



The Overview of Differences in Student Well Being Flourishing Among Junior High School and Senior High School Student in Jabodetabek Area

Adhissa Qonita¹ and Ratna Dyah Suryaratri²

¹Faculty of Psychology Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

²Faculty of Psychology Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

AdhissaQonita@unj.ac.id

Abstract

Schools need to start introduce education that pays attention to students' mental health from an early age. This needs to be done as a preparation for students to become adults in the future. One of the mental health factors that needs to be considered is students' well-being at school or student well being. This research was conducted using quantitative methods based on the theory of well-being flourishing, namely the PERMA Profiler by Seligman and using The EPOCH questionnaire compiled by Kern, et al which was re-developed in the school context by the Prodi Psikologi UNJ research group. The research was conducted on 401 junior high school students and 526 high school students in the Jakarta, bogor, depok, tanggerang and bekasi area. The results of the research show that there is a significant difference in student well-being between junior high school students and high school students ($p= 0.000 < 0.05$). Both groups have high well-being categories, but Senior high school students have more high student well-being (66,3%) compared to junior high school students (50,6%). That because the different between age, time, and area.

Keyword

Well being, student well being, Junior High School, High School, Student.

1. Introduction

School is a place of secondary education. Most adolescents spend time in the school environment. adolescents who are already attending secondary school, both middle school, high school and vocational school, generally spend around 7 hours a day at school. This shows that adolescents spend almost of their time every day at school. Therefore, it is not surprising that the influence of school on adolescent development is quite large. School is an ideal place to provide opportunities for adolescents as students to develop themselves and also focus not only on the learning process but also on promoting character and paying attention to the physical and mental health.

© The Author(s) 2025

I. Widiyanah et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Education Innovation (ICEI 2024)*,

Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 888,

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-360-3_113

Schools are considered to have to start introducing positive education by paying attention to the mental health of their students from an early age. This needs to be done to strengthen students' self-attention and emotional intelligence in order to prepare themselves to become adults in the future (Waters, 2014). On the other hand, with healthy mentality students are expected to have positive psychological characteristics which should be able to increase academic achievement, reduce unpleasant behavior, and have better physical health in adulthood (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor & Schellinger, 2011). Currently, several programs are being developed to pay more attention to students' mental health in schools, one of which is the program provided by WHO. It's just that these health programs sometimes still use health theory and general health promotion and not many looks at mental health from well-being

This time, most people sees the results at school as limited to academic achievement and pays less attention to students' evaluations and their experiences also their feelings at school (Dello-Lacovo, 2009). Schools should also need to find out more, pay attention and also develop students' well-being, so that these results can be used by students to prepare themselves for their adulthood (Kern, Waters, Adler, & White, 2014). Well-being itself is basically an abstract construct so there are many concepts that often overlap with the concept of well-being. There are several concepts of well-being that are quite well-known, therefore well-being sometimes has various terms such as happiness, subjective well-being, thriving or developing, or flourishing or terms that indicate fertile development (Butler & Kern, 2016). In general, Huppert (2014) defines well-being as feeling comfortable and functioning well.

Lack of well-being can have a negative impact on students, where it can give rise to aggressive, problematic behavior, and other negative psychological impacts including making students less able to concentrate or also less optimal cognitive abilities (Nidianti & Desiningrum, 2015; Effendi & Siswati, 2017; Khatimah, 2015; Rohman & Fauziah; 2017 dalam Wijayanti & Sulitiobudi 2018). On the other hand, achieving a person's well-being will result in several positive things including increasing academic achievement, success in doing something, strong friendships and also improved physical health (Diener & Chan, 2011; Huppert, 2009).

Well-being should be one of the goals of implementing education and schools should also contribute to the well-being of their students. Schools themselves are expected to be able actualize students' potential holistically and enable students to have better well-being. From the previous explanation, it can be seen that well-being influences almost all aspects of optimizing student functioning (Frost, 2010). It is important for schools to make students feel that they have good well-being, which can only be felt by students when they feel safe, comfortable, happy and healthy at school. To be able to run a school,

it is also necessary to know the state of students' well-being. Examinations related to students' well-being can also help teachers and school counselors obtain comprehensive information about what students are having difficulties with and need to develop psychologically. Where not all students feel they have good well-being, some students need to improve several components of their well-being, for example in terms of positive emotions or improving their social relationships.

