

Student Wellbeing Differences Reviewed from Learners' Perceptions of Servant Leadership Teachers in State Elementary Schools

Raden Bambang Sumarsono¹, Sunarni², Desi Eri Kusumaningrum³, Djum Djum Noor Benty⁴, Athalla Nauval Bhayangkara⁵, Nurul Mustabsyiroh⁶, Sasi Maulina⁷

^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7} Educational Administration-Universitas Negeri Malang, Semarang St, Number 5, Malang, East Java, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article History:

Accepted: 24-11-2022
Approved: 15-05-2023

Keywords:

student wellbeing;
servant leadership;
teachers;
state elementary schools

Authors Correspondence:

Raden Bambang Sumarsono
Educational Administration
Universitas Negeri Malang
Semarang St, Number 5, Malang, East Java, Indonesia
Email: raden.bambang.fip@um.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine differences in the level of student wellbeing in terms of student perceptions of teacher performance in applying servant leadership in the learning process. This study uses a correlational quantitative method. The population is 30,980 students. The sample technique used was purposive sampling, with a total of 151 students. Data was collected using a questionnaire technique. Data analysis techniques used descriptive and One-way between groups (ANOVA). The results showed that the level of student welfare was in the very good category, the level of implementation of servant leadership by teachers was in the very good category, and there were differences in student welfare seen from the teacher's perception of the implementation of servant leadership in learning.

An important point of the purpose of this research is to measure the difference in student wellbeing judging from the perception of learners towards the implementation of servant leadership teachers. The implications of the results of this study will certainly result in (1) measuring students wellbeing in Blitar regency and (2) measuring the level of students wellbeing perception of servant leadership at the research site. These results will certainly be used as a basic reference in developing policies or improvements in the human resources of educational institutions in related research locations, especially those related to student happiness and welfare, as well as the ability of teachers in managing learning through servant leadership. The flow of the implementation of an optimally integrated education system is the creation of prosperous learners in the educational process. (Kusumaningrum, Benty, & Gunawan, 2019). The welfare of a learner in an educational institution has a high urgency, because it is closely correlated with the high or low effectiveness of the function of learners in schools as a learning community (Fraillon, 2004). The section can be defined thus in the initial paragraph because, the learning community acquires a leading role in the success or failure of the learning process (Victorian Government, 2010). On various foundations that can be assessed if the measurement of student welfare has a high urgency in terms of monitoring about the success or failure of educational institutions carrying out their main duties and functions in terms of education as a whole.

The results of the study by Huebner, Suldo, & Valois (2003) the five most important areas that affect learners' life satisfaction are (1) family, (2) friends, and (3) self. In a country in Europe, namely England (Rees, 2010), The welfare of the child is delegated its indicators on several important things that consist the same as the results of Huebner, Suldo, & Valois (2003) it's just added 5 other things, namely (1) appearance, (2) free time, (3) future, (4) home, (5) money and ownership. Petegem, et al (2008) provide exposure related to five dimensions of well-being in children, namely physical, psychological, cognitive, social, and economic. The physical dimension of a child is defined as something visible to the naked eye as well as (1) health, (2) physical ability, (3) the body's ability in terms of motor. The psychological dimension will lead to mental, the ability to overcome problems, and resilience is under pressure. Other things such as cognitive dimensions include, logical mathematical ability, academic achievement, and the ability of problem solving contextual problems. The social dimension is a relationship with parents, peers, or social activities followed by learners. Finally, the economic dimension includes various things or indicators in financial ability in terms of meeting primary, secondary, or tertiary needs.

Student wellbeing can simply be interpreted as a condition where students feel positive energy when carrying out activities in school, and represented through (1) resilience in learning, (2) self-satisfaction, and (3) socially good relations with all school residents (Campbell, Gray, Macintyre, & Stone, 2020). Research that covers the realm of student wellbeing intensity needs to be improved because it has a causality relationship to the development of education policy (Karyani, et al 2014). The dynamics of problems at the student wellbeing level that are less than optimal will have an impact on the deviant behavior of

students, especially in terms of adverse behavior and non-compliance with all regulations, policies, and rules that have been made in schools (Petegem, et al 2008). On that basis, research on student wellbeing needs to be improved by researchers in the current era, in addition to research on the educational process in the era of the pandemic. Fraillon (2004) articulate student wellbeing is a student who is aware of his role in the school community, which certainly leads to the effectiveness of his activities such as successfully (1) obeying the rules, (2) obeying school policies, or even being able (3) to contribute his achievements to the school institution. Fraine, et al (2005) Stated student welfare as a state when students feel comfortable and able to develop their potential in school. The effectiveness can be viewed from two dimensions that embrace personal abilities, namely in terms of intrapersonal and interpersonal.

