

---

# COMPARISON OF SCHOOL WELL-BEING OF FULL-DAY AND HALF-DAY SCHOOL STUDENTS

**Ulifa Rahma\*, Rr. Karina Putri Pramitadewi, Risna Hotmauli Tambun Saribu, Faizah, Yuliezar Perwiradara**

**\*Correspondent Author**

---

Ulifa Rahma  
Universitas Brawijaya  
Jalan Veteran, Ketawanggede,  
Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur  
Indonesia  
Email: [ulifa.rahma@ub.ac.id](mailto:ulifa.rahma@ub.ac.id)

Rr. Karina Putri Pramitadewi  
Universitas Brawijaya  
Jalan Veteran, Ketawanggede,  
Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur  
Indonesia  
Email: [karina.putri@ub.ac.id](mailto:karina.putri@ub.ac.id)

Risna Hotmauli Tambun Saribu  
Universitas Brawijaya  
Jalan Veteran, Ketawanggede,  
Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur  
Indonesia  
Email: [risna.saribu@ub.ac.id](mailto:risna.saribu@ub.ac.id)

Faizah  
Universitas Brawijaya  
Jalan Veteran, Ketawanggede,  
Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur  
Indonesia  
Email: [faizah@ub.ac.id](mailto:faizah@ub.ac.id)

Yuliezar Perwiradara  
Universitas Brawijaya  
Jalan Veteran, Ketawanggede,  
Lowokwaru, Kota Malang, Jawa Timur  
Indonesia  
Email: [yulizar.perwiradara@ub.ac.id](mailto:yulizar.perwiradara@ub.ac.id)

Page  
12-17

## ABSTRACT

*This study aimed to find out the difference in school well-being on senior high school students with full-day and half-day systems. The population of this comparative study was 552 students, consisting of 249 full-day school students and 304 half-day students. The respondents were recruited using accidental sampling technique with a minimum sample of 169 students. To collect the data, a school well-being profile questionnaire was employed, which was developed based on Konu and Rimpela's dimensions of school well-being, i.e., having, loving, being, and health. The result of the study found no difference in school well-being between senior high school students with a full-day and half-day system. The majority of Full-day school students' school well-being was at moderate level, while the majority of half-day school students was in categorized as high.*

*Keywords:* school well-being, full-day school, half-day school, senior high school

## INTRODUCTION

School is a formal education institution provided by the government, it functions not only for learning but also for developing students' morals, character, aptitude, and interest (Santrock, 2014). It constitutes adolescents' microsystem, in which they

spend most of their time. Minister of National Education Decision of 2004, Chapter 4, Article 4 states that 60% of 16-18-year-old individuals attend senior high school. Adolescents who attend junior and senior high school generally spend their time at school approximately seven hours a day.

Accordingly, a school may greatly influence adolescents' development (Sarwono, as cited in Nidianti and Desiningrum, 2015).

Among various learning systems in education, there are half-day and full-day school systems. A half-day school, according to Baharuddin (2010), is a school that begins at 07.00 until 13.00 with an average duration of six hours per day. According to Herdiana (2007), one of the weaknesses of half-day school is it does not have other activities outside the classroom hours due to limited duration (i.e., 6 hours). Consequently, students lack interaction with their friends and could not establish effective, open communication. Furthermore, half-day school students feel overloaded by homework.

The education system in Indonesia is widely discussed in the last two years after Muhadjir Effendy, the minister of education and culture proposes a new program. This program, known as the full-day school program, is an effort to improve the education quality and students' character development as well as educators' performance improvement (Faiz, 2017).

In this program, the school hour begins from 07.00 to 16.00 (8 hours a day). This program does not state that the students spend all these hours in the classroom. Instead, that school hours are divided into classroom and extracurricular activities. Ari Santoso, the Head of Communication and Information of the Ministry of Education and Culture, states that this program aims to strengthen character education by increasing extracurricular hours (Kuswandi, 2017). (Kuswandi, 2017). as a place where students spend their time, it is expected that the school can monitor the students' behavior, thus facilitating them to behave in accordance with the national character. The school is expected to promote students' character by delivering materials related to citizenship and religion, as stipulated in Law no. 20 of 2003.

Some parties stated their disagreement with this program, including the NU centerboard (PBNU). PBNU stated that full-day school potentially leads to some problems, including lack of time to build a

social relationship with friends, safety issues for students whose home is far from school, and limited facilities that hinders the implementation of full-day school (Rahadian, 2017).

From the students' perspective, a student of SMA Abdul Wahid Hasyim, Pesantren Tebuireng, Jombang said that full-day school programs bring some benefits. Among several advantages of the full-day school program, he said that he received more materials than half-day school. Moreover, he had a better relationship with friends since they spend more time together in school. In addition, it was reported that some students said that they could respect time better. However, despite the advantages, the students' problem concerns with exhaustion (Budianto, 2017).

