



## **Adaptation and Validation of the Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) for Indonesian Orphanage Students**

**Ghozali Rusyid Affandi<sup>1\*</sup>, Widyastuti<sup>2</sup>, Mohammad Faizal Amir<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup> Psychology Department, <sup>3</sup> Primary School Teacher Education Department,  
Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo

\*Corresponding Author. Email: [ghozali@umsida.ac.id](mailto:ghozali@umsida.ac.id)

**Abstract:** This study aims to adapt the Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) into Indonesian and analyze the quality of its psychometric properties. The adaptation model refers to the concept developed by Beaton with 5 (five) stages, including initial translation, synthesis of the translations, back translation, expert committee, and pre-final version testing. This research method used descriptive quantitative by adapting measuring instruments. This research was conducted offline and online on students who live in the Aisiyah Orphanage in East Java and students who are cared for by their parents with an age range of 12-18 years (N = 187; Boys 16% and Girls 83%). This study used Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) instruments with data collection techniques using the SEQ-C scale. Data analysis using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and internal consistency reliability using JASP Version 16.0.0. The results of the CFA in model 2 show that there is a model fit (model fit) with the data, with a score of  $\chi^2 = 169,999$  ( $p = 0.421 > 0.05$ ); RMSEA =  $0.008 < 0.08$ ; CFI =  $0.999 > 0.9$ ; TLI =  $0.999 > 0.9$ ; SRMR =  $0.059 < 0.08$  and has a loading factor  $> 0.4$ . Reliability test using internal consistency on each factor SEQ-C shows good results (including factors A, B, and C). SEQ-C, adapted into Indonesian, has met adequate validity and reliability to be used as a measuring tool for self-efficacy in students living in orphanages in Indonesia. However, it needs to be tested on students more generally, starting from elementary to high school.

### **Article History**

Received: 13-07-2022

Revised: 22-08-2022

Accepted: 01-09-2022

Published: 20-09-2022

### **Key Words:**

Self Efficacy  
Questionnaire for  
Children; Students;  
Orphanages;  
Confirmatory Factor  
Analysis.

**How to Cite:** Affandi, G., Widyastuti, W., & Amir, M. (2022). Adaptation and Validation of the Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) for Indonesian Orphanage Students. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*, 8(3), 521-533. doi:<https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v8i3.5809>



<https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v8i3.5809>

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA License](#).



## **Introduction**

Self-efficacy is an individual's belief about his ability to organize and carry out the desired tasks and actions to achieve maximum results (Bandura et al., 1999). Self-efficacy refers to the belief that one can learn or act in a certain way (Schunk & Benedetto, 2021). The self-efficacy hypothesis strongly emphasizes the individual and how that person views his or her own personal skills as major factors in successful outcomes (Gallagher, 2012). With adequate self-efficacy, it will help orphanage students to increase their psychological capacity while in the orphanage. The results of previous studies show that students with good self-efficacy positively impact the realm of study and their socio-economic (Malinauskas, 2017; Stolz et al., 2022). Students who live in orphanages tend to have higher risk behaviors and lower communication skills and self-efficacy compared to those cared for by their parents (Rezaie & Alizadeh, 2017). This is also supported by research that shows that the self-efficacy of orphanage students tends to be in the low-medium category (Atieka, 2015). The results of interviews and SSCT tests conducted by (Suryaningrum, 2015) show indications of low self-efficacy of orphanage students in achieving their life goals, both in the context of studies and economics and social.

In education, students' academic performance, reflected in learning outcomes and learning achievement, is apparently influenced by their self-efficacy (Anggraeni et al., 2020; Honicke & Broadbent, 2016). The higher the self-efficacy of students, the higher the student's learning outcomes, but for students who have low self-efficacy, it will impact their low learning outcomes. This is because it turns out that students with high self-efficacy will be able to increase their motivation to study harder compared to those with low self-efficacy (Manuaba & Susilawati, 2019).

The research results showed that although a student has a clear goal (goal setting) in his studies, if his self-efficacy is low, then this will also affect his learning performance, which is also not optimal (Affandi & Hastjarjo, 2011). This is because self-efficacy is a mediator that will increase the influence of goal setting on students' academic performance. Not only that, the positive impact of self-efficacy also affects students' interest in continuing their studies at a higher level. The higher the students' self-efficacy level, the greater their interest in studying (Rokhimah, 2014). Self-efficacy for students also has a positive impact on socio-economic factors. A student with high self-efficacy is better able to adjust when he is in an orphanage so that he is more able to carry out activities in the orphanage with a happy feeling (Mahmudi & Suroso, 2014; Rahma, 2011). Not only that, but self-efficacy also helps orphanage students get up faster from the adversity they experience when facing a problem (Laura, 2019). Even from an economic point of view, it turns out that someone with high self-efficacy will have an impact on decreasing anxiety in looking for work (Hood et al., 2021; Prasetyo, 2005; Razak, 2021). Thus allowing someone to be more confident when looking for work, participate in the selection and be more productive in doing a job.

