Self-Efficacy as Predictor of Happiness Among Public Senior High School Students

FERLYN B. RECTO   MARISON FELICIDAD R. DY   HELGA P. VERGARA

Department of Human and Family Development Studies
College of Human Ecology
University of the Philippines Los Baňos

Abstract: *The study determined the relationship of self-efficacy and happiness among public senior high school students as influenced by sex, social support, family income, and school curriculum. The 212 public senior high school students accomplished self-administered questionnaires which included the General Self-efficacy Scale, Oxford Happiness Questionnaire, and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. More than half of the respondents had below average self-efficacy levels. Around half were not particularly happy or unhappy and less than two-thirds had high levels of social support. Females' self-efficacy levels were higher than males but sex was not a predictor of self-efficacy. Happiness levels of females were higher than males. Social support was not a significant predictor of self-efficacy but was a significant predictor of happiness. Family income was a significant predictor of self-efficacy in higher income classes and it was a significant predictor of happiness in lower and middle classes. Students from the public laboratory high school reported higher self-efficacy levels in comparison to those following a national curriculum. There were no differences in happiness levels based on school curriculum. Self-efficacy was a predictor of happiness among public senior high school students.*

Keywords: *self-efficacy, happiness, public senior high school, social support, family income, sex, school curriculum*

I. Introduction:

Adolescence is a crucial stage in life as it is accompanied by many developmental changes and major adjustments in order to cope with the roles that adolescents are expected to fulfill. These life events have effects on adolescents and the environments they are in. The severity and nature of these effects may vary from individual to individual, depending on how they face such situations. Their approaches may vary as there are different factors that could influence a person when undertaking a task. Albert Bandura, a renowned psychologist, proposed that self-efficacy could be one of these factors.

"Perceived self-efficacy is people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives" (Bandura, 1994, p. 2). Self-efficacy has garnered much attention based on numerous researches conducted on it (Strecher et al., 1986; Tenaw, 2013; Santos et al., 2014). It has been linked to variables such as academic achievement, well-being, health, and motivation. Many researchers have found common attributes of people with high self-efficacy and low self-efficacy. For instance, Rice (1998) noted that children who excel in academic work or in sports activities have higher self-efficacy levels. These findings prove that self-efficacy can be a significant factor on developmental aspects.

Self-efficacy is believed to influence one's emotional reactions. Bandura (1994) said that depression and anxiety could be the results of inefficacy to control. People with high self-efficacy are likely to experience a more positive emotional state. Aside from emotions, Turk & Speers (1983) stated that self-efficacy can have various effects on behavior and thought patterns such as one's behavior towards a task. Liebert & Spiegler (1987) found that people willingly engage in tasks they feel they can accomplish based on their abilities but avoid tasks they believe they cannot accomplish.

If self-efficacy reflects someone's belief in accomplishment and effectiveness, will it be an adequate predictor of one's happiness? Happiness is "a quality or state characterized by pleasure, delight, joy, gladness, and contentment" (Rice, 1998, pp. 529-530). It is beneficial to maintain an overall sense of well-being since it could motivate one in achieving other life goals and in maintain harmonious interactions (Biswas-Diener & Dean, 2010). Only a few researches have tried to relate self-efficacy and happiness. Pordanjani et al. (2014) presented that self-efficacy could predict the happiness of college students because individuals with low self-efficacy could perceive situations negatively which could lead to stress that will eventually affect how they deal with difficulties. As a result, a lower happiness level is likely to occur. Considering the developmental issues in adolescence and the educational reform in the Philippines, senior high school students would make an interesting study group.

The K-12 basic education curriculum reform was implemented in the Philippines in 2012 through the Department of Education (DepEd). It caused mixed reactions but the former administration still pursued the program. The Grade 11 students of SY 2016-2017 are the first batch to experience the K-12 curriculum for senior high school. Thus, various adjustments are being made and efforts are being done by the DepEd for the improvement of the country's new education system.

Combined with the fact that this first batch of senior high school students is comprised of adolescents, they would make a suitable study sample for self-efficacy and happiness to see how they can be assisted to improve their well-being. Further, other factors such as social support, family income level, sex, and school curriculum may help in understanding the relationship between self-efficacy and happiness.

Although studies have been conducted focusing on these variables, these researches usually included college students as the respondents. Only a few studies that focus on the self-efficacy and happiness of high school students can be accessed. Furthermore, as the K-12 program is a relevant issue at present, studies that would explore it are needed.

The research study aimed to determine the relationship of self-efficacy to the happiness of adolescent senior high school students from public schools. This study can serve as a future reference for educators and researchers of human development, positive psychology, educational psychology, and related fields. It could also help educators and practitioners in developing appropriate approaches to help these students achieve optimum potentials by exploring their well-being. Specifically, it aimed to answer these questions:

1. What is the self-efficacy level of senior high school students in a public high school following a national curriculum and a public laboratory high school?

2. What is the happiness level of the respondents?

3. What are the effects of sex, social support, family income level, and school curriculum on the self-efficacy and happiness levels of the respondents?

4. What is the relationship of the self-efficacy level to the happiness level of the respondents?

2. Methodology

This is a quantitative study which used a cross-sectional design as data were gathered at one point in time. Senior high school students were chosen from two public schools in Bay, Laguna; a school which follows the DepEd curriculum and a laboratory high school. Purposive sampling was employed. With 90% confidence interval and a 5% margin of error, the sample size of 212 was computed, with 126 students from the school with a Deped curriculum and 86 students from the public laboratory high school.

