

How to Cite:

Sulla-Sulla, M. L., Cruz-Ccama, A., Laquise-Astulle, J. J., & Alemán-Vilca, Y. (2022). Family functioning and self-efficacy in population groups of arequipa according to sociodemographic variables. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S7), 4396–4410.
<https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS7.12803>

Family functioning and self-efficacy in population groups of arequipa according to sociodemographic variables

Margarita Lurdes Sulla-Sulla, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5569-5143>, Bachelor in Social Work, Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa, Peru.

María Alejandra Cruz-Ccama, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9615-0529>, Bachelor in Social Work, Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa, Peru.

Julissa Judith Laquise-Astulle, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9820-6036>, Bachelor in Social Work, Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa, Peru.

Yaneth Alemán-Vilca, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9820-6036>, PhD in Administration, Licentiate in Social Work, Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa, Peru.

Corresponding author: yaleman@unsa.edu.pe

Abstract--Introduction: The systemic perspective explains family functioning through family relationships considering the influence of family cohesion, flexibility and communication, likewise, the concept of self-efficacy is used to understand the beliefs, perceptions and expectations presented by human beings, identifying their capabilities to achieve their goals at a given time. Objective: Family functioning and self-efficacy were related in population groups of Arequipa according to sociodemographic variables. Methods: The study was a correlational, quantitative, non-experimental, cross-sectional study. Non-probabilistic convenience sampling was used. A total of 893 people residing in the city of Arequipa participated, including the population groups (adolescents; young people; adults; and older adults). Two measurement scales were used for family functioning and self-efficacy. Results: The correlation was $r_w = 0.31$ ($p < 0.001$; 95% CI: 0.25 - 0.37), there is a correlation of moderate magnitude and positive direction between the study variables. The averages of the family functioning variable indicated good family functioning ($M=64.78$). Concerning self-efficacy, the averages indicate ($M=30.64$), which in the population groups were of moderate level with a tendency to increase. Conclusions: There is a statistically significant relationship between the variables family functioning and self-efficacy (the higher the family functioning the higher the self-efficacy). It is

assumed that the predominant type of family in the city of Arequipa is functional and flexible. And the level of self-efficacy was moderate with a tendency to high in adults and older adults.

Keywords---Family functioning, self-efficacy, population groups.

Introduction

La perspectiva sistémica explica el funcionamiento familiar a través de las relaciones familiares considerando la influencia de la cohesión, flexibilidad y comunicación familiar, asimismo, el concepto de autoeficacia se utiliza para entender las creencias, percepciones y expectativas que presentan los seres humanos, identificando sus capacidades para lograr sus metas en un determinado momento.

Objetivo: Se relaciono el funcionamiento familiar y la autoeficacia en grupos poblacionales de Arequipa según variables sociodemográficas.

Métodos: El estudio fue correlacional, cuantitativo, y no experimental, transeccional. Se utilizó el Muestreo no probabilístico por conveniencia. Participaron 893 personas que residen en la ciudad de Arequipa, se incluyeron los grupos poblacionales (adolescentes; jóvenes; adultos; y adultos mayores). Utilizando dos escalas de medición para funcionamiento familiar y autoeficacia.

Resultados: La correlación fue de $r_w = 0.31$ ($p < 0.001$; IC 95%: 0.25 - 0.37), existe correlación de magnitud moderada y con dirección positiva entre las variables de estudio. Los promedios de la variable funcionamiento familiar indicaron un buen funcionamiento en la familia ($M=64.78$). En relación con la autoeficacia los promedios señalan ($M=30.64$), que en los grupos poblacionales fueron de nivel moderado con tendencia a ir incrementándose.

Conclusiones: Existe una relación estadísticamente significativa entre las variables funcionamiento familiar y autoeficacia (a mayor funcionamiento familiar mayor autoeficacia). Se asume que el tipo de familia predominante en la ciudad de Arequipa es funcional y flexible. Y el nivel de autoeficacia fue de nivel moderado con tendencia a alto en adultos y adultos mayores.

