

Research Paper

## Impact of Self-Efficacy and the Family Environment on the Resilience of Physically Impaired Adolescents

Mercy Joy Sebastian<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Priyanka S J<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Jasseer J<sup>3\*</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The present study explores the impact of self-efficacy and the family environment on the resilience of physically impaired adolescents. The study was conducted among 150 participants from Kerala. The data were collected using the Bharathiar University Resilience Scale, Family Environment Scale, and General Self-Efficacy Scale. Stepwise regression analysis revealed that both self-efficacy and family environment as significant predictors of resilience. Self-efficacy, with a larger explanatory power, accounts for 38.6% of resilience variance, while family environment explains 1.6%. The study through light on the importance of nurturing self-efficacy and fostering a supportive family environment to enhance resilience in physically impaired adolescents, offering valuable insights for interventions and support programs.

**Keywords:** Resilience, Family Environment, Self-Efficacy, Physically Impaired Adolescents

Physical impairment encompasses various conditions influencing an individual's ability to move or engage in specific physical activities, including cerebral palsy, spinal cord injuries, muscular dystrophy, and limb amputations. Adolescents grappling with physical impairments encounter distinct challenges in their daily lives, such as mobility issues, activity limitations, and the potential for social isolation.

In the face of these obstacles, numerous adolescents with physical impairments demonstrate resilience, adeptly adapting to their circumstances in constructive ways. Resilience, characterized by the capacity to rebound from adversity, manage stress, and uphold a positive perspective amid challenges, becomes pivotal in enhancing the well-being and fostering positive outcomes for physically impaired adolescents. Recognizing the factors contributing to resilience in this demographic is essential for effective support and promoting their overall positive development.

The resilience of physically impaired adolescents can be shaped by various factors, including their perceived self-efficacy—reflecting their belief in effectively managing

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, University of Kerala, Kariavattom Campus, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala.

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor (on contract), Sree Narayana College, Chempazhanthy, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala.

<sup>3</sup>Professor & Head, Department of Psychology, University of Kerala, Kariavattom Campus, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala

\*Corresponding Author

Received: December 27, 2023; Revision Received: December 27, 2023; Accepted: December 31, 2023

## **Impact of Self-Efficacy and the Family Environment on the Resilience of Physically Impaired Adolescents**

physical impairments and overcoming challenges. Furthermore, the family environment holds significance in bolstering the resilience of these adolescents. Positive family dynamics, supportive relationships, and a feeling of belonging collectively contribute to fostering greater resilience and overall well-being in this population.

Adolescents grappling with physical impairment encounter distinctive hurdles in their developmental journey and daily lives. Nevertheless, certain individuals facing these challenges highlight resilience, adapting and coping effectively in the face of adversity. Recognizing the elements contributing to resilience in adolescents with physical impairments is crucial for creating interventions that foster their well-being and facilitate positive outcomes.

A key determinant in bolstering resilience among physically impaired adolescents is perceived self-efficacy—their belief in successfully executing specific tasks or navigating particular situations. When these individuals harbor confidence in their ability to manage physical challenges and surmount obstacles, they demonstrate a greater capacity to rebound from setbacks and maintain a positive perspective.

The family environment is another important factor that may influence the resilience of physically impaired adolescents. Supportive family relationships, positive communication, and a sense of belonging can all contribute to a sense of resilience and well-being in these individuals. Conversely, negative family dynamics or lack of support can undermine resilience and contribute to feelings of isolation and vulnerability.

Muthuveloe and Chinnappan (2019) examined the relationship between perceived self-efficacy and resilience in 70 orthopedically handicapped adolescents. They found that higher levels of perceived self-efficacy were associated with greater resilience, which was mediated by social support.

Williams and colleagues (2013) studied the role of family support in promoting resilience among 56 orthopedically handicapped adolescents. They found that family support was a significant predictor of resilience, and that self-efficacy partially mediated this relationship.

Thompson and colleagues (2018) investigated the impact of a family-based intervention on the resilience of 24 orthopedically handicapped adolescents. The intervention aimed to improve family communication and support, and enhance perceived self-efficacy. The researchers found that the intervention increased resilience and improved family relationships.

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### ***Participants:***

The Participants for the study consisted of 150 physically impaired adolescents who were randomly selected from different parts of Kerala.

#### ***Variables:***

The present study made use of Resilience, Family Environment, and Self-efficacy as variables.

## Impact of Self-Efficacy and the Family Environment on the Resilience of Physically Impaired Adolescents

### Instruments:

The study was carried out by using the following instruments.

- **The Bharathiar University Resilience Scale:** The Resilience Scale of Bharathiar University (BURS), developed by Annalakshmi in 2009, served as the tool for assessing resilience in this study. Comprising 30 items, the scale identified seven domains of resilience. Respondents rated each statement on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all appropriate) to 5 (most appropriate). The individual's psychological resilience level was determined by summing up the participant's responses to all 30 statements, resulting in a single score on the scale. Scores on the BURS range from 30 to 150, reflecting varying levels of resilience. The scale demonstrated satisfactory reliability, with a Cronbach alpha of 0.82.
- **Family Environment Scale:** George and Sananda Raj, 2003, developed family Environment scale and it measures the degree of family environment of adolescents. Instructions given in the manual has been followed for the administration and scoring of this tool. For positive items the scores of 5,4,3,2, and 1 were given for the responses, strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree, while it was reversed for negative items. The cronbach alpha was found to be 0.89, so the scale have adequate reliability and have content validity.
- **General Self-Efficacy Scale (Ralf Schwarzer & Matthias Jerusalem, 2000 revised):**The General Self-Efficacy Scale, a revised instrument developed by Ralf Schwarzer and Matthias Jerusalem in 2000, is designed for self-administration within the context of a comprehensive questionnaire. The scale comprises 10 items, which are best presented in a randomly mixed format alongside other items sharing a similar response structure. Typically taking around 4 minutes to complete, the scale exhibits a reliability score of 0.63, affirming its reliability and confirming face validity in assessment contexts.