Since a full-day school program brings both positive and negative effects, it is necessary to address the supporting factors of a full-day school program to minimize the potential negative effect.

In 2005, The Good Childhood Inquiry surveyed 8000 children aged 14-16 years old (Pople, as cited in Gray, 2011). The survey report shows that when children are asked about the good thing and pleasure in life, they often spontaneously mention school and education. Further investigation revealed that they like school because they can spend their time with friends as a source of warmth, support, and pleasure. When they do not have such a relationship, they may feel a sense of minority.

A pleasant experience in school is also related to the presence of good, supportive teachers that makes classroom hours interesting and fun. Some respondents stated that tests and homework are the sources of stress, which can also be associated with long study time. That survey showed that some issues should be taken into consideration to promote students' comfort during the school hours, such as, among others, facilities, environment, friends, teachers, and potential bullying (Pope, as cited in Gray, 2011).

Several issues explained in the result of that study illustrate a picture of students'

desired school condition, which improves their school well-being. By having school well-being, students tend to be more healthy (Papalia, Olds, & Feldman, 2008). Such well-being could be achieved when the students view their school positively (Nanda, Widodo, Soedarto, & Semarang, 2015). School well-being, according to Konu and Rimpela (2002), refers to a school condition that allows individuals to fulfill their basic needs, including the school condition (having), social relationship at school (loving), self-fulfillment (being), and health.

Regarding the facilities, the study conducted by Inayah, Martono, & Sawiji (2013) found that facilities positively affect students' achievement in economic subjects. This is consistent with The Liang gie (in Inayah, dkk., 2013) who argues that an ideal learning activity should be supported by adequate facilities including classroom, proper lighting, books, and learning media. Nanda et al. (2015) Found that higher school well-being level results in higher self-efficacy.

A monotonous school experience may serve as a significant source of stress and diminish students' life quality (Huebner & McCullough in Khatimah, 2015). This supports Fatimah's (2010) study that found that higher stress level is followed by students' worse perception of their school. In line with the previous statement, Torshem (as cited in Fatimah, 2010), found that students' stress adversely affects their interpersonal relationship, making them perceives their school atmosphere as discomforting. Students' perception of their school is subjective, meaning that each student may have different perceptions related to their school.

School well-being is a concept developed by Konu and Rimpela (2002), which initially refers to Allardt's concept of well-being. Allardt (as cited in Konu & Rimpela, 2002) defines school well-being as a school situation that allows individuals to satisfy their basic needs, both material and non-material needs. Based on Allardt's concept of well-being, Konu and Rimpela (2002) develop a concept of well-being in the school context. Konu and Rimpela (2002) define school well-

being as a school condition that allows individuals to fulfill their basic needs, which includes four dimensions, namely having (school condition), loving (social relationship), being (self-fulfillment), and health.

Grounded from the phenomena above, the present study aimed to compare the students' school well-being in half-day school and full-day school system. The result of the study may provide feedback for the implementation of the government's educational program.

## METHODOLOGY

The present study was categorized as comparative quantitative study. The following table presents the operational definition of school well-being.

Table 1.

*Dimension and Indicator of Konu and Rimpela's School Well-Being*

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<i>Having</i>	Physical condition of the school and its surrounding
	Condition of learning environment in school
	Service provided by the school
<i>Loving</i>	Needs of social relationship in the school environment between students, school, and the surrounding community.
<i>Being</i>	Opportunity provided for students' development
<i>Health</i>	Physical health
	Mental health

The population of the study was senior high school students in full-day and half-day school systems. The number of participants in the present study was determined using G\*Power 3.1 software with correlation p H1 0.1; error probability 0,05; power 0,95 and correlation p H0 0, resulting in 169 students of full-day (n = 249) and half-day school (n = 304). The participants were recruited using accidental sampling technique.

The data of the study were collected using School Well-being Profile (SWP) questionnaire. This questionnaire was

specifically developed by Konu and Koivisto (2011) for senior high school students and was adapted in the present study. This questionnaire consists of 79 items and use 5-points Likert scale ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree)

The participants were asked to tick the column that suits with them based on the statement. The reliability of the instrument was 0.79-0.94 (Konu & Koivisto, 2011). Table 2 below presents the SWP questionnaire blueprint

Table 2  
*School Well-Being Profile Blueprint*

Dimension	item	Total Item	Percentage
<b>Having</b>	1-26	26	32.91 %
<b>Loving</b>	27-43	17	21.52 %
<b>Being</b>	44-67	24	30.38 %
<b>Health</b>	68-7	12	15.19 %
<b>Total</b>		79	100 %