Palabras Clave: Funcionamiento familiar, autoeficacia, grupos poblacionales

Introduction

In the current Peruvian context, the family has suffered serious psychosocial and economic problems, highlighting the increase of stress, domestic violence, depression, anxiety, insomnia, job loss, economic precariousness, academic desertion, emotional lability, and psychosomatic symptoms among the most relevant, compromising the health and life of its members, as a result, and effect of the COVID-19 pandemic. ⁽¹⁾

The circumplex model developed,⁽²⁾ under the systemic perspective explains and analyzes family functioning based on family relationships, taking into consideration the influence of family cohesion, flexibility and communication.⁽³⁾

In this sense, family functioning is characterized by how its members interact to determine whether the family is functional or dysfunctional: while the functional refers to the presence of rules, roles and limits that satisfy the needs of its members, the dysfunctional refers to the absence of compliance with these rules, roles and limits that lead to situations of difficulties and instability in its members.⁽⁴⁾

On the other hand, the social cognitive theory⁽⁵⁾ introduces the concept of self-efficacy to understand the beliefs, perceptions and expectations presented by human beings, identifying their capabilities to achieve their goals at a given moment.⁽⁶⁾ In addition,⁽⁷⁾ demonstrated that self-efficacy is a competence that determines the effectiveness of a person's behavior to face the different life situations he/she experiences.

Likewise, within the expressions of self-efficacy that condition thinking, they are regulated by two types of expectations: first, efficacy, which regulates successful behavior to achieve the desired purpose, and second, outcome, which refers to the belief that certain behaviors will bring about good achievements.⁽⁸⁾

Regarding family functioning and self-efficacy in population groups, according to previous studies, some research was found that related both variables in other samples, it was found that family functioning has been related more to academic self-efficacy, especially in students in the schooling stage, highlighting the contribution of⁽³⁾ who argue that the family plays the role of mediating effect in the emotional regulation of children to face the academic activities that occurred during virtual education as an effect of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Therefore, family functioning has been related to other variables of interest such as Quality of life in older adults,⁽⁹⁾ mental health in students,⁽¹⁰⁾ family violence,⁽¹¹⁾ suicide in adolescents highlighting that the family plays an important role in the emotional support of the members.⁽¹²⁾ Also, the variable self-efficacy has been related to stress in teachers,⁽¹³⁾ physical activity in older adults,⁽¹⁴⁾ emotional intelligence in university students,⁽¹⁵⁾ use of ICTs in students,⁽¹⁶⁾ resilience in athletes⁽¹⁷⁾ among the most important research concludes that people demonstrate their ability and skills to cope with daily life situations.

In Peru, no relevant studies were found in population groups on the study variables, however, some studies were also found that relate family functioning with academic self-efficacy conducted before the Covid-19 pandemic, most of these studies correspond to undergraduate and master's theses, highlighting a study by Oruna,⁽¹⁸⁾ who found that there is no significant relationship between the family environment and self-efficacy in health sciences students, considering that the family environment does not emotionally support these students so that they can solve academic situations.

In this sense, there is a need to conduct empirical studies on family functioning in population groups to understand the real dynamics of functional and/or dysfunctional families and how their members develop their capabilities (self-efficacy) to cope with life situations.

Therefore, the objective was to determine the relationship between family functioning and self-efficacy in population groups in Arequipa according to sociodemographic variables.

Methods

The study was correlational, with a quantitative approach and a non-experimental, cross-sectional design, and the information was collected during the months of January to April 2022.

Participants

Non-probabilistic sampling by convenience. A total of 893 people residing in the city of Arequipa participated, including the population groups (adolescents aged 12 to 17 years: 89; young people aged 18 to 29 years: 205; adults aged 30 to 59 years: 438; and older adults aged 60 to 65 years: 161). Participants' ages ranged from 12 to 65 years ($M = 37.79$, $SD = 16.46$). In addition, 491 were female (54.98%) and 402 were male (45.02%). The description of the participants is presented in Table 1.

