Jurnal Guru Dikmen dan Diksus
Volume 6 Number 2, 2023. Page 189-198
p-ISSN: 2655-481x, e-ISSN: 2723-6404

Cross Setting Duration Sebagai Upaya Harmonisasi Intelligence Quotient dan Emotional Quotient Bagi Generasi New Normal di SMK Negeri 1 Abang

I Wayan Laba
SMK Negeri 1 Abang, Karangasem, Bali, Indonesia

Email: iwayanlaba111@gmail.com

(Received: June 10, 2022; Accepted: October 25, 2022; Published: December 30, 2023)

ABSTRACT

The transition from emergency remote instruction to restricted face-to-face schooling created challenges for students' academic engagement and socioemotional adjustment. This study examines school-community responses to Cross Setting Duration (CSD), a locally designed strategy alternating distance and classroom instruction while regulating lesson duration at SMK Negeri 1 Abang, Bali, Indonesia. Conducted in October 2021, the study used a descriptive design integrating Google Forms questionnaires and interviews. The study reports 152 respondents drawn from a school population of 1,011 students and teachers. Descriptive results indicate an average understanding score of 84.85%, positive feelings of 84.5%, and positive perceptions of 57% across the two components of CSD. For the cross-setting component, 98.2% demonstrated understanding, 87% reported positive feelings, and 57% expressed a positive perception; the respective values for duration were 71.5%, 82%, and 57%. These results indicate generally favorable acceptance but also concerns about shortened instructional time. Because no standardized cognitive or emotional intelligence measures or comparison group were used, the evidence concerns perceived acceptability rather than demonstrated changes in intelligence quotient (IQ) or emotional quotient (EQ). The study highlights the need to combine flexible timetabling with sufficient instructional time, social interaction, and systematic monitoring of academic and socioemotional outcomes.

Keywords: blended learning; cross setting duration; vocational education; socioemotional learning; post-pandemic schooling

INTRODUCTION

School reopening after COVID-19 disrupted familiar routines of learning, peer interaction, and classroom participation. International research distinguishes emergency remote teaching from deliberately designed online learning, and shows that learning disruption varied substantially across contexts (Iglesias-Pradas et al., 2021; Engzell et al., 2021; Hammerstein et al., 2021; Kuhfeld et al., 2020). The shift also raised concerns about student motivation, mental health, and social connection (Loades et al., 2020; Viner et al., 2022; Son et al., 2020; Aristovnik et al., 2020).

In Indonesia, the transition was shaped by restrictions on classroom occupancy, attendance schedules, and lesson duration. SMK Negeri 1 Abang in Karangasem, Bali, introduced Cross Setting Duration (CSD) to alternate distance and face-to-face instruction while limiting the length of classroom sessions. An initial school diagnostic assessment reported that 69% of students preferred remote learning, mainly because of flexibility. Teachers also observed that returning students had difficulty sustaining attention during lessons.

These school-level observations motivated the intervention but were not standardized assessments of IQ or EQ.

Blended learning research emphasizes that integration, interaction, and learner support matter more than simply alternating delivery modes (Rasheed et al., 2020; Boelens et al., 2017; Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Hrastinski, 2019; Müller & Mildenberger, 2021). Research on self-regulation and student engagement further suggests that adaptation requires structured autonomy, feedback, and meaningful relationships (Broadbent, 2017; Zimmerman, 2002; Panadero, 2017; Fredricks et al., 2004).

The present study therefore asks: How did members of the SMK Negeri 1 Abang community understand, experience, and evaluate CSD during the transition to restricted face-to-face schooling? Its purpose is descriptive: to document implementation and perceived responses, rather than to establish causal effects on cognitive or emotional intelligence.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Blended and Alternating Learning Settings

CSD combines two operational decisions: cross setting, the rotation between distance and in-person learning, and duration, the time allocated to each lesson. Unlike a validated instructional model, CSD is the school's locally defined scheduling approach. Existing evidence suggests that successful blended delivery depends on coherent course design, effective online activities, and the educational quality of face-to-face time (Means et al., 2013; Martin et al., 2020; Bond et al., 2021; Bao, 2020; Dhawan, 2020; Adedoyin & Soykan, 2023).

