International Journal of Islamic Educational Psychology
Vol. 3, No. 1, June 2022
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18196/ijiep.v3i1.14476

School Well-being in Terms of Self-Determination and Patience in Vocational High School Students

[1,2]Hafizh Zain Abdillah, [3]Fauzi Rahman, [2]Muniratul Husna, [4]Charli Sitinjak, [5]Nurul Hidayah, [5]Mujidin Mujidin

[1]STIKES Citra Delima Bangka Belitung, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[3]Universitas Muhammadiyah Riau, Indonesia
[4]Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia
[5]Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia

***Corresponding email**: hafizhzainabdillah@stikescitradelima.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received : 13/04/2022
Revised : 08/06/2022
Accepted: 14/06/2022

Keywords:
school well-being, self-determination, patience, Vocational High School, Students

ABSTRACT

Previous research on school wellbeing has highlighted the need for its implementation in schools. This research aims to uncover two elements influencing school well-being: self-determination and patience. This study used quantitative methods with multiple linear regression analysis. The population in this study was 672 students of classes X, XI, and XII at SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Yogyakarta. The sampling technique employed in this study was cluster-random sampling with a sample of 178 students. The results showed an F-value of 27.182 with an absolute significance level (p-value) of < 0.01, so the major hypothesis was accepted. The self-determination and patience variables simultaneously (together) could affect school well-being. The effect of self-determination on school well-being was 20%, while patience only contributed 3.67%. This research revealed (1) there was a positive influence of self-determination and patience on the well-being of vocational school students, (2) there was a positive effect of partial self-determination on school well-being, meaning that partial self-determination could predict school well-being, and (3) there was no partial positive effect of patience on school well-being, indicating that partial patience could not predict school well-being.

Citation:
Abdillah, H. Z., Rahman, F., Husna, M., Sitinjak, C., Hidayah, N., & Mujidin, M. (2022). School well-being in terms of self-determination and patience in vocational high school students. *International Journal of Islamic Educational Psychology*, *3*(1), 19-34. http://dx.doi.org/10.18196/ijiep.v3i1.14476

INTRODUCTION

As a type of formal education, school becomes one of the most significant aspects of an individual's development during adolescence. Schools significantly affect the positive development of an individual's potential, skills, and personal characteristics, both for the individual and the environment (Sukmadinata, 2004). As one of the student learning environments, schools affect students' health, welfare, and development, making WHO (World Health Organization) pay special attention to health promotion in schools (health-promotion schools). The health-promotion schools' program as an environment aims to increase schools that can promote health and strengthen their capacity as a healthy environment in life, learning, and the workplace. With this program, WHO hopes to make schools a learning environment that can contribute to students as the next generation of educated and healthy nations (World Health Organization, 1998).

The WHO's health-promotion schools program (1998) has encouraged the theoretical model of school well-being based on sociological, educational, psychological, and health improvement. In this case, the school well-being model looks at student well-being, consisting of four components: having (school condition), loving (social relationships), being (self-fulfillment), and health (health status) (Konu & Rimpelä, 2002).

Having (school conditions) is the physical environment around the school. The areas to be discussed are a safe working environment, biological and chemical substances that interfere with health, comfort, noise, ventilation, temperature, and others. Other aspects of school conditions include the learning environment, curriculum, group size, study schedule, and punishments. Then, loving (social relationship) refers to the social learning environment, teacher-student relationships, peer relations, group dynamics, bullying, cooperation between school and home, decision-making in schools, the overall organizational atmosphere in schools, school climate, and learning climate in schools and student satisfaction at school. In addition, being (self-fulfillment) is an opportunity for students given by the school for self-fulfillment. Meanwhile, health (health status) is the absence of sources of disease and sick students. The health status of these students includes physical and mental aspects of psychosomatic symptoms, chronic diseases, minor illnesses (such as flu), and appreciation of self (illness) (Konu & Rimpelä, 2002).

When implemented in schools, school well-being initiatives are crucial and beneficial because healthy, happy, and prosperous students in class can learn more successfully and contribute positively to their schools and the community (Konu & Lintonen, 2006). According to a study, strong academic achievement is linked to the employment of more effective learning tactics, more focused attention, and positive emotional experiences at school (Schutz et al., 2010). Conversely, students who are unhappy at school report anxiety, display less cognitive abilities and learning achievement, and are more likely

to experience psychological stress and ill health, leading to the argument that students' happiness and academic performance are linked (Schutz et al., 2010).

