CONSTRUCTION OF STUDENT WELL-BEING SCALE

FOR 4-6TH GRADERS

Irine Kurniastuti [1]   Saifuddin Azwar [2]

Faculty of Psychology
Universitas Gadjah Mada

This study was aimed to develop an instrument of student well-being measurement for elementary school. The scale was based on the review of well-being research in children by Pollard and Lee (2003) adapted to the school context referring to the psychological well-being approach suggested by Ryff and Keyes (1995). The process of construction of the scale was started by making three parallel scales. Each scale composed was tested on 200 respondents, so the total number of the respondents was 600. The results of the analysis of the three scales were used as the basis for preparing a compilation scale. The compilation scale was then tested on 215 respondents. The results of the analysis of the compilation scale showed that 39 items composed had satisfying psychometric properties, i.e. the reliability coefficient, item discrimination index, and content validity, while structurally, factor structures still needed to be improved.

Keywords: elementary school, psychological well-being, student well-being

Student well-being pada anak usia Sekolah Dasar di Indonesia belum banyak dikaji, demikian pula usaha untuk mengembangkan indikator yang relevan untuk mengungkap *well-being* anak di sekolah belum banyak dilakukan. Di sisi lain, alat ukur untuk mengetahui *well-being* siswa sangat dibutuhkan seiring dengan meningkatnya kesadaran masyarakat terhadap *well-being* siswa di sekolah. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengembangkan instrumen pengukuran *student well-being* dalam konteks Sekolah Dasar (SD). Skala yang dikembangkan didasarkan pada reviu penelitian *well-being* pada anak yang dilakukan oleh Pollard dan Lee (2003) dan disesuaikan dengan konteks sekolah yang mengacu pada pendekatan kesejahteraan psikologis dari Ryff dan Keyes (1995). Penelitian dilakukan dengan menyusun tiga skala paralel. Setiap skala yang disusun ini diujikan kepada 200 responden, sehingga total responden adalah 600 siswa. Hasil analisis terhadap ketiga skala dijadikan dasar untuk menyusun satu skala kompilasi. Skala kompilasi ini kemudian diujikan kepada 215 responden. Hasil analisis terhadap skala kompilasi menunjukkan bahwa 39 aitem yang disusun mempunyai properti psikometris yang memuaskan jika ditilik dari koefisien reliabilitas, daya beda aitem, dan validitas konten, sedangkan secara struktural, struktur faktornya masih perlu diperbaiki.

Kata kunci: kesejahteraan psikologi, sekolah dasar, *student well-being*

Middle-childhood span is an important time for children to develop their various competencies cognitively, socially, and emotionally. Children who succeed in passing the middle-childhood well will develop an attitude of good self-acceptance, confidence, and good relationships with others (Eccles, 1999). The success experienced by children in this age becomes predictive power of emotional development and behavior in the future (Eid & Larsen, 2008). On the other hand, middle-childhood can also be a vulnerable period and at risk for children if they do not make it through the challenges of this period (Eccles, Lord, & Buchanan, 1996; NICE, 2008; Yazdani, 2011) which often influential to the well-being of children

[1] Korespondensi dengan penulis dapat dilakukan melalui: irine.kurnia@gmail.com

[2] Atau dengan menghubungi: sfazwar@ugm.ac.id

(Charlesworth, Wood, & Viggiani, 2007), especially the well-being of children in schools. Case studies of school-quitting client in Consulting Psychology Unit show that mostly it occurs in the mid-range of childhood (Ampuni & Andayani, 2007).

The discussion about middle-childhood cannot be separated from the environment and school despite the fact that many factors influence it (Charlesworth et al., 2007). Children's condition in school will affect his/her well-being. Schools become an important context in the development of children well-being in middle-childhood, which is also often referred to school age. Well-being of school children cannot be viewed separately from the context of the school because children spend a lot of time in school (Eccles, 1999).

The results of Huebner and Gilman study (2006) on life satisfaction in children as an indicator of well-being suggested that when children felt dissatisfaction with the school, they were more susceptible to a variety of behavioral problems in the future. This underscores the importance of protecting children's well-being in school environment, such as the effort by the World Health Organization (WHO) in promoting mental health and well-being at school; the students seek emotional and social well-being (WHO, 2011). This is supported also by Gutman and Feinstein (2008) and Opdenakker and Van Damme (2000) who found that the experiences in schools have an important role to the well-being of children.