The pandemic accelerated technology adoption but also exposed inequalities in digital readiness and teacher preparation (Crawford et al., 2020; König et al., 2020; Kim & Asbury, 2020; Trust & Whalen, 2020). Blended-learning research accordingly supports combining flexibility with planned instructional interaction, rather than interpreting reduced classroom hours as an inherently effective strategy (Rasheed et al., 2020; Boelens et al., 2017; Müller & Mildenberger, 2021).

Cognitive and Socioemotional Adjustment

Academic performance and emotional competence are related but distinct constructs. Meta-analyses identify associations between emotional intelligence and academic achievement, yet such findings do not justify a fixed 20/80 partition between IQ and EQ (MacCann et al., 2020; Sánchez-Álvarez et al., 2020). School-based social and emotional learning interventions can support social competence and academic functioning (Durlak et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2017; Pozo-Rico & Sandoval, 2020).

Achievement emotions, self-determination, and social-cognitive motivation help explain why students may welcome a return to school while remaining anxious about attendance, health, and workload

(Pekrun, 2006; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2020; Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2020). Supportive teachers, peers, and school belonging are also important for adolescent adjustment (Wentzel, 1998; Roorda et al., 2011; Allen et al., 2018; Eccles & Roeser, 2011; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2014).

Studies conducted during the pandemic also connect emotional resilience, engagement, and academic adaptation, while documenting student stress and the importance of institutional support (Estrada Guillén et al., 2022; Cao et al., 2020; Besser et al., 2022). In this study, however, questionnaire responses are indicators of attitudes toward CSD, not direct measures of cognitive or emotional ability.

METHODS

The study was carried out at SMK Negeri 1 Abang, Karangasem, Bali, in October 2021. It adopted a descriptive design combining questionnaire percentages with interviews and document-based accounts of school scheduling. The stated population was 1,011 individuals: 652 students in Grades X–XI, 312 Grade XII students, and 47 educators. The reported sample was 152 individuals: 98 students in Grades X–XI, 47 Grade XII students, and seven educators. The manuscript describes questionnaire respondents as randomly selected, whereas interviews were based on incidental availability; the exact randomization procedure is not documented.

Two Google Forms questionnaires were used: one assessed cross-setting responses among Grades X–XI, and the other assessed duration responses among Grade XII. Interviews involved curriculum leadership, teachers, and students. The reported dimensions were understanding, feelings, and positive perceptions. Responses were summarized descriptively as percentages; interview accounts were used to contextualize patterns. No validated IQ/EQ instrument, baseline–follow-up test, inferential test, or comparison group was reported. Accordingly, no causal inference about “harmonization” is warranted.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of Cross Setting Duration

School procedures dated September 27, 2021, established distancing and classroom protocols for restricted in-person instruction. Grades X–XI alternated between in-person and distance learning across the school week, with a rotating timetable; Grade XII attended restricted in-person classes for five days. Classroom lessons were set at 30 minutes per instructional period, whereas remote lessons were described as 45 minutes. These arrangements were intended to support gradual readjustment while reducing contact density.

Understanding, Feelings, and Perceptions

The original study reported that 98% of Grades X–XI respondents recognized the alternation of face-to-face and remote learning. A majority expressed satisfaction with the arrangement: 51% felt happy and 36% very happy. Regarding future scheduling, 57% favored continued rotation, 42% favored fully face-to-face instruction, and 1% favored remote-only learning. These figures describe respondents' stated preferences, not measured learning gains.

For the duration component, 75% selected 30 minutes as the expected face-to-face lesson length. Some students interpreted the question as referring to a full instructional session rather than one period, suggesting ambiguity in the questionnaire wording. When asked whether the duration should change, 57% wanted longer lessons and 43% preferred the existing duration. Another item found that 57% considered the shortened duration beneficial, while 43% expressed concerns about task completion, comprehension, and limited peer interaction.

Table 1. Summary of school-community responses to Cross Setting Duration

Response dimension	Cross setting (%)	Duration (%)	Reported CSD mean (%)
Understanding	98.2	71.5	84.85
Positive feelings	87	82	84.5
Positive perceptions	57	57	57

Note. Percentages are transcribed from the original article. The two questionnaires addressed different student cohorts; the CSD mean is the unweighted arithmetic mean of the two reported percentages. It should not be interpreted as a population-weighted estimate.

The mean understanding score is (98.2 + 71.5)/2 = 84.85%; the mean positive-feeling score is (87 + 82)/2 = 84.5%. The positive-perception score was 57% for both components. The original abstract rounds understanding to 84.8%. Given the different cohorts and absence of item-level denominators, the reported averages are descriptive summaries rather than psychometrically validated scales.