In this light, this study is significant since it aims to uncover two elements that can influence school well-being: self-determination and patience. Self-determination in the educational setting has been the subject of several studies (Mamahit, 2014; Paramitha et al., 2014; Geon, 2016). However, no one has precisely linked it to school well-being regarding studies. Several studies have also shown that self-determination, as described in the self-determination theory, can predict well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Ryan et al., 1996; Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R., & Reis, 1996; Baard et al., 2004).

METHODS

This study used quantitative methods with multiple linear regression analysis. The population in this study was 672 students of classes X, XI, and XII at SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Yogyakarta. The sampling technique used in this study was cluster-random sampling, resulting in 178 students consisting of seven classes (study groups), with the number of subjects varying in each class from 24 to a maximum of 36 people. Samples were taken randomly in two classes from each level, so the total consisted of six classes. Then, the measuring instrument used in this study was a Likert model attitude scale, covering three: the school well-being scale with 48 statement items, the self-determination scale with 36 statement items, and the patience scale with 30 statement items. Each scale contained favorable and unfavorable statements. Testing of measuring instruments was carried out on the same population by taking 84 students as subjects with details: 31 students of class X, 24 students of class XI, and 29 students of class XII. The test results of the measuring instrument obtained the school well-being scale with 25 statement items (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.854), the self-determination scale with 21 statement items (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.831), and the patience scale with 23 statement items (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.847).

RESULTS

Results of Scale Validity and Reliability Testing School Well-being Scale

The school well-being scale consisted of 48 statement items with a correlation value ranging from -0.166 to 0.495. This value indicated an unsatisfactory number since the resulting score did not reach a correlation value of 0.5, while the evaluation score was 0.3. The researchers then decided to lower the evaluation score to 0.25 to maintain item representation for each aspect measured.

Items with a correlation coefficient lower than 0.25 were dropped, as many as 20 items and the remaining 28 statement items had a correlation value ranging from 0.202 to 0.57. Based on these conditions, some items had a correlation value of <0.25, as many as two items. Furthermore, the two items referred to were aborted, so the remaining 26 items had a correlation value between 0.245

and 0.582, and one more had a low correlation value. Finally, one item with low correlation was dropped until 25 items remained had the expected correlation value ranging from 0.294 to 0.593. Thus, all remaining items met the evaluation criteria and could be used as measuring tools.

Table 1. Distribution of Passing and Dropping Items on the School Well-Being Scale

Dimension	Item Pass		Number of Items	Item Drop		Number of Items
	Favorable	Unfavorable		Favorable	Unfavorable	
Having	9, 17, 33, 41	5, 21, 37, 45	8	1, 25	13, 29,	4
Loving	10, 18, 42	14	4	2, 26, 34	6, 22, 30, 38, 46	8
Being	11, 19, 27, 35, 43	15, 23, 31, 39	9	3	7, 47	3
Health	28, 44	32, 40	4	4, 12, 20, 36	8, 16, 24, 48	8
Total	14	11	25	9	13	23

The remaining 25 items were used as instruments to measure school well-being in the research sample because they met the criteria for the internal consistency of the measuring instrument. Then, the school well-being scale consisting of 25 items could be stated as a reliable measuring tool based on the Cronbach coefficient score of 0.854.

Table 2. New Numbering of the School Well-being Scale

Dimension	Old Item Number		New Item Number		Number of Items
	Favorable	Unfavorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	
Having	9, 17, 33, 41	5, 21, 37, 45	2, 7, 16, 21	1, 10, 18, 25	8
Loving	10, 18, 42	14	3, 8, 22	5	4
Being	11, 19, 27, 35, 43	15, 23, 31, 39	4, 9, 12, 17, 23	6, 11, 19, 14	9
Health	28, 44	32, 40	13, 24	15, 20	4
		Total			25

Self-Determination Scale

The self-determination scale comprised 36 statement items, with a correlation value ranging from -0.168 to 0.507. As in the previous scale, the correlation value showed an unsatisfactory number, so the researchers also decided to lower the evaluation score to 0.25 to maintain item representation for each aspect measured. Furthermore, 14 items were dropped; the remaining 22 had a correlation range from 0.227 to 0.576.

