

THE SCALE OF RESILIENCE IN THE PEOPLE OF SURABAYA CITY

¹Amiroh Untsal Asad, ²Hafnidar Hafnidar

¹Prodi Psikologi, Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Airlangga

²Prodi Psikologi, Fakultas Kedokteran, Universitas Malikussaleh

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Resilience Scale,
people of Surabaya City

ABSTRACT

Resilience is defined as the capacity of the individual to overcome adversity and survive any psychological stress. Resilience reflects the ability to bounce back and take advantage of opportunities. In the context of Surabaya's society, brand a is required to face various serious problems, such as high population density, pollution, and job competition. This urban life leads to a tendency to experience various disorders and psychological vulnerabilities. With this condition, researchers made a psychological scale to measure the level of resilience in the people of Surabaya City. This psychological scale refers to the theory of Reivich and Shatté (2006) on the construct of resilience consisting of seven dimensions, namely emotional regulation, impulse control, optimism, causal analysis, empathy, self-efficacy and reaching out. A total of 38 women and 16 men (N = 54) with an age range of 17-50 years participated in this study. The research method used is the Likert scale model. The study's results found as many as 32 items out of 44 items tested to be valid with a total item-correlation coefficient value of more than 0.300. As for the value of Cronbach's Alpha, it is calculated at 0.909. Thus, this Resilience Scale can be used in the context of the people of Surabaya City.

E-mail:
amiroh.untsal.asad2021@psikologi.unair.ac.id,
hafnidar@unimal.ac.id

Copyright © 2023 Economic Journal. All rights reserved.
is Licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License \(CC BY-NC 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

1. INTRODUCTION

Urban life has been rising in Surabaya City over the past few decades. Surabaya has become a metropolitan city with 2.87 million inhabitants, and more than 1.5 million workers. In carrying out their daily activities in Surabaya, they must face various serious problems, such as high population density, large amounts of pollution, and high unemployment rates. These factors are related to the pressures of urban life and the tendency to experience mental disorders (Maramis, Karimah, & Yulianti, 2017; BPS Surabaya City, 2022).

Urban life has been rising in Surabaya City over the past few decades. Surabaya has become a metropolitan city with 2.87 million inhabitants, more than 1.5 million workers. In carrying out their daily activities in the city of Surabaya, they are required to face various serious problems, such as high population density, large amounts of pollution, and high unemployment rates. These factors are related to the pressures of urban life and the tendency to experience various mental disorders (Maramis, Karimah, & Yulianti, 2017; BPS Surabaya City, 2022).

As for the matter of mental disorders, Wahyuningsih et al. (2021) in his research, the people of Surabaya City stated that the prevalence of severe to moderate stress reached 86.7% and mild stress 13.3%. Meanwhile, another study of the people of Surabaya City found that the prevalence rate of depression was found to be 15.4% with a high risk of suicide, namely 12.67% (Maramis, Pantouw, & Lesmana, 2020; Bestari et al., 2020). Moreover, a study found that the prevalence of *people with bipolar disorders* in the city of Surabaya was 4.8% in men and 5.9% in women (Maramis, Karimah, and Yulianti, 2017).

From the various problems that must be faced by the people of the City of Surabaya along with data on the prevalence of various mental disorders that are ada, it can be seen that there is a phenomenon of vulnerability in the people of the City of Surabaya. This vulnerability is certainly related to their level of resilience. As Scott et al. (2021) said, resilience correlates with susceptibility to experiencing mental disorders and the ability to overcome problems. In addition, a study found that the higher than individual's lower *the distress* experienced (Verdolini et al., 2021). With these statements in abag, researchers are interested in measuring the construct of r people of Surabaya City. Moreover, in this case, as far as the researchers search, there are still no researchers constructing a resilience scale in the people of Surabaya City. Therefore, the researchers conducted this research and constructed a scale of resilience that is feasible to use.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Resilience refers to positive adaptation, or the ability to maintain or regain mental health, even when experiencing difficulties (Wald, Taylor, & Asmundson, 2006). In line with this, Folke (2006) explains resilience as much as an individual's ability to live and thrive with environmental changes and fosters the capacity to withstand change, including against sudden and surprising changes. Moreover, Folke (2016) then critiques the term resilience to be richer, which is not only about "surviving and returning to equilibrium", but relating to complex adaptive systems always to be able to change circumstances and take advantage of opportunities in the social environment. Furthermore, resilience involves the flexibility and innovation of individuals to transform and help turn crises into opportunities (Gunderson & Holling, 2002; Nykvist and von Heland, 2014).