To measure self-efficacy, many researchers have developed measuring instruments by referring to the concept of self-efficacy proposed by Bandura. The development of self-efficacy measuring tools that have been carried out there are those that specifically measure certain conditions until they are general. As is known in previous studies can help teachers understand students to determine the level of student achievement. (1) specific self-efficacy measuring tools include the College Self-Efficacy Inventory (CSAI) to determine self-efficacy in Hispanic students in the process of adjusting to higher education in the United States (Solberg et al., 1993). (2) the Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scales (PALS) developed by Midgley et al. (2000) explores self-efficacy in learning adaptability. (3) ABC (Academic Behavioral Confidence) proposed by Sander & Sanders (2009), which is designed to measure students' academic confidence. Of these several scales, it is a scale developed to measure academic self-efficacy precisely. In addition, self-efficacy has also been developed specifically to determine a person's confidence to keep doing activities despite experiencing pain, called the Pain Self Efficacy Questionnaire (PSEQ) (Tonkin, 2008). The Adolescent Asthma Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (AASEQ) was developed to find out beliefs to manage the situation so that asthma symptoms subside (Holley et al., 2019).

General Self Efficacy (GSE) also uses a general self-efficacy measurement tool. The GSE was initially developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer in 1979, consisting of 20 items (Scholz et al., 2002). Then, in 1995, GSE was modified to 10 items. Scholz suggested that this instrument has an internal consistency of Cronbach's alpha which ranges from 0.75 to 0.91. GSE has been adapted and translated into 28 languages. Despite the complaints, responses to the items on all three GSE measures show satisfactory psychometric qualities, especially at lower GSE levels. According to the findings, the New General Self-Efficacy Scale performs slightly better than the other measures in terms of efficiency of item discrimination, item information, and relative test information function (Scherbaum et al., 2006). The following is the internal consistency of Cronbach's alpha obtained from several

countries 0.85 (Country workers), 0.85 (workers from Costa Rica), 0.88 (East Germany), 0.79 (German students), 0.81 (Poland students), 0.79 (American students), 0.82 (Turkish students) (Luszczynska et al., 2005).

Not many of the self-efficacy measuring tools that have been developed and adapted (both specific and general) have adapted measuring tools that contain three factors at once (such as the SEQ-C) which covers three domains, namely, academic, social, and emotional. SEQ-C was developed by Muris (2001) and is the only instrument suitable for children and students. This subscale contains seven items related to the "ability to cope with negative emotions". This scale was developed in the Netherlands, with a limited sample of Europeans, namely students aged 14–17. SEQ-C consists of 24 items with answer choices according to the conditions under which the subject feels, namely 1 (not at all) to 5 (excellent) (Muris, 2001). The final result of the factor analysis of the 24 items is only 21 items with a conceptually consistent loading factor and three items with a low loading factor (item 1, item 18, and item 23) (Muris, 2001).

The adaptation of previous research had only been adapted outside Indonesia. Such as in the United States, where the SEQ-C has been validated. The results showed that at the item level, two items had been removed in the factor analysis due to the inability to analyze the factors clearly so that the SEQ-C item became 19 items with the reliability level: the academic self-efficacy factor =0.82, emotional self-efficacy =0.79, and social self-efficacy =0.73 (Suldo & Shaffer-Hudkins, 2007). Apart from America, the SEQ-C adaptation was carried out in South Korea to determine children's self-efficacy in the welfare system (Kim et al., 2015). The adaptation SEQ-C results have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.85 to 0.88. The results of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with the 21-item SEQ-C version show that the items in each SEQ-C factor show acceptable factor loadings, namely academic self-efficacy (0.53-0.72), social self-efficacy (0.39-0.58) and emotional self-efficacy (0.59-0.72) (Habibi et al., 2014). An SEQ-C adaptation was also carried out in the Malaysian context by conducting a Rash Model analysis, which showed that SEQ-C had good reliability and had a valid and reliable set of items (Tan & Chellappan, 2018).

The SEQ-C created by Muris has not yet been subject to any research in Indonesian. This is significant because language influences knowledge and cognitive structure (Lupyan et al., 2020). Additionally, language can affect and mold strategic thinking and decision-making to address challenges (Gleitman & Papafragou, 2012). The current scale must be modified to measure data from the Indonesian context. Thus, this study aims to adapt the Self Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) into Indonesian and analyze the quality of its psychometric properties.