A self-administered questionnaire in English with four parts was accomplished by the respondents. The first part gathered the demographic information (age, sex, monthly family income). The second part was the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) developed by Zimet et al. (1988). MSPSS is a 12-item scale of perceived social support from family, friends, and significant other answered on a 1 (Very strongly disagree) to 7 (Very strongly agree) scale. The highest possible score is 84 and 7 is the highest possible mean score that can be obtained. Higher scores indicate high support. The third part is the Generalized Self-efficacy Scale (GSES) by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995). It is a ten-item scale that assesses one's belief of his/her ability to deal with problematic situations and react to difficulties in these events. The responses are given on a 1 (Not at all true) to 4 (Exactly true) scale. The highest possible score is 40. Higher scores indicate a higher sense of general self-efficacy. The internal reliability for GSES in

samples from 23 nations is .76- .90. The last part was the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (OHQ) by Hills and Argyle (2002). It is a 29-item scale to measure one's general happiness on a six-point rating scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The highest possible score that can be obtained is 174 with 6 as the highest possible mean score. Higher scores indicate higher happiness levels.

Informed consent was obtained after prior visits to the schools were done to ensure that the schools know the rationale of the study. Information about the purpose, procedures, significance, data gathering procedure, and contact information of the researcher were included in the consent forms. In the conduct of the research, the respondents were briefed orally in the classroom regarding the study and the survey instructions. They were given an adequate amount of time to answer the questionnaire. Usually, the participants completed the questionnaire within 15 minutes. To gather the information needed about the school curriculum, key informant interviews were done with the senior high school coordinator of each school.

Data gathered were recorded in Google Sheets and entered into Stata, a software for statistical computing and graphics. Pearson product moment correlation was computed to determine the linear relationship of self-efficacy and happiness. Linear regression model was conducted to identify the linear association of the variables (self-efficacy, happiness, sex, social support, family income, and school curriculum) and their causal relationship. Hypothesis testing on both analyses was conducted and the confidence level of the study was set at 95% with $\alpha=0.05$.

The following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: Perceived self-efficacy levels differ by sex among senior high school students;

H2: Perceived happiness levels differ by sex among senior high school students;

H3: Perceived self-efficacy levels differ by social support levels among senior high school students;

H4: Perceived happiness levels differ by social support levels among senior high school students;

H5: Perceived self-efficacy levels differ by family income levels among senior high school students;

H6: Perceived happiness levels differ by family income levels among senior high school students;

H7: Students from two public schools with different curricula differ significantly in their self-efficacy levels;

H8: Students from two public schools with different curricula differ significantly in their happiness levels; and

H9: There is a strong positive relationship between self-efficacy and happiness; self-efficacy can be a predictor of happiness.

The participants were selected through purposive sampling, a non-probability type of sampling. Therefore, generalizations pertaining to the entire population cannot be made based on the results of this study. Respondents were assessed based on self-reports, thus, neither clinical tests nor personal observations were done to further validate their claims. The study relied on quantitative data for analysis, thus, in-depth or detailed assessment of responses through qualitative research methods

(e.g. personal interviews) were not executed, except for key informant interviews that were conducted to obtain information about the school curriculum.

3.Results and Discussion

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Public Senior High School Students

Ages ranged from 15-24 years old with the mean age of the participants as 17.0 years (SD=0.88). Table 1 shows the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents. More than half were females. Of the respondents, 59.43% came from the school under a DepEd curriculum. Nearly half were from low-income families and three-fourths of the respondents from the public school following a Deped curriculum were from low-income families.

Table 1. **Sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents (N=212).**

Characteristic	Frequency (Percentage Distribution)		
	DepEd	Laboratory	TOTAL
Sex			
Female	66 (52.38%)	45 (52.33%)	111(52.36%)
Male	60 (47.62%)	41 (47.67%)	101 (47.64%)
Income Level			
Low	98 (77.78%)	3 (3.49%)	101 (47.64%)
Middle	23 (18.25%)	56 (65.11%)	79 (37.26%)
High	1 (0.79%)	25 (29.07%)	23 (10.85%)
No response	4 (3.17%)	2 (2.33%)	6 (2.83%)
TOTAL	126	86	212

Self-efficacy Levels of Public Senior High School Students

The mean score for self-efficacy of the respondents was M=27.20 (SD=4.46). Scholz et al. (2002) said that the international average score in the General Self-

efficacy Scale (GSES) is 29.55. Compared to this, the mean score for self-efficacy of the respondents was below average. Similarly, Pordanjani, et.al (2014) and Khatib (2012) both reported below average self-efficacy levels among undergraduate college students. On the other hand, Datu (2013) reported a high degree of self-efficacy among college students from a private school in Metro Manila.

Table 2 presents that nearly two-thirds of the students from a school with a DepEd curriculum was below average in terms of their self-efficacy levels. On the other hand, more than half of the students from a public laboratory high school scored above average in their self-efficacy levels. Combining all the students from two different curricula, results showed that a little more than half were below average in terms of self-efficacy levels.

Table 2. **Frequency and percentage distribution of all the respondents by self-efficacy levels (N=212).**

Self-efficacy Levels	Frequency (Percentage Distribution)		
	DepEd	Laboratory	TOTAL
Below Average	80 (63.49%)	36 (41.86%)	116 (54.72%)
Above Average	46 (36.51%)	50 (58.14%)	96 (45.28%)
TOTAL	126	86	212

Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations for the responses on the GSES. Item 6 (I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort) had the highest mean rating (M=2.94, SD=0.79) followed by Item 1 (I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough) with a mean rating of 2.84 (SD=0.75). Both items tackle the importance of one's effort and persistence when dealing with difficulties and challenges. These items are also related to the concept of locus of control which is the perception that one can control the outcomes of circumstances. An individual who has strong internal locus of control believes that s/he has control over the situation through his/her own efforts and skills. In contrast, those who have strong external locus of control believe that outside factors influence the outcomes. Relating control and self-efficacy, Bandura (1994, p. 2) said that efficacious individuals "attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills which are acquirable." It can be deduced that individuals with higher self-efficacy levels tend to have strong internal locus of control as they associate their success and failures to their own performance.

