

The Relationship between Self-Efficacy, Social Support and Psychological Well-Being among Adolescent with Physical Disabilities in Lagos State, Nigeria

Hubungan antara Efikasi Kendiri, Sokongan Sosial dan Kesejahteraan Psikologi dalam Kalangan Remaja Kurang Upaya Fizikal di Negeri Lagos, Nigeria

Nwosu Eziaha James Jay Jay, Hanina H. Hamsan and Aini Azeqa Ma'rof
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Correspondence author: hanina@upm.edu.my

Received date: 2 November 2020 / Accepted date: 12 December 2020

Dihantar: 2 November 2020 / Diterima: 12 Disember 2020

The aims of this study was to examine the relationship between self-efficacy, social support, and psychological wellbeing among adolescent with physical disabilities in Lagos State, Nigeria. Total of 300 students (141 males & 159 females) from public secondary schools participated in this study, aged between 13 to 17 years old. A multistage sampling technique was used to choose the respondent. Three established instruments were used to measure the variables studied: Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-being (Ryff, 1989), Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) (Zimet et al., 2010) and General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). The independent sample t-test analysis revealed that there was a significant difference in peers social support and psychological well-being (autonomy) between males and females. Furthermore, there was positive correlation between five factors of psychological wellbeing (autonomy, personal growth, purpose in life, self-acceptance, and environmental mastery) and social support (family & friends). There was a significant relationship between self-efficacy and social support (family & friends). Peers social support was found as the main predictor of purpose in life. Thus, the findings indicate that self-efficacy has a positive and significant impact on purpose in life, consequently, high level of self-efficacy contributes to high levels of life satisfaction. More also, social support from family and friends help to facilitate the adolescent's advancement in manners that are healthier. Gender does not have an impact on psychological well-being among male and female adolescents with physical disabilities in Nigeria. The finding of the study can assist with planning projects, methods, and strategies to improve students' self-efficacy and psychological well-being.

Keywords: adolescent, physical disabilities, self-efficacy, social support, psychological well-being

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengenal pasti hubungan antara keberkesanan diri, sokongan sosial dan kesejahteraan psikologi dalam kalangan remaja dengan kurang upaya fizikal di Lagos State, Nigeria. Seramai 300 pelajar (141 lelaki & 159 perempuan) dari sekolah menengah awam terlibat dalam kajian ini, berumur antara 13 hingga 17 tahun. Teknik pensampelan pelbagai peringkat digunakan untuk memilih responden. Tiga instrumen yang sedia ada telah digunakan untuk mengukur variabel kajian: Skala Kesejahteraan Psikologi (Ryff, 1989), Skala Tanggapan Terhadap Sokongan Sosial (MSPSS) (Zimet et al., 2010), dan Skala Efikasi Kendiri (GSE) (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). Analisis ujian-t secara bebas menunjukkan terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan bagi sokongan sosial rakan sebaya dan kesejahteraan psikologi (autonomi) antara lelaki dan perempuan. Seterusnya, terdapat hubungan korelasi yang positif antara kelima-lima faktor kesejahteraan psikologi (autonomi, perkembangan diri, tujuan hidup, penerimaan diri & penguasaan persekitaran) dan sokongan sosial (keluarga & rakan). Terdapat hubungan yang signifikan antara efikasi sendiri dan sokongan sosial (keluarga & rakan). Sokongan sosial rakan sebaya didapati berperanan sebagai faktor penentu utama tujuan hidup. Oleh itu, penemuan ini menggambarkan bahawa efikasi sendiri mempunyai hubungan yang positif dan kesan signifikan terhadap tujuan hidup, dalam masa yang sama tahap efikasi sendiri yang tinggi menyumbang kepada tahap kepuasan hidup yang tinggi. Sokongan sosial daripada keluarga dan rakan sebaya juga dapat membantu memudahcara kemajuan remaja dalam aspek kesihatan yang lebih baik. Jantina tidak memberi sebarang kesan terhadap kesejahteraan psikologi remaja dengan kurang upaya fizikal di Nigeria. Hasil kajian ini boleh membantu perancangan projek, kaedah dan strategi bagi memperbaiki efikasi sendiri dan kesejahteraan psikologi pelajar.