Apart from the definition of resilience, Reivich & Shatté (2002) describes the seven dimensions of the resilience construct which include: (1) emotional regulation, that is, the ability to calm down in the face of problems; (2) impulse control, that is, the individual's ability to avoid desires and impulses; (3) optimism, i.e. ability to see the future positively; (4) causal analysis, that is, the ability to identify the cause of a problem; (5) empathy, that is, the ability to be aware of the feelings of others; (6) self-efficacy, that is, confidence in his ability to achieve success; and (7) *reaching out*, that is, the ability to achieve the positive aspects of the life problems faced.

In contrast to this theory, the theory of Connor & Davidson (2003) states that resilience consists of five dimensions. First, *personal competence; high standard and tenacity*. This dimension means the personal ability of a resilient and resilient individual in achieving goals despite being depressed. Second, *trust in one's instincts; tolerance of negative affect; strengthening effect of stress*. This dimension is related to calmness in action. Third, *positive acceptance of change and secure relationships*. This dimension has to do with the ability to accept difficulties positively and if you are in trouble, you can relate well to others. Fourth, *control and factor*, namely the ability to control yourself in achieving goals. Finally, *spiritual influences*. This dimension is the ability to think positively because of belief in God.

In addition, resilience theory according to Benard (2004) states that resilience as adaptability and functioning well in the midst of challenging situations, has four dimensions that can be measured, namely: (1) *social competence* (the ability to relate in a social environment); (2) *problem solving skills*; (3) *autonomy* (acting independently); and *a sense of purpose and bright future*.

Grand Theory

Thus, it can be concluded that resilience is the capacity of the individual to overcome difficulties and survive any psychological stress. Resilience undermines the ability to bounce back and seize opportunities. Furthermore, from the three perspectives on resilience above, researchers see the resilience of the seven-factor model Reivich and Shatté (2006) as a complete theory and has dimensions that intersect with the theory of Connor & Davidson (2003) and the theory of Benard (2004). In their definitions that also contain the construct dimension, Reivich and Shatté (2006) define resilience as the ability of an individual to: (1) regulate emotions (the dimension of emotional regulation); (2) controlling impulses (impulse control dimensions); (3) optimistic (dimension of optimism); (4) analyzing the causality of events (dimensions of causal analysis); (5) empathize with others (empathy dimension); (6) trusting self-capacity (the efficacy dimension of self-breastfeeding); and (7) achieve the positive aspects of the life problems that have been faced (dimension *reaching out*). As for later, these seven dimensions become a reference in constructing a resilience scale.

3. METHODS

This study was designed using the Likert Scale. The Likert scale used contains four answer choices, namely SS (Strongly Agree), S (Agree), TS (Disagree), and STS (Strongly Disagree). The item statement is prepared with the rules of *favorable* (statements that are positive (support) aspects in variables) and *unfavorable* (statements that are negative (do not support) aspects in variables).

Respondents in this study must meet the characteristics of a man or woman living in Surabaya, individuals with an age range of 17-50 years, and have a minimum high school education/equivalent.

Sampling is carried out based on *robability sampling* method, namely *purposive sampling*. According to Sugiyono (2008), the *purposive sampling* method is a method of determining samples with certain considerations. Only respondents who met the established criteria were asked for their willingness to respond to the study. The sample criteria that must be met are male or female, people who are domiciled in the city of Surabaya, are individuals with an age range of 17-50 years, and have a minimum high school education/equivalent.

The instrument in this study is the Resilience Scale in the People of Surabaya City. This scale uses a Likert Scale with values from 1 to 4, namely Strongly Agree (SS) with a value of 4, Agree (S) with a value of 3, Disagree (TS) with a value of 2, and Strongly Disagree (STS) with a value of 1. Regarding the scale used, the researcher used a self-created scale based on the theory of Reivich and Shatté (2006) with a distribution of 44 items as follows in the *blueprint*.

