. To know the role of self-efficacy and family environment in regulating psychological well being of adolescents.

## Methodology

**Participants:** The participants of the study consist of 200 adolescents with a mean age of 13 and ranges from 12 to 15. Among the total participants 100 were boys and 100 were girls. Regarding the religious affiliation 86 belongs to Hindu and 114 of them were Muslims. Within the 200 participants 30 of the adolescents parents belonged to the category of both employed, 168 parents of the adolescents were in the category single parent employed that is either father or mother and the rest 2 belonged to the category of unemployed. Among the participants 33 of them belonged to joint family and 167 belonged to nuclear family.

**Instruments:** Self-efficacy scale: Self-efficacy of subjects was measured using Self-efficacy scale developed by Manikandan<sup>20</sup>. This is a one-dimensional scale which measure how the individuals are perceives their capacities. The scale consists of 14 items with five point agreement anchors. The reliability of the scale was estimated by calculating Cronbach Alpha and it was found to be .87. Author of the scale claims face validity.

**Psychological Wellbeing Scale:** Psychological Wellbeing of the participants was measured using Psychological wellbeing scale developed by Manikandan and Mary Antony (2015)<sup>21</sup>. This is a 13 item instrument based on the concept of positive functioning of the individual. Reliability of the scale was established by calculating the Cronbach Alpha and it was found to be .86. Authors also reported face validity.

**Family Environment Scale:** Family environment scale was developed by Moos and Moos (1994)<sup>22</sup>. The family environment scale is a 90 item inventory that has ten subscales that measure the social environmental characteristics of all types of families. The reliability of the total scale was found to be 0.70. The face validity of the scale was found to be adequate.

**Personal Information Sheet:** The basic details of the participants like sex, age, religion, family type, employment category of parents, place of residence and socioeconomic status were collected using this instrument.

**Procedure:** Initially informed consent of the participants was collected in writing and they were informed about nature and importance of the study. Then the instruments were administered to the participants after giving needed instructions. Assurance was given to each that the information gathered from them would be used only for research purpose and identity would be kept confidential. Then the completed instruments were collected back, scored and treated statistically.

## Results and Discussion

Today's digital world is furnished with all types of amenities and provisions. But still there exist various crises and obstacles. Most of our adolescents experience it. Therefore the elders have to support the younger ones in tackling their hardships which in turn help them to lead vigorous lives.

Biological sex of an individual may have significant effect on their psychological characteristics. Researchers in psychology always try to establish sex differences in psychological characteristics and this directs them to design intervention, theory development and management etc. Here also the researchers compared the mean scores of self-efficacy, psychological wellbeing, and family environment. The results of the analysis are presented in table-1.

The result of comparison of mean scores of male and females revealed that in the case of self-efficacy and sub dimensions of family environment such as cohesion, expressiveness, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual cultural orientation, active recreational orientation and moral and religious emphasis no significant difference exists between boys and girls. While considering psychological wellbeing ( $t=2.76$ ,  $p<.01$ ) and left sub dimensions of family environment such as conflict ( $t=2.86$ ,  $p<.01$ ), organization ( $t=1.96$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and control ( $t=2.57$ ,  $p<.05$ ). It was clear from the results that there exists significant sex difference on these variables of adolescents. While considering the mean value for psychological wellbeing even at least for small amount girls experience psychological wellbeing more than boys. In the case of variables conflict and control the mean values indicate that boys tend to feel it more than girls. Set of rules and procedures that used to run in families of Kerala scenario may in turn generate aggression and openly expressed anger in adolescent boys towards family members than girls. But in the case of mean value of organization the girls tend to follow proper structure in planning family activities and responsibilities than adolescent boys. This may be due to the cultural values and tradition followed by Kerala society.