However, researches on children's well-being, especially during the middle-childhood period are still rare to find (Gadermann, 2009). In Indonesia, research on children's well-being school context has not been done a lot. Efforts to conceptualize the well-being of children is still less satisfying (Fattore, et al., 2007; Lippman, 2005). Besides, there is not much effort made to make the appropriate well-being measure for children (Ben-Arieh, 2006). Limitations of the study on the measurement of well-being in children are a challenge for education to continue pursuing and developing the well-being measurement. This study aims to develop a student well-being measurement in the context of school, namely Student Well-Being (SWB).

The measuring instrument developed is still at the level of research instruments. Thus, this instrument cannot be used as a diagnostic tool, but the results can be used as an initial step in the development of a measurement tool for screening or monitoring purposes. The expected outcome of the construction of this research is a valid and reliable measuring instrument, which also has feature-items that are able to distinguish between individuals who have a low-measured attributes and those who have high-measured attributes.

Theory and Measurement of Well-being

In its development, well-being research is currently dominated by two main approaches, namely hedonic and eudaimonic (Waterman, 1993). Hedonic approach perceives well-being subjectively. Subjective well-being is often interchangeable with happiness, namely high positive affect, low negative affect and high life satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2008). The hedonic view improves the well-being of a person by increasing his happiness (Ryan & Deci, 2001).

The second approach is eudaimonic. Well-being theory that develops from the perspective of eudaimonic is the Psychological Well-being by Ryff (1989). Ryff and Keyes (1995) suggested that the levels of psychological well-being is a person's level in having a purpose in life, realizing the self potencies, having quality relationships with others, and feeling responsible to his own life. From the perspective of this theory, well-being tends to be seen as the emergence of a positive self attributes (Keyes, 1998).

The perspective used in this study is the eudaimonic approach, which draws on the theory of psychological well-being of Ryff and Keyes (1995). Ryff and Keyes (1995) formulated the concept of psychological well-being which consists of personal growth, self-acceptance, autonomy, purpose in life, environmental mastery and positive relations with others. The six aspects are then used as the basis for preparing the construct and modified by adding or subtracting some adjustments to the level of development of the respondents and the results of research on the well-being of children by Pollard and Lee (2003) and review of Fraillon (2004) on Student Well-Being (SWB).

Identifying the Measurement Purpose and the Operationalization of Student Well-being Concepts

The purpose of this measurement is to construct a scale to measure the well-being of students in the school context, the SWB scale. SWB is defined as the level of students' ability to carry out their duties effectively in the school community (Fraillon, 2004). SWB refers that a better life is more like an effort to demonstrate the positive potency of a student in the school context.

Researcher's review resulted in two dimensions of the student well-being. Intrapersonal dimension consists of six aspects: emotional regulation, resilience, self-esteem, curiosity, engagement, mastery orientation. Whereas, the interpersonal dimension comprises four aspects: communicative efficacy, empathy, acceptance, and connectedness.

At the intrapersonal aspects, a student internalizes what he/she felt at himself/herself and turns it into something that affects his/her function in the school community. Students who have high well-being in intrapersonal aspects are shown in the following capabilities:

Able to control emotions

Emotion controlling forms the core of the ability to control emotions and includes the monitoring, evaluation, and modification of emotional reactions (Pollard & Davidson in Frailon, 2004). Emotion controlling is manifested as emotional responses of students indicated fairly and in accordance with the circumstances around them.

Resilient in facing the problems (having resistance)

The resilience model of this study is aimed to measure difficulty focusing on the expression of students' resilience in the hypothetical contexts. The evidence of differences in the level of students' resilience is manifested by forcing students to responses that they explicitly show when facing a number of school hypothetical difficulties.

Not feeling inferior (having high self-esteem)

A prosperous person is indicated by a positive self-view (Ryff & Singer, 1996) such as self-respect. Self-respect, which is also known as self-acceptance (Ryff & Singer, 1996), describes the affective component of self-concept; refers to how a person feels about himself/herself; and is valued as something fundamental to the construct of intrapersonal well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Self-esteem included in this aspect is the self-esteem in performance or academic and social.

Having a high curiosity

Ryff and Keyes (1995) emphasize the importance of human beings to grow, be opened to new experiences, and face new challenges. Humans are expected to have the feelings to continue growing by developing a curiosity as an intrinsic desire to learn more (Pollard & Davidson, 2001, in Fraillon, 2004).

Participating in learning and school activities

Ryff and Keyes (1995) wrote that one of environmental mastery forms is participating actively in the environment. Students' engagement in the learning process includes the involvement in the learning process and school community.

Persevere in the learning process

Persevere in the learning process is an orientation to proficiency. Orientation to proficiency is defined as a desire to complete tasks with all of the efforts. A construct broader than environmental mastery (Ryff & Keyes, 1995, Ryff & Singer, 1996) can be seen as a part of the orientation on the proficiency and involvement in academic and school activities.

