EDUMASPUL:
Jurnal Pendidikan
P-ISSN 2548-8201 | E-ISSN 2580-0469

Vol. [10] No. [2] ([2026]) Page 1655-1667
DOI: 10.33487/ edumaspul.v10i2.622.

Resilience and Academic, Emotional, and Social Self-Efficacy among Adolescents: A Correlational Study

Nur Aina[1]; Abdul Saman[2]; Syahril[3]

[1]Psikologi Pendidikan / Magister Bimbingan dan Konseling, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia
[2]Psikologi Pendidikan / Magister Bimbingan dan Konseling, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia
[3]Psikologi Pendidikan / Magister Bimbingan dan Konseling, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

Corresponding author: nuuraina27@gmail.com| abdulsaman@unm.ac.id|, syahril.bk@unm.ac.id||

Received	Revised	Accepted	Published
[02-08-2026]	[22-08-2026]	[12-09-2026]	[01-10-2026]

Abstract: Adolescents must negotiate academic expectations alongside emotional strain and changing peer relationships, yet resilience is seldom examined against three distinct self-efficacy domains within one school sample. This quantitative, cross-sectional correlational study considered 73 students aged 15–18 years from a population of 140 at a public high school in Pinrang, Indonesia. Resilience was assessed with ten five-response items and self-efficacy with 21 four-response items, seven for each academic, emotional, and social domain. Measurement models were examined through confirmatory factor analysis using diagonally weighted least squares; associations were assessed using Spearman rank correlations. The reported correlations with resilience were positive for academic (ρ = .409), emotional (ρ = .530), and social self-efficacy (ρ = .455), all p < .001. Comparative fit indices were .974 for resilience and .933 for self-efficacy. Measurement reservations remained: an academic item loaded at .289, and academic–social discriminant validity was questionable (HTMT = .932). Emotional self-efficacy had the largest observed association, although differences between coefficients were not formally tested. These results support domain-specific inquiry in school counseling while permitting neither causal claims nor unrestricted generalization.
Keywords: academic self-efficacy; adolescence; emotional self-efficacy; resilience; social self-efficacy

Abstrak: Remaja harus menghadapi tuntutan akademik di samping tekanan emosional dan perubahan hubungan dengan teman sebaya, namun resiliensi jarang dikaji dalam kaitannya dengan tiga domain efikasi diri yang berbeda dalam satu sampel sekolah. Penelitian kuantitatif korelasional dengan desain *cross-sectional* ini melibatkan 73 siswa berusia 15–18 tahun dari populasi 140 siswa di sebuah SMA negeri di Pinrang, Indonesia. Resiliensi diukur dengan sepuluh butir berformat lima pilihan jawaban, dan efikasi diri dengan 21 butir berformat empat pilihan jawaban, masing-masing tujuh butir untuk domain akademik, emosional, dan sosial. Model pengukuran diuji melalui analisis faktor konfirmatori menggunakan *diagonally weighted least squares*; asosiasi dinilai menggunakan korelasi peringkat Spearman. Korelasi yang dilaporkan dengan resiliensi bersifat positif untuk efikasi diri akademik (ρ = ,409), emosional (ρ = ,530), dan sosial (ρ = ,455), seluruhnya p < ,001. Indeks kecocokan komparatif adalah ,974 untuk resiliensi dan ,933 untuk efikasi diri. Keterbatasan pengukuran tetap ada: satu butir akademik memiliki muatan faktor sebesar ,289, dan validitas diskriminan antara domain akademik dan sosial dipertanyakan (HTMT = ,932). Efikasi diri emosional menunjukkan asosiasi teramati yang terbesar, meskipun perbedaan antarkoefisien tidak diuji secara formal. Hasil ini mendukung kajian spesifik-domain dalam bimbingan dan konseling sekolah, tetapi tidak memungkinkan klaim kausal maupun generalisasi tanpa batas.

Kata kunci: efikasi diri akademik; masa remaja; efikasi diri emosional; resiliensi; efikasi diri sosial

CITATION:	Aina, N., Abdul Saman, & Syahril. (2026). The Resilience and Academic, Emotional, and Social Self-Efficacy among Adolescents: A Correlational Study. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v10i2.622
COPYRIGHT:	© [2026] Aina, N., Abdul Saman, & Syahril. (s). Open access under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0).

Introduction

In secondary school, academic work unfolds alongside shifting friendships, expanding independence, and a still-developing capacity to handle disappointment. A low examination score, a disagreement with classmates, or uncertainty at home may challenge the same student in quite different ways. Resilience research in Indonesian

schools points to the need to understand these pressures within the learning environment rather than attributing adjustment entirely to enduring personal traits (Irawan et al., 2022; Faturrohmah & Sagita, 2022).