Furthermore, the responses can be explained by the autonomy and competitiveness that most adolescents are concerned about in their current stage. Adolescents strive to exhibit autonomy in which they are able to see themselves with

a high degree of self-reliance like in decision-making. Also, a competitive atmosphere is evident among adolescents as they are in a stage wherein they seek to prove their capabilities in order to gain acceptance and admiration from peers.

Table 3. **Descriptive statistics for Generalized Self-efficacy Scale (GSES) items.**

Items	M	SD
1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	2.84	0.75
2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	2.50	0.79
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	2.68	0.78
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	2.56	0.76
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	2.68	0.79
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	2.94	0.79
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	2.81	0.77
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	2.70	0.81
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	2.77	0.84
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	2.75	0.82

Item 2 (If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want) garnered the lowest rating (M=2.50, SD=0.79). Rejection heightens feelings of self-consciousness (Riley et al., 1984). Adolescents may feel or think that they are being observed or evaluated by the people around them. As a result, they might exhibit greater concern for what others will think about them which could affect their behavior. They are also at the stage where peer conformity is a norm. These self-perceptions and expectations from others may make it difficult for the adolescents to deviate as they are striving to achieve other's approval.

Happiness Levels of Public Senior High School Students
The mean score of the respondents for the happiness scale was M=3.94 (SD=0.56), which indicates that they obtained an average score. Based on the Oxford

Happiness Scale, this is interpreted as moderately happy. Compared to other studies that used the same scale, Datu (2013) reported a total mean rating of 3.90 happiness level among college students from a private school in Metro Manila. The mean rating of happiness levels reported by Datu (2013) did not differ largely.

Table 4 shows that more than half of the respondents under a DepEd curriculum are not particularly happy or unhappy. On the other hand, less than half of the students from a public laboratory high school were not particularly happy or unhappy. Lastly, a little over half of all the respondents are not particularly happy or unhappy.

Table 4. **Frequency and percentage distribution of all the respondents by happiness levels (N=212).**

Levels of Happiness	Frequency (Percent Distribution)		
	DepEd	Laboratory	TOTAL
Not Happy	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Somewhat Unhappy	2 (1.59%)	7 (8.14%)	9 (4.25%)
Not particularly unhappy or happy	72 (57.14%)	38 (44.19%)	110 (51.89%)
Moderately Happy	50 (39.68%)	37 (43.02%)	87 (41.04%)
Very Happy	2 (1.59%)	4 (4.65%)	6 (2.83%)
Too Happy	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
TOTAL	126	86	212

Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations for all the items of the Oxford Happiness Scale (OHS). Item 9 (Life is good) had the highest mean rating (M=5.01, SD=1.32), while Item 16 (I find beauty in some things) presented the second highest mean rating (M=4.82, SD=1.14). These two items both point out a positive outlook in life.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for Oxford Happiness Scale (OHS) items.

Items	M	SD
1. I don't feel particularly pleased with the way I am.	3.62	1.30
2. I am intensely interested in other people.	4.02	1.37
3. I feel that life is very rewarding.	4.34	1.39
4. I have very warm feelings towards almost everyone.	4.04	1.18
5. I rarely wake up feeling rested.	2.92	1.33
6. I am not particularly optimistic about the future.	3.61	1.48
7. I find most things amusing.	3.99	1.17
8. I am always committed and involved.	3.68	1.27
9. Life is good.	5.01	1.32
10. I do not think that the world is a good place.	3.83	1.57
11. I laugh a lot.	4.75	1.27
12. I am well satisfied about everything in my life.	4.29	1.22
13. I don't think I look attractive.	3.15	1.36
14. There is a gap between what I would like to do and what I have done.	2.69	1.04
15. I am very happy.	4.07	1.31
16. I find beauty in some things.	4.82	1.14
17. I always have a cheerful effect on others.	4.29	1.18
18. I can fit in (find time for) everything I want to.	4.10	1.23

19. I feel that I am not especially in control of my life.	3.32	1.32
20. I feel able to take anything on.	3.90	1.12
21. I feel fully mentally alert.	3.70	1.19
22. I often experience joy and elation.	4.17	1.32
23. I don't find it easy to make decisions.	2.89	1.32
24. I don't have a particular sense of meaning and purpose in my life.	3.72	1.58
25. I feel I have a great deal of energy.	4.19	1.33
26. I usually have a good influence on events.	3.99	1.21
27. I don't have fun with other people.	4.41	1.44
28. I don't feel particularly healthy.	3.82	1.39
29. I don't have particularly happy memories of the past.	4.26	1.51

Note: Statements in italics show the items in which the scores are reversed.

For the reversed scored questions, Item 14 (There is a gap between what I would like to do and what I have done) had the lowest mean rating (M=2.69, SD=1.04). This item is pointing out the discrepancy between the actual self and the ideal self (aspired attributes). A large difference between one's self-concept and ideal views could lead to sad and depressed states of emotions (Stets & Turner, 2005). Thus, tackling self-discrepancy issues among individuals is important to enhance one's well-being. On the other hand, Item 27 (I do not have fun with other people) had the highest mean rating with 4.41 (SD=1.44). As this is a negatively worded question, the high mean score of the respondents mean a slight disagreement to the negative statement. In this regard, Item 27 points out the attachment that the adolescents have with the people around them or with their social support group. As sense of belongingness to a social group promotes a favorable well-being, the perception of an individual of his/her relationship to the people around him/her is an important factor to consider when determining happiness.

Social Support Levels of Public Senior High School Students

There is a high level of social support for 62.30% of the respondents (Table 6). Social support was low for the respondents from low-income families of the public school following the Deped curriculum while more than half of the respondents from the public laboratory school from the high-income families had high social support.

The items of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) are equally divided based on three sources of social support (significant other, family, and friends). It was found that the significant other source of social support had the highest mean rating (M=5.48, SD=1.37), followed by social support from friends (M=5.39, SD=1.24), and then, family social support (M=5.17, SD=1.38).