Based on the range of correlation values, one item had to be dropped, and the remaining 21 items had a correlation range from 0.285 to 0.574. At this stage,

all items had an item-total correlation score that met the evaluation criteria. Then, Table 3 presents the distribution of passed and failed items.

Table 3. Distribution of Passing and Dropping Items on the Self-Determination Scale

Dimension	Item Pass		Number of Items	Item Drop		Number of Items
	Favorable	Unfavorable		Favorable	Unfavorable	
Autonomy	7, 13, 19, 31	22	5	1, 25	4, 10, 16, 28, 34	7
Competence	8, 14, 20	11	4	2, 26, 33	5, 17, 23, 29, 35	8
Relatedness	3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 33	6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36	12	-	-	0
Total	13	8	21	5	10	15

The items that met the evaluation criteria were used to measure self-determination in the research sample. The reliability of the self-determination scale with 21 items showed Cronbach's alpha value of 0.831 and could be stated as a reliable measuring instrument. Next, the new numbering of the existing items was carried out as presented in the following table.

Table 4. New Numbering of Self-Determination Scale Items

Dimension	Old Item Number		New Item Number		Number of Items
	Favorable	Unfavorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	
Autonomy	7, 13, 19, 31	22	3, 8, 12, 19	15	5
Competence	8, 14, 20,	11	4, 9, 13	6	4
Relatedness	3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 33	6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36	1, 5, 10, 14, 17, 20	2, 7, 11, 16, 18, 21	12
		Total			21

Patience Scale

The patience scale had 30 statement items, with correlation values between -0.196 and 0.554. The correlation values revealed quite good numbers. However, the researchers decided to lower the evaluation score to 0.25 to avoid dropping many items simultaneously to maintain item representation for each measured aspect.

Furthermore, five items were dropped, and the remaining 25 had a correlation range from 0.167 to 0.621. Based on this range, two items were still dropped since they were worth less than the evaluation value, and the remaining 23 items had correlation values ranging from 0.254 to 0.628. In this round, all items passed the evaluation criteria. The table 5 presents the distribution of passed and failed items.

Table 5. Distribution of Passing and Dropping Items on the Patience Scale

Dimension	Item Pass		Number of Items	Item Drop		Number of Items
	Favorable	Unfavorable		Favorable	Unfavorable	
Self-control	11, 21, 25	6, 16	5	1	26, 30	3
Fortitude	12	7, 17	3	2	-	1
Persistence	3, 22	8, 18, 27	5	13	-	1
Reception	4, 14, 23	9, 19, 28	6	-	-	0
Calm attitude	15, 24	10, 20	4	5	29	2
Total	11	12	23	4	3	7

The remaining 23 items were used as instruments to measure patience in the research sample because they had met the criteria for the internal consistency of the measuring instrument. The Cronbach's alpha value for the remaining items was 0.847 and could be expressed as a reliable measuring tool. Next, the new numbering of these items was carried out, as presented in Table 6.

Table 6. New Numbering of Patience Scale Items

Dimension	Old Item Number		New Item Number		Number of Items
	Favorable	Unfavorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	
Self-control	11, 21, 25	6, 16	8, 17, 21	3, 12	5
Fortitude	12	7, 17	9	4, 13	3
Persistence	3, 22	8, 18, 27	1, 18	5, 14, 22	5
Reception	4, 14, 23	9, 19, 28	2, 10, 19	6, 15, 23	6
Calm attitude	15, 24	10, 20	11, 20	7, 16	4
		Total			23

Data Description

Based on the research data descriptively, a comparison was made between the predicted situation (hypothetical) and the situation obtained from field data (empirical) to determine the categorization. This categorization determines the percentage of subjects in a certain category (e.g., low, medium, and high). A comparison of calculation results between hypothetical scores and empirical scores of each variable can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Comparison of Hypothetical Scores and Research Data Empirical Scores

Variable	Hypothetical Score				Empirical Score			
	Min.	Max.	Avr.	SD	Min.	Max.	Avr.	SD
School Well-being	25	100	62.5	12.5	39	100	62.08	9.72
Self-Determination	21	84	52.5	10.5	43	84	62.62	7.72
Patience	23	92	57.5	11.5	49	92	66.83	8.49