Resilience is sometimes described in educational writing as persistence when learning becomes difficult. That description captures a familiar experience but is too narrow for adolescents dealing with exclusion, bullying, or family disruption. Studies of family circumstances show that young people's capacity to adapt must be situated within the resources and constraints surrounding them. A student's response to adversity is therefore better considered a process of adjustment than a simple measure of willpower (Winanti, 2022; Prasetya & Utami, 2025).

Self-efficacy concerns what individuals believe they can accomplish in a particular situation. Confidence in completing an assignment is not necessarily the same belief as being able to steady one's emotions or approach a peer after a disagreement. Indonesian scholarship on adolescent self-efficacy has recognized the importance of academic experience and socioemotional circumstances. A three-domain approach can capture distinctions that a single overall score might obscure (Putri et al., 2024).

Research has frequently linked academic self-efficacy with resilience, although the size of that association should not be assumed to be stable across settings. Budiono et al. (2022) examined the constructs in educational contexts, and Tarong et al. (2024) reported a positive relationship among high-school students. Agreement about direction does not imply that schools, year groups, questionnaires, or forms of academic pressure produce interchangeable estimates. Close attention to what each instrument measures is needed before the literature can be compared meaningfully.

The question is especially relevant to school-age respondents. Yani et al. (2024) investigated self-efficacy and academic resilience among eighth-grade students in Jember; Adilah et al. (2024) considered academic self-efficacy alongside social support in explaining resilience among junior-high students. Their findings suggest that the personal conviction captured by a questionnaire may coexist with the help students receive from teachers, relatives, or friends. A bivariate association may consequently reflect a broader pattern of school and family experience that has not been measured directly.

A separate emotional dimension deserves scrutiny. Work on emotional regulation and resilience identifies a relationship between managing feelings and adapting to adversity, including among young adults studying away from home (Andriyani & Sa'adah, 2024; Mirza et al., 2024). Believing that one can regulate emotions, however, is not evidence that one has demonstrated the skill under pressure. Studies of self-efficacy and emotional maturity in high school reinforce the importance of keeping perceived competence distinct from observed emotional functioning (Kumalasari & Munawaroh, 2022).

Social self-efficacy raises a related but different question. Evidence concerning adolescents affected by bullying and young people who have left school emphasizes the protective value of relationships and practical support. Receiving help is not identical to believing one can initiate contact, negotiate a disagreement, or seek assistance. By measuring social self-efficacy separately, a correlational study can examine the latter belief without treating social support as its synonym (Ivanka & Dewi, 2024; Pratama et al., 2023).

Social confidence has also been studied within pathways linking parenting practices, social-emotional skills, and prosocial behavior. Winahyu and Farozin (2024) considered social self-efficacy in such a mediating role, while Rita et al. (2024) studied self-efficacy in relation to peer conformity and socioemotional

competence among adolescent boarding-school students. These differing accounts make the social domain worthwhile, but they also make discriminant validity essential: a scale cannot be assumed to measure three separable beliefs merely because its items have been assigned to three labels.

Coping processes may further complicate the pattern. A'yun and Amin (2026) reported that considering coping strategy alongside academic self-efficacy added explanatory value in a study of junior-high students' academic resilience. Such evidence cautions against treating any one self-efficacy dimension as an established causal driver. It also creates a reason to examine the academic, emotional, and social correlations side by side before proposing a mechanism or an intervention.

The present study asks whether resilience is associated with three domain-specific self-efficacy scores among adolescents at one Indonesian high school. Positive associations were hypothesized for the academic, emotional, and social domains. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to evaluate the proposed measurement structures, whereas Spearman correlations were used to examine the relationships involving resilience. Keeping these analyses separate prevents associations among self-efficacy factors from being mistaken for evidence about resilience (Cynthia & Silaen, 2025; Suharti & Nugraha, 2023).

Method

Research Design and Setting

A quantitative, non-experimental, cross-sectional correlational design was used to examine resilience (X) in relation to academic, emotional, and social self-efficacy (Y). The three self-efficacy domains were treated as separate outcomes; an overall self-efficacy score was considered only as a supplementary summary. The design addresses direction and strength of association, not whether resilience causes subsequent changes in perceived competence. Comparable observational approaches have been used in adolescent resilience and academic self-efficacy research (Cynthia & Silaen, 2025; Tarong et al., 2024).

The study took place at SMAN 5 Pinrang, a public senior high school in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. Data collection was reported on 8, 9, and 11 October 2026. These three dates identify the fieldwork period; they do not establish a longitudinal design because the source reports a single correlational assessment rather than repeated outcome measurements.

Participants and Sampling

The population comprised 140 students, of whom 73 aged 15–18 years were included in the analysis. The source manuscript describes the sampling method as simple random sampling: students were listed and numbered before 73 numbers were selected. The available account does not establish whether the random selection was implemented with a physical draw or a computer-generated sequence. Until the sampling record is checked, the description should be understood as the reported method rather than independently verified randomization. Comparable sampling terminology appears in Cynthia and Silaen (2025) and Putri and Priyatama (2024).