Seligman explained Well-Being Theory or WBT, which is the latest well-being concept that combines two philosophical perspectives and is explained as a construct that encourages flourishing (Seligman, 2011). From this theory, Seligman's PERMA model is considered more suitable in terms of dimensions and can be interpreted by young people, including school students. Apart from that, this PERMA model is also linked to school structures and strategies in improving well-being (Norris, William, O'Connors & Robinson, 2013). PERMA itself consists of five large domains, namely: PERMA (1) Positive emotion leads to hedonic feelings of happiness; (2) Engagement refers to a psychological connection to an organization or activity carried out (3) Relationship where a person feels integrated, supported and cared for by the environment and feels satisfied with the social connections they have; (4) Meaning or belief that life is valuable and feeling something greater than oneself; (5) Achievement/Accomplishment includes making progress on goals, feeling capable, and having good achievements.

Measuring students' well-being is quite important to carry out on a large scale, so that it can describe the quality of students' comfort while at school. It's just that not many well-being measurements have been carried out on students in Indonesia and well-being measurements using the PERMA measuring tool itself are still very limited to certain age groups of students. Most studies using PERMA, including adaptations, use participants aged 18 years and over or at the educational level of students (Hidayat et al, 2018 in Elfida, Milla, Mansoer & Takwin 2021). According to Kern, Waters, Adlers and White (2015) there is little to almost no investigation of the Seligman PERMA model for use with adolescents, especially at school age. Considering the importance of well-being in students at school, this research wants to test the use of the development of the measuring instrument The EPOCH Measure of Adolescent Well Being developed by Kern, Benson, Steinberg, & Steinberg (2014). Based on PERMA theory in middle school, especially in the Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang dan Bekasi area which the main area of indonesia. This research want to know well being flourishing in school context especially in indonesia and school age student who almost no investigation about this before.

2 Method

2.1 Participants

Participants in this research were secondary level students, still an active student and taking part in classroom education. This research is expected to be able to obtain data on upper secondary students from various areas in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang dan Bekasi. The sampling method is cluster random sampling with a proportional number of participants according to the population. Cluster random sampling is used to determine the sample if the object to be studied or data source is very broad (Sugiyono, 2007). Cluster random sampling, namely the population consists of groups, in this study to select secondary level schools from each region. Next, representatives of secondary level schools in each region. The object of this research focuses on students' psychological well-being.

2.2 Instrument

The research team developed a school well being instrument based on the PERMA theory by Seligman and measured using the EPOCH (Engagement, Perseverance, Optimism, Connectedness, and Happiness) measuring instrument. The instrument was also developed from The EPOCH Measure of Adolescent Well Being instrument developed by Kern, Benson, Steinberg, & Steinberg (2014). The research team conducted a focus group discussion regarding the suitability of the item synthesis results, as well as conducting trials and testing the readability of the items with 28 students. In the end, this research used the EPOCH measuring tool which was developed with 24 final items.

2.3 Research Ethics

After preparing the instruments, the research teams carried out an ethical review process before starting the process of conducting research and collecting data. The ethical review was carried out by the Indonesian Scientific Psychology Consortium or KPIN. This research received permission to carry out with the recommendation 'can be carried out with controlled risks' by KPIN ethics number: 046/2023/Etik/KPIN.

2.4 Data analysis

The data analysis technique used in this research was descriptive statistical analysis to see the description and statistical test of the paired sample t-test as a test of differences in student well-being between middle school and high school students

3. Result

3.1 Participants Demographic

3.1.1 Demographic Data junior High School participants

The number of respondents obtained as of August 14 2023 was 527 students from junior high schools (SMP and equivalent) obtained from the Jabodetabek area. It's just that the data to be processed is 401 in relation to the normality of the data and the calculation of questionnaires that are suitable for use.