Assumption tests were done to find out the normality and linearity of the data. After that, the hypothesis test was done using independent sample t-test with the help of SPSS 22.0 for windows.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

The collected data were analyzed using comparison of empirical and hypothetical scores. The comparison is presented in the following table

Table 3  
*Empirical and Hypothetical Score*

Variable	Empirical Score				Hypothetical Score			
	Min	Max	M	SD	Min	Max	M	SD
Full day school	111	294	198.72	30.335	0	316	158	52.67
Half Day School	0	316	158	17.24	101	288	200.82	30.233

Table 4  
*Categories Based on Hypothetical Score*

Variable	Category	Decision	No. of students	Percentage
Full day school	Low	$X < 105,33$	0	0%
	Moderate	$105,33 \leq X < 210,67$	164	65.9%
	High	$210,67 \leq X$	85	34.1%
	Total		249	100 %
Half Day School	Low	$X < 141$	6	1.97%
	Moderate	$141 \leq X < 175$	48	15.79%
	High	$175 \leq X$	250	82.24%

Total 340 100%

The majority of Full-day school students' school well-being was in moderate level, while the majority of half-day school students was in categorized as high.

Table 5  
*Normality Test*

Variable	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistical value	Significance	Description
Full day school	0.044	0.200*	Normal
Half Day School	0.047	0.200*	Normal

The Result of Hypothesis testing showed a significance value of 0.417 (> 0.05), indicating that Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected. In other words, there is no difference in full-day and half-day school students' school well-being.

The majority of full-day school students' school-wellbeing was categorized as moderate, while the majority of half-day school students' school-wellbeing was categorized as high. This difference may be accounted for by the school system. Due to shorter school hours, half-day school students did not feel boring or exhausted. Accordingly, they reported a higher level of school well-being.

There was no significant difference between the students of the two school systems since they had pleasant learning experiences at school.

A pleasant experience in school is also related to the presence of good, supportive teachers that makes classroom hours interesting and enjoyable. Some respondents stated that tests and homework are the sources of stress, which can also be associated with long study time. That survey showed that some issues should be taken into consideration to promote students' comfort during the school hours, such as, among others, facilities, environment, friends, teachers, and potential bullying (Pope, as cited in Gray, 2011).

Several issues explained in the result of that study illustrate a picture of students' desired school condition, which improve their

school well-being. By having school well-being, students tend to be more healthy (Papalia, Olds, & Feldman, 2008). Such a well-being could be achieved when the students view their school positively (Nanda, Widodo, Soedarto, & Semarang, 2015). School well-being, according to Konu and Rimpela (2002), refers to a school condition that allows individuals to fulfill their basic needs, including the school condition (having), social relationship at school (loving), self-fulfillment (being), and health.

Regarding the facilities, the study conducted by Inayah, Martono, & Sawiji (2013) found that facilities positively affects students' achievement in economy subjects. This is consistent with The Liang gie (in Inayah, dkk., 2013) who argues that an ideal learning activity should be supported by adequate facilities including classroom, proper lighting, books, and learning media.

Students from both half-day and full-day school systems exhibited school well-being. However, those from half-day school report higher school well-being. This finding shows that the present school condition allows students to fulfill their basic needs, which includes school condition (having), social relationship (loving), self-fulfillment (being), and health (Konu and Rimpela, 2002). Based on the survey conducted by The Good Childhood Inquiry (2005), it was found that children like school matters if several factors exist. They are opportunities to spend time with friends, support and joy, supportive teachers, enjoyable learning activity, facility improvement, and protection from bullying. Some respondents stated that tests and homework are the sources of stress, which can also be associated with long study time.

In 2005, Vedder, et al. found that the presence of support affects students' self-confidence and motivation in doing their school assignment, which is also related to the dimension of being in school well-being. Regarding *health*, Rashid & Safdar (2017) suggest that children's depression level could be predicted by seeing their *perceived social support*. The study conducted by Rashid & Safdar (2017) found that high childhood depression is associated with poor social

support, meaning that higher perceived social support is related to lower depression level. In addition, it was also found that social support positively and significantly relates to work environment. The present study found that the dimensions of being, loving, and health were fulfilled.