Table 1. Blueprint aitem spread before trial

No	Dimension	Favorable	Unfavorable	Total
1	Emotional regulation	1, 9, 29, 39	2, 14, 15, 23	8
2	Impulse control	7, 10, 28, 40	16, 24, 33, 36	8
3	Optimism	19, 21, 32, 41	6, 8, 35, 42	8
4	Causal analysis	5, 12	31, 44	4
5	Empathy	11, 17	20, 30	4
6	Self-efficacy	18, 38	4, 27	4
7	<i>Reaching out</i>	3, 22, 25, 43	13, 26, 34, 37	8
	Total item	22	22	44

Aitem Writing

Aitem-aitem on the Scale of Resilience in the Surabaya City Community, researchers designed themselves in accordance with the provisions of good aitem writing. According to Azwar (2002), a good aitem can represent an indicator of behavior to be expressed, in accordance with the correct writing rules, and does not contain high social *desirability*. The following are the Resilience Scale items before they are validated.

Table 2. Aitem-aitem before validation

No.	Question
1.	I can think clearly despite being worried.
2.	I quickly got up from feeling sad/down.
3.	I'm not afraid to get out of my comfort zone.
4.	I am always afraid of making mistakes when doing tasks.
5.	I am used to solving problems by first looking for the root cause.
6.	I often hesitate when making decisions in solving problems.
7.	I easily make friends with new people.
8.	I better avoid trouble.
9.	I am a calm person in the face of any situation.
10.	I don't have any difficulties when required to cooperate with others.
11.	I feel that I am sensitive to the feelings of others.
12.	When faced with a problem, I think about why it can happen.
13.	I didn't dare to take action because I was worried about the possible impact.
14.	I feel uneasy when faced with a difficult problem.
15.	I am easily anxious when encountering a problem.
16.	I am easily discouraged if I can't solve the problem well.
17.	When my friend is sad, I can easily feel the sadness.
18.	When asked to do a task, I always believe I can do well.
19.	I believe that the trouble given to me is within my ability.
20.	The grief of others is none of my business.
21.	I believe that my future will be bright.
22.	I believe that there is a lesson behind every difficulty of life.
23.	For me, failure is natural.
24.	I have a hard time controlling my feelings of disappointment when I fail.
25.	I dare to take risks to solve the problem.
26.	I'd rather do nothing than do a troublesome thing even if it's good.
27.	I need someone else to do my assignments.
28.	I find it hard to calm down when I'm angry.
29.	I can still focus on working on something even if I'm having problems.
30.	I have a hard time feeling what the other person is feeling.
31.	I rarely reflect on the problems I am facing in earnest.
32.	For me, the end of the day is an opportunity to get better.

33. I have a hard time starting a conversation with someone else.
34. When my group is faced with a problem, I don't take the initiative to help solve it.
35. I often feel worried about the future.
36. I waited for others to approach me first.
37. I was afraid of failing to develop my abilities.
38. For me, the challenges that exist push me to grow more and more.
39. I was able to do the task well even though I was not in a *good mood*.
40. I often slam things when I'm angry.
41. When faced with a problem, I believe that I can solve it well.
42. I often have doubts about the outcome of my work.
43. I feel myself developing after encountering problems.
44. I often repeat the same error for not understanding the cause of the previous error.

Professional Judgment

Before the scale is tested, *professional judgment* is first carried out to find out the validity of the scale content created. In the procedure, after all items have been written, the scale is handed over to *professionals* or *experts* to be assessed for feasibility through the *voting* method and *content validity ratio* (CVR). For *voting*, researchers give a scale to five *professionals* who are alumni/lecturers of Psychology. Each person is given the authority to assess the feasibility of each item of the item and make suggestions on it. Decision-making is taken based on the most recommendations from *professionals* taking into account their advice.

As for the *content validity ratio* (CVR) method, the researcher gave a scale to 10 Psychology students. CVR was developed by Lawshe (1975) and the procedure is to assess each item of the item by giving a score of 0 or 1. A score of 0 is intended for rejected items, and a score of 1 is intended for accepted items. After all items are given a score, the conclusion of the score is calculated by the formula $CVR = (n_e - N/2) / (N/2)$, where CVR is *content validity ratio*, n_e is the number of *professional* members who answer 1 or receive item, and N is the total number of *professionals*.

After testing the validity of the content with two different methods, CVR and *voting*, there were no invalid item items and all of them (44 items) were declared valid but 25 of them received revision notes for editorial changes. The 25 items that require editorial changes are item numbers 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 15, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44. These items (revised) are then reassessed until they comply with the specifications and are further well arranged in the scale book and Google Form. This is intended so that the scale meets *face validity*.