Instruments

Two measurement instruments were used to collect the information: for the family functioning variable, the Family Adaptability & Cohesion Evaluation Scale (FACES III) was used,⁽¹⁹⁾ adapted by Reusche⁽²⁰⁾. The instrument consists of 20 items on a Likert-type scale (where 1=never and 5=always), starting at age 12.

For the self-efficacy variable, the General Self-Efficacy Perception Scale adapted by Grimaldo,⁽²¹⁾ was applied. The scale is unidimensional and consists of 10 items with four Likert-type response options (1=incorrect and 4=true) with scores of a maximum of 40 and a minimum of 10, starting at age 12.

In addition, for the local sample high reliability was found for both scales through the internal consistency method with Cronbach's Alpha test, family functioning ($\alpha = 0.911$) and self-efficacy ($\alpha = 0.893$) according to the measurement alpha is excellent.⁽²²⁾

Procedure

For the application of the instrument in adolescents, prior consent and authorization was obtained from their educational institutions and parents or guardians after informing them of the objectives of the study, and older people living in the community were also included and contacted, explaining the objective of the study and obtaining informed consent. Subsequently, the

instrument was handed out for each population group to respond individually. Participation was voluntary and the responses were kept completely confidential.

Statistical analysis

The data were digitized into the Microsoft Excel program in an *xlsx* file. They were then imported into the statistical software R and its virtual programming environment RStudio. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for the analyses. Categorical variables are described with frequencies and percentages, while numerical variables are described with statistics. The distributions of the study variables (family functioning and self-efficacy) were evaluated and found not to follow normal distributions; moreover, in the exploratory analysis, outliers were found in the variables. For this reason, it was decided to use robust inferential analysis. The correlation was calculated using the winsorized correlation coefficient (cutoff 0.20) and comparisons were calculated using Yuen's test (two independent samples) and robust ANOVA (three or more groups). As there were group sizes with important differences, it was decided to remove groups with less than 30 cases, to avoid measures that could be biased by extreme values. Effect sizes and confidence intervals are added to the comparisons. For the interpretation of the effect sizes, 0.2, 0.5 and 0.8 are considered small, medium and large effects, respectively.⁽²³⁾

Results

The results are presented in the following order: 1. The description of the sample is presented; 2. The descriptive statistics and the results of the normality tests of the study variables (family functioning and self-efficacy) are presented; 3. The results of the correlation between the variables are shown; and finally, the comparisons of the study variables according to the sociodemographic characteristics of the sample are presented.

Table 1 describes the sociodemographic characteristics of the sample. Age was categorized into population groups between 12 and 65 years (adolescents aged 12 to 17 years: 89 - 9.97%; young people aged 18 to 29 years: 205 - 22.96%; adults aged 30 to 59 years: 438 - 49.04%; older adults aged 60 to 65 years: 161 - 18.03%). According to the origin, it is estimated that 79.51% came from the city of Arequipa, 20.16% from other regions such as Cusco, Puno, Moquegua and Tacna, and 0.33% were foreigners.

Regarding marital status, 18.81% were married, 3.13% divorced, 76.60% single and 1.46% widowed. According to religion, 76.93% were Catholic, 6.5% Christian, 2.57% Evangelical, 11.42% had no religion and 2.57% other religions. According to educational level, 0.9% had incomplete regular basic education (RBE), 53.42% had complete regular basic education (RBE), 17.46% had higher technical education, 24.19% had a higher university education and 4.03% had postgraduate studies. In employment status, 35.95% were dependent, 32.9% were unemployed, 10.3% were casual workers and 21.05% were self-employed. Their family income was 13.44% less than the minimum living wage (1025.00 Nuevos Soles), 34.27% the minimum living wage and 52.29% more than the minimum living wage. Finally, the type of family of those surveyed was: nuclear family

67.97%, extended family 15.9%, single-parent family 11.87% and compound family 4.26%.