The data presented in Table 7 were then used to determine the subject's response to each research variable. Categorization efforts were carried out by dividing the research subjects into low, medium, and high categories. The

standard used to describe the subject in this study was the objective standard based on the measuring instrument used or the mean and standard deviation (SD) value obtained. The results of categorizing research subjects on each variable obtained in this study can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8. Categorization of Subject Responses to Research Variables

Category Level	School Well-Being			Self Determination			Patience		
	Score Range	Freq.	%	Score Range	Freq.	%	Score Range	Freq.	%
Low	39-52	28	15.7	43-54	24	13.5	49-58	28	15.7
Medium	53-71	124	69.7	55-70	124	69.7	59-75	122	68.5
High	72-100	26	14.6	71-84	30	16.9	76-92	28	15.7

Based on Table 8, generally, the respondents were in the moderate category for school well-being, self-determination, and patience.

Further investigation found that in 26 subjects with high school well-being scores, 48% (11) showed high self-determination scores, and 52% (15) revealed moderate scores. Meanwhile, 31% (eight people) uncovered high patient scores, 65% (17 people) had moderate scores, and 4% (one person) had low scores. Moreover, of a total of 124 subjects with moderate school well-being scores, 15% (18 people) had high self-determination scores, 73% (91 people) were moderate, and 12% (15 people) were low. Then, 15% (19 people) had high patient scores, 68% (84 people) were moderate, and 17% (21 people) were low. Furthermore, in 28 subjects with low school well-being scores, only 4% (one person) showed a high self-determination score, 64% (18 people) were moderate, and 32% (9 people) were low. In addition, only 4% (one person) showed high patient scores, 75% (21 people) were moderate, and 21% (six people) were low.

Assumption Tests (Prerequisite Analysis)

Distribution Normality

One of the requirements in the regression model is the normality of the data distribution, or it is clear whether the research data originating from the subject is normally distributed. A normality test was conducted to ensure the normality of the data distribution, in this case, using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov analysis technique. The data analysis results produced values as presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Kolmogorov-Smirnov. One-Sample Test Results

	Score
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	0.817
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.517*

*p-value > 0.1; the distribution of the tested data follows the normal distribution.

Based on Table 9, the significance value of Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) was 0.517, greater than 0.1. Thus, the data were normally distributed and met the assumption (prerequisite) of normality for further analysis.

Relationship Linearity

Another requirement that must be met in the analysis of the regression model is the assumption of linearity or the complete linearity of the relationship between variables. This linearity assumption states that the relationship between the variables to be analyzed follows a straight line, meaning that an increase or decrease in the value of one variable will be followed linearly by an increase or decrease in the value of another variable. The data analysis resulting in the calculation is presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Linearity Test Results Between Dependent and Independent Variables

		F	Sig.
Linearity of School Well-being & Self Determination	Linearity	52.533	0.000*
	Deviation from Linearity	1.02	0.449**
Linearity of School Well-being & Patience	Linearity	23.578	0.000*
	Deviation from Linearity	1.043	0.416**

* p-value < 0.01; significantly following a linear line

**p-value > 0.05; not significantly deviated from the linear line

As shown in Table 10, calculating the linearity test results disclosed that the relationship between school well-being and self-determination fit with a linear line. It was also followed by an insignificant deviation from linearity, meaning that the variation in the relationship between variables almost completely followed a linear relationship pattern. Likewise, the linearity score significantly affected the relationship between school well-being and patience. In other words, it corresponded to the linear line. It was followed by an insignificant deviation from linearity, indicating that the variation in the relationship between variables almost completely followed a linear relationship pattern. Hence, it is concluded that the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable one and the independent variable two both met the data linearity requirements.

Multicollinearity Between Variables

The multicollinearity test aims to determine whether, in a regression model, there is intercorrelation or collinearity between independent variables. Intercorrelation is a linear or strong relationship between one independent variable or predictor variable and other predictor variables in a regression model. The intercorrelation can be seen by the correlation coefficient values between the independent variables, the value of VIF and tolerance, the value of eigenvalue and condition index, and the standard error value of the beta or

partial regression coefficient. Ghozali (2009) stated that if there is a relationship between independent variables, there will be difficulties in separating the effects of each independent and dependent variable.