## Research Method

This research method is descriptive quantitative in the form of an adaptation of the SEQ-C into Indonesian, referring to the five stages of adaptation developed by Beaton et al. (2000), including initial translation, synthesis, back translation, Expert Committee, and test of the pre-final version. However, the researcher did not do back translation because the adaptation carried out in this study used the concept of Forward-Adaptation Designs, which did not require back translation (Hambleton & Kanjee, 1995). The test of the pre-final version of the translation of the SEQ-C into Indonesian is intended to empirically determine the measuring instrument's quality through psychometric property analysis, namely validity and reliability.

The participants in this study were 187 students at the Aisyiyah Orphanage in East Java, Indonesia. The sampling technique used in this study is purposive sampling, which

refers to the criteria, including students who live in the orphanage and students who live with their families but are financed by the orphanage (following the orphanage development activities regularly). Eighteen years old and at the school level of elementary school, middle school, or high school. The percentage of these participants comprised men as much as 16% and women as much as 83%.

Data collection techniques in this study used the SEQ-C scale (Muris, 2001), which has been adapted with several 21 items that can represent three domains of self-efficacy, namely: (1) social self-efficacy, which is related to a person's ability to establish relationships with friends; peers, (2) academic self-efficacy, which is the cognitive ability to manage behavior in learning, understand learning materials, and achieve academic expectations; (3) emotional self-efficacy related to the ability to deal with negative emotions. It includes 7 items in each subscale, with each item being rated on a range of 1 to 5 points which means not at all to very good, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from .85 to 0.88 (Muris, 2001). A higher score indicates a higher level of self-efficacy.

The analytical procedure carried out in this study is divided into three stages. In the first stage of the analysis, the discriminatory power of items was carried out using item rest correlation with the help of the JASP 0.16 program. The second stage, the constructed validity analysis, uses Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). This CFA analysis determines the suitability between items and their theoretical constructs (Said et al., 2011). The CFA method used is Diagonally Weighted Least Square (DWLS) because the data is ordinal (Li, 2016; Sari et al., 2013). The criteria used to test the accuracy of the model include CFI 0.90, TLI 0.90, RMSEA 0.08, SRMR 0.08, and Chi-Square 0.05 (Byrne, 2010). The third stage, namely testing the reliability per factor of the Self Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C), including academic self-efficacy, emotional self-efficacy, and social self-efficacy, using Cronbach's alpha to determine the reliability of multidimensional constructs in each factor (Hagelin et al., 2009; Peters, 2014).

## Results and Discussion

### Results of the Indonesian SEQ-C Adaptation

The procedure for adopting the SEQ-C is carried out through several stages. The first stage is to translate the original English text into Indonesian, which two translators carry out with English and Indonesian skills. The results of the translation in this first stage produce T1 and T2. The results of the translation are then compared and integrated by researchers and adapted to the Indonesian language in general, which results in T12. The researchers did not translate the results of T12 into English because the researchers referred to the concept of forward-adaptation designs. The expert committee reviewed the T1, T2, and T12 results in the subsequent stage to determine whether the items were appropriate given the context of the variables and the grammar used. To test a prefinal SEQ-C scale script on research participants, researchers used the results of this agreement. The examples of translation results and validation results in a pre-final script can be seen in Table 1.

**Table 1. Translation Results of SEQ-C in Indonesian**

Faktor SEQ-C	No. Item	Original Item	T1	T2	Prefinal Version
Academic Self-efficacy	4	How well can you study when there are other exciting things to do?	Seberapa baik Anda bisa belajar ketika ada banyak hal-hal lain yang lebih menarik yang	Seberapa baik kamu dapat belajar ketika ada hal menarik lainnya untuk	Seberapa baik kamu dapat belajar ketika ada banyak hal menarik



			bisa Anda lakukan?	dilakukan?	lainnya yang bisa kamu lakukan?
Emotional self-efficacy	9	How well can you prevent becoming nervous?	Seberapa baik Anda bisa mencegah diri Anda sendiri dari menjadi gugup?	Seberapa baik kamu dapat mengontrol dirimu agar tidak merasa gugup?	Seberapa baik kamu dapat mencegah dirimu sendiri dari rasa gugup?
Social Self efficacy	6	How well do you succeed in staying friends with other children?	Seberapa baik Anda berhasil mempertahankan pertemanan Anda dengan anak-anak lain?	Seberapa baik kamu berhasil tetap berteman dengan anak-anak lain?	Seberapa baik kamu bisa menjadi teman/ berteman dengan anak-anak lain?

Note: SEQ-C = Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children

### Item Discrimination Index Construct Validity of the SEQ-C

The item discrimination index analysis on the 21-item version of the SEQ-C (Muris, 2001) using item rest correlation showed that all items had  $r$  0.3, ranging from 0.336 to 0.607. This indicates that each item of the Self Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) has a good discrimination index and can distinguish individuals based on their self-efficacy. The results of the calculation of the SEQ-C item discrimination index on student subjects in Indonesia can be seen in Table 2.