Instruments and Measurement Quality

Resilience was measured with ten items coded Resilience_1–Resilience_10, each using five response categories. The self-efficacy questionnaire contained 21 items with four response categories: seven academic items (SE_Academic_1–7), seven emotional items (SE_Emotional_8–14), and seven social items (SE_Social_15–21). Domain scores were formed from their respective item responses after checking score direction and coding. The original scale attribution, adaptation history, complete item wording, and reverse-key specifications were not documented in the materials provided for this manuscript; the named constructs should therefore not be presented as validated adaptations of an

identified published measure without further documentation (Putri et al., 2024; Rita et al., 2024).

Measurement models were evaluated with CFA using a diagonally weighted least squares estimator and robust adjusted statistics for ordinal responses. The reported diagnostics included the comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker–Lewis index (TLI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), standardized factor loadings, average variance extracted (AVE), and the heterotrait–monotrait ratio (HTMT). Internal consistency was summarized with Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega. Whole-scale reliability estimates were not treated as substitutes for domain-level reliability (Marwah et al., 2024; Elipiya et al., 2025).

Procedure and Research Ethics

The source reports administration of student questionnaires during the three October 2026 collection dates, followed by item-score checks, factor analysis, and the examination of associations between scale scores. It does not specify whether the surveys were completed on paper or online, how incomplete responses were handled, or whether institutional ethical approval, student assent, and parental or guardian consent were obtained. No approval number or consent process is inferred here. These records need confirmation by the investigators, particularly because the participants were school-aged adolescents (Ivanka & Dewi, 2024; Eunike & Widhigdo, 2026).

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were planned to characterize scale scores by their minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation; numerical descriptive summaries were not included in the supplied reports and are consequently not supplied as invented findings. The manuscript records use of SPSS for descriptive analysis and correlations; the DWLS CFA output is reported separately. The principal inferential procedure was the two-sided Spearman rank correlation for resilience with each of the academic, emotional, and social self-efficacy scores, tested at $\alpha = .05$. A supplementary correlation concerned the total self-efficacy score (Nabila & Ashshiddiqi, 2023; Cynthia & Silaen, 2025).

Spearman's rho was retained because the available association results were reported using that statistic. A Pearson correlation or linear regression cannot be presented as completed merely because the study involves quantitative variables. Statistical significance refers to evidence against the no-association hypothesis; the coefficient's sign and magnitude address direction and monotonic strength. Neither a significant association nor a cross-sectional regression coefficient would establish a causal effect.

Results and Discussion

Results

Measurement Models

For the ten-item resilience scale, the CFA yielded $\chi^2(35) = 52.129$, $p = .031$. Comparative indices were favorable (CFI = .974; TLI = .967), while RMSEA = .082 (90% CI [.026, .127]) and SRMR = .066 indicate a less uniform picture of model fit. Taken together, these statistics support a plausible one-factor representation but do not justify describing its fit as unequivocally excellent. Table 1 reports the principal indices without selecting only the most favorable measures.

The 21-item three-factor self-efficacy model yielded $\chi^2(186) = 291.045$, $p < .001$. Its CFI of .933 and TLI of .924 suggest a reasonable comparative fit, but RMSEA = .089 and SRMR = .094 indicate residual misfit. Cronbach's alpha (.933) and McDonald's omega (.934) were reported for the combined scale, not separately for each of the three domains. The resilience scale yielded alpha = .884 and omega = .888. These reliability results must be read alongside the more mixed evidence concerning model fit and factor distinctiveness.

Table 1. Measurement model fit and whole-scale reliability

Index	Resilience	Self-efficacy
Factor structure	1 factor	3 factors
χ^2 (df)	52.129 (35)	291.045 (186)
χ^2 p value	.031	< .001
CFI / TLI	.974 / .967	.933 / .924
RMSEA [90% CI]	.082 [.026, .127]	.089 [.068, .108]
SRMR	.066	.094
Cronbach's α	.884	.933
McDonald's ω	.888	.934
AVE	.495	.502 / .562 / .521

Note. Self-efficacy AVE values are academic, emotional, and social. Alpha and omega refer to the combined 21-item scale.
Source: uploaded Resilience CFA and SE CFA reports.

Indicator Performance and Convergent Validity

The standardized resilience loadings ranged from .525 to .797; all ten were statistically different from zero ($p < .001$). AVE was .495, narrowly below the commonly used .50 guideline. A strong internal-consistency coefficient does not eliminate this limitation: reliability describes the coherence of item responses, whereas AVE concerns how much indicator variance is captured by the intended factor (Prasetya & Utami, 2025; Winanti, 2022).

Six of the seven academic self-efficacy items loaded between .654 and .839. The remaining item, SE_Academic_2, had a loading of .289 and R^2 = .084; although its loading reached $p = .006$, it contributed little common variance. The available questionnaire wording is insufficient to determine whether the anomaly reflects reverse scoring, ambiguous content, or a different response process. It would be premature to delete this item or infer a reason without revisiting the original instrument (Adilah et al., 2024; Yani et al., 2024).