1. Correlation between independent variables

   The correlation value between independent variables was obtained based on Pearson's Product Moment correlation calculation, as shown in Table 11. The correlation between independent variables showed the value of r = 0.562, and the value was less than 0.800, so there was no symptom of multicollinearity.

Table 11. Correlation Scores Between Independent Variables

	Self Determination	Patience
Self Determination	1	0.562
Patience	0.562	1

Dependent variable: School well-being

2. Value of VIF (variance inflation factor) and tolerance

   Collinearity statistical calculations produced VIF and tolerance values, as shown in Table 12. Based on Table 12, the tolerance score for each independent variable was 0.684, greater than 0.1, and the VIF score revealed a value of 1.462, smaller than 10. Accordingly, the multicollinearity symptom was not detected.

Table 12. Tolerance and VIF Scores on the Independent Variables

	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
Self Determination	0.684	1.462
Patience	0.684	1.462

Dependent variable: School well-being

3. Eigenvalue and condition index

   Collinearity diagnostics yielded eigenvalues and condition indexes, as shown in Table 13. The table 13 exposed that the eigenvalue scores on dimensions 2 and 3 were 0.008 and 0.007, respectively, greater than 0.001. Meanwhile, the condition index scores of both were 19.228 and 21.152, less than 30. Therefore, the symptoms of multicollinearity did not occur in the regression model.

Table 13. Eigenvalue Score and Condition Index

Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index
1	2.985	1.000
2	0.008	19.228
3	0.007	21.152

Dependent variable: School well-being

4. The standard error value of the partial regression coefficient

   The calculation of linear regression analysis produced unstandardized coefficients, as shown in Table 14. The standard error value of the partial regression coefficient for each independent variable showed the numbers 0.100 and 0.091, smaller than 1, as well as the regression coefficient value (β) of each independent variable. Hence, it can be said that the standard error value was low, and the symptoms of multicollinearity were not detected.

Table 14. Standard Error Score of Partial Regression Coefficient

	Beta (β)	Std. Error
Self Determination	0.527	0.100
Patience	0.123	0.091
Dependent variable: School well-being		

Hence, the data strictly had no multicollinearity problem so that the test results could be reliable. Then, the value of the partial regression coefficient was reliable and robust or immune to changes in other variables in the multiple regression model.

Major Hypothesis Test Results

The main hypothesis of this research is that self-determination and patience can predict school well-being. The hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analysis statistical tests, and the results are shown in Table 15.

Table 15. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Calculation Results

Variables	Regression Coefficient (Unstandardized)	t_{count}	Sig.
Constant	20.893	3.577	0.000
Self Determination	0.527	5.241	0.000
Patient	0.123	1.344	0.181
Independent Variable: School Well-being			
F_{count} =	27.182		0.000
R^2 =	0.237		

Based on Table 15, the F-value obtained was 27.182, with an absolute significance level (p-value) of < 0.01, so the major hypothesis was accepted. Thus, the self-determination and patience variables simultaneously (together) could predict the school well-being variable. In other words, self-determination and patience influenced school well-being. Then, the R2 value of 0.237 indicates that the two independent variables contributed 23.7% to the school well-being variable. Based on the values of the data regression coefficients in the table, a regression equation could be made: Y = 20.893 + 0.527X1 + 0.123X2.

Minor Hypothesis Testing

This study had two minor hypotheses: (1) a positive influence of self-determination on school well-being and (2) a positive effect of patience on school well-being. The two hypotheses stated that each independent variable partially influenced the dependent variable. The two hypotheses were tested by performing a partial t-test in regression by looking at the t-count in Table 8 above.

The t-count value for the independent variable 1 (X1; self-determination) was 5.241, with an absolute significance value (p) of < 0.01. The hypothesis was accepted. Self-determination has been proven to have a significant positive effect on school well-being. Self-determination has also been proven to predict school well-being. With high self-determination, school well-being is also high. Otherwise, the condition of low self-determination means low school well-being.