The following aspects are interpersonal aspects which include: the well-being aspect influenced by the experience of interaction with others, one's assessment of the state of the environment, and its function in society (Keyes, 1998). These aspects are:

Being able to communicate what he/she feels and thinks (having communicative efficacy)

Communicative efficacy describes the aspects of social competence and positive relationships with others (Ryff & Singer, 1996). To be able to function effectively in the school community, students need to interact with all members of the school community including other students from different grades of schools, teachers, parents, and colleagues.

Positioning themselves in others' situations (empathy)

Positive relationships with others can be demonstrated by showing empathy (Ryff & Keyes, 1995) cognitively and affectively. Gladstein (1983) suggests cognitive empathy as 'thinking as if being others' and affective empathy as 'responding with the same emotions as others'.'

Demonstrating confidence and comfort in interacting with friends, teachers, and community members

Keyes (1998) calls this aspect as an acceptance of the social environment. The acceptance is an 'understanding of society through the character and quality of others'. It is found in students' beliefs about the basic goodness of others; therefore, it becomes a construct that includes interpersonal values that are often mentioned, respect, tolerance, and understanding.

Maintaining good relationships with friends, teachers, and community members (interpersonal connectedness)

Interpersonal connectedness is 'subjective awareness to establish a close relationship with the social world' (Lee & Robbins, in Fraillon, 2004). This suggests a meaningful relationship with

'the broader and more scopeof people, as well as the variety of colleagues' (Fuller, in Fraillon, 2004; Keyes, 1998).

The aspects above are then lowered into the form of behavioral indicators as contained in Table 1.

Table 1. The Indicators of Student Well-Being Behavior

Aspects	Indicators
Able to control emotion	1. Not doing any action against the social norm to meet a temporary need (impulsivity) such as cheating, stealing, or doing an aggressive action
	2. Not showing excessive response when angry/sad
Resilient in facing problems	3. Keep feeling enthusiastic to go to school after experiencing a bad event (ex.: being bullied by friends or scolded by teachers)
	4. Keep doing homework although there are some obstacles (ex.: blackout, no helper, broken pencils)
Not feeling inferior (having high self-esteem)	5. Feeling smart and able in academic and school work
	6. Not worried by others' opinion
Having a high curiosity	7. Trying to find out a solution (ex.: answers for questions) although is not an obligation
	8. Finding out matters dealing with the lessons that are not taught in the class
Participating in learning and school activities	9. Joining activities outside of the learning hours (ex.: extracurricular, optional programs) happily
	10. Paying attentions to the teachers' explanation and participating in the learning process actively (ex.: answering questions, being active in groups)
Persevere in the learning process	11. Persevering in the learning process to master the lessons
	12. Doing homework optimally
Able to communicate what he/she feels and thinks	13. Being able to communicate what he/she feels (ex.: expressing objections, asking for help when finding difficulties)
	14. Able to communicate what he/she feels
Able to position themselves in others' situations	15. Showing care about the situation experienced by others
	16. Having his/her emotions stirred when heard, saw, or read a heartbreaking/funny story
Demonstrating confidence and comfort in interacting with friends, teachers, and community members	17. Feeling comfortable being among friends and teachers
	18. Thinking that all friends and teachers are good
Maintaining good relationships with friends, teachers, and community members	19. Having many friends
	20. Having good relationships with friends and teachers without distinguishing status, religions, or race

METHOD

Respondents

The first test was conducted to 600 4-6th graders of elementary school (men: 52%, women: 48%). The second phase of testing with scale of compilation was conducted to 215 4-6th graders of elementary school (male: 50.2%, female: 49.8%).

Procedures of the Measuring Instrument construction

The construction of the items was started by making items and pre-testing the comprehension of the items draft. Furthermore, the researcher asked for advices from her peer consisting of a literature scholar, psychology scholars and practitioners often involved with children for the refinement of the items in the scale. Items refinement included language in terms of compliance with the language of children and the contextualization with the real children's well-being in schools.

