


The Influence of Foundation Policies on Teacher Performance and Teacher Wellbeing at PKBM Alam Purwokerto

Muhammad Yunus Syahputra

Universitas Islam Negeri KH. Syaifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto

Article Info	ABSTRACT
<p>Keywords: foundation policy, teacher performance, teacher welfare</p>	<p>This study aims to analyze the influence of foundation policies on teacher performance and teacher wellbeing at the Purwokerto Alam Community Learning Center (PKBM). The background of this study is based on the importance of the role of institutional policies in creating a work climate that supports the quality of performance and welfare of educators, especially in non-formal educational institutions. This study uses an associative quantitative approach with a population study technique because the number of respondents is limited, namely 20 people consisting of teachers, education personnel, and foundation administrators. Data were collected through a closed questionnaire based on a Likert scale containing indicators of foundation policies, teacher performance, and teacher wellbeing. The instruments were tested for validity and reliability before being subjected to simple linear regression analysis. The results of the validity test showed that all instrument items had a significant correlation with the total score (r count > r table), while the reliability of the instrument reached a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.805, indicating that the instrument had high internal consistency. Regression analysis showed that the foundation's policy had a significant effect on teacher performance ($R^2 = 0.426$; $p = 0.002$) and teacher wellbeing ($R^2 = 0.503$; $p = 0.000$). The positive regression coefficient value indicated that the better the perception of the foundation's policy, the higher the teacher's performance and wellbeing. These findings indicate that transparent, fair, and supportive foundation policies can create a positive working environment for teachers. Therefore, strengthening institutional policies is a strategic step in managing human resources in non-formal educational institutions such as PKBM.</p>
<p>This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license</p> 	<p>Corresponding Author: Muhammad Yunus Syahputra Universitas Islam Negeri KH. Syaifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto joodiputra@gmail.com</p>

INTRODUCTION

Education is the main foundation in the development of a nation, and teachers play a central role in this process. The quality of education is highly dependent on the performance of teachers, which includes not only pedagogical and professional aspects, but also their psychological well-being. In the context of non-formal educational institutions such as Community Learning Activity Centers (PKBM), the role of teachers becomes increasingly crucial considering the characteristics of students and the flexibility of the existing curriculum. In the study (Wiharjo & Wulandari, 2024) (Non-Formal Education Policy in Indonesia) shows

that policies at various levels (national to local) greatly influence the quality of the provision of non-formal education. Non-formal PKBM Alam Purwokerto, as one of the non-formal educational institutions, has unique dynamics influenced by various internal factors, including policies set by the foundation that oversees it.

The phenomenon that is the focus of this research is how policies set by the foundation, as the managing entity, directly or indirectly influence performance and teacher wellbeing at PKBM Alam Purwokerto. Initial observations indicate variations in the level of teacher performance and their wellbeing conditions, which are thought to be closely related to the implementation of foundation policies. For example, policies related to remuneration, professional development, or even working hours can create different pressures or supports for teachers, which ultimately impact their motivation, teaching effectiveness, and job satisfaction. This condition is important to study considering the vital role of teachers in achieving educational goals at PKBM.

The foundation's policies have a significant impact on the operations and management of PKBM, including in terms of human resource management, especially teachers. Foundation policies affect recruitment, professional development, remuneration, and work environment. The PNF quality improvement strategy in Bandung found that regulations were indeed implemented, but their effectiveness was not optimal due to limited development funds (Hidayat et al., 2021). Some foundation policies including remuneration, workload, and professional development can create support or pressure that affects teacher performance and wellbeing (Fezahra Syafiari & Hanani, nd) emphasizes that lack of resources (e.g. qualified teachers, funds, infrastructure) hampers the implementation of policies in PKBM. These policies can include aspects of recruitment, professional development, remuneration systems, and the work environment. Teacher performance, which is defined as the work results achieved by teachers in carrying out their duties and responsibilities in accordance with established standards, is greatly influenced by the support and regulations of the foundation. When foundation policies support professional development, provide fair incentives, and create a conducive work environment, teacher performance is expected to improve. Conversely, policies that are less supportive can hinder teacher performance.

