

# Family Welfare Education in the Academic Perspective for Junior High School Students

Asih Kuswardinah<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Home Economic Departement, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia  
asih@mail.unnes.ac.id*

**Keywords:** Family Welfare Programe in Academic Perspective, High School Students

**Abstract:** Family Welfare Education has the aim to build students' morality and character; it is a logical target since the education contains the material about knowledge, illustration, behaviour and manner required for children's daily life. The characteristics of the 2013 Curriculum is that the learning is using the approaches of discovery learning, inquiry learning, project-based learning, and problem-based learning. Junior High School students are individuals who experience physical and psychological growth. In terms of age, they start to understand the meaning of happiness, wellness, and responsibility. The building of character, knowledge, and skills are conducted holistically in a curriculum. In the end, the curriculum will be able to produce better generation (Regulation of Ministry of Education and Culture, Number 65, 2013). According to the perspective of academic, teachers agree that the Family Welfare Programme to High School education is essential to better the morality and the character of the students (Asih, 2014, Sri Endah, 2015). The idea is in line with the 2013 curriculum, which focuses on both issues.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2013 Curriculum changes the previous curriculum, which is 2006 School-based Curriculum. Family Welfare Education (FWE) is a locally organized unit for students in the 2006 curriculum. The other choices are Electronics, Computer, and Arts. The choice for the school's local unit is based on the availability of teachers and supporting infrastructure. The course of FWE is the main choice in Indonesian, specifically for Junior High School students. The substance of the unit is directly relevant to students' normative actions in their daily life, which are mainly related to their morality and character (Asih, 2009, 2014).

The government has inserted the FWE since the 1960s. However, the government of Semarang city has halted the unit since 2000 for Junior High School and 1997 for Senior High School. The same case happens in a lot of towns and regencies in Indonesia. The absence of the unit initiates the establishment of local handicraft production in the 2013 curriculum. People consider that the change of unit is improper because it changes the aim of educating students' behaviour to upgrade students' practical skills. The objective of FWE is to guide

morality and strengthen students' character. From the perspective of 2013 Curriculum, the exchange has an ambivalent potential which should be minimized in order not to impact students' academic development. The impact will imply to the decrease of quality in students' morality and character in the future.

## 2 DISCUSSION

In the academic perspective, FWE is a conscious and planned effort to build an individual's spiritual, physical, and social skills by guiding them or their family. FWE aims to improve individuals and families' quality of life, which eventually providing (Asih, 2007). The quality of the teacher-student relationship can have a strong influence on students' academic and social achievement (Hamre & Pianta, 2001).

FWE has a concern about guiding the morality and character of the students. The concern is logical because the local wisdom provides students example on how to behave and how to apply good citizen's behaviour in their daily life. The objective

of the unit is to make the individual normatively accepted by society and family. FWE is a manifestation of character education which focuses on virtue, habit, and disposition. The course guides the students to be mature and responsible (Ryan, & Bohlin, 1999). The statement is in line with Lickona and Davidson () that a learning process educates individuals to have great character and working performance. The working production is oriented to tasks' mastery, perseverance, positive behaviour, and commitment to work hard. The performance is what it takes to develop students' talents, skills, and competence.

Meanwhile, morality has the orientation to the relation between integrity, awareness, justice, respect, and cooperation. If the character condition people's productive life, morality should be ethical (Lickona & Davidson, 2004). Based on Asih (2010), the operationalisation of FWP's aim highlights the characters of 1) leading, guiding, and protecting the family; 2) maintaining the security of individuals and the family, and 3) building peace and wealthy physical and mental for individual and family based on the context of Pancasila. The highlights are in line Berniga's (2003) maturation of moral, which includes the elements of 1) moral sensitivity, 2) moral judgement, 3) moral motivation and 4) moral character.

FWE conceptually associates students' morality and characters. Morality is an essential agent for individual conception (Carr, 2010). The belief to personal's moral integrity is vital to protect the individual from denial, rationalisation, or specific irrational necessity (Bandura, 1999). An individual is inseparable from an ethical dilemma (Taylor, 1989, p 112). Lickona (2004) mentions that character is the natural trait of individuals in responding to their surrounding situation based on their moral perspective. The inherent characteristic is manifested in normative action, such as manner, honesty, and responsibility. She adds that there are three things to deal with in guiding the morality of students, which are knowing, loving, and acting the good. Daniel Goleman (1995) states that character education educates value which covers nine basic principles, which are 1) responsibility; 2) respect; 3) fairness; 4) courage; 5) honesty; 6) citizenship; 7) self-discipline; 8) caring; and 9) perseverance. An educational attempt succeeds if people can internalize these principles into their life.

Furthermore, Goleman adds that 80% of the success is based on characters, while 20% is based on intellectuality. Hence, the role of individuals is

essential to their life. The character is a quality which is automatically developed and natural. The building of character should be planned, united, adaptive, and be able to stimulate the perception, motive, or the interest of an individual to learning objects.