Table.1 Demographic Descriptive of Junior High School Participant

Descriptive		Frequency	Presentation
Age	12	35	8 %
	13	132	32.4 %
	14	184	45.2 %
	15	56	14.4 %
Total		521	100%
Gender	Boys	205	51.1 %
	Girls	196	48.9 %
Total		401	100%
House Town	Jakarta	164	40.8 %
	Bogor	91	22.9 %
	Depok	61	15.0 %
	Tangerang	1	0.2 %
	Bekasi	83	21.1 %
Total		401	100%
School Status	Negeri	230	57.2 %
	Swasta	171	42.8 %
Total		401	100%

From the table above, it can be seen that the majority of participants in this study were over 14 years old (N=184, 45.2%), male (N= 205, 51.1%), living in Jakarta (N=164, 40.8%) and attended public schools (N= 230, 57.2%).

3.1.2 Demographic Data Senior High School participants

The number of respondents obtained as of August 14 2023 was 526 students from senior high schools (SMA and equivalent) obtained from the Jabodetabek area.

Table.2 Demographic Descriptive of High School Participant

Descriptive	Frequency	Presentation	
Age	15	89	17%
	16	106	19.3%
	17	152	29.1%
	>17 Tahun	179	34.6 %
Total		526	100%
Gender	Laki-laki	189	35.%
	Perempuan	338	64.9%
Total		526	100%
House Town	Jakarta	181	34.7%
	Bogor	63	12.1%
	Depok	64	12.3%
	Tangerang	49	8.3%
	Bekasi	170	32.6%
Total		526	100%
School Status	Negeri	472	90.6%
	Swasta	55	9.4%
Total		526	100%
Jurusan	IPA/Sains	245	46.1%
	IPS/Sosial	269	51.6%
Total		526	100%

From the table above, it can be seen that the majority of participants in this study were over 17 years old (N=179, 34.6%), female (N= 338, 64.9%), living in Jakarta (N=181, 34.7%) , attended a state school (N=472, 90.6%), and majored in social studies or social studies (N=269, 51.6%).

3.2 Student Well Being

3.2.1 Junior High School Student Well Being

Table 3. Student Well Being Categorization Middle School Participant

Categorization	Norm	F	(%)
Low	$X < 87,37$	198	49,4

High	$X > 87,37$	203	50,6
Total		401	100

Table 4. Student Well Being Categorization High School Participant

Categorization	Norm	F	(%)
Low	$X < 94,71$	177	33,7
High	$X > 94,71$	349	66,3
Total		526	100

From the table above can be concluded that most junior high school students feel they have high well-being or as much as 50.6%, however there is not much difference with students who feel they have low well-being or as much as 49.4%. In contrast to junior high school students, high school students feel seen to have high well-being or as much as 66.3%. This result has quite a big difference with students who have low well-being, namely 33.7%. The results show that the student well-being of high school students in the Jabodetabek area tends to be higher than the student well-being of junior high school students in the Jabodetabek area.

3.3 The Tabulation Data of Jabodetabek area

Table 5. Tabulation of Student Well Being and Jabodetabek Area

Domisili	SWB SMP			SWB SMA		
	High	Low	Total	High	Low	Total
Jakarta	85	83	168	57	129	186
Bogor	59	57	116	26	35	61
Depok	11	23	34	19	45	64
Tanggera	2	0	2	16	26	42
ng						
Bekasi	41	40	81	59	114	173
Total			401	Total		526

It can be seen from the results above that it can be concluded that there is no difference between low and high student well being in each domicile in Jabodetabek. It can be seen that there are not many differences junior high school student well-being in the Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang and Bekasi areas. It's just a little different in the student well-being of high school students, it can be seen that in the Jakarta and Bekasi

areas, high student well-being is much more numerous than low student well-being. This shows that high school students in the Jakarta and Tangerang areas have high student well-being compared to other areas in Jabodetabek.