Teacher performance includes academic, contextual, and adaptive tasks. Wellbeing includes physical, mental, emotional, and social well-being. International studies show that school climate and support for basic psychological needs have a significant impact on teacher well-being according to Self-Determination Theory (Harrison et al., 2025). In addition to performance, the aspect of teacher wellbeing is also an important concern. Teacher wellbeing refers to the physical, mental, emotional, and social wellbeing of teachers that allows them to function optimally and feel satisfied with their work. Teachers with high wellbeing tend to be more motivated, innovative, and able to face challenges in teaching. Foundation policies can directly or indirectly affect teacher wellbeing, for example through workload, psychosocial support, opportunities to participate in decision-making, and job security guarantees. Therefore, understanding how foundation policies at PKBM Alam Purwokerto affect teacher performance and wellbeing is essential to identifying areas for continuous improvement and development.

Several previous studies have shown a positive relationship between organizational support and employee performance. This study found that the principal's managerial perception and organizational climate have a significant influence on teacher performance. (Dachfolfany & Wawan Saputra, 2023). Other research by (RahadianZ et al., 2025) also indicated that organizational commitment and work ethic are positively correlated with teacher performance. In addition, in the context of well-being, studies on work-life balance and organizational commitment show an impact on employee job satisfaction, which is indirectly relevant to well-being. (Yuliani & Ekhsan, 2024). These findings confirm that organizational factors, including policies, play a crucial role in shaping individual performance and well-being within an institution.

Research Gap Exposure: Although there are many studies on performance and wellbeing in the workplace, and the factors that influence them, studies that specifically examine the influence of foundation policies on teacher performance and wellbeing simultaneously in the context of PKBM in Indonesia are still very limited. Existing studies tend to focus on formal schools or performance aspects alone, without comprehensively integrating the dimensions of teacher wellbeing. This gap indicates that there is no in-depth understanding of how foundation policies specifically shape the dynamics of teacher performance and wellbeing in non-formal educational institutions such as PKBM Alam Purwokerto. Therefore, this study attempts to fill this gap by quantitatively analyzing the causal relationship between foundation policies, teacher performance, and teacher wellbeing.

To solve this research problem, several relevant concepts and theories will be used as a basis. The concept of Foundation Policy will be analyzed based on the regulations, procedures, and practices implemented by the foundation related to human resource management, especially teachers. The concept of Teacher Performance will refer to the theory of performance that includes task, contextual, and adaptive aspects, as well as performance indicators that are relevant to the teaching profession. Meanwhile, Teacher Wellbeing will be approached through subjective and psychological wellbeing theories, which include emotional, psychological, and social dimensions. Theories such as Social Exchange Theory can be used to explain how foundation support (through policies) can affect teacher commitment and performance. In addition, Conservation of Resources Theory can help understand how foundation policies can affect the availability of resources to teachers and its impact on their wellbeing. A quantitative approach will be used to test the causal relationships between these variables.

METHOD

This study uses an associative quantitative approach to test the influence of foundation policies on teacher performance and wellbeing at PKBM Alam Purwokerto. (Creswell, 2015). This study aims to determine the extent to which perceptions of foundation policies can influence variations in teacher performance and welfare. The study population consisted of 13 educators and education personnel (11 teachers and 2 education personnel) and 7 people from the foundation. Because the population is limited, all of them were made respondents through population study techniques. Data were collected using a closed questionnaire based

on a Likert scale of 1–5 covering three main constructs, namely foundation policies (transparency, participation, policy clarity, and management support), teacher performance (responsibility, discipline, task implementation, and teaching quality), and teacher wellbeing (work comfort, social relationships, and emotional balance). The instrument was prepared based on the theory of organizational policies and work welfare, and tested using construct validity manually and reliability with Cronbach's Alpha, with a minimum reliability value of 0.70 (George & Mallery, 2003). Data analysis was conducted in two stages. First, descriptive analysis was used to describe the distribution of data through mean values, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values. Second, a simple linear regression analysis was conducted to test the effect of foundation policies on teacher performance and wellbeing. This analysis includes regression coefficient tests, R square, and significance tests using t-tests and F-tests, with a significance level of 0.05. The entire analysis process was carried out with the help of statistical software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the data obtained from the research instruments and processed using SPSS software. The analysis includes descriptive statistics, validity tests, reliability, and simple regression tests. The results obtained are then discussed by linking the research findings with theories and previous study results to provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena studied.

Descriptive Statistical Test Results

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Foundation Policy	20	11	19	15.10	2.404
Teacher Performance	20	6	19	14.70	3.147
Wellbeing Teacher	20	11	19	15.35	2.412
Valid N (listwise)	20				

The above results show that in general:

1. The Foundation's policy has an average score of 15.10 with a standard deviation of 2,404, which indicates that respondents' perceptions of the foundation's policy are in the fairly high category and the distribution of data is fairly homogeneous.
2. Teacher Performance has an average of 14.70 and a standard deviation of 3.147, which shows that respondents' perceptions of teacher performance are also quite high, but with slightly wider data variations than other variables.
3. Teacher Wellbeing has an average score of 15.35, the highest value among the three variables, with a standard deviation of 2.412, indicating that teacher wellbeing is perceived relatively positively and evenly by respondents.