Junior High School is the necessary education for formal education in Indonesia after the Elementary education. Junior High School is included in the nine-year compulsory education program. John Santrock (2004) mentions that there are some characteristics for Junior High School students, which are: a. Abstract and idealistic, wherein the puberty, students tend to draw their personality with abstract and idealistic words. Most of the students can distinguish themselves to the ideal character they want; b. Differentiated; the concept explains that students themselves are differentiated in a different context; c. The contradiction within them self, students differentiate themselves into different roles and settings which contradict one to another; d. The Fluctuating Self, the contradiction causes students to emotionally fluctuate and unstable until they can accept who they are; e. Real and Ideal, true and False Selves, students can construct their ideal personality as well as implement that to develop their cognitive development; f. Self-conscious, explains that students are more aware of themselves than younger children in understanding their personality with the acquisition of reflective trait. They like to get any suggestions from their friends; and g. Self-protective, students' mechanism to protect themselves from negativity. The positive images are attractive, sensitive, careful, attentive, and curious.

Junior High School students are teenagers in the age of 12-14. Age is the determining period of students' mental growth. Students are most likely to experience physical and psychological emotion and pressure. Therefore, if parents are not intensively instilling norm, the students are most likely to deviate norms. The accumulation of norms deviation causes a lot of social problems, such as juvenile delinquency, drugs, free sex, and students' fight. The cases happen in most big cities in Indonesia. The situations mostly occur due to the decrease in parenting quality. The parents primarily focus on their job and activities. They lack on prioritizing what matters for their children, including instilling norms and building characters. The success of building a family is based on the relation between family members. Most families in Indonesia are not prosperous. There are some

factors behind it, which are the minimum contact between family member, the minimum understanding of family welfare, and the minimum application of the methods which can transform people to practical knowledge which can build the family. In Indonesia, most of the family still considers financial as the main factor of their welfare. This understanding should be changed. Thus, a school should insert the issue and solve the problem in a rigid and formal education unit. In this case, FWE is the best solution to solve the problem.

The building of the norm is useful in the spectrum of family environment (informal education) and society (non-formal education). The norms can be instilled to an individual holistically. Through the routine understanding process, the students will follow the example in these environments in a long and complicated way. FWE can assist the students facing through the phase in planned teaching with a naturally acquired substantive material. The assistance can solve the lack possessed by family, society, or government in filtering the information obtained by the students in this modern era.

### 3 CONCLUSIONS

Family Welfare Education aims to guide students' moral and builds their character. School as a formal foundation for students' education is the best spectrum to instil the norm of family welfare, specifically for Junior High School students.

### 4 SUGGESTION

It is suggested to the Directorate General of Curriculum and Directorate of Elementary and High School Education to reinsert Family Welfare Education to 2013 Curriculum.

### REFERENCES

- Addison, J. T. (1992). Urie Bronfenbrenner. *Human Ecology*, 20 (2), 16-20.
- Asih, K. (2010). *Ilmu Kesejahteraan Keluarga (cetakan ke 2)*. Semarang: UNNES Pers.
- Asih, K. (2009). *Pembinaan kelompok wanita tani melalui pendidikan wirausaha pangan pengolahan hasil pertanian di kabupaten Semarang*. Laporan Penelitian: LP2M Unnes.
- Asiatun., Djemari, M. (2009). Evaluasi program pendidikan keterampilan PKK pada sekolah lanjutan tingkat pertama (SLTP) di kabupaten Sleman. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan Yogyakarta*, 3(4).
- Balson Maurice. (2010). *Menjadi Orang Tua yang Lebih Baik*. Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara Publisher.
- Bandura,A.(1999). Moral disengagement in the preparation of inhumaities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3 (3), 269-275.
- Benninga, J. S. (2003). Moral and Ethical Issues in Teaching Education. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 1-9.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1990). *Discovering what families do. In Rebuilding the Nest: A New Commitment to the American Family*. USA: Family Service America.
- Carr, D. (2001). Moral and personal identity. *International Journal of Education and Religion*, 2 (1), 79-97.
- Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P., Oesterle, S., Fleming, C. B. and Hawkins, J. D., (2004). The Importance of Bonding to School for Healthy Development: Findings from the Social Development Research Group. *Journal of School Health*, 74, 252–261.
- Depdikbud. (1998). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Depdikbud. (1996). *Modul pelatihan Pengelola Kurikulum Muatan Lokal PKK*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Greenspan, S. I. and Shanker, S. I. (2004). *Cambridge:The First Idea*. USA: Da Capo Press.
- Gumilar, G. (2010). Makna komunikasi simbolik di kalangan pengguna tato kota Bandung. *Jurnal Mediator*, 9 (1).
- Hamre, B. K. & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationship and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, 72, 625-638.
- Henderson, Z. P. (1995). Renewing our social fabric. *Human Ecology*, 23 (1), 16-19.
- Kemendikbud. (2012). *Pusat Data Statistik Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Dikbud.
- Kemendiknas. (2010). *Pembinaan Pendidikan Karakter di Sekolah Menengah Pertama*. Jakarta: Diknas.
- Santrack, J. (2004). *Perkembangan Remaja*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Tim Penggerak PKK. (2009). *Buku Pintar Pembinaan dan Kesejahteraan Keluarga*. Semarang: UNNES Press.
- Tadkiroatun Musfiroh. (2008). *Pendidikan Karakter*. Yogyakarta: UNY Pers.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang *Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*.