Table 6. **Frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents by social support levels (N=212).**

Level of Social Support	Frequency (Percentage Distribution)		
	DepEd	Laboratory	TOTAL
Low	4 (64.30%)	1 (1.20%)	5 (2.40%)
Medium	41 (32.50%)	34 (39.50%)	75 (35.40%)
High	81 (3.20%)	51 (59.30%)	132 (62.30%)
TOTAL	126	86	212

Table 7 presents the means and standard deviations for the item responses on the MSPSS. Item 2 (There is a special person with whom I can share joys and sorrows) had the highest rating with 5.58 (SD=1.49). According to Steinberg (2005), the onset of adolescents' display of autonomy from adults, like their parents, could be influenced by their growing concern for intimate/romantic relationships or activities. They are at the stage where their peers become more significant in their lives and they feel they are ready for more intimate relationships. Also, some of them may be living away from their parents and thus, depend more on peers for social support, especially in the case of the students from the public laboratory high school as they are from different parts of the country and aim to graduate from this considerably premiere high school.

Item 8 (I can talk about my problems with my family) had the lowest mean rating with 4.62 (SD=1.72). This could be due to living away from home and the only way to connect is through phone calls and social media sites. Sometimes, some problems are better discussed face-to-face. Without this opportunity, adolescents may decide to discuss their problems with other significant adults like a teacher or with a peer like a friend or romantic partner. The low rating may also be attributed to the parents. For instance, Baumrind (as cited by Schickedanz et al., 2001), claims that the authoritarian parenting style negatively affects the parent-child relationship. Also, the

family is subjected to many adjustments and alterations concerning finances, social structure, and obligations (Steinberg, 2005) like job terminations or work demands. These changes to the family relations and structure may clash with the changes that adolescents undergo, thus, resulting to a less favorable relationship.

Table 7. **Descriptive statistics of Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) items.**

Items	M	SD
1. There is a special person who is around when I am in need.	5.38	1.64
2. There is a special person with whom I can share joys and sorrows.	5.58	1.49
3. My family really tries to help me.	5.48	1.51
4. I get the emotional help & support I need from my family.	5.22	1.71
5. I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me.	5.40	1.68
6. My friends really try to help me.	5.47	1.58
7. I can count on my friends when things go wrong.	5.19	1.44
8. I can talk about my problems with my family.	4.62	1.72
9. I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.	5.56	1.40
10. There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings.	5.51	1.71
11. My family is willing to help me make decisions.	5.34	1.57
12. I can talk about my problems with my friends.	5.41	1.61

Self-efficacy and Sex

Table 8 shows that the self-efficacy level of males was lesser by 0.26 compared to females. Despite the difference, the p-value shows that it was not statistically significant. Thus, there were no sex differences on self-efficacy among senior high school students.

In contrast to the results, Santos et al. (2014) found that higher self-efficacy levels were found in males. Likewise, Meece et al. and Wigfield et al. (cited by Wigfield & Eccles, 2002), said that males are more positive about their abilities in mathematics, science and technology, implying the importance of the content or knowledge domain. Williams (2014) found that self-efficacy was higher in female students and that self-regulated learning, such as taking notes in class, finishing home works on time, and planning school work, helped in enhancing self-efficacy. However, some studies (Hunagund & Hangal, 2014; Sawari & Mansor, 2013) claim that there is no significant difference between males and females in terms of self-efficacy levels. Further, Friedricks & Eccles (cited by Steinberg, 2005) stated that the difference on how males and females perceive themselves decreases as the adolescent years progress. As an implication, the self-efficacy differences between sexes may not be evident anymore among the senior high school students who are in their middle to late adolescent years.

Table 8. **Regression analysis of self-efficacy and sex, social support, family income and school curriculum.**

Self-efficacy	Coefficient	t	p-value
Sex (male)	-0.26	-0.42	0.68
Social Support: Moderate	2.77	1.35	0.18
High	2.93	1.44	0.15
Income: Low	0.9	0.96	0.34
Lower middle income	0.19	0.20	0.84
Middle class	1.96	1.93	0.06
Upper middle	2.22*	2.15	0.03
Upper	5.11*	3.36	0.00
Rich	3.24*	2.79	0.01
School curriculum (Laboratory)	2.57	4.29	0.00

*Note: *Predictor is significant if p-value < 0.05, otherwise it is not significant.*

Another possible explanation is the gender equality status in today's society. Movements and campaigns for gender equality are more noticeable now as seen with

the combined efforts of some government and non-government organizations through laws, policies, social media, mass media and other propaganda. The Philippine Star (2015), a print and digital newspaper, reported that the Philippines ranked as the 7th highest among all countries in Asia Pacific, in the Global Gender Gap Index which measured gender equality among 145 countries worldwide. This shows that the status of gender equality in the country has improved over the years. As an implication, the ability of an individual to do things formerly and strictly associated to the opposite sex has lessened, thus, affecting individuals' perceptions of their abilities. Other factors, such as the social situation and classroom interactions, which is unique from person to person, also affect one's perceptions of his/her abilities.

Self-efficacy and Social Support

The self-efficacy of students with moderate and high social support levels were higher by 2.77 and 2.93, respectively, compared to students with low social support (Table 8). However, using the p-values, results showed that the predictors were not significant. Thus, there was no statistically linear dependence of self-efficacy on social support detected.

Adler-Constantinescu et al. (2012) and Torres & Solberg (2001) found that the availability of social support from significant people was positively related to self-efficacy. This could be due to the social persuasion given by significant people that makes a person convinced that s/he can accomplish a certain task. Based on the results, it can be deduced that social support, as a motivation to succeed on a task, may not be as effective and influential as other sources of motivation. For example, Schickedanz et al. (2001) pointed out that intrinsic motivation may push someone to achieve a task because of the sense of accomplishment and mastery. Lerner et al. (2011) also said that intrinsically motivated individuals have a sense of control over certain events. This means that the person believes that s/he can or will succeed on a task, which largely relates to self-efficacy. Thus, external factors such as social support may not be the primary influence to the respondents' self-efficacy levels. The respondents could be influenced by intrinsic motivations.