After the draft of the item was refined and reassembled, panelists who were competent in the preparation of measuring instruments and related topics judged the relevance of the items with the measured indicators. Assessment was done by assigning a number between 1 through 5. Assessment results were analyzed using statistical formulas of Aiken's V as follows:

V= ∑s / [n(c-1)]
s = r-lo
lo = lowest validity assessment value (in this case = 1)
c = highest validity assessment value (in this case = 5)
r = number given by an appraiser

After that, a pretest to 32 respondents was conducted to know the understanding and acceptance of the respondents to the items arranged. Then the items were reviewed and refined based on the panelists' assessment, and the advices from panelists and respondents. The selection of the items was based on the highest item relevance value and the basic understanding of the pre-test respondents.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability methods used in this study were in the form of internal consistency by computing the α-coefficients. The validity used is the content validity and the factor structure test. The Aiken's V formula was used to calculate the content validity coefficient. The factor analysis approach with exploratory factor analysis/EFA was used to test the factor structure. EFA is often used for data exploration, associated with the spread of grain on a number of certain latent factors (Brown, 2006).

RESULTS

Item Generation

The first item writing produced 80 items. The results of the first pre-test to 5 elementary school students showed that sentences in the item draft and the selection method of responses were easy to understand. Nevertheless, there were still many suggestions to refine the items from the students, elementary school teachers and children practitioners.

The second item writing produced 115 items. The items were then split into two scales, each of which contained 55 and 60 items. Each scale was then tested on 17 students and 15 students from the lowest grade level, the 4th grade.

Meanwhile, the analysis result of the item content from the panelists showed that the V number was above 0.650. Since the value of V ranges from 0 to 1, then the panelists' assessment result indicated that the constructed items were relevant with the indicators measured according to the panelists.

Advices from the panelists were collected and combined with the advice from the pre-test respondent. After the items were corrected or eliminated as the advice from the panelists and respondents, 80 final items were obtained. Some examples of the items are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Items and assessment results of V

Item examples	V
Aku mengambil barang temanku yang sangat kuinginkan	0.958
Aku menyontek dalam keadaan terdesak	0.958
Aku mengambil uang temanku ketika tidak ada orang lain yang melihat	0.875
Aku mencoret-coret meja sekolah	0.917
Aku memukul teman yang membuatku marah	0.958
Aku kembali bermain dengan teman yang membuatku marah	0.750
Aku memukul teman yang merusak barangku	0.917
Aku menangis meraung-raung karena marah dengan temanku	0.750
Aku membolos karena benci dengan salah satu pelajaran	0.875

*a half of the result of Aiken's V

Alternative Forms Generation

Considering that a scale with many items will make the respondents feel tired and lost focus, which will affect the scores obtained, shorter alternative scales were drafted and they could be tested in many subjects at a time. The alternative scales were developed by selecting the best 55 of the 80 items. The selected 55 items were then duplicated into three parallel scales.

The three parallel scales composed had the same substance presented in different sentences. To make them easy to distinguish, they were named scale1, scale2, and scale3. Furthermore, each of the scales was distributed to 200 respondents.

The discriminant index analysis for the items of each scale using standard $r_{ix} >0.3$ indicated that scale1 successfully managed to capture 21 of the 40 items expected to have a good discriminant index, scale2 was able to capture 30 items, and scale3 captured 21 items.

Scale Compilation

The number of the targeted items was 40 on the scale. The result of the items selection on scale1, scale2, and scale3 did not meet the expected target, which was 40 items, in which each indicator had two items. Therefore, items with the best discriminant index from each scale were compiled to create a single scale.

The compilation of the three scales, by considering the best discriminant index of the items and the target fulfillment of one indicator consisted of two items, produced 39 items. The reduction of one item from the first target was because from the compilation result, there was one indicator that was only represented by one item. The other items did not qualify because they did not meet the psychometric requirements. The compiled scale was then ready to be tested again.

The compilation scale was tested on 215 respondents. The data obtained was then analyzed. The analysis result of the compiled scale showed that almost all of the items had satisfying discriminant index (r_{ix} >0.3) and only five of them that did not meet the standard r_{ix}= 0.3 (see Table 3 in Appendix). However, the items were not necessarily excluded from the analysis. Discriminant index coefficient of the items approaching $r_{ix} = 0.3$ was still acceptable considering the scope of the content domain to be disclosed and the usage purpose of the test results (Azwar, 2012b).

Considering the fulfillment of the measured domain and psychometric requirements based on item-total correlation coefficient, a number of items approaching nearly the value of $r_{ix} = 0.3$ was still preserved. Thus, the total of items passing the selection was 39 items.

Reliability Test

The reliability of the 39 best items contained in the compilation scale was then tested. The reliability was tested using internal consistency reliability which showed that the reliability coefficient based on Cronbach's Alpha was 0.88.

Factor Structure Analysis

Furthermore, factor analysis was conducted to examine the factor structure. The analysis showed the value of KMO was 0.815 with a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (<0.01). From these results, it can be concluded that the sample of the study was eligible for factor analysis.