3.4 The Student Well Being Differences between Junior High School and Senior High School

Table 6. Group Statistic

Student Well Being	Pendidikan	N	Mean
	SMP	401	87.49
	SMA	526	94.71

Table 7. Independent Sample T-test Result

	F	t	Sig (2 tailed)
Equal variances assumed	.036	-7.880	.000
Equal variances not assumed		-7.985	.000

The results above show that there is a significant difference between the level of student well being of junior high school students and high school students, where the significance value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05 or P value $.000 < 0.05$. Results

4. Discussion

Schools are the main place to promote both physical and mental health among children and adolescents. Therefore, it is important to know about student well-being among students. This research was attended by 401 junior high school students and 526 senior high school students in the Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi (Jabodetabek) area. From the results of this research, we got the difference between student well-being of junior high school students and senior high school students in the Jabodetabek area the significance result was $p \leq 0.05$. From the categorization results, it can be concluded that both junior high school and senior high school students tend to have high student well-being. High student well-being indicates that students feel there is well-being at school and they receive a positive influence from school (Nidianti & Desiningrum, 2015). However, among junior high school students there is not much

difference or only 50.6%, whereas among senior high school students it appears that 66.3% have high student well-being. These results show that the student well-being of senior high school students is better than that of junior high school students in the Jabodetabek area.

Differences in the perception of each student and student development between levels of education make a significant difference in the student well-being of junior high school and senior high school students in the Jabodetabek area. From the resulting data, the variations in the student well-being category experienced by students are greatly influenced by differences in individual student perceptions in receiving and achieving their well-being at school. Basically, variations in the student well-being category are greatly influenced by differences in the perceptions of each student in receiving and achieving their well-being at school. Where according to the meaning of Engels et al (2004) student well being is defined as a positive expression shown by students towards their school environment which is the result of the harmony of environmental factors and students' expectations of their school. Therefore, differences in student well-being may occur due to students' different views and expectations, especially in terms of their school area, age and length of education.

If we look at the school area, it can be seen that most senior high school students who have high well-being are in the cities of Jakarta and Bekasi. Where as the center of Indonesia, it allows for the development of schools and the availability of better facilities and information that can support students to feel more prosperous. The school environment is one of the dimensions of student well-being according to the model developed by Konu, Rimpela, Lintonen and Rimpela (2003). Where, the Having dimension or the physical condition of the school is something that can build student well-being. A comfortable environment with more attention to facilities allows students to develop their student well-being. Cuyvers, et al (In Nidianti & Desiningrum, 2015) say that infrastructure influences well-being, where student well-being will increase as the quality of school infrastructure gets better.

If we look at their ages, basically both of them are in their adolescence, but they both have different levels of adolescence. Where, according to WHO, junior high school students aged 12-15 years are included in the category of early adolescence or high puberty, while senior high school students aged 15-17 years are in late adolescence. Where in late adolescence a person has developmental changes including cognitive development, where according to Piaget (in Pappalia et al, 2010) at the end of adolescence (in this study high school students) a person has begun to be able to think abstractly and hypothetically so that he can systematically solve a problem. This ability to think allows late teens at senior high school age to have the urge to think more logically rather than just

relying on their emotions, thereby enabling them to think more about their well-being as students. On the other hand, junior high school students are still quite busy experiencing the transition of changing themselves because they are in puberty. Where the period of puberty ranges from 10-14 years for girls and 12-16 years for boys. Puberty causes many changes in teenagers so that they feel uncomfortable with their changes and need to adapt. This may cause junior high school students to still adapt and not place too much emphasis on their well-being so there is not much difference from the distribution of student well-being.

Junior high school and senior high school students also have different levels of education and also the length of time students study at a formal level. The length of study is 7-9 years of formal study for junior high school students and 10-12 years of formal study for high school students. The length of time students go to school will influence the formation of their experiences and acceptance of daily learning activities. Where the length of study may make a difference in the student's environment, such as how to building relationships with teachers, getting social support, and friendship relationships, which are factors that can improve the well-being that students have at school (In Aulia, 2018).

In general, the results of this research show that at the high school level aged 12-17 years there has not been much research regarding student well-being which is flourishing using the PERMA theory. This research found that there were significant differences in student well-being between junior high school and senior high school students in Jabodetabek. Where according to the categorization, the student well being scores of senior high school students tend to be higher than those of junior high school students. It can also be seen that most senior high school students who have high student well-being live in Jakarta and Bekasi. Jakarta and Bekasi who are the biggest city of JABODETABEK area. The closer student to the capital of indonesia, the more they are to get assistance and better facilities in school or public area (Diany & Mardiansyah, 2022)

5. Conclusion

These results indicate that differences in student well-being may be caused by student development and environment. Differences in the level of student well-being of junior school and senior high school students in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang dan Bekasi may be differentiated from the area where they study , the age of the student, and the length of time the student has studied.