**Table-1**  
**Mean, SD and 't' Value of Self-Efficacy, Psychological Wellbeing and Family Environment by Sex**

Variables	Sex	N	Mean	S. D	't' Value
Self-efficacy	Girls	100	50.42	9.241	0.22
	Boys	100	50.69	8.032	
Psychological wellbeing	Girls	100	54.22	6.581	2.76**
	Boys	100	51.72	6.246	
Cohesion	Girls	100	6.93	1.350	1.09
	Boys	100	6.71	1.493	
Expressiveness	Girls	100	4.89	1.421	0.94
	Boys	100	4.71	1.258	
Conflict	Girls	100	2.06	1.406	2.86**
	Boys	100	2.67	1.596	
Independence	Girls	100	5.62	1.262	0.05
	Boys	100	5.61	1.470	
Achievement Orientation	Girls	100	6.54	1.243	0.49
	Boys	100	6.45	1.344	
Intellectual Cultural orientation	Girls	100	5.37	1.618	0.44
	Boys	100	5.47	1.630	
Active Recreational Orientation	Girls	100	5.06	1.681	0.44
	Boys	100	5.16	1.555	
Moral Religious Emphasis	Girls	100	6.09	1.652	0.14
	Boys	100	6.12	1.266	
Organization	Girls	100	7.07	1.208	1.96*
	Boys	100	6.71	1.402	
Control	Girls	100	3.85	1.424	2.57*
	Boys	100	4.35	1.395	

\*\* $p<.01$ , \* $p<.05$

Religious practice of the family is another important variable which affect the individual behaviour. Membership in a religious group will definitely shape the behaviour. Here the investigators collected information about the religious membership (not religiosity) and there were participants from two main religious groups namely Hindu and Muslim. The mean scores of participants of these two religious groups on the study variables were compared and the results are presented in table-2.

Religiosity includes one's quality of being religious and devoutness to particular religion. Various aspects of religion shape individuals' perspective regarding different affairs and issues of society. Comparison of mean scores of Hindu and Muslim religion revealed that there is no significant difference between Hindu and Muslims on sub dimensions of family environment such as cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, active recreational

orientation, organization and control. On the contrary there exists significant difference for variables self-efficacy ( $t=3.71$ ,  $p<.01$ ), psychological wellbeing ( $t=2.82$ ,  $p<.01$ ), and two dimensions of family environment namely intellectual cultural orientation ( $t=2.12$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and moral religious emphasis ( $t=2.26$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Adolescent belonging to Hindu religion compared to Muslims have high level of self-efficacy and psychological wellbeing.

Family type still another variable has received attention from behavioural scientists while studying individual in a family or social context. Because the interaction, love, care, consideration and many other personality characteristics and values of a person are moulded by family. In this study there were two type of family namely Joint and Nuclear participants belongs. The mean scores on study variables of members of Joint and Nuclear were compared and the results are presented in table-3.

**Table-2**  
**Mean, SD and 't' Value of Self-Efficacy, Psychological Wellbeing and Family Environment by Religion**

Variables	Religion	N	Mean	S. D	't' value
Self -efficacy	Hindu	86	53.08	8.512	3.71**
	Muslim	114	48.65	8.268	
Psychological wellbeing	Hindu	86	54.44	6.181	2.82**
	Muslim	114	51.86	6.577	
Cohesion	Hindu	86	6.84	1.388	0.15
	Muslim	114	6.81	1.457	
Expressiveness	Hindu	86	4.94	1.240	1.30
	Muslim	114	4.69	1.409	
Conflict	Hindu	86	2.47	1.554	0.80
	Muslim	114	2.29	1.515	
Independence	Hindu	86	5.66	1.223	0.43
	Muslim	114	5.58	1.469	
Achievement Orientation	Hindu	86	6.48	1.185	0.17
	Muslim	114	6.51	1.371	
Intellectual Cultural orientation	Hindu	86	5.70	1.587	2.12*
	Muslim	114	5.21	1.621	
Active Recreational Orientation	Hindu	86	5.21	1.660	0.75
	Muslim	114	5.04	1.585	
Moral Religious Emphasis	Hindu	86	5.84	1.486	2.26*
	Muslim	114	6.31	1.427	
Organization	Hindu	86	6.99	1.279	0.92
	Muslim	114	6.82	1.347	
Control	Hindu	86	4.01	1.410	0.76
	Muslim	114	4.17	1.445	