Table 1. Description of the sample

Variable	Description	
	<i>f</i>	%
Population groups		
Teenagers	89	9.97
Youth	205	22.96
Adults	438	49.04
Older adults	161	18.03
Source		
Arequipa	710	79.51
Other regions	180	20.16
Foreign	3	0.33
Marital status		
Married	168	18.81
Divorced	28	3.13
Single	684	76.60
Widower	13	1.46
Religion		
Catholic	687	76.93
Christian	58	6.50
Evangelical	23	2.57
Other	23	2.57
None	102	11.42
No. of relatives in the family		
From 2 to less	62	6.94
3 to 4 family members	415	46.47
5 to 6 family members	314	35.16
From 6 to more	102	11.42
Level of education		
EBR Incomplete	8	0.90
EBR Complete	477	53.42
Technical superior	156	17.46
Superior university	216	24.19
Postgraduate	36	4.03
Employment status		
Dependent	321	35.95
Unemployed	292	32.70
Eventual	92	10.30
Independent	188	21.05
Family type		
Composite Family	38	4.26
Extended family	142	15.90
Single-parent family	106	11.87
Nuclear family	607	67.97
Family income		

Less than minimum wage	120	13.44
Minimum wage	306	34.27
More than the minimum wage	467	52.29

Note: RBE: Regular Basic Education

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the variables and the results of the Shapiro-Wilk normality test. It is observed that both variables do not follow normal distributions ($p < 0.001$). Furthermore, in the exploratory analysis, the presence of outliers was found, so it was decided to apply the robust correlation, specifically the winsorized correlation (cutoff = 0.20). The correlation was $r_w = 0.31$ ($p < 0.001$; 95% CI: 0.25 - 0.37), which means that there is a statistically significant correlation between the variables *family functioning* and *self-efficacy*, of moderate magnitude and positive direction.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the study variables and assessment of normality.

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>DE</i>	<i>Asim</i>	<i>Curt</i>	W (<i>p</i>)
Family functioning	64.78	65	11.38	-0.49	1.01	0.98 (< .001)
Self-efficacy	30.64	31	6.18	-0.4	-0.38	0.97 (< .001)

Note: M: Mean; Mdn: Median; Asym: Skewness; Kurtosis: Kurtosis; W: Shapiro Wilk; p: Significance.

Table 3 shows the comparisons of the family functioning variable according to sociodemographic variables. Statistically significant differences were observed in functioning according to population group, sex (male > female), marital status (married > single), employment status, family type and family income. For comparisons of three or more groups, post hoc tests were applied for pairwise comparisons. For the population group variable, no statistically significant differences were found between groups (pairwise comparisons). For the employment status variable, differences were found between dependent vs. unemployed ($p < 0.05$). In the pairwise comparisons between family types, no statistically significant differences were found. Finally, in the family income variable, significant differences were found between people with incomes below minimum wage and people with minimum wage ($p < 0.05$) and people with more than minimum wage ($p < 0.05$). Regarding the effect sizes, these were less than .5, so they are small effects.

Table 4 shows the comparisons of the variable self-efficacy according to sociodemographic variables. Statistically significant differences were observed in self-efficacy according to population group, sex (male > female), origin (Other regions > Arequipa), marital status, educational level, employment status and family income. For comparisons of three or more groups, post hoc tests were applied for pairwise comparisons. For the population group variable, no statistically significant differences were found between groups (pairwise comparisons). In the comparisons according to educational level, differences were found between people with postgraduate studies with the rest of the groups ($p < 0.05$), people with higher technical studies with those with complete RBS ($p < 0.05$) and higher university studies ($p < 0.05$). Regarding employment status, the

differences found to show that those unemployed present differences with dependent ($p < 0.05$) and independent workers ($p < 0.05$), and finally, in the comparisons according to family income, there were no significant differences in the pairwise comparisons. Regarding the effect sizes, these were less than 0.5, so they are small effects. Except for educational level, which had a medium effect.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics and comparison of the family functioning variable according to sociodemographic variables.