The analysis was done by confirming the aspects that have been made before, namely 10 aspects. The analysis results are shown in Table 4 (appendix). The result of factor analysis with 10 extracted factors showed that some items had a very low factor loading to show, some items did not cohere in the expected factor, and some items managed to cohere in the expected factor.

If the positive and negative signs were ignored, of the 10 factors that were expected to arise on the result of this analysis, there were four factors corresponding to the construct. These factors were factor5, factor2, factor1, and factor6. However, of the four items expected to cohere into one factor, there were two items cohere in the same factor, while the other factor consisting of three items was derived from different indicators.

Thus, it can be seen that the result of confirmatory factor analysis has not been able to show a satisfying confirmation result. The emerged factors did not represent the previously arranged factors. This result raised another question about the factors that actually construct the SWB scale. Therefore, further analysis with exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine the factor composition of the SWB scale.

The exploratory factor analysis performed based on the value of eigenvalues (with 1 as the default value) resulted in 12 identified factors. Of the twelve factors that emerged, some items did not cohere and had <0.4 loading factor. Besides that, the anti-image analysis showed there were four items that had a value under 0.5; thus, the four items were not included in the analysis. Then, without the four items, the analysis was conducted again. The analysis revealed the existence of 10 identified factors. Then, items with more than 0.4 factor loading on two or more factors or not meeting the 0.4 factor loading were not included in the analysis. The analysis was performed once again and the last analysis results showed that there were four emerging factors (see Table 5).

Table 5. The results of Analysis of Exploratory Factor

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
Aku takut guru akan menganggapku bodoh jika aku salah menjawab soal	.850			
Aku khawatir teman-teman akan menilaiku bodoh jika aku tidak dapat menjawab soal	.592			
Aku takut bertanya pada guru meski aku tidak paham apa yang diperintahkannya	.525			
Aku membaca buku mengenai pengetahuan umum		.671		
Jika tidak mengerti, aku menjawab soal dengan asal-asalan		.545		
Aku mendapatkan nilai yang bagus untuk tugas-tugasku		.537		
Aku berpikir bahwa aku juga dapat menang lomba seperti temanku		.443		
Aku membaca buku meski tidak disuruh oleh guru		.434		
Aku menyalin jawaban temanku karena terdesak waktu			.815	
Aku merusak barang milik sekolah			.470	
Aku memukul teman yang membuatku marah				-.681
Aku berkelahi dengan teman				-.626

Based on the similarity of the collected items, factor1 showed items revealing about the components of self-esteem. The second emerged factor was a collection of items indicating someone's effort in developing him/herself to reach the maximum achievement. Factor3 was related to the way a person controls him/herself not to show a behavior that is contrary to the social norms in order to meet immediate needs. Factor4 showed the inability of controlling emotions.

DISCUSSION

The reliability coefficient in the construction of this scale was 0.88. If compared to the standard specified by the experts before such Urbina (2004) and De Vauss (2002), which stated that a minimum reliability coefficient of 0.8 is considered as quite significant, the level of reliability obtained in the construction of this scale is already satisfying.

Some other well-being scales which can be said have a good reliability also had more than 0.70 reliability, such as the Psychosocial Well-Being Inventory (PSWBI) arranged by Negovan (2010), and more than 0.80 reliability , such as the Pacific Identity and Wellbeing Scale (PIWBS) by Manuela and Sibley (2012). The scale in this study had an internal consistency of 0.88. Therefore, it can be concluded that the constructed SWB scale was reliable.

However, a high reliability value should be interpreted carefully because the reliability of the scale will produce a different coefficient if tested on other respondents and in other situations when imposed on a group of respondents in certain situations (Azwar, 2012b). The scale was tested on a group of respondents with relatively similar characteristics. Therefore, the existing reliability coefficient should be interpreted carefully and needs to be tested to a broader sample so that the reliability figures can actually be enforced.

Besides a high reliability, a scale's items are expected to be able to distinguish between the respondents with high measured attributes and the respondents with low measured attributes. Perceived from the item-total correlation coefficient, the items in this scale met the satisfying psychometric property requirement. Nevertheless, the high items correlation coefficient does not show the attributes measured by the items and the desired attributes.

In the construction of this scale, the items generated were already written correctly and in accordance with the behavioral indicators that have been formulated correctly too. This was supported by the high content validity given by the panelists. Logically, the items were valid because they had been through the correct process and based on the review of panelists and practitioners. However, even though the content validity of the scale already met the requirements, it did not guarantee the items would be valid on the construct test.