Scale Trials

The Resilience Scale trial in the Surabaya City Community was tested on 56 respondents with an age range of 17-50 years, but only 54 respondents met the *sampling* criteria. This trial was conducted *online* from November 30, 2022 to December 4, 2022. Furthermore, the scale trial was carried out by distributing questionnaires in the form of Google Form yang listed in posters to various social media, namely LinkedIn, Instagram, Telegram, and WhatsApp. The researcher first explains a brief narrative of self-introduction, a description of the scale, and the characteristics of the respondents needed. In addition, in the Google Form there is also a brief description of the scale to provide understanding to the respondent and *informed* consent as a form of respondent's consent to participate in the research.

Analysis of Trial Results Data

Data analysis of trial results using the SPSS 23 application. This application aims to get an idea of the validity value and reliability of the scale.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity Trial Results

From the results of the validity test using the SPSS 23 application, it was found that as many as 32 item grains out of 44 item items were tested to be valid with a total item correlation coefficient value of more than 0.300. This refers to Azwar (2016) which states that item d is valid if the total item correlation coefficient is more than 0.300. That is, as many as 12 items died because less than 0.300. The results of the analysis of the SPSS can be seen in the SPSS Results can be seen in Table 10. The fallen item is marked with a parenthetical "()".

Table 3. Aitem spread blueprint after trial

No	Dimension	Favorable	Unfavorable	Total
----	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------

The Scale Of Resilience In The People Of Surabaya City. Amiroh Untsal Asad, et.al

1	Emotional regulation	1, 9, 29, 39	2, (14), 15, 23	8
2	Impulse control	7, 10, 28, (40)	16, (24), 33, 36	8
3	Optimism	19, 21, 32, 41	(6), (8), 35, 42	8
4	Causal analysis	5, (12)	(31), 44	4
5	Empathy	11, (17)	(20), 30	4
6	Self-efficacy	18, 38	4, (27)	4
7	<i>Reaching out</i>	3, 22, 25, 43	(13), 26, (34), 37	8
Total aitem		22	22	44

Reliability Test Results

Based on the reliability test of the Resilience Scale in the Surabaya City Community, an alpha-cronbach score of 0.909 was found. According to DeVellis (2011), the reliability coefficient is considered very good if the score is between 0.800 to 0.900. On the other hand, Azwar (2016) explained that reliability is considered satisfactory if it reaches a minimum score of 0.900. In this case, then it can be seen that the scale is feasible and reliable.

Table 4. Reliability test results

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.909	31

Aitem Valid

Based on the results of validity and reliability that have been carried out, it can be concluded that there are 32 valid and reliable items on the Resilience Scale in the Surabaya City Community. Regarding *the blueprint* aitem valid, can be seen in Tabel 5.

Table 5 Aitem spread blueprint after trial

No	Dimension	Favorable	Unfavorable	Total
1	Emotional regulation	1, 7, 20, 28	2, 10, 16	8
2	Impulse control	6, 8, 19	11, 23, 25	8
3	Optimism	13, 14, 22, 29	24, 30	8
4	Causal analysis	5	32	4
5	Empathy	9	21	4
6	Self-efficacy	12, 27	4	4
7	<i>Reaching out</i>	3, 15, 17, 31	18, 26	8
Total aitem		19	13	32

DISCUSSION

By looking at the results of testing the validity and reliability of a item, it can be concluded that the Resilience Scale measuring instrument in the Surabaya City Community is classified as a satisfactory scale by meeting the characteristics of a good scale, namely valid and reliable. Item tested to be valid with a total item-correlation coefficient value of more than 0.300. The scale that has met the validity test and the reliability coefficient of 0.909 has met the specified score standard, which is more than 0.900 according to Azwar (2017). Therefore, it can be seen that this scale is already feasible to use.

Apart from the research that has been carried out, the factor of lack of researcher supervision during the implementation of the research (because it is carried out *online*) can also affect the results of the study. Moreover, other factors such as respondents' mood, respondents' knowledge, and environmental circumstances when filling out the scale can contribute to the research results. For this reason, further research is expected to minimize this influence with stricter selection of respondents and more intense supervision.