The construct validity test on the Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) uses CFA with the DWLS method, which aims to determine the item's suitability with the underlying theoretical construct. There are 2 models in the SEQ-C factor analysis. Model 1 includes all items from the SEQ-C, which amounted to 21 items (Muris, 2001), and Model 2 eliminates items that have a factor loading of 0.4. Table 3 shows the model fit index based on CFA, and Table 4 shows the standardized loading factor for each SEQ-C item. In model 1, testing is carried out based on three self-efficacy factors, including 21 final items (Muris, 2001). The results of the measurement model test on the SEQ-C model 1 as contained in table 3 indicate a good fit of the model (goodness of fit) with a score of  $\chi^2 = 203,634$  ( $p = 0.178 > 0.05$ ); RMSEA = 0.019 0.08; CFI = 0.996  $> 0.9$ ; TLI = 0.995  $> 0.9$ ; SRMR = 0.062 0.08. The social self-efficacy factor, which is comprised of the item "How well can you express your opinion when your classmates disagree with your opinion?" (S1), was found to have a factor loading of 0.4 during the testing of model 1. This means that the item does not describe the theoretical construct of social self-efficacy, as stated in Table 4.

**Table 2. Discrimination Index of SEQ-C Item Version 21 Item**

Number of Item SEQ-C (21 versions)	Item-rest correlation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 1	0.306	3.263	1.095
Item 2	0.395	3.993	1.111
Item 3	0.479	3.939	0.95
Item 4	0.47	3.612	1.108
Item 5	0.46	3.971	0.991

Item 6	0.541	3.399	0.94
Item 7	0.423	3.259	1.225
Item 8	0.568	3.349	1.053
Item 9	0.551	3.939	0.927
Item 10	0.472	4.036	0.938
Item 11	0.447	3.712	1.096
Item 12	0.581	3.576	0.923
Item 13	0.468	3.223	1.092
Item 14	0.605	3.888	1.069
Item 15	0.492	3.439	0.92
Item 16	0.378	4.094	1.047
Item 17	0.545	3.716	0.974
Item 18	0.564	4.047	0.97
Item 19	0.536	3.446	1.102
Item 20	0.603	3.856	0.9
Item 21	0.423	3.367	1.106

Note: SEQ-C = Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children

In model 2, it is still based on three self-efficacy factors, but in model 2, item 1 (S1) is excluded from the CFA analysis. The results show that by removing items with a loading factor of 0.4, the results show an increase in the loading factor for the other items shown in model 2 (Table 4). In detail, the loading factor for academic self-efficacy with 7 items ranges from 0.585–0.726; for emotional self-efficacy with 7 items has a loading factor ranging from 0.47–0.725; while social self-efficacy with 6 items has a loading factor ranging from 0.476–0.715 (Figure 1). The results of the measurement model test on SEQ-C model 2 show that there is a fit model with the data, with a score of  $\chi^2 = 169,999$  ( $p = 0.421 > 0.05$ ); RMSEA =  $0.008 < 0.08$ ; CFI =  $0.999 > 0.9$ ; TLI =  $0.999 > 0.9$ ; SRMR =  $0.059 < 0.08$  as shown in table 3.

**Table 3. Fit Index for CFA Model on SEQ-C**

Fit index	Model 1: 21 Item	Model 2: 20 Item
2	203.634 (df = 186; $p = 0.178$ )	169.999 (df = 167; $p = 0.421$ )
RMSEA	0.019	0.008
CFI	0.996	0.999
TLI	0.995	0.999
SRMR	0.062	0.059

Note: SEQ-C = Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children, CFA = confirmatory factor analysis; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual. Model 1 is a 3-factor model with a total of 21 items. Model 2 is a 3-factor model with 20 items that issue 1 item, namely item number 1 (S1).

**Table 4. Factor Loading Item SEQ-C**

	Model 1	Model 2
Academic Self Efficacy		
3. How well can you study when you can do so many other interesting things? (A1)	0.583	0.585
6. How well can you master a chapter for the test? (A2)	0.654	0.652
9. How well do you manage to finish all your homework every day? (A3)	0.651	0.653
12. How well can you focus during class? (A4)	0.702	0.703