Kata kunci: remaja, kurang upaya fizikal, efikasi sendiri, sokongan sosial, kesejahteraan psikologi

Adolescents is a period of natural changes, social advances and psychological modifications. Although not all adolescents will experience the same changes, out of proportion younger individuals with disabilities are prone to face difficult situations than their normally developing friends. Logically, most adolescents who have one disability or the other will love to have social prospects and developmental encounters like their normally developing friends. Notwithstanding, is almost impossible for adolescents with physical disabilities to partake in any social activities as their friends without disabilities at the similar rate and stage especially when faced with hard times, hence, negative psychosocial impacts like dejection and pressure can be the result (Maxey & Beckert, 2016). The public in general does not always recognize that disability is a part and parcel of humankind but rather, individuals will in general glance at the impacts of disability as a barrier (Murugami, 2009). The 2006 Nigerian census stated that, 3,253,169 people with disabilities, even so, a Nigerian NGO guarantees the statistics did not cover the in depth of disability in Nigeria. World document on disability reported that, around 25 million Nigerians had at a minimum one disability, while 3.6 million of these had huge problems in functioning. As of 2020, there are reportedly over 27 million Nigerians dwelling with some type of disability. In descending order, the five most frequent types of disabilities present in Nigeria as of 2017 are physical impairment, mental impairment, ear impairment, eye impairment and physical impairment (Raising the Floor-International, 2017).

Disability in Nigeria is seen as a curse; thus, individuals oppress people with disabilities, even inside the family. The resultant culture has truly precluded these Nigerians from claiming their privileges to the pride of the human individual and to the improvement of their maximum capacity to take an interest in the formative procedure of Nigeria. Therefore, psychological well-being is vital for adolescents, as it is the state of being emotionally and mentally well, which helps individual to function well in daily life and crucial to be aware of (Ikediashi & Akande, 2015).

Psychological well-being is how people feel about their daily activities of livelihood and might extent from pessimistic psychological strains or mental state such as depression, exasperation, assertion, worry, lack of happiness and positive mental health which is as a result that led to the state of being unsatisfied (Jahoda, 1958). More also, one of the top priorities known to promote a healthy human development is improving adolescents' wellbeing. People with disabilities tend to outline wellbeing as self-determined and unbiased, which means freedom from pain and having both emotional and physical well-being. Suggestions has been made due to some evidence that stated that an elevated level of self-reflection of wellbeing may alleviate the unfavorable impact of disability on the fulfillment of life and sickness (Diener & Chan, 2011, 2009; Patrick, et al., 2002).

Social support is one of the factors related to adolescents' psychological well-being. Research has shown that absence of social support is known of being among one of the components which has given rise to numerous challenges psychologically amidst undergraduates. More also, social support takes part in a significant role in overseeing psychological problems, quit a good amount of literature and experimental research has shown the connection between

psychological problems and social support among undergraduate students (Yasin & Dzulkifli, 2011). Furthermore, previous studies have shown that social support influenced well-being among adolescent (Rothon et al., 2011; Khatib et al., 2013), however, relationships between social supports and psychological well-being are often being examined in terms of their direct linkage. Adolescents who have friends who supports them obtain benefit to improve themselves as they study to talk, listen and they gradually have passion towards others, peers are an essential means to assist teenagers evaluate the milieu excluding their surroundings (Santrock, 2001). Also, parental involvement and effective parental conduct have been observed to be an element that should stop adolescents from taking part in violent actions (Bronfenbrenner, 1995).

Furthermore, self-efficacy had a significant and positive influence on psychological well-being. Therefore, a high level of fulfillment and commitment is because of a high level of self-efficacy, if self-efficacy is low psychological wellbeing is also low, if self-efficacy is high psychological wellbeing also high (Siddiqui, 2015). Warner et al. (2011) notice that without one's general self-belief in one's potential to take care of the responsibilities placed on themselves and achieve ones' objective, perceived self-efficacy may fluctuate in the presence of the existing issues they encounter. According to Sagone and Caroli (2013), there is a tremendous relationship between psychological well-being and general self-efficacy, mainly personal growth, self-acceptance, and environmental mastery. For age, the highest ratings of positive relations with others, personal growth, self-acceptance, and purpose in life were obtained by 16 years adolescents except for autonomy, whilst low scores were 14years and 18 years.

Today in Nigeria, many individuals are viewed to go through signs and symptoms of physical health problem because of this lack of social support that is gotten from a perfect neighborhood life. Adolescents' living with impairments are confronted via social stigma, prejudices, and discrimination. A social distance places them in social isolation from their able-bodied friends (Shaar, 2013). Studies that have been done specifically to identify the variables relating to psychological well-being are very limited. There are also limited documented study on the adolescents with physical disabilities in Nigeria, thus this study intends to give additional details in this discipline. The above issues that have been outline is a clear indication that shows how vital it is to examine the relationship between self-efficacy, social support and psychological well-being among adolescents with physical disabilities in Nigeria.