### Data Collection Procedure

After obtaining permission from the concerned authority, the investigators personally met with each participant. The purpose of the study was briefly explained, and the confidentiality of the responses was ensured. Upon obtaining consent from the participants, the investigators administered the questionnaires one by one. The investigator helped the participants to clear their doubts regarding the method of responding.

**Table- 1 Results of stepwise regression analysis with Resilience as the dependent variable and Self-efficacy and Family environment as predictors**

DV	PV	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> change	Std. error of the estimate	Beta Coefficient
Resilience	Self-efficacy	0.621	0.386	0.384	0.386	29.813	0.621
	Family Environment	0.634	0.402	0.398	0.016	29.469	0.157

The results shown in Table 1 indicate that both self-efficacy and family environment were found to be significant predictors of resilience. The correlation coefficients (R) between self-efficacy and resilience (0.621) and between family environment and resilience (0.634) suggest moderate positive relationships.

## Impact of Self-Efficacy and the Family Environment on the Resilience of Physically Impaired Adolescents

The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is a measure of the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (resilience) that can be explained by the predictor variables. In this case, the  $R^2$  for self-efficacy is 0.386, indicating that self-efficacy accounts for 38.6% of the variance in resilience. The  $R^2$  for family environment is 0.402, suggesting that family environment explains 40.2% of the variance in resilience. Together, these variables account for 40.2% of the variance in resilience.

The statement that self-efficacy emerged as a more prominent predictor than family environment implies that self-efficacy explains a larger proportion of the variance in resilience compared to family environment. Specifically, self-efficacy accounts for 38.6% of the variance, while family environment accounts for 1.6% of the variance in resilience.

The obtained beta associated with family environment is stated as  $\text{Beta} = 0.157$ . The beta coefficient represents the standardized regression coefficient, which indicates the strength and direction of the relationship between the predictor variable (family environment) and the outcome variable (resilience). A positive beta value suggests that higher levels of family environment are associated with higher levels of resilience.

### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study findings highlight the significant predictive roles of both self-efficacy and the family environment in resilience among physically impaired adolescents. Although self-efficacy stands out as the more prominent predictor, contributing to a larger proportion of the variance, the family environment also plays a role in elucidating resilience. These results underscore the importance of nurturing self-efficacy and cultivating a supportive family environment as integral factors for enhancing resilience in adolescents facing physical impairments.

### REFERENCES

- Achour, M. & Mohd Roslan Mohd Nor. (2014). The effects of social support and resilience on life satisfaction of secondary school students. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies* 4(1): 12–20.
- Al-Dubai, S. A., M. A. Aishangga, K. G. Rampal and Nik Aziz Sulaiman. (2012). Factor structure and reliability of the Malay version of the perceived stress scale among Malaysian medical students. *Journal of Medical Sciences* 19: 43–49.
- Armstrong, M. I., S. Bernie-Leftkovich and M. T. Ungar. (2005). Pathways between social support, family well-being, quality of parenting, and child resilience: What we know. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 14(2): 269–281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10826-005-5054-4>.
- Bandura, A. 1997. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barutchu, C. D. and H. Bert. 2013. The relationship between social support and quality of life in patients with heart failure. *Journal of Pakistan Medical Association* 63(4): 463–467.
- Benard, B. 1993. Fostering resiliency in kids. *Educational Leadership* 51(3): 44–48.
- Brooks, J. E. 2006. Strengthening resilience in children and youths: Maximizing opportunities in the schools. *Children and Schools* 28: 69–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cs/28.2.69>.
- Calmes, S. A. 2012. The relationship between adverse childhood events, resilience, and substance dependence among a college freshman population. PhD diss., the University of Toledo.

## Impact of Self-Efficacy and the Family Environment on the Resilience of Physically Impaired Adolescents

- Cassidy, S. 2015. Resilience building in students: The role of academic self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6: 1781. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01781>.
- Cayirdag, N. 2012. Perceived social support, academic self-efficacy, and demographic characteristics as predictors of perceived stress. PhD diss., Middle East Technical University.
- Clifton, P. A., R. P. Perry, C. A. Stubbs and L. W. Roberts. 2004. Faculty environments, psychosocial dispositions, and the academic achievement of college students. *Research in Higher Education* 45(8): 801–827. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/S11162-004-5950-2>.
- Cicchetti, D. 2010. Resilience under conditions of extreme stress: A multilevel perspective. *World Psychiatry* 9: 145–154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2051-5545.2010.tb00297.x>.
- Cohen, S. 2004. Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist* 59: 676–84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.676>.
- Cohen, S., T. Kamarck and R. Mermelstein. 1983. A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour* 24: 385–396. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2136404>.
- Dent, R. J. & R. J. S. Cameron. 2003. Developing resilience in children who are in public care: The educational psychological perspective. *Routledge* 19(1): 3–19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0266736032000061170>.

### ***Acknowledgment***

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

### ***Conflict of Interest***

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

***How to cite this article:*** Sebastian, M.J., Priyanka, S.J. & Jasseer, J. (2023). Impact of Self-Efficacy and the Family Environment on the Resilience of Physically Impaired Adolescents. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(4), 2810-2814. DIP:18.01.264.20231104, DOI:10.25215/1104.264