\*\* $p<.01$ , \* $p<.05$

**Table-3**  
**Mean, SD and 't' Value of Self-Efficacy, Psychological Wellbeing and Family Environment by Family type**

Variables	Family Type	N	Mean	S. D	't' value
Self-efficacy	Joint	33	49.64	9.943	0.67
	Nuclear	167	50.74	8.377	
Psychological wellbeing	Joint	33	53.00	7.850	0.23
	Nuclear	167	52.96	6.253	
Cohesion	Joint	33	7.21	1.431	1.74
	Nuclear	167	6.74	1.414	
Expressiveness	Joint	33	5.03	1.571	1.08
	Nuclear	167	4.75	1.292	
Conflict	Joint	33	2.06	1.580	1.25
	Nuclear	167	2.43	1.519	
Independence	Joint	33	5.52	1.395	0.45
	Nuclear	167	5.63	1.364	
Achievement Orientation	Joint	33	6.85	1.202	1.73
	Nuclear	167	6.43	1.301	
Intellectual Cultural orientation	Joint	33	5.88	1.317	1.79
	Nuclear	167	5.33	1.663	
Active Recreational Orientation	Joint	33	4.82	1.758	1.14
	Nuclear	167	5.17	1.586	
Moral Religious Emphasis	Joint	33	6.45	1.416	1.50
	Nuclear	167	6.04	1.472	
Organization	Joint	33	6.91	1.284	0.09
	Nuclear	167	6.89	1.328	
Control	Joint	33	4.06	1.321	0.17
	Nuclear	167	4.11	1.452	

Results of comparison of mean scores revealed that neither nuclear nor joint have no significant effect on self-efficacy, psychological wellbeing and also on ten dimensions of family environment. This indicates that whether joint or nuclear family the emotional bonding between the family members were high and nullify the effect of number of family members.

To know the contribution of self-efficacy and family environment to psychological wellbeing of adolescents regression analysis was performed with enter method and results presented in table-4.

**Table-4**  
**Statistical characteristics of regression**

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>
Regression	.537	.288

In the table-4, R square provides an indication of the explanatory power of the regression model on psychological wellbeing. In this case, the percentage of variance in psychological wellbeing accounted for by self-efficacy and family environment was 29%. That is, about 29% ( $R^2=0.29$ )

changes in Psychological wellbeing by self-efficacy and family environment.

**Table-5**  
**Summary of the ANOVA**

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
Regression	2441.206	11	221.928	6.930**
Residual	6020.614	188	32.025	
Total	8461.820	199		

\*\*p< .01

To test the linear relationship between the independent and dependent variable regression ANOVA was done and the results showed that at 1% error level, there is a linear relationship between self-efficacy, family environment variables and psychological wellbeing.

**Table-6**  
**Simultaneous regression between self- efficacy, family environment and psychological wellbeing**

Variables	B	Beta	t-value
Self-efficacy	.255	.337	4.95**
Cohesion	.103	.022	0.309
Expressiveness	.001	.000	0.002
Conflict	-.299	-.070	-1.04
Independence	-.598	-.125	-1.87
Achievement Orientation	.358	.071	1.05
Intellectual Cultural orientation	-.034	-.008	-0.12
Active Recreational Orientation	.582	.144	2.08*
Moral Religious Emphasis	-.192	-.043	-0.675
Organization	1.080	.218	3.04**
Control	-.008	-.002	-0.027

\*p< .05, \*\*p< .01

From table-6, it can be seen that self-efficacy, active recreational orientation and organization were the significant predictors of psychological wellbeing among adolescents. People with good amount of self-efficacy always experience psychological wellbeing. The extent of participation in social and recreational activities also influences one's psychological well being. Psychological wellbeing is maintained and improved by appropriate planning in family activities and carrying out responsibilities.