Overall, the three variables have an average value above the midpoint of the scale (assuming a maximum scale of 20), which reflects that respondents tend to give positive assessments of the foundation's policies, teacher performance, and teacher wellbeing.

Validity Test Results

Table 2.Manual Construct Validity Test

		p1	p2	p3	p4	p5	p6	p7	p8	p9	p10	p11	p12	total
p1	Pearson Correlation	1	.575**	.261	.586**	.018	-.050	-.148	.021	.184	.651**	.088	.520*	.451*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.008	.267	.007	.941	.833	.532	.928	.436	.002	.713	.019	.046
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p2	Pearson Correlation	.575**	1	.412	.535*	.199	.156	.284	.199	.137	.564**	.229	.563**	.636**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008		.071	.015	.399	.512	.226	.401	.564	.010	.331	.010	.003
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p3	Pearson Correlation	.261	.412	1	.554*	.523*	.082	.188	.180	.384	.328	.246	.439	.664**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.267	.071		.011	.018	.731	.426	.448	.094	.158	.296	.053	.001
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p4	Pearson Correlation	.586**	.535*	.554*	1	.105	-.158	.109	.220	.261	.286	.035	.312	.482*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.015	.011		.659	.506	.648	.352	.267	.221	.885	.181	.032
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p5	Pearson Correlation	.018	.199	.523*	.105	1	.461*	.130	.499*	.183	.204	.682**	.373	.696**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.941	.399	.018	.659		.041	.585	.025	.440	.387	.001	.106	.001
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p6	Pearson Correlation	-.050	.156	.082	-.158	.461*	1	.447*	.490*	.086	.087	.619**	.074	.550*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.833	.512	.731	.506	.041		.048	.028	.718	.714	.004	.757	.012
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p7	Pearson Correlation	-.148	.284	.188	.109	.130	.447*	1	.427	.130	.059	.262	.104	.457*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.532	.226	.426	.648	.585	.048		.060	.585	.804	.264	.662	.043
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p8	Pearson Correlation	.021	.199	.180	.220	.499*	.490*	.427	1	.089	-.009	.745**	.083	.611**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.928	.401	.448	.352	.025	.028	.060		.710	.971	.000	.729	.004
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p9	Pearson Correlation	.184	.137	.384	.261	.183	.086	.130	.089	1	.359	.312	.018	.463*
	Sig. (2-tailed)													
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.436	.564	.094	.267	.440	.718	.585	.710	.121	.181	.941	.040	
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	
p10	Pearson Correlation	.651**	.564**	.328	.286	.204	.087	.059	-.009	.359	1	.235	.576**	.572**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.010	.158	.221	.387	.714	.804	.971	.121		.318	.008	.008
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p11	Pearson Correlation	.088	.229	.246	.035	.682**	.619**	.262	.745**	.312	.235	1	.051	.708**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.713	.331	.296	.885	.001	.004	.264	.000	.181	.318		.830	.000
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
p12	Pearson Correlation	.520*	.563**	.439	.312	.373	.074	.104	.083	.018	.576**	.051	1	.561*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.010	.053	.181	.106	.757	.662	.729	.941	.008	.830		.010
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
total	Pearson Correlation	.451*	.636**	.664**	.482*	.696**	.550*	.457*	.611**	.463*	.572**	.708**	.561*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.046	.003	.001	.032	.001	.012	.043	.004	.040	.008	.000	.010	
	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Validity testing was conducted using the Corrected Item-Total Correlation method using Pearson correlation between each item (p1–p12) to the total overall score. The number of respondents was 20 people, so the r value of the table in $\alpha = 0.05$ and $df = 18$ is 0.444. Based on the table above, all items (p1 to p12) have a correlation value (r count) greater than r table (0.444) and are significant at the 95% confidence level ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that all items are construct valid, because each item correlates significantly with the total score and measures aspects relevant to the construct being studied.

This high validity indicates that the instrument has good internal consistency in measuring the intended variables, and each item contributes significantly to the total score. Therefore, all items can be retained for further analysis.