The intrapersonal dimension is the high or low level of awareness or self-awareness of a learner to always understand his rights, obligations, duties, and functions in school (Hurlock E.B, 2000). In line with this, the interpersonal dimension is an assessment of various behaviors in the school environment (Hurlock E.B, 2000). This is if widely interpreted, then something that can be known, this interpersonal dimension that determines the height or low role of him in school according to the rights, duties, and excitement of his environment (Fraillon, 2004). Victorian Government (2010) Carrying out research on students wellbeing, a conclusion can be taken if the achievements of students with high welfare are not decided by internal matters only, but socially it is also able to intervene in various processes of achieving students wellbeing comprehensively.

Literature studies that have been carried out by researchers have revealed that if there are other factors that have an attachment in improving student welfare in the context of educational institutions, one of these things is teacher servant leadership. Especially in the behavior of teachers when carrying out the learning process. Servant leadership is a pattern of learning leadership for teachers who are oriented towards full service to students by prioritizing several main dimensions, namely (1) communication, (2) emotional healing, and (3) acceptance (Dierendonck & Patterson, 2010). Communication is defined as a pattern of teacher communication towards students that is constructive towards all aspects of learning and learning (Ham & Kim, 2015). Emotional healing is defined as the teacher's ability to manage student stress levels to always be stable, so that the learning and learning process is dynamic (Dierendonck & Patterson, 2010). The last is acceptance or the teacher's ability to understand if each student has unique advantages and disadvantages, and is believed to still be able to excel according to their advantages (Greenleaf, 2002).

The success of learning in one school is very closely related to the learning model, communication patterns, teacher awareness, and leadership of a teacher towards the class taught by him. (Wiyani, 2017). One of the leadership models that are believed to be able to realize student wellbeing is servant leadership. Servant leadership according to Avolio & Gardner (2005) is a process of leading in carrying out an activity with the orientation of serving by prioritizing subordinates. Servant leadership can be seen from the behavior of the leader who comes from the sincerity of a leader's heart in providing service in leading the way (Greenleaf, 2002). Based on this opinion when interpreted in the learning process by teachers, a teacher is expected to be able to prioritize the needs of students, so that this leadership is more visible very closely between a leader, namely teachers and those led by students.

Teacher behavior in applying servant leadership to students may be able to influence learners in understanding something including understanding learning materials. The behavior produced by teachers will cause perceptions, both negative and positive towards students. The movement of such activities or activities in the relationship of teachers with students, interesting to examine because the perception is certainly diverse, not in a whole unity between individuals and students (Daryanto, 2017).

The results of the study that have been presented before, partly focus on the development of student wellbeing instruments, student wellbeing achievement based on the perception of teacher behavior in learning, and the factors forming student wellbeing. However, in this study researchers placed the existing concerns on the differences in student wellbeing in terms of learners' perceptions of the implementation of their teacher's servant leadership.

METHOD

Researchers use quantitative research methods. The research location is in the State Elementary School (SDN) Blitar Regency. The unit of analysis is students who are registered in the basic education data. Based on basic education data, the total population of elementary school students in Blitar Regency is 30,980 children spread across 22 sub-districts. Because the population is so large, the researchers used a sample. The samples were taken based on various considerations, including: students from SDN accredited A, students in grades 5 and 6, and the location of the SDN is in the city district area. With such considerations, the sampling technique is based on objectives or purposive sampling. Through such provisions, the sampling technique is based on purpose or purposive sampling (Sugiyono, 2019). The number of samples in this study were 151 students. Data collection using questionnaire techniques. Because at the time the data collection was still in the Covid-19 pandemic, the questionnaire was modified using the Google form platform. All the data that has been collected is analyzed using parametric statistics, because the research data is assumed to be distributed normally, and the mapping of this research data is assumed to be homogeneous. It is on that basis that the statistical analysis technique is tested for differences using one-way between groups (ANOVA).

RESULTS

This descriptive analysis is intended to find out how high the happiness of learners or student wellbeing during the learning process and also to find out how high the implementation or implementation of services by teachers as learning leaders or servant leadership. Both of these variables are measured or analyzed using descriptive analysis techniques.