5. CONCLUSION

This psychological scale refers to the theory of Reivich and Shatté (2006) about the construct of resilience by consisting of seven dimensions, namely emotionalization squads, impulse control, optimism, causal analysis, empathy, self-efficacy, and *reaching out*. A total of 38 women and 16 men (N = 54) with an age range of 17-50 years participated in this study. The output of this study is a Resilience Decree through validity and reliability tests with the SPSS application. Initially, researchers made 44 items based on theoretical aspects of resilience, then revised in the *professional judgement* process with a *content validity ratio* (CVR) with 10 Psychology students and *voting* with five Psychology alumni/lecturers and obtained

The Scale Of Resilience In The People Of Surabaya City. Amiroh Untsal Asad, et al

25 aitems which the editors changed on the advice of them. As for the validity test carried out, it was found that as many as 32 aitems out of 44 aitems tested were valid with a total item-correlation coefficient value of more than 0.300. In the last stage, namely the reliability test, an alpha-cronbach score of 0.909 was obtained. This figure indicates that the Resilience Scale is considered worthy of being a resilience measurement instrument and can be used will.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the preparation of a scientific article entitled " Resilience Scale in the Surabaya City Community", the researcher expressed his gratitude to: Malikussaleh University, as an institution that provides a forum for guidance and teaching through learning activities for the Construction of Psychological Measuring Instruments course. Mrs. Dr., Hafnidar S, Psi., MSc. as the supervisor of the Ps ikology Measuring Instrument Construction course.

REFERENCE

- [1] Azwar, S. (2002). *Preparation of Psychological Measuring Instruments*. Student Library.
- [2] Azwar, S. (2016). *Reliability and Validity* (4th Ed.). Learning Library.
- [3] Central Statistics Agency of Surabaya City. (2022). *Executive Summary of Surabaya City Employment August 2021*. <http://bit.ly/3hCS21u>.
- [4] Benard, B. (2004). *Resiliency: What we have learned*. WestEd.
- [5] Bestari, D., Atika, A., Margono, H. M., Maramis, M. M., & Muhdi, N. (2020). Validity and reliability test of Sheehan-suicidality tracking scale in Indonesian adult general population. *EurAsian Journal of Bioscience*, 14(1), 2527–2532.
- [6] Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and anxiety*, 18(2), 76-82.
- [7] DeVellis, R. F. (2011). *Scale Development: Theory And Applications*. SAGE Publishing.
- [8] Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses. *Global environmental change*, 16(3), 253-267.
- [9] Folke, C. (2016). Resilience (republished). *Ecology and society*, 21(4).
- [10] Grotberg, E. H. (1999). *Tapping Your Inner Strength: How to Find the Resilience to Deal with Anything*. Oakland. New Harbinger Publications.
- [11] Gunderson, L. H., & Holling, C. S. (Eds.). (2002). *Panarchy: understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Island press.
- [12] Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel psychology*, 28(4), 563-575.
- [13] Maramis, M. M., Karimah, A., Yulianti, E., & Bessing, Y. F. (2017). Screening of Bipolar Disorders and Characteristics of Symptoms in Various Populations in Surabaya, Indonesia. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 32(2), 90-98.
- [14] Maramis, M. M., Pantouw, J. G., & Lesmana, C. B. J. (2020). Depression screening in Surabaya Indonesia: Urgent need for better mental health care for high-risk communities and suicide prevention for men. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 002076402095735. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764020957359>.
- [15] Nykvist, B., and J. von Heland. (2014). Social-ecological memory as a source of general and specified resilience. *Ecology and Society*, 19(2), 47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/es-06167-190247>.
- [16] Reivich, K., & Shatté, A. (2002). *The resilience factor: 7 essential skills for overcoming life's inevitable obstacles*. Broadway Books.
- [17] Verdolini, N., Amoretti, S., Montejo, L., García-Rizo, C., Hogg, B., Mezquida, G.,... & Solé, B. (2021). Resilience and mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of affective disorders*, 283, 156-164.
- [18] Scott, K. M., Zhang, Y., Chardoul, S., Ghimire, D. J., Smoller, J. W., & Axinn, W. G. (2021). Resilience to mental disorders in a low-income, non-Westernized setting. *Psychological medicine*, 51(16), 2825-2834.
- [19] Sugiyono. (2008). *Business Research Methods: Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Approaches*. Alfabeta.
- [20] Rev. Wahyuningsih, S. et al. (2021). Stress Tendencies of Surabaya Residents during the COVID-19 Pandemic In Terms of Type K of Introverted and Extroverted Personalities. *Journal of Research*, 2(1), 69-81.
- [21] Wald, J., Taylor, S., & Asmundson, G. J. G., et al. (2006). *Literature review of concepts: psychological resiliency*. Toronto (ON): Defence R&D Canada.