Interpreting the Findings

The high reported understanding of cross setting suggests that rotating attendance was communicated relatively clearly. In contrast, lower understanding of duration and the divided preference for longer lessons indicate that time allocation requires more explicit communication and periodic adjustment. This interpretation is consistent with research emphasizing learner autonomy, self-regulation, and planned engagement in mixed-mode instruction (Broadbent, 2017; Ballouk et al., 2022; Zimmerman, 2002; Panadero, 2017).

The positive emotional response to school reopening is consistent with the importance of peer relationships and school belonging (Wentzel, 1998; Roorda et al., 2011; Allen et al., 2018). Yet enjoyment of a scheduling strategy does not demonstrate improvement in EQ, and no IQ measurement was administered. Similarly, research on social-emotional learning demonstrates that properly implemented programs can affect outcomes, but the present design cannot establish comparable effects for CSD (Durlak et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2017; MacCann et al., 2020).

Teacher interviews described benefits of seeing students in person and concerns about covering learning objectives within 30-minute lessons. These accounts align with evidence that engagement depends on quality of interaction and instructional design, not merely contact time (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Hrastinski, 2019; Müller & Mildenberger, 2021; Fredricks et al., 2004). More generally, pandemic-era studies underscore that the effects of remote learning and school closures depend on local resources, student characteristics, and implementation conditions (Engzell et al., 2021; Hammerstein et al., 2021; Kuhfeld et al., 2020; Bond et al., 2021).

Limitations and Practical Implications

This single-school study relied on descriptive self-report data and interviews. It did not report item wording in full, reliability coefficients, response rates by subgroup, randomization records, or direct IQ/EQ scores. Differences between the cross-setting and duration groups also limit comparisons. Consequently, the results are best interpreted as implementation feedback. Future studies should measure academic progress and socioemotional competence with validated instruments before and after implementation, compare alternative timetables, and document sampling and questionnaire construction.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At SMK Negeri 1 Abang, CSD was generally understood and positively received during the 2021 transition to restricted face-to-face learning. Reported mean responses were 84.85% for understanding, 84.5% for positive feelings, and 57% for positive perceptions. Students nonetheless expressed substantial concern about short lessons. School leaders should preserve the flexibility of alternating learning settings while reviewing lesson length, communication, and opportunities for teacher–student interaction. The evidence supports conclusions about perceived acceptability and implementation needs, not demonstrated changes in IQ or EQ.

REFERENCES

Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2023). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: The challenges and opportunities. Interactive Learning Environments, 31(2), 863–875. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180

Allen, K., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D., Hattie, J., & Waters, L. (2018). What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 30, 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-016-9389-8

Aristovnik, A., Keržič, D., Ravšelj, D., Tomaževič, N., & Umek, L. (2020). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on life of higher education students: A global perspective. Sustainability, 12(20), 8438. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208438

Ballouk, R., Mansour, V., Dalziel, B., McDonald, J., & Hegazi, I. (2022). Medical students' self-regulation of learning in a blended learning environment: A systematic scoping review. Medical Education Online, 27(1), 2029336. https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2022.2029336

Bao, W. (2020). COVID-19 and online teaching in higher education: A case study of Peking University. Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2(2), 113–115. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.191

Besser, A., Flett, G. L., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2022). Adaptability to a sudden transition to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: Understanding the challenges for students. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology, 8(2), 85–105. https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000198

Boelens, R., De Wever, B., & Voet, M. (2017). Four key challenges to the design of blended learning: A systematic literature review. Educational Research Review, 22, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.06.001

Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2021). Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the first global online semester. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18, 50. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00282-x

Broadbent, J. (2017). Comparing online and blended learner's self-regulated learning strategies and academic performance. The Internet and Higher Education, 33, 24–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2017.01.004

Cao, W., Fang, Z., Hou, G., Han, M., Xu, X., Dong, J., & Zheng, J. (2020). The psychological impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on college students in China. Psychiatry Research, 287, 112934. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112934

Crawford, J., Butler-Henderson, K., Rudolph, J., Malkawi, B., Glowatz, M., Burton, R., Magni, P. A., & Lam, S. (2020). COVID-19: 20 countries' higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching, 3(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2020.3.1.7

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 49(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520934018

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. Child Development, 82(1), 405–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x

Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21(1), 225–241. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00725.x