15. How well did you pass in all subjects? (A5)	0.619	0.62
17. How well can you satisfy your parents or family with the schoolwork you can complete? (A6)	0.627	0.62
20. How well can you pass school exams? (A7)	0.724	0.726
<b>Emotional Self Efficacy</b>		
2. How well do you manage to cheer yourself up when you experience an unpleasant event? (E1)	0.469	0.47
4. How well do you manage to calm yourself down when you're really scared? (E2)	0.564	0.564
8. How well can you prevent yourself from getting nervous? (E3)	0.673	0.673
11. How well can you control your feelings? (E4)	0.563	0.574
14. How well can you encourage yourself when you're feeling down? (E5)	0.722	0.725
19. How well did you manage to suppress negative thoughts? (E6)	0.618	0.607
21. How well have you managed to suppress feelings of worry about things that are not necessarily going to happen? (E7)	0.489	0.483
<b>Social Self Efficacy</b>		
1. How well can you express your opinion when your classmates disagree with you? (S1)	0.349	-
5. How well can you be friends/friends with other children? (S2)	0.581	0.597
7. How well can you chat/talk to people you don't know? (S3)	0.49	0.487
10. How well can you cooperate harmoniously with your classmates? (S4)	0.588	0.594
13. How well can you tell other kids that they are doing something you don't like? (S5)	0.536	0.529
16. How well can you tell your friends about funny incidents/experiences when you are together? (S6)	0.466	0.476
18. How well did you maintain your friendships with other children? (S7)	0.701	0.715

Note: n = 278. Model 1: 21 items. Model 2: 20 items by removing item number 1 (S1). SEQ-C = Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children. All factor loadings were significant  $p < .001$




Figure 1. CFA Path Diagram on SEQ-C Model 2 (n = 278)

Note: ASE = Academic Self-Efficacy, SSE = Social Self-Efficacy, ESE = Emotional Self-Efficacy

## Descriptive Statistics and Reliability SEQ-C

Table 5. shows the results of a descriptive analysis of self-efficacy in students in Indonesia. The mean total self-efficacy score from SEQ-C model 2 (20 items) between male and female students was higher for female students. The average total self-efficacy score for female students is 73.84 and for male students, 71.972. The average academic self-efficacy shows that female students (25.68) show a higher average when compared to male students (24.5). The mean of social self-efficacy also shows that the mean of female students (22,767) is higher than that of male students (22,236). Likewise, the emotional self-efficacy of female students (25.393) also showed a higher average when compared to male students (25.236). The reliability results on the SEQ-C Model 2 show that the Cronbach Alpha coefficient on each self-efficacy factor and the total score has good internal consistency. For the academic self-efficacy factor, = 0.834, for the social self-efficacy factor, = 0.722, while the emotional self-efficacy factor shows reliability = 0.786. The internal consistency reliability for the total score of = 0.885.

**Table 5. Descriptive Statistics – Reliability of Model 1 and Model 2 SEQ-C**

	Gender	n	Mean	SD	Range	Min	Max	Cronbach's (Model 1: SEQ-C 21 Item)	Cronbach's (Model 2: SEQ-C 20 Item)
Academic Self- efficacy	Female	206	25.68	4.396	21	14	35	0.834	0.834
	Male	72	24.5	4.642	20	15	35		
Social Self- efficacy	Female	206	22.767	4.143	18	12	30	0.717	0.722
	Male	72	22.236	3.833	17	13	30		
Emotional Self- efficacy	Female	206	25.393	5.128	24	11	35	0.786	0.786
	Male	72	25.236	4.886	20	15	35		
Total Self- efficacy	Female	206	73.84	11.527	56	42	98	0.885	0.885
	Male	72	71.972	11.57	52	45	97		

The SEQ-C adaptation refers to the self-efficacy scale developed by Muris after the psychometric test, which consisted of 21 items. The analysis results in model 1 show that there is 1 item with a loading factor below 0.4, so it must be discarded because it does not describe the theoretical construct of self-efficacy. Model 2 with 20 items shows an increase in factor loading on each SEQ-C item, namely 0.47–0.726, and has a good model fit. The results of this study are by the construct of self-efficacy theory compiled by Muris (2001) with reference to 3 self-efficacy factors: academic self-efficacy, emotional self-efficacy, and social self-efficacy. The previously developed SEQ-C consisted of 24 items. After testing, factor analysis showed that 3 items failed, meaning that the remaining 21 items were valid and had a good model fit (Muris, 2001).

The instruments adapted in this study can later be helpful in future research as a data collection tool to test individual beliefs about their abilities to carry out their duties as students. In the long term, SEQ-C is a valid instrument for measuring academic, social, and emotional self-efficacy in the long term to understand student development during adolescence (Kim et al., 2015). The SEQ-C is an essential instrument in providing a measure of students' beliefs about their social, academic, and emotional competence. SEQ-C has adequate conformity with a well-explained factor structure where there are three domains: academic, social, and emotional (Farnia et al., 2020).