Variable	M	DE	$t_{\text{yuen}} /$ Frobus to	TE	Variable	M	DE	$t_{\text{yuen}} /$ Frobus to	TE	
Population group					Employment status					
Teenagers	62.4	11.5	2.72 (p = 0.04)	0.17 (0.06 - 0.3)	Dependent	66.25	10.86	2.96 (p = 0.04)	0.14 (0.05 - 0.26)	
Youth	63.4	11.8			Unemployed	63.37	12.22			
Adults	65.5	10.9			Eventual	65.11	10.47			
Older adults	66.1	11.7			Independent	64.32	11.12			
					Family type					
Sex					Composite family	59.18	13.06	4.84 (p < 0.01)	0.31 (0.09 - 0.54)	
Male	65.7	11.2	2.09 (p = 0.03)	0.10 (0.02 - 0.2)	Extended family	64.30	11.03			
Female	64.1	11.5	Single-parent family	62.81	10.80					
Marital status					Nuclear family	65.59	11.33			
Married	66.95	10.34	2.16 (p = 0.03)	0.14 (0.0 - 0.28)	Family income					
Single	64.39	11.49			Less than minimum wage	61.78	12.45	3.21 (p = 0.04)	0.18 (0.07 - 0.31)	
Religion					Minimum wage	64.80	11.71			
Catholic	64.65	11.23	2.35 (p = 0.10)	0.23 (0.0)	More than the minimum	65.55	10.76			

				6 -	wage									
Christian	67.9 5	10.6 0		0.3 9)	Source									
None	62.5 9	12.0 2			Arequipa	64.5 1	11.4 3	1.69 (p = 0.09)	0.1 1 (0.0 0 - 0.2 5)					
Family No.				Other regions	65.8 8	11.2 6								
2 or less	64.2 3	12.1 5	0.18 (p = 0.91)	0.1 3 (0.0 4 - 0.3)										
3 - 4	65.0 5	11.0 5												
5 - 6	64.4 7	11.9 7												
7 or more	65.0 3	10.4 7												
Instruction														
Complete EBR	65.2 2	10.9 8	2.03 (p = 0.12)	0.2 3 (0.0 9 - 0.4 2)										
Technical Sup.	65.3 7	11.7 0												
University Sup.	63.0 2	11.6 4												
Postgradu ate	68.4 4	10.3 5												

Descriptive statistics and comparison of the variable self-efficacy according to sociodemographic variables.

Variable	M	DE	$t_{\text{yuen}} /$ Frobus to	TE	Variable	M	DE	$t_{\text{yuen}} /$ Frobus to	TE		
Population group					Employment status						
Teenagers	29.0	5.70	7.02 ($p < 0.001$)	0.23 (0.11 - 0.33)	Dependent	31.26	6.21	7.78 ($p < 0.001$)	0.21 (0.08 - 0.31)		
Youth	29.57	6.17			Unemployed	29.49	6.06				
Adults	31.34	6.24			Eventual	30.29	5.99				
Older adults	31.19	5.99			Independent	31.55	6.17				
					Family type						
Sex					Composite family	30.79	6.13	2.14 ($p = 0.10$)	0.25 (0.03 - 0.35)		
Male	31.2	6.61	3.39 ($p < 0.001$)	0.17 (0.06 - 0.27)	Extended family	30.15	6.04				
Female	30.2	5.77			Single-parent family	29.55	6.27				
Marital status					Nuclear family	30.94	6.19				
Married	31.43	6.59	1.95 ($p = 0.05$)	0.11 (0.00 - 0.29)	Family income						
Single	30.51	6.07			Less than minimum wage	29.46	6.63	3.42 ($p = 0.03$)	0.16 (0.04 - 0.26)		
Religion					Minimum wage	30.26	6.39				
Catholic	30.54	6.10	0.27 ($p = 0.76$)	0.15 (0.03 - 0.27)	More than the minimum wage	31.20	5.87				
Christian	30.84	5.21			Source						
None	30.75	6.96			Arequipa	30.38	6.16	1.59 ($p < 0.01$)	0.17 (0.02 - 0.3)		
Family No.					Other regions	31.63	6.21				