Emotional self-efficacy indicators showed comparatively consistent loadings (.715–.781) and AVE = .562. Social indicators were more variable (.558–.867), with AVE = .521; academic AVE was .502. These numbers offer qualified evidence for the intended factors. They do not independently establish that the three constructs are distinct from one another; evidence about their overlap is needed as well (Andriyani & Sa'adah, 2024; Winahyu & Farozin, 2024).

Table 2. Indicator loadings and average variance extracted

Construct	n	Loading range	AVE
Resilience	10	.525–.797	.495
Academic	7	.289–.839	.502
Emotional	7	.715–.781	.562
Social	7	.558–.867	.521

Note. n = number of items; all values are standardized loadings. Academic item 2 = .289. No items were removed or re-estimated.

Separation of the Self-Efficacy Domains

Latent correlations among the self-efficacy domains were .781 for academic–emotional, .906 for academic–social, and .760 for emotional–social; all were reported with $p < .001$. The corresponding HTMT values were .823, .932, and .842. The academic–social HTMT of .932 exceeds a frequently applied .90 threshold and raises a substantive discriminant-validity concern. Students may have drawn on a broad belief in their competence when evaluating both schoolwork and social interaction, but the current analysis cannot establish that interpretation. A theoretically grounded higher-order model is one option for future testing (Rita et al., 2024; Putri et al., 2024).

Table 3 concerns correlations between latent self-efficacy factors. These coefficients are not correlations with resilience. The distinction matters because the study's hypotheses concern resilience in relation to each domain, which was analyzed separately from the CFA factor-covariance matrix.

Table 3. Associations between the three self-efficacy factors

Factor pair	Latent r	HTMT
Academic–emotional	.781	.823
Academic–social	.906	.932
Emotional–social	.760	.842

Note. All latent correlations p < .001. Values are taken from the self-efficacy CFA report and do not involve resilience.

Resilience and Domain-Specific Self-Efficacy

The previously reported Spearman analysis yielded positive associations between resilience and academic self-efficacy (ρ = .409, p < .001), emotional self-efficacy (ρ = .530, p < .001), and social self-efficacy (ρ = .455, p < .001). The association with the overall self-efficacy score was ρ = .578, p < .001. The findings support all three directional hypotheses under the stated α = .05 criterion, with coefficients of moderate magnitude (Budiono et al., 2022; Nabila & Ashshiddiqi, 2023).

Table 4. Reported Spearman correlations with resilience (N = 73)

Self-efficacy domain	ρ	p
Academic	.409	< .001
Emotional	.530	< .001
Social	.455	< .001
Overall score	.578	< .001

Note. ρ = Spearman rank correlation; two-sided tests. These figures were reported in the prior response-level analysis, not in the CFA outputs. Re-analysis of the original workbook is needed for independent verification.

Emotional self-efficacy had the highest observed coefficient, followed by social and academic self-efficacy. These are descriptive differences, not evidence that the coefficients differ significantly. Because the three associations share a resilience variable and are estimated from the same students, formal comparison would require a method for dependent correlations. The reported rho values also await a direct audit against the item-level response workbook; they should not be confused with CFA-derived latent correlations.

Discussion

Academic Confidence under Learning Demands

The academic association (ρ = .409) suggests that students who perceived themselves as more capable of recovering from difficulties also tended to express confidence in approaching school tasks. This accords with the general direction of work linking academic self-efficacy to resilience among Indonesian students (Cynthia & Silaen, 2025; Budiono et al., 2022). The distinction between general resilience and specifically academic resilience remains important, however: the current ten-item scale was not established as a measure of adversity restricted to schoolwork.

Suharti and Nugraha (2023) placed academic self-efficacy within a broader account of social support and resilience among vocational students. Their approach points to a plausible omission from a model containing only two constructs. The association detected here may coexist with access to responsive teachers, a dependable peer network, or family support. Without measuring those conditions, the data cannot determine whether academic self-efficacy is a pathway, a correlate, or partly a reflection of a supportive learning environment.

The developmental setting also matters. Elipiya et al. (2025) examined parental emotional support and self-efficacy in university students' academic resilience; Agustian and Friyatmi (2025) considered family and lecturer support. These studies are useful comparisons, but college demands are unlike those encountered by 15–18-year-old high-school students. Differences in available autonomy, grading pressures, and help-seeking opportunities make it inappropriate to transfer estimated associations uncritically from one age group to another.

Academic self-efficacy had the smallest reported rho of the three domains. That ranking warrants attention but not a claim that academic confidence matters less than emotional or social confidence. The weak loading for one academic item creates a plausible measurement explanation for some attenuation; unmeasured coping differences are another possibility. A'yun and Amin (2026) found that coping strategy contributed to accounts of academic resilience alongside academic self-efficacy. Re-examining item wording and domain reliability would be more informative than ranking the dimensions as though their scales were equally precise.