Another explanation is about the feedback that social support may give to the individual which may or may not affect his/her self-concept. Derlega & Janda (1978) said that the way people see themselves governs the way they handle knowledge about themselves. If an individual sees himself/herself as greater or less than the evaluation of others, s/he may not acknowledge it, thus, making one's self-concept independent from the presence or absence of social support.

Self-efficacy and Family Income

The self-efficacy levels of upper middle income to rich students were higher than those from the low-income families (Table 8). However, the significance of the differences in self-efficacy based on family income varied. Based on the p-values, the low income, lower middle income, and middle income families were almost non-significant predictors of self-efficacy. However, higher family income (upper middle income, upper income, rich) were significant predictors of self-efficacy. Thus, the significant effects of family income to self-efficacy can only be seen in those belonging to the higher income families.

The difference in self-efficacy levels of adolescents from various income classes can be explained by the variations in the opportunities that each class has. For instance, according to Leventhal & Brooks (as cited by Steinberg, 2005), adolescents with poor backgrounds are more likely to have lesser opportunities to have resources that forward favorable development and give assistance in times of need. Adolescents from higher income brackets are more likely to obtain higher quality of capital that could promote their competence beliefs such as better education, healthy diet, and more complete healthcare. The inability to provide these resources for the family may result to stress and worries which are detrimental in building self-efficacy beliefs.

The differences in opportunities was further explained by Schunk & Miller (as cited in Pajares & Urdan, 2006). They said that there is a higher chance for learning problems to occur among members of a poor family which may result to inadequate development of one's efficacy levels. Low accessibility to good sources of nutrition, psychosocial stimulation, learning materials, and health services may play roles in this inadequacy. Aside from learning problems that lower income classes are more prone to, psychological disturbances are also more likely to occur among them (Derlega & Janda, 1978). These psychological problems may be a result of various resource and relationship stressors and conflicts that may affect an individual's perception of his/her success on a task.

Self-efficacy and School Curriculum

Table 8 shows that there is a significant difference (p=0.00) in self-efficacy based on school curriculum. Self-efficacy of students from a public laboratory high school was higher by 2.57 compared to those under a DepEd curriculum.

The Philippine K-12 program for senior high school involves tracking, wherein the students are grouped based on their abilities and interests. The three tracks are: Academic track; Technical, Vocational, and Livelihood (TVL), and Sports and Arts (Official Gazette, n.d). The Academic track has five strands: General Academic Strand (GAS); Pre-Baccalaureate Maritime; Accountancy, Business and Management (ABM); Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS); and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM).

For School Year 2016-2017, according to the official website of the Department of Education (n.d.), the public DepEd school in which the respondents study offers the Academic track (STEM & ABM) and TVL track with four specializations: Dressmaking (National Certificate II), Tailoring (National Certificate II), Rice Machinery Operations (National Certificate II), and Organic Agriculture (National Certificate II). On the other hand, the public laboratory high school offers the Academic track with these strands: STEM, GAS and HUMSS.

Tracks differ from one another. One track may include advanced math and science courses while the other track may have the basic courses only. This characteristic of tracking could lead to an unfavorable perception of those tracks with less advanced courses. Furthermore, Seidman et al. (as cited by Schickedanz et al., 2001) said that such negative approaches could lead to decreased levels of how students perceive themselves as competent and how they evaluate themselves in the academic setting. It is possible that their efforts and interest in learning may be affected. Also, having more advanced or technical subjects have their impact on the

students' perceptions and efforts. A significant difference of the public laboratory high school is that it offers a curriculum with greater focus on the STEM strand and the teachers are professors of the premier national university. Thus, this attribute of the public laboratory high school may have influenced the greater self-efficacy levels of the students.

Another factor that could explain the higher efficacy levels of the students from the public laboratory high school is that its admitted students are the top 125 in the schools' entrance examination out of approximately 6,000 applicants. The fact that they qualified in this school would likely increase the level of how they perceive themselves, especially in terms of academic abilities.

Happiness and Sex

Table 9 shows the p-value indicates that sex as a predictor of happiness was significant. The happiness level of males was lower by 0.25 compared to females. These results can be attributed to male characteristics that are mostly brought about by gender stereotyping and expectations.

Whereas other literature revealed no significant differences in happiness among sexes (Mahon, 2005; Shafiq et al., 2015; Sangeetha & Chetan, 2016), several studies found significant differences in happiness between males and females (Ading et al., 2012; Sharma & Gulati, 2015) which supported the findings. Feldman (2005) said that suicide is more probable to happen in male adolescents five times higher than in females. One of the reasons for these suicidal tendencies is the feeling of unhappiness. Gender expectations could be a factor for the decreased happiness levels of males. Males are expected to show assertiveness, boldness, independence, and being reserved (Derlega & Janda, 1978). These expectations can become hindrances for them to undertake some tasks and goals that they want for themselves due to fear of being criticized about their masculinity. These gender expectations can also inhibit them from expressing and sharing their emotions which could result to psychological disturbances, thus, affecting their well-being. Geary (1998, as cited by Thies & Travers, 2006) said that females are more open and passionate in conveying their emotions. Females are more capable of analyzing other people's emotions. These female capabilities benefit their well-being as these also relate to greater awareness and understanding of oneself. Self-awareness and proper management of emotions contribute to healthier relationships which, in turn, affect happiness.

Happiness and Social Support

The happiness levels of students with moderate and high social support levels were higher, by 0.63 and 1.02, respectively, in comparison to students with low social support (Table 9). The p-value shows that the predictors were significant. Thus, there was a significant relationship between happiness and social support levels. Furthermore, it was found out that the social support categories explain 17.08% of the variation in happiness levels.