Based on the results of regression analysis the relationship between Psychological wellbeing, self efficacy and family environment will be as follows

$PWB = 32.11 + (0.26 \times SEFFS) + (0.582 \times ARO) + (1.08 \times ORG)$   
Where; PWB= Psychological Wellbeing, SEFFS= Self Efficacy, ARO= Active Recreational Orientation, ORG=Organization.

## Conclusion

Adolescent's have very distinct and specific needs. Elders should take utmost care in handling the problems faced by adolescents. This sequentially benefits adolescents to grow as robust citizens of the world. Due to complexities and particular differences in the adolescence, it has always been interest of researchers. The main focus of the study was to assess the role of self efficacy and family environment in regulating psychological wellbeing of adolescents. Results revealed that there exist significant sex difference among adolescents in variables such as psychological wellbeing and sub dimensions of family environment organization and control. There exists significant religious difference for variables self-efficacy, psychological wellbeing and two dimensions of family environment namely intellectual cultural orientation and moral religious emphasis. In the case of family type neither nuclear nor joint have any significant difference between self-efficacy, psychological wellbeing and also on ten dimensions of family environment. People with strong and optimistic family environment and high self efficacy experiences wellbeing. It's the task of the society to equip the adolescents with wellbeing which in turn help them to encounter adversities of the modern world.

## References

1. Hurlock E.B., *Developmental Psychology-A life Span Approach*, Mcgraw -Hill Publishing Co.Ltd (1996)
2. Bradburn N., *The structure of psychological well-being.*, (1969)
3. Diener E., Subjective well-being, *Psychological Bulletin.*, **95**, 542-575 (1984)
4. Kahneman D., Diener E. and Schwarz, N., *Well-being: Foundations of hedonic psychology(Eds).*,(1999)
5. Lyubomirsky S. and Lepper H.S., A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research.*, **46**, 137-15 (1999)
6. Rogers C., *On becoming a person.*, Houghton Mifflin (1961)
7. Ryff C.D., Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.*, **57**, 1069-1081(1989a)
8. Ryff C.D., Beyond Ponce de Leon and life satisfaction: New directions in quest of successful ageing, *International Journal of Behavioral Development.*, **12**, 35-55 (1989b)
9. Waterman A.S., Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic

- enjoyment, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **64(4)**, 678–691(1993)
10. Diener E., Subjective well-being, In E. Diener (Ed.), *The science of well-being*, 11–58 (2009)
  11. Michaelson J., Abdallah S., Steuer N., Thompson S. and Marks N., *National accounts of well-being Bringing real wealth onto the balance sheet* (2009)
  12. Stiglitz J., Sen A. and Fitoussi J. P. *Report by the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress*, (2009)
  13. Pollard E. and Lee P., Child well-being: A Systematic review of the literature *Social Indicators Research*, (2003)
  14. Deci E.L. and Ryan R.M., Hedonia, eudaimonia, and well-being: An introduction, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 1–11, **61(1)**, 9–78 (2008)
  15. Huppert F., Psychological Well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences, *Applied Psychology*, (2009)
  16. Bandura A., Self-efficacy toward a unified theory of behavioral change, *Psychological review*, **84**, 191-215, (1977)
  17. Birch, Adolescents whose parents are divorced: An interview study and Ethnographic Analysis, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, (1987)
  18. Bandura A., Self-efficacy in changing societies., Freeman Publishing, (1995)
  19. Schneewind. and Klaus., Impact of family processes on Control Beliefs, In Albert Bandura (ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies*., 114-148, (1995)
  20. Manikandan K., Self-Efficacy Scale, Department of Psychology, University of Calicut, (2015)
  21. Manikandan K. and Mary Antony P., Psychological Well Being Scale, Department of Psychology, and University of Calicut, (2015)
  22. Moos R.H and Moos B.S., Family Environment Scale Manual, Consulting Psychological Press Inc., (1981)