Construct validity test was performed to prove that the measurement result obtained by items of the scale were highly correlated with the theoretical construct underlying in the construction of the scale (Azwar, 2012b). The confirmatory factor analysis result showed that aspects emerging on the SWB scale were not in accordance with the previously prepared construct, i.e. consist of 10 aspects. Factor structure that emerged from the result of confirmation with 10 factors did not show the expected factors' structure. Several factors had a low factor loading and some others overlap or cross over into other factors.

Generally, there were two things affected the results of this factor analysis. First, items that did not cohere in the proper place were likely the result of the correlation between items that did not comply with the construct. An item just might provide information about things described by the measurement results of other items in the same scale. Aspect that was jointly described by several items was identified as a variable or latent factor. This latent factor can be expressed indirectly through a number of operational behavioral indicators. On the other hand, to formulate appropriate behavioral indicators is not an easy thing to do.

Behavioral indicators in the construction of this scale was limited by two indicators of each aspect due to a consideration that the respondents were still children and it would be inappropriate if they were given a long scale. The limited the number of indicators made the scale constructed not comprehensive enough to reveal the desired attributes. In addition, parts of the limited behavioral indicators are likely to overlap with behavioral indicators of the other psychological attributes (Azwar, 2012b).

The second possibility was that the level of difficulty in constructing simple and easy to understand items by child respondents. In this scale, every aspect arranged was different, but the indicators were still posing a double meaning when elaborated into items. As the result, there was aspects overlapping and the items were crossing over from the original aspects. Simple sentences arranged to be easily understood by children even negated the distinctive power of each item.

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff (2003) stated there were several sources that could potentially lead to a bias in the measurements in psychology. In a questionnaire measurement method, the source of misinterpretation could be caused by the influence of the items characteristics. The items characteristics are those containing a high social desirability, ambiguous items, inappropriate scale format, and the description of the items in negative sentences. In this scale, there were ambiguous items needed to be fixed for the purpose of further development of the scale.

CONCLUSION

From the validity of the content, the discriminant index, and the reliability coefficient, the scale in this study had fulfilled the requirement of satisfying psychometric properties. However, structurally, this scale still needs a lot of improvement to be able to run its measuring function correctly. The structural factors analysis result showed that the emerging factors were inconsistent with the previous composed construct while the result of factor exploratory produced four factors identified, namely factors containing items related to self-esteem, self-development, normative behavior, and emotional control.

SUGGESTION

Suggestions for the next researchers who wish to continue this research are, firstly, review the construct of the student well-being in the school and determine the appropriate construct with the objective of the measure. Secondly, review the indicators that construct each aspect in terms of wording and the amount of indicators. Indicators which are less able to represent measured attributes operationally can be

rearranged and then redo the item writing. Thirdly, future studies should be applied to a more extensive and varied respondents characteristics.

REFERENCES

Ampuni, S. & Andayani, B. (2007). Memahami anak dan remaja dengan kasus mogok: gejala, penyebab, struktur kepribadian, profil keluarga, dan keberhasilan penanganan. *Jurnal Psikologi,34* (1), 55-75.

Azwar, S. (2012a). *Penyusunan Skala Psikologi.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Azwar, S. (2012b). *Reliabilitas dan Validitas.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

Ben-Arieh, A. (2006). *Measuring and Monitoring the well-being of young children around the world* (a Report to UNESCO). Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001474/147444e.pdf

Brown, T.A. (2006). *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Charlesworth, L., Wood, J., & Viggiani, P. (2007). Dimensions of human behavior: the changing life course (4th Ed) In Hutchison, E. D. *Middle Childhood* (pp. 175-26). New Delhi: Sage Publication, Inc.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Hedonia, eudaimonia, and well-being: an introduction. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*, 1-11. doi: 10.1007/s10902-006-9018-1

De Vaus, D.A. (2002) Surveys in Social Research (5th edition) London: Routledge.

Eccles, J. S. (1999). The development of children ages 6 to 14. *The Future of Children: When School is Out, 9*(2), 30-44.

Eccles, J. S., Lord, S., & Buchanan, C. M. (1996). School transitions in early adolescence: What are we doing to our young people? In J. L. Graber, J. Brooks-Gunn, & A. C. Petersen (Eds.), *Transitions through adolescence: Interpersonal domains and context* (pp. 251-284). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eid, M. & Larsen, R. J. (2008). *The Science of Subjective Well-Being.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Fattore, T., Mason, J., & Watson, E. (2007). Children's conceptualization(s) of their well-being. *Social Indicator Research, 80,* 5-29. doi: 10.1007/s11205-00609019-9

Fraillon, J. (2004). *Measuring Student Wellbeing in the Context of Australian Schooling: Discussion Paper* Commissioned by the South Australian department of Education and Children's services as an agent of the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. Retrieved from http://www.mceetya.edu.au/verve/_resources/Measuring_Student_Well-Being_in_the_Context_of_Australian_Schooling.pdf

Gadermann, A. M. (2009). *The satisfaction with life scale adapted for children: Investigating the structural, external, and substantive aspects of construct validity* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/16320/ubc_2010_spring_gadermann_anne.pdf?sequence =1

Gladstein, G. A. (1983). Understanding Empathy: Integrating Counseling Developmental, and Social Psychology Perspectives. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*(4), 467-482.