Emotional Self-Efficacy and Coping with Strain

The emotional association was the largest observed (ρ = .530). A student who believes that frustration, anxiety, or disappointment can be managed may also be more willing to re-engage after setbacks. Studies of emotional regulation and resilience make this interpretation credible without turning it into a demonstrated mechanism (Andriyani & Sa'adah, 2024; Mirza et al., 2024). Emotional self-efficacy, however, is a report of confidence; the study included no behavioral observation of emotion-regulation skills.

Comparing .530 with the social coefficient of .455 and academic coefficient of .409 could invite a school counselor to prioritize emotional coping. The numerical ordering alone is not a sufficient basis for doing so. The three correlations are statistically dependent, and no formal test of their difference was conducted. Family circumstances, classroom climate, and students' lived exposure to stress may all affect how they answer both resilience and emotional self-efficacy items (Putri et al., 2024; Eunike & Widhigdo, 2026).

Resilience in the face of bereavement illustrates why the context behind a questionnaire score should not be ignored. Fadhil and Mardianto (2024) discussed the importance of peer support among adolescents who had lost a parent. Their experience is quite different from ordinary examination anxiety. A student who reports sadness following a major loss should not be labelled emotionally ineffective, nor should resilience be defined as a refusal to express distress. School support must allow room for normal reactions to difficult events.

Social Confidence and an Uncertain Measurement Boundary

Social self-efficacy concerns confidence in engaging with others, managing disagreement, and seeking assistance. Winahyu and Farozin (2024) examined it in a model of parenting, social-emotional skills, and prosocial behavior; Rita et al. (2024) explored related socioemotional competence among adolescents in boarding schools. These studies provide a rationale for retaining a social dimension in theoretical models, but only if the items distinguish it adequately from students' more general confidence.

The positive social correlation (ρ = .455) is compatible with the view that confidence in interpersonal situations accompanies adaptive responses to hardship. At the measurement level, however, academic–social factor correlation (.906) and HTMT (.932) show substantial overlap. The observed association with resilience may contain variance shared with academic confidence. Item revision, an alternative factor structure, and cross-validation would therefore be preferable to portraying three

domains as unequivocally independent (Adilah et al., 2024; Marwah et al., 2024).

Social support is especially important in research on bullied adolescents. Ivanka and Dewi (2024) and Hidayat and Ikromi (2024) examined relationships between social support and resilience in school-age populations. Their work highlights a distinction between believing that one can obtain help and actually having trustworthy people available. A school intervention focused solely on students' self-belief could overlook a classroom environment in which peers are hostile or adults are unresponsive.

Family experiences place a similar limit on individual explanations. Winanti (2022) explored resilience across different family backgrounds, while Prasetya and Utami (2025) related social support and self-efficacy to resilience among adolescents from disrupted families. Personal confidence may matter, but it is embedded in relationships and unequal access to resources. Neither a weak resilience score nor an uncertain social efficacy score should be taken as evidence that a young person has failed to try hard enough.

Evidence from young people who have left school and from bereaved adolescents further suggests that friendships can serve different functions under different pressures (Pratama et al., 2023; Fadhil & Mardianto, 2024). The present instrument asks how competent adolescents believe themselves to be in social situations. It does not count actual supportive contacts, measure the quality of friendships, or observe help-seeking behavior. That distinction limits how directly the social correlation can be translated into a counseling recommendation.

Implications, Limitations, and Future Research

For school counseling, the first implication is methodological. An instrument with one academic loading of .289 and an academic–social HTMT above .90 should be examined carefully before it is used to sort students into academic, emotional, or social intervention groups. The meaning of a score matters as much as its statistical association. Reviewing item wording with students and testing alternative factor structures would provide a sounder basis for domain-specific support (Tarong et al., 2024; Yani et al., 2024).

There is nevertheless a practical rationale for attending to emotional coping, help-seeking, and academic mastery experiences together. Eunike and Widhigdo (2026) considered social support and resilience in connection with adolescents' psychological well-being under academic stress. Marwah et al. (2024) examined academic resilience alongside self-efficacy and self-regulation. These studies offer useful directions for program design, but the present analysis contains no intervention arm and cannot show that a particular counseling strategy will improve resilience.

The main inferential constraints are the single-school sample, a cross-sectional design, incomplete documentation of the selection and questionnaire procedure, and uncertainty about the original scale sources and reverse coding. The factor results also suggest restricted discriminant validity for the academic and social domains. The Spearman coefficients originated in an earlier analysis, not in the two CFA reports, and the individual-level workbook was not available for independent recalculation when this manuscript was assembled. All these limitations should be resolved or acknowledged before external review (Nabila & Ashshiddiqi, 2023; Cynthia & Silaen, 2025).