Several studies reported similar results. King et al. (2014) reported that the stress levels of college students can be reduced by the emotional support that can be received from their parents, guardians and peers. This change in stress levels can cause an increase in one's perceived happiness levels. Additionally, Tan et al. (2016)

reported that extroverts, who are characterized with high self-esteem, tend to have increased social support which improves one's happiness levels. Ward (as cited by Steinberg, 2005, p. 635) stated that "adolescents' happiness and psychological well-being are tied closely to their feelings of belongingness, inclusion, and social support." This proves that adequate levels of social support could lead to increased levels of happiness. When the adolescent is given support, s/he knows that s/he is important to significant persons, that there is a group that s/he can belong to, and will look out for his/her welfare. The achievement of this need adds up to the positive well-being of an individual.

Table 9. **Regression analysis of happiness and sex, social support, family income and school curriculum.**

Happiness	Coefficient	t	p-value
Sex (male)	-0.25*	-3.26	0.00
Social Support: Moderate	0.63*	2.66	0.01
High	1.02*	4.39	0.00
Income: Lower	-0.33*	-3.50	0.00
Middle income	-0.26*	-2.02	0.05
Upper income	-0.09	-0.75	0.46
Rich	-0.60	-0.40	0.69
School curriculum (Laboratory)	0.01	0.12	0.91

*Note: *Predictor is significant if p-value < 0.05, otherwise it is not significant.*

Happiness and Family Income

The happiness level of rich students was lower by 0.60 in comparison with the students from other income classes (Table 9). As the family income levels increase, the happiness levels of the students decrease. There were some variations with the results. The lower and middle class predictors of self-efficacy were found to be significant while the higher income classes were not significant predictors of happiness. Thus, the significant changes of the predictors' (family income) effect to self-efficacy were only observed in those belonging to the lower and middle classes. In the scale used for this study, families belonging to these classes are those who earn less than Php 7,890.00 to Php 78,900.00/month.

The differences in the happiness-income correlation found in various studies can be explained by the Conceptual-Referent Theory of Happiness. The theory states that people differ in their concept of a happy life because everyone has his/her own ideas about this (Rojas, 2005). People will behave differently in their pursuit of happiness due to their differing conceptual referents. Therefore, the significance of income to an individual may depend on his/her concept of happiness. Thus, studies show varying effects of income to happiness. The different conceptions of what happiness is can be rooted on the cultural background of the individual, thus, using the cultural approach. Diener & Suh (2000) said that people differ in their concepts of happiness relatively because of what they consider to be important. If an individual has high regard for money, then, having more would increase his/her happiness levels. In addition, other factors could moderate the effect of income to happiness such as values. For instance, the well-being of the lower classes can be found in their achievement of their primary needs such as food, shelter, and clothing. On the other hand, the satisfaction of the higher income class can be more diverse. Thus, an individual's standards of living play a major role in his/her evaluation of happiness.

The lower classes have been observed as having resilience in times of difficulties as they are more commonly subjected to extreme and challenging situations. Achieving happiness despite these conditions could mean a satisfactory job or a happy family life, which would affect how they evaluate their present life status. As Rae & MacConville (2012, p. 25) said, difficulties in life can be "positive, as struggles, hardship and challenges are considered to be necessary components of an emotionally rich life."

Happiness and School Curriculum

Although there was a difference of 0.01 in happiness levels based on school curriculum, the difference was not statistically significant. Thus, it cannot be said that school curriculum is a significant predictor of happiness.

This can be explained by various literature. Berk (2004) said that school transitions and adjustments give rise to life changes that adolescents may not be prepared for or do not understand. The transition from being a Grade 10 student to a senior high school student could be a factor in the relationship of happiness and school curriculum. As all of the respondents belong to the first batch of senior high school students after the implementation of the K-12 program, the effect of the curriculum to their happiness levels was not significant and unique for each group because all of them experienced the changes and the uncertainties which came with the reform.

Moreover, tracking is present in both curricula. Tracking involves certain disadvantages such as discrimination of abilities which could later result to low self-esteem, conflict in relationships among students of different tracks, poor performance, doubts if they are in the right track, and the influence of being in this track on their college and later work lives.

Self-efficacy and Happiness

The Pearson correlation coefficient (r=0.40) suggested a moderate positive correlation. As self-efficacy increases, happiness also increases. The level of

statistical significance (p-value) of the correlation coefficient is 0.00 which means that there is a statistically significant relationship between self-efficacy and happiness. The coefficient of determination (r2= 0.16) shows that 16% of the variability observed in the happiness levels can be predicted from the relationship between self-efficacy and happiness.

Table 10. **Correlation analysis of self-efficacy and happiness levels of the respondents.**

		Happiness
Self-efficacy	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	0.40
	Significance Level	0.00
	N	212

Table 11 shows the results of the stepwise regression analysis and the subset of predictors that were most significant. Results showed that for every one unit increase in self-efficacy level, happiness level increases by 0.05, holding social support and sex constant. The results of this study showed that other variables can be significant predictors of happiness. However, this study was primarily focused on self-efficacy. Another important result of this study was that self-efficacy and happiness were not just linearly related, but were also causally associated to one another.

Table 11. **Stepwise regression analysis of predictors of happiness.**

Happiness	Coefficient	t	p-value
Self-efficacy	0.05	6.41	0.00
Moderate social support	0.46	2.16	0.03
High social support	0.85	3.99	0.00
Sex	-0.14	-2.08	0.04

Note: Predictor is significant if p-value < 0.05, otherwise it is not significant.