Gutman, L. M. & Feinstein, L. (2008). *Children's Well-Being in Primary School: Pupil and School Effects.* London: Centre for Research on The Wider Benefits of Learning.

Huebner, E. S. & Gilman, R. (2006). Characteristics of adolescents who report very high life satisfaction. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*(3), 311-319.

Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*(2), 121-140.

Keyes, C. L. M. (2003). Complete mental health: An agenda for the 21th century. In C. L. M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing. Positive psychology and the life well-lived* (pp. 293–312). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Lippman, L. (2005). *Indicators and Indices of Child Well-being: A Brief History.* Maryland: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Manuela, M. S. & Sibley, C. G. (2012). The pacific identity and wellbeing scale (piwbs): A culturally-appropriate self-report measure for pacific peoples in new Zealand. *Social Indicator Research, 1,* 1-21. doi: 10.1007/s11205-012-0041-9

Marks, H. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: patterns in the elementary, middle and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(1), 153-184.

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Social and Emotional Wellbeing in Primary Education (2008). *Quick Reference Guide.* Retrieved from http://www.nice.org.uk/newsroom/features/NICE200809AnnualReport.jsp

Opdenakker, M.C. & Van Damme, J. (2000). Effects of schools, teaching staff and classes on achievement and well-being in secondary education: Similarities and differences between school outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 11*, 165–196.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., & Lee, J.Y. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88* (5), 879-903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Pollard, E. & Lee, P. (2003). Child well-being: a systematic review of the literature. *Social Indicators Research, 61* (1), 59-78.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudemonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 141-166.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 1069-1081.

Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 1069-1081.

Ryff, C. D. & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). Psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(4), 719-727.

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1996). Psychological Well-Being: Meaning, Measurement, and Implications for Psychotherapy Research. *Psychother Psychosom, 65*, 14- 23.

Waterman, A. (1993). Two conception of happiness: contrast of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(4), 678-691.

World Health Organization. Mental health: a state of well-being (2011). *Report of the WHO Departement of Mental Health.* Retrived from http://www.who.int/features/factfiles/mental_health/en/

Yazdani, F. (2011). How students with low level subjective wellbeing perceive the impact of the environment on occupational behavior. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*, *18* (8).

Appendix

Table 3. Items Discrimination Index of the Compiled Scale

Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Aku menyalin jawaban temanku karena terdesak waktu	.300	.887
Aku merusak barang milik sekolah	.282	.887
Aku memukul teman yang membuatku marah	.391	.886
Aku menyapa temanku meski aku pernah marah dengannya	.341	.887
Aku malas mengikuti pelajaran karena nilaiku jelek	.420	.885
Aku malas berangkat ke sekolah karena ada yang menjahili	.280	.887
Aku tidak mengerjakan PR karena jumlahnya banyak	.363	.886
Aku mengerjakan semua PR-ku	.362	.886
Aku berpikir bahwa aku juga dapat menang lomba seperti temanku	.417	.885
Aku merasa tidak mampu menyaingi prestasi temanku	.347	.887
Aku khawatir teman-teman akan menilaiku bodoh jika aku tidak dapat menjawab soal	.310	.887
Aku takut guru akan menganganggapku bodoh jika aku salah menjawab soal	.305	.887
Aku hanya belajar saat di kelas saja	.468	.885
Sepulang sekolah, aku belajar lagi untuk menjawab soal yang belum terselesaikan	.508	.884
Aku membaca buku mengenai pengetahuan umum	.401	.886
Aku membaca buku meski tidak disuruh oleh guru	.368	.886
Aku senang kalau pulang sekolah lebih awal karena tidak harus mengikuti kegiatan di sekolah	.407	.886
Aku mengerjakan tugas piket dengan senang hati	.374	.886
Aku memperhatikan penjelasan guru	.516	.884
Aku ikut mengerjakan tugas kelompok	.474	.885
Aku membaca kembali pelajaran saat di rumah	.453	.885
Aku membaca bahan ulangan sampai mengerti	.387	.886
Aku mendapatkan nilai yang bagus untuk tugas-tugasku	.356	.886
Jika tidak mengerti, aku menjawab soal dengan asal-asalan	.444	.885
Aku menahan kencing karena takut meminta izin guru ke toilet	.303	.887
Aku menyampaikan pendapatku di kelas	.371	.886
Aku takut bertanya pada guru meski aku tidak paham apa yang diperintahkannya	.339	.887
Aku menolong teman yang terjatuh	.496	.884
Aku membantu teman yang kesulitan	.531	.884
Aku sedih ketika membaca cerita tentang bencana alam	.456	.885
Aku ikut tertawa ketika temanku menceritakan hal yang lucu	.291	.887
Aku senang belajar bersama teman-teman di sekolah	.495	.884
Aku senang diajar oleh guru-guruku	.541	.883
Aku mempercayai kata-kata guruku	.305	.887
Aku merasa curiga dengan teman-temanku	.287	.888
Aku mengenal siswa dari lain kelas	.281	.888
Aku bermain dengan teman-teman ketika istirahat	.330	.887
Aku berkelahi dengan teman	.354	.886
Aku bergaul dengan semua teman	.528	.884