Measurement of student welfare/happiness or student wellbeing needs to be done to monitor how the school can carry out its duties properly, namely it can create happiness or well-being for its learners so that school goals will be achieved. The questionnaire distributed to respondents was multiple choice with a draft choice (1) strongly agreed, (2) agreed, (3) disagreed and (4) strongly disagreed. The scale used is a rating, with a total of 43 multiple-choice questionnaires. Some examples of such questions are as follows in the attached image. From the results of descriptive analysis obtained data as presented in table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Analysis results of Student Wellbeing Variables in Blitar Regency

No	Meaning	Range	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very Unhappy	37—64	0	0
2	Unhappy	65—92	5	3,3
3	Happy	93—120	67	44,4
4	Very Happy	121—148	79	52,3
Total			151	100

Based on table 1 it is known that: as many as 79 responses or 52.3% expressed very happy during the learning process, there were 67 or 44.4% of respondents expressed happiness during the learning process, only 5 respondents or 3.3% of respondents expressed unhappy during the learning process, and none of them felt very unhappy. From the presentation of the results of the descriptive analysis, a conclusion can be drawn that the level of happiness of students or student wellbeing in SDN Blitar Regency 52.3% is very happy.

The measurement of servant leadership variables is intended to see a picture of the implementation of leadership from a teacher in the learning process. Respondents who filled out this questionnaire were students independently, in order to maintain the objectivity of filling the questionnaire, the research team was given an introduction to the word at the beginning of the questionnaire that referred to the student's direction to fill in objectively. Then for the content of the questionnaire instrument represents servant leadership variables such as (1) teachers who always provide confidence in students, (2) teachers provide dynamic communication with students, and (3) the provision of rewards and punishments that are balanced according to portions. Everything in the questionnaire is adjusted to the language that is easily digested by elementary school students. From the results of descriptive analysis obtained data as presented in table 2.

Table 2. Results of Servant Leadership Descriptive Analysis

No	Meanings	Range	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very Unkind	16—27	2	1,3
2	Bad	28—39	2	1,3
3	Good	40—51	71	47,1
4	Excellent	52—64	76	50,3
Total			151	100

Based on table 2 it is known that: as many as 76 responses or 50.3% stated that the teacher's servant leadership during the learning process was very good, there were 71 or 47.1% of respondents expressed good for the implementation of servant leadership by teachers during the learning process, and only 2 respondents or 1.3% of respondents expressed bad and very bad over the implementation of servant leadership by teachers during the learning process. From the exposure of descriptive analysis results, it can be concluded that the implementation of servant leadership by teachers during the learning process is 50.3% very good.

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Variabel	Equal variances assumed	60.741	.000	58.124	300	.000	69.669	1.199	67.310	72.028
	Equal variances not assumed			58.124	212.257	.000	69.669	1.199	67.306	72.032

Group Statistics					
	Kode	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Variabel	1	151	120.93	13.349	1.086
	2	151	51.26	6.223	.506

Figure 2. Results of Analysis of Differences in Student Wellbeing and Servant Leadership

Analysis of this different test with the aim to test the hypothesis whether the difference in student wellbeing or happiness is reviewed from the perception of learners towards servant leadership teachers. Based on the results of the analysis of different test data on student wellbeing and servant leadership with the t test (distinguishing 2 unrelated variables / independent) get a value of t of 58,124 and sig. 0.000 so that there is enough evidence to conclude there is a difference in student wellbeing or happiness reviewed from the perception of learners towards servant leadership teachers in SDN Blitar Regency. Based on these results, researchers can provide interpretations if students have happiness that is in line with the implementation of servant leadership from teachers during learning. Simply put, if the more learners feel served by the teacher in everything while learning, the higher the happiness by students. The key word of the t test results is that the higher the student's perception of servant leadership which causes a sense of service from teachers in students, the higher the happiness of students in related educational institutions when carrying out the learning process.

DISCUSSION

Based on descriptive analysis, the results were obtained that the level of welfare or happiness of students (student wellbeing) in SDN Blitar Regency showed a positive trend that the implementation of the learning process had an impact on the achievement of student wellbeing. This is certainly evidenced in the results of research that reports if the data obtained is categorized as very good and good. The resulting data shows an excellent category with a percentage of 52.3% and a good 44.4% for student wellbeing achievement. This indicates that teachers in Blitar Regency can create a fun learning process for students.