									3)
2 or less	30.7 1	6.3 2	0.87 (p = 0.45)	0.1 4 (0.0 4 - 0.2 5)					
3 - 4	30.7 1	6.2 8							
5 - 6	30.8 1	6.1 1							
7 or more	29.8 4	5.9 4							
Instruction									
Complete EBR	30.4 3	6.0 9	12.23 (p < 0.001)	0.4 1 (0.2 6 - 0.5 3)					
Technical Sup.	31.4 8	6.4 7							
University Sup.	29.8 8	6.0 9							
Postgraduate	34.9 7	4.6 3							

Discussion

The objective of this study was to determine the relationship between family functioning and self-efficacy in population groups in Arequipa according to sociodemographic variables.

The correlation test estimates that there is a statistically significant relationship between the variables *family functioning* and *self-efficacy*, of moderate magnitude and positive direction. This means that the higher the family functioning, the higher the self-efficacy in the population groups, considering that the family continues to be the social institution that regulates and sustains the emotional support of its members in the face of difficulties or situations that have arisen in the current context, such as the Covid-19 pandemic. ⁽³⁾

The averages of the family functioning variable indicate good family functioning (M=64.78). These results show that families are cohesive because emotional closeness with sincere and warm relationships is evident. In addition, families in Arequipa can adapt with flexibility to solve or resolve life problems faced by their members, so it is assumed that the predominant type of family in the city of Arequipa is functional and flexible.

Comparisons of family functioning according to sociodemographic variables show statistically significant differences according to sex, with men having higher levels of family support compared to women; also, according to marital status, married people have higher levels of family support than single people, and unemployed people receive less support from the family than dependent people, As for family income, it is people with lower income who receive less support from the family compared to dependent workers; however, by type of family no statistically significant differences were found, therefore, in the different types of family

(composite, extended, single-parent, nuclear) there are similar levels of family functioning (good).

Regarding self-efficacy, the averages indicate ($M=30.64$) that the levels presented by the population groups are of moderate level with a tendency to increase in adults and older adults and lower averages in adolescents; this corroborates what⁽⁵⁾ indicated that people learn socially by observation and above all by life experience. Therefore, a person's ability to cope with life situations is influenced by the competencies developed in the different stages of life, with the probability of succeeding in a particular situation.

When comparing the results of self-efficacy according to socio-demographic variables, statistically significant differences were found in gender, with males being more self-efficient than females in difficult times such as the current context; married people also have higher levels of self-efficacy than single people, according to education. According to employment status, people with a postgraduate degree are more self-efficient than the other schooling groups; according to family income, people with an income above the minimum wage are more self-efficient than those with a lower income. No significant differences were found in self-efficacy according to religion and family type, finding similar levels in the different groups.

Therefore, it is demonstrated that the analysis of family functioning and self-efficacy according to sociodemographic variables presents ample knowledge for science, showing how people and their family's function, support each other and provide sustainability to face the different situations of life; however, these results contradict Oruna's findings. ⁽¹⁸⁾ In this respect, in the present study, we come closer to showing that the family plays a significant role in the emotional support of its members to help them face their daily life.

Finally, there were some limitations in the development of the study, finding some people who did not collaborate with the development of the study, in addition, the pandemic still maintains some restrictions to contact people directly, so only a purposive sample was obtained; it is suggested to continue doing this type of studies in larger samples to strengthen the data found in this research, in addition, that from the approach of other disciplines interested in the subject, multidisciplinary studies can be generated.

Conclusions

There is a statistically significant relationship between the variables *family functioning* and *self-efficacy*, of moderate magnitude and positive direction.

It is assumed that the predominant family type in the city of Arequipa is functional and flexible.