Many studies on self-efficacy and happiness/subjective well-being have already presented the positive relationship that exists between the two (Santos, et al., 2014; Pordanjani et al., 2014; and Hunagund & Hangal, 2014). The literature cited

explained that a high level of self-efficacy is a contributing factor to one's social skills and relations, perception of events, and efforts exerted on a task. All these benefits help in fulfilling tasks and goals, and maintaining positive emotional states. Bandura (1994) said that an individual's achievements and welfare are developed through high levels of perceived self-efficacy. It is from these accomplishments and well-being that happiness can be achieved. As increased self-efficacy is attributed to more desirable performances and outcomes, positive effects to well-being and happiness levels can be observed.

Rae & MacConville (2012, p. 26) said that "learning associated with positive emotions and well-being is retained whereas learning that is associated with negative emotions - stress, boredom, confusion and low motivation - detract from the learning process." The respondents are the first batch of senior high school students who are experiencing the transitions that goes with the educational reform. Thus, it should be aimed that adolescents achieve a favorable level of happiness as this can be their asset in fulfilling goals in their lives, particularly in their academic and career endeavors.

4.Conclusion and Recommendations

The study determined the relationship of self-efficacy and happiness among public senior high school students. Further, the relationships of sex, social support, family income, and school curriculum to self-efficacy and happiness were looked into. Self-administered questionnaires were accomplished by 212 public senior high school students under a DepEd curriculum and from a public laboratory high school. The respondents were identified in response to the need of evaluating them based on the current Philippine education reform, the K-12 senior high school program. Respondents were asked to rate themselves, based on a Likert scale, on the General Self-efficacy Scale, Oxford Happiness Questionnaire, and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support.

More than half of the respondents had below average self-efficacy levels. Around half of the respondents were not particularly happy or unhappy and less than two-thirds had high levels of social support. Females' self-efficacy levels were higher than males but the difference was not significant to conclude that sex is a predictor of self-efficacy. Happiness levels of females were higher than males. Social support was not a significant predictor of self-efficacy but was a significant predictor of happiness. Family income was a significant predictor of self-efficacy in higher income classes and it was a significant predictor of happiness in lower and middle classes. Students from the public laboratory high school reported higher self-efficacy levels as compared with those under a DepEd curriculum. There were no differences in happiness levels based on school curriculum. Self-efficacy and happiness had a moderate positive correlation. Self-efficacy was a predictor of happiness among public senior high school students.

As this study focused on students and looked into their situation in the academic setting, the academic performance of the respondents can be considered to further explore the association of self-efficacy to positive outcomes. Qualitative approaches such as interviews can also be employed together with a quantitative research design to have a more in-depth evaluation of the relationship of the variables.

Results of this study show that self-efficacy is affected by higher income only. Community and school programs or policies that can help less privileged students in acquiring the resources they need would help. For example, school supplies, learning materials, and services can be provided to develop their skills further. On the other hand, results also showed that students from lower classes were happier and this can be a motivator for them to achieve positive outcomes. To maintain or improve their happiness levels, social support has to be cultivated in the home, school and community.

Due to the changes brought about by the educational reform, efforts should be done to help the students adapt to these. It is recommended that curriculum developers and school administrators employ interventions that would help the students improve their self-efficacy and increase their happiness levels. For instance, counteracting the negative characteristics of tracking may help. More positive communication and relationships among students of various tracks are necessary to avoid feelings of indifference and inferiority. The necessity and effects of placing students in tracks early on can be an area of research.

It is recommended that adolescents should involve themselves in events or activities that can increase their self-efficacy beliefs. Bandura (1994) proposed some sources of self-efficacy like mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and somatic and emotional states. Exploring these topics with the guidance of adults or experts at home or at school should be considered.

References

Ading, C. E., Seok, C. B., Hashmi, S. I., & Maakip, I. Religion and gender differences in stress, happiness and life satisfaction [Abstract]. *Southeast Asia Psychology Journal*, 1, 46-55, 2012. Retrieved November 16, 2016, from http://www.cseap.edu.my/sapj/indexa.php/journal/singleJournal/6

Adler-Constantinescu, C., Beşu, E., & Negovan, V. Perceived social support and perceived self-efficacy during adolescence. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 78*, 275-279, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.294

Bandura, A. Self-efficacy. In V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press, 1998. Retrieved September 10, 2016, from https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/BanEncy.html

Berk, L. E. *Infants, Children, and Adolescents* (5th ed.). p. 566. Boston: Pearson, 2004.

Biswas-Diener, R., & Dean, B. The coaching paradox and the positive psychology solution. *Positive Psychology Coaching: Putting the Science of Happiness to Work for your Clients*. p. 14. New Jersey: John Wiley & Son, 2010.

Datu, J.A. Be happy and believe in your capacity: Establishing link between subjective well-being and self-efficacy among Filipino adolescents. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology, 2*(3), 3-10, 2013. doi:10.5861/ijrsp.2012.206

Derlega, V. J., & Janda, L. H. *Personal Adjustment: The Psychology of Everyday Life*. pp. 77-385. Canada: Silver Burdett Company, 1978.

Diener, E., & Suh, E. M. *Culture and Subjective Well-being*. p. 188. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.

Feldman, R. S. *Understanding Psychology* (7th ed.). pp. 70-446. New York: Mc-Graw Hills, 2005.

Hills, P., & Argyle, M. The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire: A compact scale for the measurement of psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 1073–1082, 2002.

Hunagund, D. L., & Hangal, S. J. Self-efficacy and happiness in youth. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 40*(1), 70-73, 2014. Retrieved September 15, 2016, from
http://search.proquest.com/openview/d5c97df4332cdf43a0521b2099dd2c75/1?pq-origsite=gscholar

Khatib, S. A. Exploring the relationship among loneliness, self-esteem, self-efficacy and gender in United Arab Emirates college students. *Europe's Journal of Psychology EJOP, 8*(1), 159-181, 2012. doi:10.5964/ejop.v8i1.301

King, K., Vidourek, R., Merianos, A., & Singh, M. A study of stress, social support, and perceived happiness among college students . *Journal of Happiness & Well-being, 2*(2), 132-144, 2014. Retrieved April 19, 2017, from
http://www.journalofhappiness.net/frontend/articles/pdf/v02i02/4.pdf

Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., & Benson, J. B. (Eds.). *Positive Youth Development.* (Vol. 41). p. 94. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2011.