Belief in students plays a vital role in predicting motivation and expectations, which determines the level of persistence and effort in achieving the desired results (Buri & Kim, 2020; Kim et al., 2015; Manuaba & Susilawati, 2019). Self-efficacy can shape the development of behavior, attitudes, and socio-emotions while carrying out their beliefs (de Fátima Goulão, 2014). Students' positive beliefs can be adjusted by recognizing the influence of family, peers, and school (Coleman & Karraker, 2008). Several previous researchers have also tested the validity and reliability of SEQ-C among students (Habibi et al., 2014; Suldo & Shaffer-Hudkins, 2007; Tan & Chellappan, 2018). Tan & Chellappan (2018) mention that academic self-efficacy produces the highest reliability value among the three domains of self-efficacy. This study's results align with previous research that the level of academic self-efficacy is higher than the level of social and emotional self-efficacy (Habibi et al., 2014). This is similar to the research results that self-efficacy has the highest reliability value of 0.83. Academic self-efficacy has a strong relationship with academic achievement (Loo & Choy, 2013; Yokoyama, 2019)

The SEQ-emotional C's self-efficacy domain revealed a significant relationship with the life satisfaction dimension, showing that students with high levels of life satisfaction typically hold optimistic beliefs about their capacity to succeed academically, socially, and in managing negative emotions (Caprara et al., 2013; Deer et al., 2018; Schneider et al., 2022). In this study, it was found that the self-efficacy of female students was higher than that of male students. This is in line with previous research, which stated that female students had higher academic and social self-efficacy than male students (Malinauskas, 2017). This impacts the achievement of different academic achievements between female and male students (Affandi & Hastjarjo, 2011; Honicke & Broadbent, 2016; Mont & Dogan, 2015). Hence, the implications of adapting SEQ-C can be used by researchers to measure adolescent self-efficacy, as well as being used by teachers to identify and develop the self-efficacy of students living in orphanages.

## Conclusion

The conclusion of this study shows that the results of the adaptation of SEQ-C into Indonesian have good validity and reliability. The CFA results show that the model fits the data; although of the 21 items, there is 1 item that has a poor loading factor, so it is not included in the Indonesian version of the SEQ-C scale. The analysis results also show that each SEQ-C factor consisting of academic, social, emotional, and the total score has good internal consistency.

## Recommendation

Based on the analysis results and the limitations of this study, the researcher suggests to the next researcher to test the SEQ-C on clinical samples, such as bullying victims, stressed students, and depressed students. In order to identify them more precisely concerning how the SEQ-C items function and to correlate them with other scales to ascertain their predictive validity on different variables, it is also advised to analyze psychometric properties using other approaches, such as the Rasch model.

## Acknowledgment

The researcher would like to thank the Council for Higher Education, Research and Development (Diktilitbang) PP Muhammadiyah for the funding support that has been provided. Thanks are also conveyed to the Aisiyyah Orphanage throughout East Java, the Social Welfare Council PWA Aisiyyah East Java, and the University of Muhammadiyah

Sidoarjo for the support in the form of facilities and infrastructure that have been provided to researchers.

## References

- Affandi, G. R., & Hastjarjo, T. D. (2011). Pengaruh tipe penentuan tujuan (goal setting) terhadap performansi bahasa inggris siswa: Dengan efikasi diri dan kemampuan awal bahasa inggris sebagai kovariabel. *Jurnal Psikologi Tabularasa*, 6(1), 277–288. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26905/jpt.v5i2.181>
- Anggraeni, A. S. D., Ismail, W., & Damayanti, E. (2020). The Effect of Self-Efficacy through Positive Thinking Ability on Student Achievement. *Jurnal Psibemetika*, 13(2), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.30813/psibernetika>
- Atieka, N. (2015). Self efficacy remaja panti asuhan dan peningkatannya melalui pendekatan bimbingan kelompok. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, Psikologi, Bimbingan Dan Konseling ISSN*, 5(2), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.24127/gdn.v5i2.317>
- Bandura, A., Freeman, W. H., & Lightsey, R. (1999). Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. In *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy* (Vol. 13, Issue 2, pp. 158–166). <https://doi.org/10.1891/0889-8391.13.2.158>
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *SPINE*, 25(24), 3186–3191. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014>
- Buri, I., & Kim, L. E. (2020). Teacher self-efficacy, instructional quality, and student motivational beliefs: An analysis using multilevel structural equation modeling. *Learning and Instruction*, 66(December 2019), 101302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101302>
- Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Caprara, G., Vecchione, M., Barbaranelli, C., & Alessandri, G. (2013). Emotional stability and affective self-regulatory efficacy beliefs: Proofs of integration between trait theory and social cognitive theory. *European Journal of Personality*, 27(2), 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1847>
- Coleman, P. K., & Karraker, K. H. (2008). Parenting self-efficacy among mothers of school-age children: Conceptualization, measurement, and correlates. *Family Relation*, 49(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2000.00013.x>
- de Fátima Goulão, M. (2014). The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Academic Achievement in Adults' Learners. *Athens Journal of Education*, 1(3), 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.1-3-4>
- Deer, L. B. K., Gohn, K., & Kanaya, T. (2018). Anxiety and self-efficacy as sequential mediators in US college students' career preparation. *Education and Training*, 60(2), 185–197. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-07-2017-0096>
- Farnia, V., Asadi, R., Abdoli, N., Radmehr, F., & Alikhani, M. (2020). Psychometric properties of the Persian version of General Self-Efficacy Scale ( GSES ) among substance abusers the year 2019 – 2020 in Kermanshah city. *Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health*, 8(3), 949–953. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cegh.2020.03.002>
- Gallagher, M. W. (2012). Self-Efficacy. In *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior: Second Edition* (2nd ed.). Elsevier Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-375000-6.00312-8>
- Gleitman, L., & Papafragou, A. (2012). New Perspectives on Language and Thought. In *The Oxford Handbook of Thinking and Reasoning* (pp. 1–81). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199734689.013.0028>