Reference

- Aulia., Farah (2018) Improving Student Well Being in School. Internasional Conference of Mental Health, Neuroscience, and CyberPsychology. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32698/25275>
- Butler, J. & Kern, M. L. (2016). The PERMA-Profilier: A brief multidimensional measure of flourishing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 6(3), 1-48. <https://doi:10.5502/ijw.v6i3.526>
- Dello-Lacovo, B. (2009). Curriculum reform and 'quality education' in China: An overview. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29(3), 241– 249.
- Diany, W.F., Mardiansyah, F.J (2022) Kajian Perbandingan Ketersediaan Fasilitas-Kecamatan Sebelum dan Sesudah Pemekaran di Kabupaten Kerinci. *Desa-Kota Vol-4*, 226-240
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(2), 143-156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y>
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82, 405–432. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
- Effendi, A. S., & Siswati, S. (2017). Hubungan Antara School Well-being Dengan Intensi Delinkuensi Pada Siswa Kelas XI SMK Negeri 5 Semarang (The Relationship Between School Well-being and Delinquency Intention in Class XI Students of SMK Negeri 5 Semarang). *Empati*, 5(2), 195-199.
- Engels, N., Aelterman, A., Van Petegem, K., & Schepens, A.(2004). Factors which influence the well being of pupils in Flemish secondary schools. *Educational Studies*, 30(2). doi : 10.1080/0305569032000159787.
- Elfida, D., dkk. (2021). Adaptasi dan uji properti psikometrik The PERMA-Profilier pada orang Indonesia. *Persona: Jurnal Psikologi Indonesia*, 10(1), 81-103. <https://doi.org/10.30996/persona.v10i1.4986>
- Frost, P. (2010). The Effectiveness of Student Well-being Programs and Services. Victorian Auditor-General's Report.
- Huppert, F. A. (2014). The state of wellbeing science: Concepts, measures, interventions, and policies. In F. A. Huppert & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Wellbeing: A complete reference guide: Interventions and policies to enhance wel-being* (Vol. IV, pp. 1– 50). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Kern, M. L., Waters, L. E., Adler, A. & White, M. A. (2015). A multidimensional approach to measuting well-being in students: Application of the PERMA framework. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 10(3), 262-271.
- Kern, M. L., Benson, L., Steinberg, E., & Steinberg, L. (2014). *The EPOCH measure of adolescent well-being*. Unpubulished manuscript.

- Khatimah, H. (2015). Gambaran school well-being pada peserta didik program Kelas akselerasi di SMA Negeri 8 Yogyakarta (Description of school well-being in students of the accelerated class program at SMA Negeri 8 Yogyakarta). *Psikopedagogia*, 4(1), 20–30.
- Konu, A., Alanen, E., Lintonen, T., & Rimpela, M. (2002). Factor structure of the school well-being model. *Health Education Research : Theory & Practice*, 17(6), 732–742. doi :10.1093/her/17.6.732
- Nidianti, W. E., & Desiningrum, D. R. (2015). Hubungan antara school well-being dengan agresivitas. *Jurnal Empati*, 4(1), 202–207.
- Rasyid, A. (2021). Konsep dan Urgensi Penerapan School Well-Being pada Dunia Pendidikan. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 5(1).
- Rasyid, N., Ahmad, A.T., & Agussalim, A.A (2022) Gambaran Student Well-Being pada peserta Didik Sekolah Menengah Atas. *Jurnal Psikologi Talenta Mahasiswa*. E-ISSN 2807-789X
- Rohman, I. H., & Fauziah, N. (2016). Hubungan antara adversity intelligence dengan school well-being (Studi pada Siswa SMA Kesatrian 1 Semarang). 5, 322–326.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2012). *Flourish (2nd ed.)*. Random House Australia Pty, Ltd.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Waters, L. (2014). Balancing the curriculum: *Teaching gratitude, hope and resilience*. In H. Sykes (Ed.), *A love of Ideas* (pp. 117–124). Albert Park: Future Leaders Press.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