Liebert, R. M., & Spiegler, M. D. The Family of Social Learning Theories. *Personality: Strategies and Issues* (5th ed., Vol. 2). p. 472. Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1987.

Mahon, N. E. Happiness as related to gender and health in early adolescents [Abstract]. *Clinical Nursing Research*, 14(2), 175-190, 2005. doi:10.1177/1054773804271936

Official Gazette. The K-12 Basic Education Program. (n.d.). Retrieved October 5, 2016, from http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/k-12/

Pajares, F., & Urdan, T. C. Self-efficacy Development in Adolescences. *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*. p. 85. Greenwich, CT: IAP - Information Age Pub, 2006.

Philippine Star. Highest in Asia Pacific: Philippines climbs to 7th in gender equality Index, 2015. Retrieved November 30, 2016, from
http://www.philstar.com/business/2015/11/19/1523353/highest-asia-pacific-philippines-climbs-7th-gender-equality-index

Pordanjani, R.T., Yahyanezhad, F., & Moharer, A. Self-efficacy, academic achievement and happiness. *International Journal of Education and Applied Sciences*, 1(4), 181- 188, 2014.

Rae, T., & MacConville, R. *Building Happiness, Resilience and Motivation in Adolescents: A Positive Psychology Curriculum for Well-being*. p. 25-26. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2012.

Rice, P. F. *Human Development: A Lifespan Approach* (3rd ed.). pp. 232-530. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998.

Riley, T., Adams, G.R., & Nielsen, E. Adolescent egocentrism: The association among imaginary audience behavior, cognitive development, parental support and rejection. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 13 (5), 401-417, 1984.

Rojas, M. A conceptual referent theory of happiness: Heterogeneity and its consequences. [Abstract]. *Social Indicators Research,* 74(2), 261-294, 2005. Retrieved November 20, 2016 from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-004-4643-8

Sangeetha, V., & Chetan, S. Happiness and peer pressure among adolescents. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(1), 103-105, 2016. doi:10.15614/ijpp/2015/v6i1/88483

Santos, M. J., Magramo, C. S., Jr., Oguan F., Jr., & Paat. Establishing the relationship between general self-efficacy and subjective well-being among college students. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Education, 3*(1), 1-12, 2014. Retrieved September 11,

2016, from http://www.ajmse.leena-luna.co.jp/AJMSEPDFs/Vol.3(1)/AJMSE2014(3.1-01).pdf

Sawari, S.S. & Mansor, N.B. A study of students' general self-efficacy related to gender differences. *International Journal of Informative and Futuristic Research*, 1 (4), 62-67, 2013. Retrieved October 6, 2016, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268210257_A_study_of_student%27s_general_self-efficacy_related_to_gender_differences

Schickedanz, J. A., Schickedanz, D. L., Forsyth, P. D., & Forsyth, G. A. *Understanding Children and Adolescents* (4th ed.). pp. 407-631. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2001.

Scholz, U., Dona, B. G., Sud, S., & Schwarzer, R. Is general self-efficacy a universal construct? Psychometric findings from 25 countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 18, 242-251, 2002.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. 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, England: NFER-NELSON, 1995.

Shafiq, S., Naz, R. A., Ansar, M., Nasrulla, T., Bushra, M., & Imam, S. Happiness as related to mental health among university students. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *5*(9), 124-132, 2015. Retrieved November 16, 2016, from http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_5_No_9_September_2015/13.pdf

Sharma, N., & Gulati, J. K. Gender differences in happiness, self-esteem and personality traits in adolescents living in socioeconomic hardship. *International Journal of Home Science, 1*(1), 18-25, 2015. Retrieved November 16, 2016, from http://www.homesciencejournal.com/archives/2015/vol1issue1/PartA/13.pdf

Steinberg, L. D. *Adolescence* (7th ed.). pp. 126-635. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education, 2005.

Stets, J. E., & Turner, J. *The Sociology of Emotions*. p. 144. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Strecher, V. J., Devellis, B. M., Becker, M. H., & Rosenstock, I. M. The role of self-efficacy in achieving health behavior change. *Health Education & Behavior, 13*(1), 73-92, 1986. doi:10.1177/109019818601300108

Tan, C., Krishnan, S. A., & Lee, Q. The role of self-esteem and social support in the relationship between extraversion and happiness: A serial mediation model [Abstract]. *Current Psychology,* 1-9, 2016. doi:10.1007/s12144-016-9444-0

Tenaw, Y. A. Relationship between self-efficacy, academic achievement and gender in analytical chemistry at Debre Markos College of Teacher Education [Abstract]. *African Journal of Chemical Education, 3*(1), 2013. Retrieved October 5, 2016, from http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajce/article/viewFile/84850/74836

Thies, K. M., & Travers, J. F. *Handbook of Human Development for Health Care Professionals*. p. 28. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett, 2006.

Torres, J.B. & Solberg, V.S. Role of self-efficacy, stress, social integration, and family support in Latino college student persistence and health. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59 (1), 53-63, 2001. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1785

Turk, D. C., & Speers, M. A. The role of cognitive schemata and cognitive processes in maladaptive behavior of clients and clinicians. In P. C. Kendall (Ed.), *Advances in Cognitive-Behavioral Research and Therapy* (Vol. 2). p. 16. New York: Academic Press, 1983.

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. *Development of Achievement Motivation*. San Diego: Academic Press, 2002.

Williams, J.W. Gender differences in school children's self-efficacy beliefs: Students' and teachers' perspectives. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 9 (3), 75-82, 2014. Retrieved November 14, 2016 from http://www.academicjournals.org/article/article1395936110_Webb-Williams.pdf

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*(1), 30-41, 1998. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_2