Method

Sample

The sample of the present study consisted of 300 (males 141 & females 159) students. Multistage sampling technique was used to choose respondents from public secondary schools in Ikeja, Agege, Ifako-Ijaiye and Muchin Local Government Area Lagos State, Nigeria.

Instruments

Psychological well-being: Psychological well-being was measured using an adopted version of self-reported Psychological well-being scale, the Ryff scales of psychological well-being (Ryff, 1989). This section consisted of fifty-four questions which were used to measure the participant's psychological wellbeing. Respondents were to score each item using a 6-point Likert from strongly disagree (choice 1) to Agree (choice 6). The scale included six subscales that measured self-acceptance, personal growth, purpose in life, personal relationship with others, autonomy. Each subscale consisted of nine questions. Cronbach's alpha of psychological wellbeing according to each sub scale in the current study was (self-acceptance 0.71, personal growth 0.68, purpose in life 0.65, positive relationships with others 0.78, environmental mastery 0.64 and autonomy 0.60).

Social support: Social support was measured using an adopted version of self-reported Perceived social support / Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) (Zimet et al., 2010). This scale consisted of twelve questions. The respondents were asked to answer each question on a 7-point Likert scale from very strongly disagree (scale-1) to very strongly agree (scale-7). The scale included two subscales that measures family and friends, each subscale consisted of four questions. Cronbach's alpha of social support according to each sub scale in the current study was (family 0.60 and friends 0.53).

Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy was measured using an adopted version of the general Self-Efficacy scale (GSE)

(Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). This section consisted of ten questions. Respondents were to score each item using a 4-point likert scale from ever (choice 1) to often (choice 4). Cronbach's alpha of self-efficacy scale in the current study was 0.51.

Procedure: The instruments were administered on the adolescents with physical disabilities attending government secondary schools, good relationships were formed before the distribution of the instruments, proper instructions were provided to the respondents and confidentiality was taken into account; after that the questionnaires were distributed, they respondents took thirty to forty-five minutes to answer the questionnaires and finally data was collected.

Data analysis: The information that was gathered in the current research was analyzed by utilizing the IBM SPSS Statistics version 20. Independent Sample T-Test, Pearson Correlation Test, Multiple Linear Regression and Hierarchical Regression were used to confirm the research objectives.

Results

As depicted in Table 1, majority of the respondents had upper/ lower disability and spina bifida (80%), while the rest had hearing problems, eye problems and others (20%) which included dwarfism. About the severity of physical disability majority had medium and low physical disabilities (90%).

Table 1
Participant Characteristics

Background	n	(%)	Mean	Sd	Min	Max
Type of physical disability						
Upper/Lower limbs	163	54.0				
Spina bifida	76	26.0				
Hearing problems	25	8.0				
Eye problem	30	10.0				
Others	6	2.0				
Severity of physical disability			2.36	0.65	1.00	3.00
Severe (7-10)	29	10.0				
Moderate (4-6)	134	44.0				
Mild (0-3)	137	46.0				

According to Table 2, the findings of the current studies shows there is a significant difference in social support from friends between male and female. Females (M = 4.19, SD =

0.912) showed a higher support from friends than males (M = 3.94, SD = 0.759), $t = -2.483$, $p < .05$.

Table 2
Independent Sample t-test Analysis to Compare the Difference in Social Support between Male and Female

Social support	Gender	n	Mean	Sd	t	p
Family	Male	141	3.56	0.673	-.618	.537
	Female	159	3.60	0.691		
Friends	Male	141	3.94	0.759	-2.483	.014
	Female	159	4.19	0.912		

Table 3 indicated that, among all six dimension of psychological well-being females (Mean = 4.20, SD = 0.708) had a higher statistically significant scores than males

(Mean = 4.03, SD = 0.608), $t = -2.207$, $p < .05$ in one of the dimensions namely: autonomy.