Table 4. The factor analysis results with extraction of 10 factors

Aspects	No.	Items	Loading factors									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Able to control emotion	1	Aku menyalin jawaban temanku karena terdesak waktu					**-.637**					
	2	Aku merusak barang milik sekolah					**-.644**					
	3	Aku memukul teman yang membuatku marah				-.520						
	4	Aku menyapa temanku meski aku pernah marah dengannya										
Resilient in the face of problems	5	Aku malas mengikuti pelajaran karena nilaiku jelek										
	6	Aku malas berangkat ke sekolah karena ada yang menjahili										
	7	Aku tidak mengerjakan PR karena jumlahnya banyak									.499	
	8	Aku mengerjakan semua PR-ku										
Not feeling inferior (having high self-esteem)	9	Aku berpikir bahwa aku juga dapat menang lomba seperti temanku										.491
	10	Aku merasa tidak mampu menyaingi prestasi temanku										
	11	Aku khawatir teman-teman akan menilaiku bodoh jika aku tidak dapat menjawab soal		**.587**								
	12	Aku takut guru akan menganganggapku bodoh jika aku salah menjawab soal		**.752**								
Having a high curiosity	13	Aku hanya belajar saat di kelas saja										
	14	Sepulang sekolah, aku belajar lagi untuk menjawab soal yang belum terselesaikan	**.539**									
	15	Aku membaca buku mengenai pengetahuan umum										.422
	16	Aku membaca buku meski tidak disuruh oleh guru	**.433**									
Participating in	17	Aku senang kalau pulang sekolah lebih awal karena tidak harus mengikuti kegiatan di sekolah						-.418				

Category	No	Statement							
learning and school activities	18	Aku mengerjakan tugas piket dengan senang hati				.513			
	19	Aku memperhatikan penjelasan guru							
	20	Aku ikut mengerjakan tugas kelompok							

*continuity of the previous table

Category	No	Statement							
Persevere in the learning process	21	Aku membaca kembali pelajaran saat di rumah	**.669**						
	22	Aku membaca bahan ulangan sampai mengerti						.567	
	23	Aku mendapatkan nilai yang bagus untuk tugas-tugasku							.566
	24	Jika tidak mengerti, aku menjawab soal dengan asal-asalan							
Able to communicate what he/she feels and thinks	25	Aku menahan kencing karena takut meminta izin guru ke toilet							
	26	Aku menyampaikan pendapatku di kelas							
	27	Aku takut bertanya pada guru meski aku tidak paham apa yang diperintahkannya	**.543**						
Able to position themselves in situations experienced by others	28	Aku menolong teman yang terjatuh					**.498**		
	29	Aku membantu teman yang kesulitan					**.627**		
	30	Aku sedih ketika membaca cerita tentang bencana alam							
	31	Aku ikut tertawa ketika temanku menceritakan hal yang lucu							
Demonstrating confidence and comfort in interacting with	32	Aku senang belajar bersama teman-teman di sekolah			**-.446**				
	33	Aku senang diajar oleh guru-guruku			**-.754**				
	34	Aku mempercayai kata-kata guruku		.662					

friends, teachers, and community members	35	Aku merasa curiga dengan teman-temanku		
Maintaining good relationships with friends, teachers, and community members	36	Aku mengenal siswa dari lain kelas		
	37	Aku bermain dengan teman-teman ketika istirahat		.410
	38	Aku berkelahi dengan teman	-.607	
	39	Aku bergaul dengan semua teman		.465