- Habibi, M., Tahmasian, K., & Ferrer-wreder, L. (2014). Self-efficacy in persian adolescents: Psychometric properties of a persian version of the self-efficacy questionnaire for children (SEQ-C). *International Perspectives in Psychology*, 3(2), 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036059>
- Hagelin, C. L., Wengström, Y., Runesdotter, S., Johan, C., Runesdotter, S., Hagelin, C. L., Wengstro, Y., & Fu, C. J. (2009). *The psychometric properties of the Swedish Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory MFI-20 in four different populations The psychometric properties of the Swedish Multidimensional Fatigue*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02841860601009430>
- Hambleton, R. K., & Kanjee, A. (1995). Increasing the validity of cross-cultural assessments : Use of improved methods for test adaptations. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 11(3), 147–157. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.11.3.147>
- Holley, S., Knibb, R., Latter, S., Liossi, C., Mitchell, F., Radley, R., & Roberts, G. (2019). Development and validation of the Adolescent Asthma Self-Efficacy Questionnaire ( AASEQ ). *Eur Respir J*, 54. <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01375-2018>
- Honick, T., & Broadbent, J. (2016). The influence of academic self-efficacy on academic performance: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review*, 17, 63–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.11.002>
- Hood, S., Barrickman, N., Djerdjian, N., Farr, M., Magner, S., Roychowdhury, H., Gerrits, R., Lawford, H., Ott, B., Ross, K., Paige, O., Stowe, S., Jensen, M., & Hull, K. (2021). “I like and prefer to work alone”: Social anxiety, academic self-efficacy, and students’ perceptions of active learning. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 20(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.19-12-0271>
- Kim, Y., Kim, K., & Lee, S. (2015). Testing the self-efficacy questionnaire with korean children in institutionalized care. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 27(6), 734–742. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731515606219>
- Laura, S. (2019). Hubungan antara self efficacy dan regulasi emosi dengan resiliensi pada remaja yang tinggal di panti asuhan. In *Skripsi*. Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung.
- Loo, C. W., & Choy, J. L. F. (2013). Sources of Self-Efficacy Influencing Academic Performance of Engineering Students. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 1(3), 86–92. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-1-3-4>
- Lupyan, G., Abdel Rahman, R., Boroditsky, L., & Clark, A. (2020). Effects of Language on Visual Perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 24(11), 930–944. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.08.005>
- Luszczynska, A., Gutierrez-Dona, B., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). General self-efficacy in various domains of human functioning: Evidence from five countries. *International Journal Of Psychology*, 40(2), 80–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590444000041>
- Mahmudi, M. H., & Suroso, S. (2014). Efikasi Diri, Dukungan Sosial dan Penyesuaian Diri Dalam Belajar. *Persona: Jurnal Psikologi Indonesia*, 3(02), 183–194. <https://doi.org/10.30996/persona.v3i02.382>
- Malinauskas, R. K. (2017). CEnhancing of self-efficacy in teacher education students. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 6(4), 732–738. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2017.4.732>
- Manuaba, I. B. P. A., & Susilawati, L. K. P. A. (2019). Hubungan dukungan sosial dan efikasi diri dengan motivasi berprestasi pada remaja awal dan tengah yang tinggal di