Based on Table 15, the t-count value for the independent variable 2 (X2; patience) was 1.344, with a significance value (p) of 0.181, greater than 0.05. Therefore, the second minor hypothesis was rejected. Hence, there was no significant effect of patience on school well-being.

The results of testing the two minor hypotheses above were confirmed by the calculation of the predictor contribution or the contribution of the influence of the independent variables (self-determination and patience) on the dependent variable (school well-being), consisting of the effective contribution (SE) and the relative contribution (SR). The effective contribution (SE) was calculated by the formula SE(X)% = Beta (X) x rxy x 100%, whereas the relative contribution (SR) was measured by the formula SR(X)% = SE(X)%/R2. The calculation components are presented in Table 16.

Table 16. Standardized Regression Coefficient (β) and Correlation Coefficient (rxy)

Variable	Standardized Regression Coefficient (β)	Correlation Coefficient (rxy)	R^2
Self determination	0.418	0.479	0.237
Patience	0.107	0.342	

Dependent variable: School well-being

Based on the above formula, the effective contribution of the self-determination variable (X1) to school well-being was 0.418 x 0.479 x 100% = 20%. Then, the effective contribution of the patience variable (X2) to school well-being was 0.107 x 0.342 x 100% = 3.67%. Meanwhile, the self-determination variable's relative contribution (SR) was 20%/0.237 = 84%, while the patience variable's relative contribution (SR) was 3.67%/0.237 = 15%. The calculation results of the two predictor contributions or the contribution of the influence confirmed the effect of self-determination on school well-being, with an influence

contribution of 20%. At the same time, patience only had an influence contribution of 3.67%.

Discussion

This study aimed to empirically examine the effect of self-determination and patience on the school well-being of vocational students. Statistical analysis results on data obtained from research subjects provided empirical evidence that the major hypothesis, self-determination and patience could predict school well-being, was accepted. Self-determination and patience simultaneously affected school well-being. The data analysis also showed that the two independent variables contributed 23.7% to the school well-being variable. In addition, a search of data based on variable categorization revealed real evidence of the effect of the two independent variables on school well-being. All subjects with high school well-being scores had self-determination and patience, ranging from moderate to high, although one person had low patience scores.

Moreover, the results of testing the minor hypothesis, stating that each independent variable had a partial effect on the dependent variable, showed the strong influence of one of the independent variables, the self-determination variable, on school well-being. On the other hand, the patience variable showed a weak influence, even in general. Thus, the statistics showed no effect based on the significance value of the calculation of the t-value. These results indicated that the first minor hypothesis was accepted, while the second was rejected.

The first minor hypothesis that was accepted provides additional empirical evidence supporting previous scientific findings that self-determination determines well-being (Adams et al., 2017; Baard et al., 2004; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Levesque et al., 2010; Niemiec & Ryan, 2009). In this case, students' self-determination specifically determined their well-being in their school well-being. The findings of this study also enrich empirical data for the relationship between the two variables, especially on the subject of vocational students.

Furthermore, the results of the rejected second minor hypothesis test have not been able to provide strong empirical evidence to support the findings of Schnitker & Emmons (2007), suggesting that preliminary evidence showed that patience was positively correlated with subjective well-being. However, the findings of this study have provided additional data in the study of patience in secondary school students, in addition to the study conducted by (Khormaei et al., 2017). Moreover, studies on patience, especially in Indonesia, often involve student subjects such as those conducted before (Subandi, 2011; El Hafiz et al., 2013; Ramdani et al., 2018).

CONCLUSION

Based on the research, analysis, and discussion described previously, self-determination and patience positively influenced the welfare of vocational school students. The higher the self-determination and patience, the higher the welfare of vocational school students. Conversely, the lower the self-determination and patience, the lower the welfare of vocational school students. Thus, the welfare of vocational school students could be determined based on the student's self-determination and patience. This research also proved the positive influence of partial self-determination on school well-being. Partial self-determination could predict school well-being. Apart from that, partial patience had no positive effect on school well-being, meaning that partial patience cannot predict school well-being.