Each needs category explained by Konu and Rimpela (i.e., having, loving, being, and health) demands school and its community's role to support students' fulfillment of those needs. The presence of social support may positively affect students (Malecki, dkk., 2000)

## REFERENCES

- Azwar, S. (2012). *Penyusunan skala psikologi* (Edisi 2). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Barrera, M. (1986). Distinctions between social support concepts, measures, and models. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(4), 413–445.
- Baharuddin. (2010). *Pendidikan dan psikologi perkembangan*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Barsihanor & Hafiz, Abdul. (2016). Studi komparasi keterampilan sosial antara siswa sekolah dasar yang menggunakan sistem full day dan reguler. *MUALLIMUNA: Jurnal Madrasah Ibtidaiyah*, 2(1), 95-103.
- Effendi, A. S., & Siswati. (2016). Intensi delikueni pada siswa kelas XI SMK negeri 5 Semarang, 5(April), 195–199.
- Faiz, A. (2017). Terapkan full day school, mendikbud ingin perbaiki kinerja guru. Retrieved from <https://nasional.tempo.co/read/884301/terapkan-full-day-school-mendikbud-ingin-perbaiki-kinerja-guru>
- Fatimah, B.S. (2010). Hubungan antara stress dengan school well-being pada siswa kelas XI SMA Negeri di Jakarta. *Skripsi*. Depok: Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Indonesia.
- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians.

- International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 10(2): 486–489.
- Herdiana, I. (2007). *Full Day School, Kuatah Kita?*.  
<http://www.kabarindonesia.com/berita.php?pid=13&dn=20070328160938> Diakses pada tanggal 3 Januari 2018
- Hidayati. (2017). Ini isi peraturan mendikbud tentang full day school. Retrieved from <https://kumparan.com/@kumparannews/ini-isi-peraturan-mendikbud-tentang-full-day-school>
- Ihsanuddin. (2017). Jokowi teken perpres pendidikan karakter, kewajiban sekolah 8 jam dihapus. Retrieved from <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2017/09/06/13414751/jokowi-teken-perpres-pendidikan-karakter-kewajiban-sekolah-8-jam-dihapus>
- Inayah, R., Martono, T., & Sawiji, H. (2013). Pengaruh kompetensi guru, motivasi belajar siswa dan fasilitas belajar terhadap prestasi belajar mata pelajaran ekonomi pada siswa kelas XI IPS SMA negeri 1 Lasem Jawa Tengah Tahun Pelajaran 2011/2012.
- Konu, A., & Koivisto, A. M. (2011). The school well-being profile - a valid instrument for evaluation. *Proceedings in EDULEARN11 Conference*, (July), 1842–1850.
- Konu, A., & Rimpelä, M. (2002). Well-being in schools: a conceptual model. *Health Promotion International*, 17(1), 79–87.
- Kuswandi. (2017). Ini penjelasan full day school dari kemendikbud. Retrieved from <https://www.jawapos.com/pendidikan/17/06/2017/ini-penjelasan-full-day-school-dari-kemendikbud>
- Liu, Wang, Mei, Jie, Tian, Lili & Huebner, E. Scott. (2016). Age and gender differences in the relation between school-related social support and subjective well-being in school among students. *Springer*, 125, 1065–1083.
- Malecki, M. C., Demaray, M. K., & Elliot, S. N. (2000). A working manual on the development of the child and adolescent support scale, (2000), 1–50.
- Nanda, A., Widodo, P. B., Soedarto, J., & Semarang, S. T. (2015). Efikasi diri ditinjau dari school well-being pada siswa sekolah menengah kejuruan di Semarang, 4(3), 90–95.
- Nidianti, Winda Esty & Desiningrum, Dinie Ratri. (2015). Hubungan antara school well-being dengan agresivitas. *Jurnal Empati*, 4(1), 202–207.
- Papalia, D., Olds, S., & Feldman, R. D. (2008). *Human development: psikologi perkembangan* ((Edisi Kes). Jakarta: Kencana.
- Rahadian. (2017). PBNU jabarkan 9 potensi kerugian akibat 'full day School. Retrieved from <https://www.google.co.id/search?q=PBNU+jabarkan+9+potensi+kerugian+akibat+%27full+day+School&oq=PBNU+jabarkan+9+potensi+kerugian+akibat+%27full+day+School&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>
- Rashid, A., & Safdar, S. (2017). Comparative analysis of childhood depression and perceived social support among orphan girls and boys, 7(3), 3–7.
- Santrock, J. W. (2014). *Psikologi pendidikan*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Sarason, I. G., Sarason, B. R., & Pierce, G. R. (1990). Social Support: The search for theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9(1), 133–147.
- Tian, L., Liu, B., Huang, S., & Huebner, E. S. (2013). Perceived social support and school well-being among Chinese early and middle adolescents: The mediational role of self-esteem, 991–1008.
- Vaananen, Juha-Matti, Marttunen, Mauri, Helminen, Mika & Heino, Riittakerttu Kaltiala. (2014). Low perceived social support predicts later depression but not social phobia in middle adolescence. *Health Psychology & Behavioural Medicine*, 2(1), 1023–1037.
- Vedder, P., Boekaerts, M., & Seegers, G. (2005). Perceived Social Support and Well Being in School; The Role of Students' Ethnicity, 34(3), 269–278.

Vijayakumari, K. (2015). Perceived social support as a predictor of school engagement of secondary school students. *Guru Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 450-456.