Further work should test differences between the three correlations using a method appropriate for shared participants and a common variable, and should report uncertainty intervals for each association. Inspecting the original item codes, re-estimating subscale reliability, and fitting a theoretically specified joint measurement model would strengthen interpretation. Studies in additional schools could test whether the observed pattern generalizes.

Comparisons with previous research should consistently distinguish general resilience from the academic-resilience construct used in many related publications (Budiono et al., 2022; A'yun & Amin, 2026).

Conclusion

Among the 73 students included in this study, the reported Spearman coefficients indicated positive associations of resilience with academic (ρ = .409), emotional (ρ = .530), and social self-efficacy (ρ = .455), each with $p < .001$. Resilience was also associated with total self-efficacy (ρ = .578). Emotional self-efficacy showed the largest observed coefficient, but no statistical test established that it differed from the other two. These are associations in a single school sample, not estimates of causal influence.

Both questionnaires showed high overall internal consistency, while the measurement evidence remained qualified: academic and social self-efficacy were strongly overlapping factors (HTMT = .932), and one academic item loaded weakly (.289). Interpreting the domains separately will require further measurement scrutiny. A reproducible recheck of the raw response data, fuller sampling documentation, and confirmation of ethical procedures are necessary before the manuscript can be treated as a fully verified account.

References

Adilah, M. A. R., Andriany, A. R., & Nasution, N. (2024). Peran academic self efficacy dan social support terhadap academic resilience pada siswa sekolah menengah pertama [The role of academic self-efficacy and social support in academic resilience among junior high school students]. *Research and Development Journal of Education, 10*(2), 817–825. https://doi.org/10.30998/rdje.v10i2.24468
Open-access PDF: https://journal.lppmunindra.ac.id/index.php/RDJE/article/download/24468/6961

Agustian, F., & Friyatmi, F. (2025). Pengaruh dukungan orang tua, dukungan dosen dan efikasi diri terhadap resiliensi akademik mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Negeri Padang [The influence of parental support, lecturer support, and self-efficacy on academic resilience among students of the Faculty of Economics and Business at Universitas Negeri Padang]. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai, 9*(3), 30461–30472. https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v9i3.32386
Open-access PDF: https://jptam.org/index.php/jptam/article/download/32386/21669/56011

Andriyani, R. R., & Sa'adah, N. (2024). Peran regulasi emosi terhadap resiliensi diri pada remaja: Systematic literature review [The role of emotion regulation in adolescents' resilience: A systematic literature review]. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research, 4*(6), 4676–4689. https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i6.17051
Open-access PDF: https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative/article/download/17051/11389/29273

A'yun, S. Q., & Amin, Z. N. (2026). Hubungan academic self-efficacy dengan academic resilience: Tinjauan berdasarkan coping strategy siswa SMP Walisongo 1 Semarang [The relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic resilience: Considering coping strategies among junior high school students at SMP Walisongo 1 Semarang]. *Jurnal Studi Guru dan Pembelajaran, 9*(1), 500–510. https://doi.org/10.30605/jsgp.9.1.2026.8236
Open-access PDF: https://e-journal.my.id/jsgp/article/download/8236/5362

Budiono, A. N., Suryani, W., & Triana, D. (2022). Hubungan academic self eficacy dengan academic resilience [The relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic resilience]. *Jurnal*

Consulenza: Jurnal Bimbingan Konseling dan Psikologi, 5(2), 147–157. https://doi.org/10.56013/jcbkp.v5i2.1589
Open-access PDF: https://ejurnal.uij.ac.id/index.php/CONS/article/download/1589/1261

Cynthia, S. S., & Silaen, S. M. J. (2025). Hubungan efikasi diri dan dukungan sosial dengan resiliensi akademik pada siswa sekolah menengah [The relationship of self-efficacy and social support with academic resilience among secondary school students]. *Contiguity: Jurnal Psikologi, 23*(1). https://doi.org/10.37817/jurnalcontiguity.v23i1.4719
Open-access PDF: https://journals.upi-yai.ac.id/index.php/jurnalcontiguity/article/download/4719/3612/

Elipiya, E., Kholidin, F. I., & Prasetia, A. T. (2025). Pengaruh dukungan emosional orang tua dan efikasi diri terhadap resiliensi akademik mahasiswa [The effects of parental emotional support and self-efficacy on university students' academic resilience]. *Jurnal Pembelajaran, Bimbingan, dan Pengelolaan Pendidikan, 5*(3). https://doi.org/10.17977/um065.v5.i3.2025.5
Open-access PDF: https://journal3.um.ac.id/index.php/fip/article/download/6496/4236/13018

Eunike, P., & Widhigdo, J. C. (2026). Peran dukungan sosial dan resiliensi terhadap kesejahteraan psikologi remaja yang mengalami stres akademik [The role of social support and resilience in the psychological well-being of adolescents experiencing academic stress]. *Jurnal Konseling dan Pendidikan, 14*(1), 828–837. https://doi.org/10.29210/1209300
Open-access PDF: https://www.jurnal.konselingindonesia.com/index.php/jkp/article/download/2093/896