- panti asuhan di Bali. *Jurnal Psikologi Udayana*, 6(1), 161–170. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24843/JPU.2019.v06.i01.p16>
- Midgley, C., Maehr, M. L., Hruda, L. Z., Anderman, E., Anderman, L., Freeman, K. E., & Urdan, T. (2000). *Manual for the patterns of adaptive learning scales*. School of Education University of Michigan.
- Mont, A., & Dogan, U. (2015). Related papers Psychological Correlates of University Students' Academic Performance: A Systematic Review. Student Engagement, Academic Self-efficacy, and Academic Motivation as Predictors of Academic Performance. *Anthropologist*, 20(3), 553–561. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2015.11891759>
- Muris, P. (2001). A brief questionnaire for measuring self-efficacy in youths. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 23(3), 145–149. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010961119608>
- Peters, G. (2014). *The alpha and the omega of scale reliability and validity*. 16, 56–69. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/h47fv>
- Prasetyo, E. B. (2005). Hubungan antara faktor-faktor efikasi diri dengan kecemasan dalam mendapatkan pekerjaan pada mahasiswa tingkat akhir. *Skripsi*, 1–176.
- Rahma, A. N. (2011). Hubungan Efikasi Diri Dan Dukungan Sosial Dengan Penyesuaian Diri Remaja Di Panti Asuhan. *Psikoislamika : Jurnal Psikologi Dan Psikologi Islam*, 8(2), 231–246. <https://doi.org/10.18860/psi.v0i0.1551>
- Razak, N. (2021). How Self-Efficacy Drives Job Performance: The Role of Job Anxiety and Intrinsic Motivation. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 25(2), 190. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jm.v25i2.735>
- Rezaie, E., & Alizadeh, K. H. (2017). The comparison of risky behavior, communication skills and self-efficacy between adolescents of orphanage, replacement families and normal families in Bandar Abbas. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 6(5), 54–60. <https://doi.org/10.21859/jne-06058>
- Rokhimah, S. (2014). Pengaruh Dukungan Sosial dan Efikasi Diri Terhadap Minat Melanjutkan Pendidikan ke Perguruan Tinggi Pada Siswa SMA Negeri 1 Tenggarong Seberang. *Psikoborneo: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 2(3), 149–156. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v2i3.3656>
- Sander, P., & Sanders, L. (2009). Measuring academic behavioural confidence: The ABC scale revisited. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(1), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802457058>
- Scherbaum, C. A., Cohen-Charash, Y., & Kern, M. J. (2006). Measuring general self-efficacy: A comparison of three measures using item response theory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(6), 1047–1063. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164406288171>
- Schneider, S., Beege, M., Nebel, S., Schnaubert, L., & Rey, G. D. (2022). The Cognitive-Affective-Social Theory of Learning in digital Environments (CASTLE). In *Educational Psychology Review* (Vol. 34, Issue 1). Educational Psychology Review. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09626-5>
- Scholz, U., Doña, B. G., Sud, S., & Schwarzer, R. (2002). Is general self-efficacy a universal construct? Psychometric findings from 25 countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 18(3), 242–251. <https://doi.org/10.1027//1015-5759.18.3.242>





- Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2021). Self-efficacy and human motivation. In *Advances in Motivation Science* (1st ed., Vol. 8). Elsevier Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adms.2020.10.001>
- Solberg, V. S., O'Brien, K., Villareal, P., Kennel, R., & Davis, B. (1993). Self-Efficacy and Hispanic College Students: Validation of the College Self-Efficacy Instrument. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 15(1), 80–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07399863930151004>
- Stolz, R. C., Blackmon, A. T., Engerman, K., Tonge, L., & McKayle, C. A. (2022). Poised for creativity: Benefits of exposing undergraduate students to creative problem-solving to moderate change in creative self-efficacy and academic achievement. *Journal of Creativity*, 32(2), 100024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yjoc.2022.100024>
- Suldo, S. M., & Shaffer-Hudkins, E. (2007). Evaluation of the self-efficacy questionnaire for children in two samples of american adolescents. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 25(4), 341–355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282907300636>
- Suryaningrum, C. (2015). Model pembelajaran kognisi sosial untuk meningkatkan efikasi diri anak panti asuhan. *Seminar Psikologi & Kemanusiaan*, 978–979. [http://mpsi.umm.ac.id/files/file/59-64 Cahyaning suryaningrum.pdf](http://mpsi.umm.ac.id/files/file/59-64%20Cahyaning%20suryaningrum.pdf)
- Tan, S. K., & Chellappan, K. (2018). Development assessing the validity and reliability of the self- efficacy questionnaire for children (SEQ – C) among malaysian adolescents : Rasch model analysis. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 51(3), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2018.1435192>
- Tonkin, L. (2008). The pain self-efficacy questionnaire The Impact of Event Scale ( IES ). *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy*, 54(1996), 2007–2008. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0004-9514\(08\)70073-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0004-9514(08)70073-4)
- Yokoyama, S. (2019). Academic self-efficacy and academic performance in Online Learning: A mini review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(JAN), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02794>