The levels of self-efficacy presented by the population groups are of moderate level with a tendency to increase in adults and older adults and lower averages in adolescents.

Scientific contribution

The contribution of the present study is to correlate two variables that are poorly associated in the Peruvian context, especially in population groups (adolescents, youth, adults, and older adults), to provide relevant information on family functioning and self-efficacy.

References

1. Díaz Dd. Efectos psicosociales de la pandemia COVID-19 en la familia. *Rev San Gregorio*. 2021 [acceso: 05/05/2022]; 1(48):149-168. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.36097/rsan.v0i48.1833>
2. Olson D H, Sprenkle D H, Russell C S. Circumplex model of marital & family systems I: Cohesion & adaptability dimensions, family types, & clinical applications. *Family Process*. 1979; 18:3-28.
3. Orozco Vargas A E, Aguilera Reyes U, García López G I, Venebra Muñoz A. Funcionamiento Familiar y Autoeficacia Académica: Efecto Mediador de la Regulación Emocional. *Rev Edu*. 2022 [acceso: 06/05/2022];(396):125-147. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2022-396-532>
4. Valdiviezo C, Lara Machado J. Influencia del funcionamiento familiar y bienestar psicológico en padres de familia ecuatorianos. *Rev Méd Elect*. 2021 [acceso: 06/05/2022];43(4):987-1000. Disponible en: http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1684-18242021000400987&lng=es&tlng=es
5. Bandura A. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman; 1977.
6. Díaz Mujica A, Sáez Delgado F, Cobo Rendón R, Valle M D, López Angulo Y, Pérez Villalobos M V. Revisión sistemática sobre autoeficacia en universitarios: conceptualización y medición. *Interdisciplinaria*. 2022 [acceso: 08/05/2022];39(2):37-54. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.16888/interd.2022.39.2.3>
7. Pereyra C I, Ronchieri C d V, Rivas A, Trueba D A, Mur J, Páez N. Autoeficacia: una revisión aplicada a diversas áreas de la psicología. *Ajayu Órgano de Difusión Científica del Departamento de Psicología UCBS*. 2018 [acceso: 10/05/2022];16(2):299-325. Disponible en: http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2077-21612018000200004&lng=es&tlng=es
8. Iaochite R T, Noronha A P P, Casanova D C G, Dos Santos A A, Azzi R G. Regulatory emotional self-efficacy and social self-efficacy: Validation evidence of related constructs. *Psico-USF*. 2022 [acceso: 14/05/2022]; 27(1):31-43. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-82712022270103>
9. Duran Badillo T, Herrera J L H, Salazar Barajas M E, Mireles Alonso M A, Oria Saavedra M, Ruiz Cerino J M. Funcionamiento familiar y calidad de vida en adultos mayores con hipertensión arterial. *Cien y Enfer*. 2022 [acceso: 14/05/2022];28. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.29393/ce28-3fftj60003>
10. Poorzamani A. La relación entre el funcionamiento familiar, la identificación personal y la salud mental de estudiantes femeninos de la escuela secundaria en karaj. *Univ y Soc*. 2020 [acceso: 16/05/2022];12(4):234-239. Disponible en: <https://rus.ucf.edu.cu/index.php/rus/article/view/1637>
11. Gómez Campuzano M L, Gaviria Arrieta N, Pérez Gómez M M, Alvis Barranco L. Funcionamiento familiar en hogares con niños desplazados por la