Table 3

Independent Sample t-test Analysis to Compare the Difference in Psychological Well-being between Male and Female

Psychological wellbeing (overall)	Gender	n	Mean	Sd	t	p
Autonomy	Male	141	4.03	.608	-2.207	.028
	Female	159	4.20	.708		
Environmental Mastery	Male	141	3.77	.559	-.994	.321
	Female	159	3.84	.698		
Personal	Male	141	4.07	.570	-.841	.401
	Female	159	4.14	.833		
Purpose in life	Male	141	4.12	.529	.105	.916
	Female	159	4.11	.816		
Self-acceptance	Male	141	4.06	.595	-1.021	.308
	Female	159	4.14	.848		
Positive relationship with others	Male	141	3.38	.436	-.457	.648
	Female	159	3.40	.354		

According to Table 4, there was a positive significant relationship between autonomy, environmental mastery,

personal growth, purpose in life, self-acceptance, and social support (family and friends), $p < .05$.

Table 4

Pearson Correlation Analysis between Psychological Well-being and Social Support

Psychological wellbeing	Social support	
	Family	Friends
Autonomy	.166**	.229**
Environmental mastery	.215**	.212**
Personal growth	.223**	.229**
Purpose in life	.224**	.276**
Self-acceptance	.120**	.261**
Positive Relationship with others	-.016	-.115*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 5 depicted that, there was a positive significant relationship between self -efficacy and social support from

family ($r = .388$, $p < .05$) and between self-efficacy and social support from friends ($r = .371$, $p < .05$).

Table 5

Pearson Correlation Analysis between Independent Variable and Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy	Social support	
	Family	Friends
	.388**	.371**

** $p < .01$.

As depicted in Table 6, the largest coefficients was for friends (Beta = .217). This means that social support from

friends is the strongest predictor which explains the dependent variable (purpose in life).

Table 6
Multiple Regression Analysis on the Prediction of Purpose in Life

Predictor variables	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	p
(Constant)	2.928	.281	-	10.437	.000
Family	.118	.067	.116	3.345	.079
Friends	.178	.053	.217	0.018	.001
Self-efficacy	.017	.115	.009	0.149	.882

Note: R = .295^a, R² = .087, Adjusted R² = .078

Discussion

The objective of the study was to examine the relationship between self-efficacy, social support and psychological well-being. The findings of this study indicate that, female respondents perceived significantly higher social support from friends than male respondents, while there was no significant difference in social support from family for both genders. Females have friends who sincerely try to assist them and can discuss with them in times of troubles than males. The findings are similar with the findings of Matud et al. (2003), they concluded that there are gender differences in the structure of perceived social support and that these differences can be explained by socialization experiences and social roles associated with gender. Among all six dimensions of psychological well-being females had a higher statistically significant scores than males in one of the dimensions namely: autonomy. It means females respondents are independent and regulates their behavior independent of social pressures, the results are not similar to the findings of (Gomez, et al., 2018) who stated that women reported lower psychological well-being and more health problems than men. The total effect of gender on both well-being and health problems was found to be significant.

Also, the findings of this study revealed that, there were a significant relationship between five factors of psychological wellbeing and social support, there was also a positive significant relationship between self-efficacy and social support (family & friends) but there was no significant relationship between all six factors of psychological wellbeing and self-efficacy. This study determined that as perceived social support levels decrease, psychological well-being also decreases. The fact that people are not aware of the presence of social support implies it will decrease their autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, purpose in life and self-acceptance by leading them to experience worst. Also, if the respondents have good social support, then their self-efficacy significantly will be enhanced. Social support is an essential useful resource that can assist people cope with stress, strengthen self-confidence, and enhance self-efficacy. Cultivating and enhancing adolescents with physical disabilities social support network has a positive impact on diminishing their work stress and improving their self-efficacy (Wang, 2015). According to Glozah (2013), a significant interaction impact was found indicating that the influence of educational stress

on psychological well-being depends extensively on perceived social support from family and friends. This finding is constant with the stress-buffering speculation that perceived support protects humans from existence stress which in flip enhances psychological wellbeing.

The result of stepwise multiple regression analysis shows that the largest coefficients was for friends (Beta = .217, p < 0.05). This means that social support from friends is the strongest predictor which explains the dependent variable (purpose in life). The results are partially like those of Yasin and Dzulkifli (2011), who revealed that the psychological wellbeing of a person is predicted by two types of social support, namely family and friends. This, in line with Ecological Theory's explanation on the role of microsystem in human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1995).

Conclusion

Based on these findings it can be concluded that self-efficacy has a positive and significant effect on purpose in life among adolescents with physical disabilities, therefore, a high level of self-efficacy contributes to a high level of fulfillment in life. More also social support from family and friends help to facilitate the adolescent's advancement in manners that are healthier, more attempt should be made to reduce the stereotype of how people see physical disabilities in our society today. Furthermore, gender does not have an impact on psychological wellbeing among male and female adolescents with physical disabilities in Nigeria. This is an indication that gender bias has reduced in Nigeria and that both male and female are being raised equally, giving both gender the same number of privileges and opportunities.