The implications of this research can be conveyed as follows: it is important for parties interested in improving students' school welfare, especially parents and educators, to support increasing student self-determination by supporting student competence, autonomy, and connectedness, as well as increasing student patience simultaneously. This research has limitations because it only tested students as a whole without making any differences in gender, origin, family conditions, or cultural factors. Researchers also did not look at the influence between variables regarding certain lessons. So, for further research, especially for researchers interested in studying school welfare, students can increase research collaboration to sharpen and strengthen studies on subjects with certain characteristics to increase the generalization of learning results. It is also necessary to consider other variables that can contribute to students' school well-being, such as self-esteem, self-concept, meaningfulness, gratitude, optimism, or personality-related variables.

REFERENCES

Adams, N., Little, T. D., Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-Determination Theory. In: Wehmeyer, M., Shogren, K., Little, T., Lopez, S. (eds) Development of Self-Determination Through the Life-Course. *Springer, Dordrecht* (pp. 47-54). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1042-6_4

Baard, P. P., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*(10), 2045–2068. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02690.x

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology, 49*(3), 182–185. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012801

El Hafiz, S., Rozi, F., Mundzir, I., & Pratiwi, L. (2013). Konstruk psikologi kesabaran dan perannya dalam kebahagiaan seseorang. *Laporan Penelitian: Lembaga Penelitian Universitas Hamka*. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.11259.36649

Geon, S. A. B. (2016). Hubungan antara efikasi diri dan determinasi diri siswa kelas x SMA Charitas. *Jurnal Psiko-Edukasi, 14*(1), 28–38. Retrieved from http://ojs.atmajaya.ac.id/index.php/fkip/article/view/545/426

Ghozali, I. (2009). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program SPSS, Semarang*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang.

Khormaei, F., Farmani, A., & Yazdani, F. (2017). Predicting self-control on the basis of patience and its components among high school students. *Practice in Clinical Psychology, 5*(1), 11–16. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.jpcp.5.1.11

Konu, A., & Lintonen, T. (2006). Theory-based survey analysis of well-being in secondary schools in Finland. *Health Promotion International, 21*(1), 27–36. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/dai028

Konu, A., & Rimpelä, M. (2002). Well-being in schools: A conceptual model. *Health Promotion International, 17*(1), 79–87. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/17.1.79

Levesque, C., Copeland, K. J., Pattie, M. D., & Deci, E. L. (2010). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 618–623. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00612-6

Mamahit, H. C. (2014). Hubungan antara determinasi diri dan kemampuan pengambilan keputusan karir siswa SMA. *Journal Psiko-Edukasi, 12*(2), 90-100.

Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory and Research in Education, 7*(2), 133–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878509104318

Paramitha, A., Luawo, M. I. R., & Tjalla, A. (2014). Hubungan antara determinasi diri dengan nilai hasil belajar siswa kelas XI SMAN 53 Jakarta. *Insight: Jurnal Bimbingan Konseling, 3*(1), 29–34. https://doi.org/10.21009/INSIGHT.031.05

Ramdani, Z., Supriyatin, T., & Susanti, S. (2018). Perumusan dan pengujian instrumen alat ukur kesabaran sebagai bentuk coping strategy. *Jurnal Psikologi Islam dan Budaya, 1*(2), 97–106. https://doi.org/10.15575/jpib.v1i2.2955

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Ryan, R. M., Sheldon, K. M., Kasser, T., & Deci, E. L. (1996). All goals are not created equal: An organismic perspective on the nature of goals and their regulation. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior* (pp. 7–26). The Guilford Press.

Schnitker, S. A., & Emmons, R. A. (2007). Patience as a virtue: Religious and psychological perspectives. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 18*, 177–207. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004158511.i-301.69

Schutz, P. A., Quijada, P. D., De Vries, S., & Lynde, M. (2010). Emotion in educational contexts. In International Encyclopedia of Education (pp. 591–596). *Elsevier*. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00605-9

Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R., & Reis, H. T. (1996). What makes for a good day? Competence and autonomy in the day and in the person. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(12), 1270–1279. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F01461672962212007

Subandi, P. (2011). Sabar: Sebuah konsep psikologi. *Jurnal Psikologi UGM, 38*(2), 215-227. https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.7654

Sukmadinata, N. S. (2004). *Landasan psikologi proses pendidikan*. PT. Remaja Rosda Karya.

World Health Organization. (1998). *WHO's global school health initiative: Health promoting schools*. In World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland (pp. 243–256).