Fadhil, M., & Mardianto. (2024). Kontribusi dukungan sosial teman sebaya terhadap resiliensi pada remaja yang mengalami kehilangan akibat kematian orang tuanya [Peer social support and resilience among adolescents who have lost a parent]. *Nusantara: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial, 11*(2), 874–879.
Open-access PDF: https://jurnal.um-tapsel.ac.id/index.php/nusantara/article/download/14908/9244

Faturrohmah, A., & Sagita, D. D. (2022). Resiliensi akademik siswa sekolah menengah pertama dalam mengikuti pembelajaran tatap muka terbatas (TMT) di Daerah Khusus Ibukota (DKI) Jakarta [Academic resilience of junior high school students during limited face-to-face learning in Jakarta]. *Bulletin of Counseling and Psychotherapy, 4*(1), 167–178. https://doi.org/10.51214/bocp.v4i2.188
Open-access PDF: https://journal.kurasinstitute.com/index.php/bocp/article/download/188/212/

Hidayat, N., & Ikromi, Z. A. (2024). Hubungan antara dukungan sosial dengan resiliensi pada siswa sekolah menengah pertama [The relationship between social support and resilience among junior high school students]. *Eudaimonia Journal Psychology, 1*(1).
Open-access PDF: https://ojs.sains.ac.id/index.php/eudaimonia/article/download/5/52

Irawan, R., Renata, D., & Dachmiati, S. (2022). Resiliensi akademik siswa [Students' academic resilience]. *Orien: Cakrawala Ilmiah Mahasiswa, 2*(2), 135–140. https://doi.org/10.30998/ocim.v2i2.8130
Open-access PDF: https://jim.unindra.ac.id/index.php/orien/article/viewFile/8130/1162

Ivanka, R., & Dewi, F. I. R. (2024). Dukungan sosial sebagai prediktor resiliensi remaja korban bullying [Social support as a predictor of resilience in adolescent victims of bullying]. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora, dan Seni, 8*(2), 378–384.

https://doi.org/10.24912/jmishumsen.v8i2.27385.2024
Open-access PDF: https://journal.untar.ac.id/index.php/jmishumsen/article/download/27385/18926

Kumalasari, D. T., & Munawaroh, E. (2022). Hubungan efikasi diri dan dukungan sosial terhadap kematangan emosi di SMA Negeri 5 Semarang [The relationship between self-efficacy, social support, and emotional maturity at SMA Negeri 5 Semarang]. *Jurnal Al-Taujih: Bingkai Bimbingan dan Konseling Islami, 8*(2), 117–127. https://doi.org/10.15548/atj.v8i2.3382
Open-access PDF: https://ejournal.uinib.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/attaujih/article/view/3382/3127

Marwah, S., Eryanto, H., & Widyastuti, U. (2024). The effect of social support, self-efficacy, and self-regulation on academic resilience. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi, Perkantoran, dan Akuntansi, 5*(3), 746–758. https://doi.org/10.21009/jpepa.0503.17
Open-access PDF: https://journal.unj.ac.id/unj/index.php/jpepa/article/download/49859/19309/150141

Mirza, R., Hutagalung, M. U., Silalahi, L., Petrisely, W., Elvinawanty, R., & Hafni, M. (2024). Resiliensi ditinjau dari regulasi emosi pada mahasiswa perantauan [Resilience in relation to emotion regulation among students living away from home]. *Jurnal Diversita, 10*(1), 143–155. https://doi.org/10.31289/diversita.v10i1.9040
Open-access PDF: https://ojs.uma.ac.id/index.php/diversita/article/download/9040/5692

Nabila, S., & Ashshiddiqi, A. M. (2023). Hubungan antara efikasi diri dan resiliensi pada mahasiswa yang sedang mengerjakan skripsi [The relationship between self-efficacy and resilience among students completing a thesis]. *Proyeksi, 18*(1), 23–35. https://doi.org/10.30659/jp.18.1.23-35
Open-access PDF: https://jurnal.unissula.ac.id/index.php/proyeksi/article/download/20478/8325

Prasetya, R. W., & Utami, C. T. (2025). Hubungan dukungan sosial dan efikasi diri dengan resiliensi pada remaja broken home di Kota Semarang [Social support, self-efficacy, and resilience among adolescents from disrupted families in Semarang]. *J-CEKI: Jurnal Cendekia Ilmiah, 4*(5), 1911–1922. https://doi.org/10.56799/jceki.v4i5.10575
Open-access PDF: https://ulilalbabinstitute.id/index.php/J-CEKI/article/download/10575/8127