References

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1995). In P. Moen, G. H. Elder, Jr. & K. Luscher (Eds.), *Examining lives in context: Perspective on the ecology of human development* (pp. 619–647). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from, <http://www.its.dept.uncg.edu/hdf/facultystaff/Tudge/Bronfenbrenner%201995.dt>
- Diener E. & Chan M.Y. (2011). Happy people live longer: Subjective well-being contributes to health and longevity. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 3(1), 1–43. doi:10.1111/j.1758-0854.2010.01045.x

- Glozah, F. N. (2013). Effects of academic stress and perceived social support on the psychological well-being of adolescents in Ghana. *Open Journal of Medical Psychology*, 2(4), 143–150. doi:10.4236/ojmp.2013.24022
- Gomez, B., D., Lucia, C. A. & Salinas, P. J. (2018). Gender differences in psychological well-being and health problems among European health professionals. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30002335>.
- Ikediashi, N. N., & Akande, J.A. (2015). Anti-behaviors among Nigerian Adolescents. *Journal of Research and Method of Education*, 5(4), 31–36.
- Jahoda, M. (1958). *Current concepts of positive mental health*. New York: Basic Books 9.
- Khatib, Y., Bhui, K., & Stansfeld, S. A. (2013). Does social support protect against depression & psychological distress? Findings from the RELACHS study of East London adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36(2), 393–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.01.001>
- Matud, M. P., Ibanez, I., Bethencourt, J. M., Marrero, R. & Carballeira, M. (2003). Structural gender differences in perceived social support. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35(8), 1919–1929. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869\(03\)00041-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(03)00041-2).
- Maxey, M. & Beckert, T. E. (2016). Adolescents with disabilities. *Adolescent Research Review*, 2(2), 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-016-0043-y>
- Murugami, M. (2009). Disability and integrity. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 29. doi:10.18061/dsq.v29i4.979.
- Patrick, D. L., Edwards, T. C., & Topolski, T. D. (2002). Adolescent quality of life, part II: Initial validation of a new instrument. *Journal of Adolescence*, 25, 287–300.
- Raising the Floor – International (2017). *Physical disability is a limitation on a person's physical functioning, mobility, dexterity or stamina*. Retrieved from <https://ds.gpii.net/content/what-physical-disability>
- Rothon, C., Head, J., Klineberg, E., & Stansfeld, S. (2011). Can social support protect bullied adolescents from adverse outcomes? A prospective study on the effects of bullying on the educational achievement and mental health of adolescents at secondary schools in East London. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34(3), 579–588. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2010.02.007>
- Ryff, Carol D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081.
- Sagone, E. & Caroli, M. E. (2013). Relationships between resilience, self-efficacy, and thinking styles in Italian middle adolescents. *Procedure-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 92, 838–845. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.763
- Santrock, J. W. (2001). *Adolescence* (8th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- 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.
- Shaar, K. H. (2013). Severe war trauma and post-traumatic stress disorder in adolescents with sensory impairments. *Health Psychology Research*, 1(2), 16. doi:10.4081/hpr.2013.686
- Siddiqui, S. (2015). Impact of self-efficacy on psychological well-being among undergraduate students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2 (3), doi: 10.25215/0203.040, dip: 18.01.040/20150203
- Silbereisen, R. K. & Todt, E. (1994). The broader context of social influence in adolescence. In R. K. Silbereisen & E. Todt (Eds.), *Adolescence in Context: The interplay of family, school, peers, and work in adjustment*. New York: Springer-Verlag Inc
- Wang, C., Qu, H. & Xu, H. (2015). Relationship between social support and self-efficacy in women psychiatrists. *Chinese Nursing Research*, 2(4), 103–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnre.2015.10.002>
- Warner, L. M., Ziegelmann, J. P., Schuz, B., Wurm, S., Tesch-Romer, C. & Schwarzer, R. (2011). Maintaining autonomy despite multimorbidity: Self-efficacy and the two faces of social support. *European Journal of Aging*, 8(1), 3–12.
- Yasin, M. S., & Dzulkifli, M. A. (2011). The relationship between social support and academic achievement. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(1), 277–281.
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet S. G. & Farley, G. K. (2010). The Multidimensional Scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 1988, 52, 30–41.