The level of welfare or happiness of students (student wellbeing) can be seen from how students follow the educational process in the education unit. In the context of this study, student wellbeing is measured from the social relationship between teachers and participants. When the relationship or relationship between teachers and learners shows a positive pattern, student wellbeing will be realized, on the contrary, when the relationship between teachers and learners shows a behavior that is not good, student wellbeing will not be realized. Konu & Rimpela (2002) provide conclusions on several things related to the welfare of students in the educational institution environment, namely (1) school conditions, (2) social relations, and (3) self-fulfillment of the ability to get learning feedback, finally (4) health status in educational institutions.

Meanwhile, from the results of descriptive analysis of servant leadership variables showed excellent results. The percentage of servant leadership is also likewise with the evidence of 50.3% very good and 47.1% good. The meaning of servant leadership implemented by teachers in SDN Blitar Regency can be accepted by students. Learners see excellent performance on the realization of the implementation of servant leadership. Servant leadership is a leadership pattern that directs followers to develop in the context of reputation, capability, and contribution in building individuals who are able to carry out tasks earnestly, but still be happy. In the context of this research, servant leadership is realized in the figure of the teacher in providing learning services to his students, he as a leader who serves the learning needs of his learners (Damore & Rieckhoff, 2019).

A servant leader (teacher) in carrying out his duties can be seen from some of the traits or behaviors attached to him. This can be known from how a teacher treats his students. According to Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), Servant leadership has several dimensions that can be used as an indicator that a leader applies the leadership style, namely (1) Altruistic Calling, meaning that the teacher will be more concerned with the needs of his learners than his own needs, (2) Emotional Healing, a

teacher has commitment and skills in recovering to learners who experience past problems or trauma, (3) Listening, a teacher is able to have the sensitivity of what is needed by students, (4) Emphaty, a teacher is able to know what is being felt and thought by his learners, (5) Stiwardship, a teacher always uses openness and persuasion in everything to build student trust, and (6) Persuasion, a teacher is able to take approaches in order to convince learners such as providing support or helping to make a decision.

People's perceptions will not be the same, so each other must have a difference in looking at or interpreting a phenomenon. Similarly, students' perception of student wellbeing conditions and the application of servant leadership by teachers. From the results of different test analysis, it was obtained that there were differences in student wellbeing or happiness judging from the perception of students towards servant leadership teachers at SDN Blitar Regency. This means that the application of servant leadership by teachers is interpreted differently by students. The better the achievement of student wellbeing, it is possible that students will perceive better for the implementation of servant leadership by teachers. Vice versa, the worse the achievement of student wellbeing, it is possible that students will perceive badly over the implementation of servant leadership by teachers.

Teachers who apply servant leadership will influence students to further improve their learning outcomes. Meanwhile, in the implementation of leadership, the teacher has a role in meeting the needs of his students so that he is accepted and recognized as a servant leadership (Poli, 2011). Thus, students will try to improve their learning outcomes because all needs in supporting smooth learning have been met by teachers. Such teacher behavior will indirectly encourage students to be more motivated and challenged in developing themselves and achieving achievements in their learning.

From the results of the anova or t test that has been implemented, conclusions can be drawn if there is a difference in student wellbeing or happiness judging from the perception of students towards servant leadership teachers in SDN Blitar Regency. The results of the anova represent if student wellbeing can be realized and created through servant leadership, and there are differences in perceptions related to student happiness towards servant leadership practices. It can be interpreted, from these results if something that affects student wellbeing is not only sourced from servant leadership, but there are other factors that are certainly beyond the purpose or scope of this research. One of the other factors that can affect student wellbeing is the religious aspect of students, because referring to previous research it is said that the higher the religious aspect of a student from the age of 10—17 years will affect his happiness level (Aini, 2017). Simply put, it can be concluded, that the higher the religious aspect of a student, the higher the level of happiness.