Engzell, P., Frey, A., & Verhagen, M. D. (2021). Learning loss due to school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(17), e2022376118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2022376118

Estrada Guillén, M., Monferrer Tirado, D., & Rodríguez Sánchez, A. (2022). The impact of COVID-19 on university students and competences in education for sustainable development: Emotional intelligence, resilience and engagement. Journal of Cleaner Production, 380, 135057. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.135057

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 7(2), 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001

Hammerstein, S., König, C., Dreisörner, T., & Frey, A. (2021). Effects of COVID-19-related school closures on student achievement: A systematic review. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 746289. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.746289

Hrastinski, S. (2019). What do we mean by blended learning? TechTrends, 63, 564–569. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-019-00375-5

Iglesias-Pradas, S., Hernández-García, Á., Chaparro-Peláez, J., & Prieto, J. L. (2021). Emergency remote teaching and students' academic performance in higher education during the COVID-19 pandemic: A case study. Computers in Human Behavior, 119, 106713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106713

Kim, L. E., & Asbury, K. (2020). "Like a rug had been pulled from under you": The impact of COVID-19 on teachers in England during the first six weeks of the UK lockdown. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 90(4), 1062–1083. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12381

Kuhfeld, M., Soland, J., Tarasawa, B., Johnson, A., Ruzek, E., & Liu, J. (2020). Projecting the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on academic achievement. Educational Researcher, 49(8), 549–565. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20965918

König, J., Jäger-Biela, D. J., & Glutsch, N. (2020). Adapting to online teaching during COVID-19 school closure: Teacher education and teacher competence effects among early career teachers in Germany. European Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 608–622. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1809650

Loades, M. E., Chatburn, E., Higson-Sweeney, N., Reynolds, S., Shafran, R., Brigden, A., Linney, C., McManus, M. N., Borwick, C., & Crawley, E. (2020). Rapid systematic review: The impact of social isolation and loneliness on the mental health outcomes of children and adolescents in the context of COVID-19. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 59(11), 1218–1239.e3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2020.05.009

MacCann, C., Jiang, Y., Brown, L. E. R., Double, K. S., Bucich, M., & Minbashian, A. (2020). Emotional intelligence predicts academic performance: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 146(2), 150–186. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000219

Martin, F., Sun, T., & Westine, C. D. (2020). A systematic review of research on online teaching and learning from 2009 to 2018. Computers & Education, 159, 104009. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104009

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Teachers College Record, 115(3), 1–47.

Müller, C., & Mildenberger, T. (2021). Facilitating flexible learning by replacing classroom time with an online learning environment: A systematic review of blended learning in higher education. Educational Research Review, 34, 100394. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100394

Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. Frontiers in Psychology, 8, 422. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422

Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. Educational Psychology Review, 18, 315–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9

Pozo-Rico, T., & Sandoval, I. (2020). Can academic achievement in primary school students be improved through teacher training on emotional intelligence as a key academic competency? Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 2976. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02976

Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. Computers & Education, 144, 103701. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103701

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher–student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. Review of Educational Research, 81(4), 493–529. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311421793

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61, 101860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860

Salmela-Aro, K., & Upadyaya, K. (2014). School burnout and engagement in the context of demands–resources model. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84(1), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12018

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020). Motivation and social cognitive theory. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 60, 101832. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101832

Son, C., Hegde, S., Smith, A., Wang, X., & Sasangohar, F. (2020). Effects of COVID-19 on college students' mental health in the United States: Interview survey study. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 22(9), e21279. https://doi.org/10.2196/21279

Sánchez-Álvarez, N., Berrios Martos, M. P., & Extremera, N. (2020). A meta-analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and academic performance in secondary education: A multi-stream comparison. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 1517. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01517

Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A follow-up meta-analysis. Child Development, 88(4), 1156–1171. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12864

Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 28(2), 189–199.

Viner, R., Russell, S., Saulle, R., Croker, H., Stansfield, C., Packer, J., Nicholls, D., Goddings, A.-L., Bonell, C., Hudson, L., Hope, S., Ward, J., Schwalbe, N., Morgan, A., & Minozzi, S. (2022). School closures during social lockdown and mental health, health behaviors, and well-being among children and adolescents during the first COVID-19 wave: A systematic review. JAMA Pediatrics, 176(4), 400–409. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.5840

Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social relationships and motivation in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 90(2), 202–209. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.90.2.202

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory Into Practice, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2