- violencia. Arch Venez de Farma y Terap. 2020 [acceso: 17/05/2022];39(3):318-321. Disponible en: http://saber.ucv.ve/ojs/index.php/rev_aavft/article/view/19454
12. Marco Sánchez S, Mayoral Aragón M, Valencia Agudo F, Roldán Díaz L, Espliego Felipe A, Delgado Lacosta C, Hervás Torres G. Funcionamiento familiar en adolescentes en riesgo de suicidio con rasgos de personalidad límite: Un estudio exploratorio. Rev Psico Clín Niños y Adolesc. 2020 [acceso: 18/05/2022];7(2):50-55. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.21134/rpcna.2020.07.2.6>
 13. García Garnica M, Chacón Cuberos R, Expósito López J, Martínez A. La gestión emocional y la autoeficacia se asocian con bajos niveles de estrés en el profesorado universitario español: una perspectiva nacional. Bordon Rev de Pedag. 2022 [acceso: 19/05/2022];74(1):29-44. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2022.90354>
 14. Córdova León K, Fernández Huerta L, Careaga Romero N. Autoeficacia para el desempeño de actividad física en personas mayores. Rev Anda de Med del Dep. 2022 [acceso: 25/05/2022];15(1):33-37. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.33155/j.ramd.2020.09.002>
 15. Bonilla Yucailla D, Balseca Acosta A, Cárdenas Pérez M J, Moya Ramírez D. Inteligencia emocional, compromiso y autoeficacia académica. Análisis de mediación en universitarios ecuatorianos. Interdisciplinaria. 2022 [acceso: 27/05/2022];39(2):249-264. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.16888/interd.2022.39.2.16>
 16. Padilla Carmona T, Flores J G, Rísquez A. Autoeficacia en el uso de tic en estudiantes universitarios maduros. Educ. 2022 [acceso: 29/05/2022];XX1,25(1):19-40. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.30254>
 17. Romero M T, Garrido Guzmán M E, Vázquez C C. Autoeficacia y resiliencia: diferencias entre deportistas practicantes de fitness/culturismo y no deportistas. Retos. 2022 [acceso: 30/05/2022];44:232-241. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.47197/RETOS.V44I0.88937>
 18. Oruna A. Ambiente familiar y percepción de la autoeficacia en estudiantes de ciencias de la salud de una universidad privada de Huacho. Act Psico Peru. 2017 [acceso: 30/05/2022];1(2):325-352. Disponible en: <http://201.234.119.250/index.php/ACPP/article/view/14/11>
 19. Olson D H, Portner J, Lavee Y. Manual de la Escala de Cohesión y Adaptabilidad Familiar (FACES III Manual). Minneapolis: Life Innovation. 1985.
 20. Reusche R. El modelo circunplejo del funcionamiento familiar en la estructura familiar de adolescentes de nivel socio-económico medio: un estudio exploratorio en residentes en Lima [Tesis de Maestría]. Universidad Femenina del Sagrado Corazón, Lima, Perú. 1994.
 21. Grimaldo M. Propiedades psicométricas de la escala autoeficacia general de Baessler & Schwarzer. Rev Cult. 2005 [acceso: 02/04/2022];1:213-229. Disponible en: https://www.revistacultura.com.pe/revistas/RCU_19_1_propiedades-psicometricas-de-la-escala-de-autoeficacia-general-de-baessler-schwarzer.pdf
 22. Merino Soto C. Diferencias entre coeficientes alfa de Cronbach, con muestras y partes pequeñas: un programa VB. Anal de Psico. 2016 [acceso:

14/05/2022];32(2): 587-588. Disponible en:
<https://dx.doi.org/10.6018/analesps.32.2.203841>

23. Mair P, Wilcox R. Robust statistical methods in R using the WRS2 package. Behavior Research Methods. 2020 [acceso: 14/05/2022];52(2):464-488. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01246-w>

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Authors' contribution

¹Margarita Lurdes Sulla Sulla: Research organization and planning. Writing of the introduction. Data analysis. Approval of the final version of the manuscript.

²Maria Alejandra Cruz Ccama: Writing of the introduction. Data collection and analysis. Elaboration of the methodological design. Approval of the final version of the manuscript.

³Julissa Judith Laquise Astulle: Drafting of the introduction. Data collection and analysis. Elaboration of the methodological design. Approval of the final version of the manuscript.

⁴Yaneth Alemán Vilca: Elaboration of work protocols, elaboration of the article, bibliographic review, style review. Approval of the final version of the manuscript.