Other things that can be studied besides servant leadership as a stimulus for student happiness, there is also a stimulus or other factors, namely adversity intelligence. Adversity intelligence is the ability of individuals to respond and manage the difficulties into a challenge to solve it through all their abilities (Rohman & Fauziah, 2016). Simply put, it can be interpreted if student wellbeing can be realized through the optimism of a learner arising from adversity intelligence. The higher the adversity intelligence of a student, the higher the level of wellbeing that will appear in the student's person when carrying out the learning and learning process in school. A thing that can be drawn from all discussions about anova or t test in this study, is that servant leadership is addressed variously by students to their ability to be wellbeing, and can be concluded from the literature that has a close relationship with student wellbeing, that religious aspects and adversity intelligence are also other factors besides servant leadership that makes students happy.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions that can be taken from research on student wellbeing differences are reviewed from students' perceptions of servant leadership teachers at SDN Blitar Regency, presented if the level of student wellbeing or student wellbeing in SDN Blitar Regency 52.3%, the level of implementation of servant leadership by SDN teachers Kabupaten Blitar 50.3%, and there is a difference in student wellbeing or happiness judging from the perception of learners towards servant leadership teachers in SDN Blitar Regency. For other researchers, they can continue this research, of course, by adding a number of possible variables that can influence the achievements of student wellbeing and servant leadership. It could also be with other research methods or analytical techniques.

REFERENCES

- Aini, R. (2017). Hubungan Antara Religiusitas Dengan Psychological Well-Being Pada Siswa SMP Muhammadiyah 7 Semarang Rusda Aini Linawati, Dinie Ratri Desiningrum. *Jurnal Empati*, 7(3), 105–109.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
- Barbuto & Wheeler. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(3), 300–326.
- Campbell, L., Gray, S., Macintyre, T., & Stone, K. (2020). Literacy, numeracy and health and wellbeing across learning: Investigating student teachers' confidence. *International Journal of Education Research*, 100(January), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101532>
- Damore, S. J., & Rieckhoff, B. S. (2019). School Leader Perceptions: Coaching Tool and Process. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 16(1), 57–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775119868258>

- Daryanto, S. (2017). *Manajemen Peserta Didik*. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.
- Dierendonck, V. D. & Patterson, K. (2010). *Servant Leadership: Developments in Theory and Research*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fraine, R.D., Landeghem, G.V., Damme, J.V., & Onghena, P. (2005). An analysis of well-being in secondary school with multilevel growth curve models and multilevel multivariate models. *Quality & Quantity*, 39, 297–316.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Ham, S. H., & Kim, R. Y. (2015). The Influence of Principals' Instructional Leadership on Teachers' Use of Autonomy-Supportive Instruction: An Analysis of Three Asia-Pacific Countries. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 24(1), 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0158-x>
- Huebner, E.S., Suldo, S.M., & Valois, R. . (2003). Psychometric Properties of Two Brief Measures of Children's Life Satisfaction: The Students' Life Satisfaction Scale and the Brief Multidimensional Students' Life Satisfaction Scale. *Paper Prepare for the Indicators of Positive Development Conference*.
- Karyani, U., Prihartanti, N., Prastiti, W.D., Lestari, R., Hertinjung, W.S., Prasetyaningrum, J., Yuwono, S., & P. (2014). Wellbeing on child's perspectives. *Paper Presented on The 5th Asian Association of Indigenous and Cultural Psychology*.
- Konu, A., & Rimpela, M. 2002. (2002). Well-being in school: a conceptual model. *Health Promotion International*, 17(1), 78–89.
- Kusumaningrum, D. E, Benty D.D.N, & Gunawan, I. (2019). *Manajemen Peserta Didik: Suatu Pengantar*. Depok: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Petegem, K.V., Aelterman, A., Keer, H.V., & Rosseel, Y. (2008). The influence of student characteristics and interpersonal teacher behaviour in the classroom on student's wellbeing. *Social Indicators Resesearch*, 85, 279–291.
- Poli, W. I. M. (2011). *Kepemimpinan Stratejik: Pelajaran dari Yunani Kuno hingga Bangladesh*. Makassar: Identitas Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Rees, G., Goswami, H. & B. (2010). *Developing an index of children's subjective well being in England*.
- Rohman, I. H., & Fauziah, N. (2016). Hubungan Antara Adversity Intelligence Dengan School Well-Being (Studi pada Siswa SMA Kesatrian 1 Semarang). *Empati*, 5(2), 322–326.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R& D* (Sutopo, Ed.). Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Victorian Government. (2010). *The Effectiveness of Student Wellbeing Programs and Services*. Retrieved from <http://www.audit.vic.gov.au/publications /2009-10/290110-Student-Wellbeing- Full-Report.pdf>
- Wiyani, N. A. (2017). *Manajemen Kelas : Teori Dan Aplikasi Untuk Menciptakan Kelas yang Kondusif* (2nd ed.; R. K. Ratri, Ed.). Yogyakarta: AR-RUZZ.