Pratama, M. A., Nurdin, M. N. H., Akmal, N., & Dewi, E. M. P. (2023). Pengaruh dukungan sosial terhadap resiliensi remaja putus sekolah di Kota Makassar [The influence of social support on resilience among school dropouts in Makassar]. *Flourishing Journal, 3*(10), 434–440. https://doi.org/10.17977/um070v3i102023p434-440
Open-access PDF: https://journal3.um.ac.id/index.php/psi/article/download/4461/2829/8741

Putri, N. I. K., & Priyatama, A. N. (2024). Mindset and resilience: A correlational study in senior high school 12th grade students. *Jurnal Psikologi Teori dan Terapan, 15*(2), 117–125. https://doi.org/10.26740/jptt.v15n02.p117-125
Open-access PDF: https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/jptt/article/download/29628/11601/107913

Putri, T. H., Asseggaf, S. N. Y. R. S., Ramaita, Fatriona, E., & Priyono, D. (2024). Faktor yang berhubungan dalam perkembangan efikasi diri pada remaja di Indonesia: Kajian literatur [Factors associated with the development of self-efficacy among adolescents in Indonesia: A literature

review]. *Jurnal Keperawatan Jiwa, 12*(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.26714/jkj.12.3.2024.513-524
Open-access PDF: https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/JKJ/article/download/14722/pdf

Rita, R., Iswinarti, I., & Fasikhah, S. S. (2024). Pengaruh konformitas positif terhadap kompetensi sosio-emosional yang dimediasi oleh self-efficacy pada santri remaja [The effect of positive conformity on socioemotional competence mediated by self-efficacy among adolescent Islamic boarding-school students]. *Psychological Journal: Science and Practice, 4*(1), 202–208. https://doi.org/10.22219/pjsp.v4i1.28795
Open-access PDF: https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/pjsp/article/download/28795/14596/117230

Suharti, V., & Nugraha, S. P. (2023). Dukungan sosial dan resiliensi akademik selama pembelajaran daring dengan mediasi efikasi diri akademik pada siswa SMK [Social support and academic resilience during online learning: The mediating role of academic self-efficacy in vocational students]. *Jurnal Psikologi Malahayati, 5*(2), 350–361. https://doi.org/10.33024/jpm.v5i2.10229
Open-access PDF: https://www.ejurnalmalahayati.ac.id/index.php/PSIKOLOGI/article/download/10229/pdf

Tarong, U. S., Geradus, U., Korohama, K. E. P., & Apriliana, I. P. A. (2024). Hubungan efikasi diri dengan resiliensi akademik pada siswa SMA Kristen 1 Kupang [The relationship between self-efficacy and academic resilience among students at SMA Kristen 1 Kupang]. *Jurnal Bimbingan Konseling Flobamora, 2*(1), 31–38. https://doi.org/10.35508/jbkf.v2i1.13599
Open-access PDF: https://ejurnal.undana.ac.id/index.php/JBKF/article/download/13599/6572/

Winahyu, D. M. K., & Farozin, M. (2024). Social self-efficacy sebagai mediator dampak pola asuh autoritatif dan social-emotional skills pada perilaku prososial remaja [Social self-efficacy as a mediator of authoritative parenting and social-emotional skills in adolescents' prosocial behavior]. *Persona: Jurnal Psikologi Indonesia, 13*(1), 135–153. https://doi.org/10.30996/persona.v13i1.10935
Open-access PDF: https://jurnal.untag-sby.ac.id/index.php/persona/article/download/10935/6980

Winanti, H. R. S. (2022). Perbedaan resiliensi anak dari keluarga broken home dengan anak keluarga utuh [Differences in resilience between children from disrupted and intact families]. *Counseling As Syamil: Jurnal Ilmiah Bimbingan Konseling Islam, 2*(1), 30–39. https://doi.org/10.24260/as-syamil.v2i1.561
Open-access PDF: https://e-journal.iainptk.ac.id/index.php/as-syamil/article/download/561/283/

Yani, Y. N. I., Budiono, A. N., & Mutakin, F. (2024). Hubungan antara self efficacy dengan resiliensi akademik siswa kelas VIII SMPN 02 Silo Jember tahun ajaran 2023–2024 [The relationship between self-efficacy and academic resilience among eighth-grade students at SMPN 02 Silo Jember, 2023–2024]. *Ristekdik: Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling, 9*(4), 518–526. https://doi.org/10.31604/ristekdik.2024.v9i4.518-526
Open-access PDF: https://jurnal.um-tapsel.ac.id/index.php/Ristekdik/article/download/18576/pdf

Declarations

Conflict of Interest

The authors' conflict-of-interest statement must be confirmed by the submitting author before submission. No declaration of

absence or presence of competing interests was included in the source manuscript.

Generative AI Disclosure

AI-assisted translation, language editing, and document formatting were used in preparing this manuscript. The authors remain responsible for confirming the accuracy of all reported findings, the provenance of the cited literature, the originality of the work, and the final submitted text.