Reliability Test Results

Table 3. Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.805	12

Reliability testing was conducted to determine the level of internal consistency of the research instrument consisting of 12 items. The test results using the Cronbach's Alpha method showed a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.805 where the number indicates a high result.

Thus, all items in this research instrument are consistent and suitable for use to measure the intended construct (for example: foundation policy, teacher performance, or teacher wellbeing, depending on the context of the variable).

Hypothesis Testing

The Influence of Foundation Policy on Teacher Performance

Table 4. F Test ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	55,779	1	55,779	13,348	.002b
Residual	75,221	18	4.179		
Total	131,000	19			

a. Dependent Variable: Teacher Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Foundation Policy

The results of the regression analysis through the F test show that the calculated F value is 13,348 with a significance value of 0.002. This significance value is much smaller than the probability level $\alpha = 0.05$, which means that the regression model used in this study is statistically significant. In other words, the independent variable, namely the Foundation Policy, simultaneously has a significant influence on the dependent variable, Teacher Performance.

This shows that the existence of policies designed and implemented by the foundation has an important contribution in encouraging the improvement of teacher performance. Policy support can include regulations that support professionalism, work incentives, capacity building, or fair and transparent work structures. When foundation policies are developed effectively, teachers feel appreciated, supported, and well-directed in carrying out their duties. This will have an impact on improving the quality of learning planning, teaching implementation, and evaluation of student learning outcomes. Thus, it can be concluded that foundation policies not only have an administrative role, but also become a strategic and significant factor in encouraging teacher performance.

Table 5. T-test
Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	6,634	2,469		2,687	.015
Foundation Policy	.587	.161	.653	3.653	.002

a. Dependent Variable: Teacher Performance

The t-test was conducted to determine how much influence the independent variable Foundation Policy has on the dependent variable Teacher Performance partially. Based on the results of the simple linear regression analysis, the calculated t value was 3.653 with a significance value (p-value) of 0.002. This significance value is much smaller than $\alpha = 0.05$, which indicates that the Foundation Policy has a significant effect on Teacher Performance partially. This means that when the foundation policy variable stands alone without being combined with other variables, its effect remains significant on improving teacher

performance. In addition, the regression coefficient value of 0.587 indicates that every 1 unit increase in perception of the foundation policy will increase the teacher performance score by 0.587 units, assuming other variables are held constant. The Beta value (standardized coefficient) of 0.653 indicates that the strength of the influence of the foundation policy is in the strong category on the teacher performance variable. Substantively, this strengthens that the existence and implementation of foundation policies—including regulations, reward systems, and institutional support—are able to create a conducive work climate for teachers in carrying out their professional duties. Teachers who feel facilitated by fair and visionary policies will be encouraged to improve the quality of their performance, both in terms of planning, implementing, and evaluating learning.

The Influence of Foundation Policies on Teacher Wellbeing

Table 6. F Test
ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	51,518	1	51,518	18,172	.000b
	Residual	51,032	18	2,835		
	Total	102,550	19			

a. Dependent Variable: Teacher Wellbeing

b. Predictors: (Constant), Foundation Policy

The F test was conducted to determine whether the Foundation Policy variable has a significant influence simultaneously on Teacher Wellbeing. The results of the regression analysis showed that the calculated F value was 18.172 with a significance value (p-value) of 0.000. This value is much smaller than $\alpha = 0.05$, which means that the regression model built is statistically significant. This means that the Foundation Policy variable simultaneously has a significant influence on the level of teacher wellbeing. This shows that the existence of good, fair, and structurally supportive policies for the welfare of educators can increase teachers' perceptions of the comfort, happiness, and meaning of their work in educational institutions. Thus, this finding confirms that foundation policies not only affect teachers' technical performance but also have psychological and emotional impacts on their wellbeing. High teacher wellbeing will indirectly support productivity, loyalty, and job satisfaction in the long term.

Table 7. T-test
Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	6,829	2,034		3.358	.004
Foundation Policy	.564	.132	.709	4.263	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Teacher Wellbeing

The results of the t-test show that the Foundation Policy variable has a calculated t value of 4.263 with a significance value (p-value) of 0.000. This value is much smaller than the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, which means that the Foundation Policy has a partial significant

effect on Teacher Wellbeing. The regression coefficient value of 0.564 indicates that every 1 unit increase in the foundation policy score will increase teacher wellbeing by 0.564 units, assuming other variables remain constant. Meanwhile, the Beta value of 0.709 shows a high influence strength, indicating that the foundation policy is a dominant factor in shaping the level of teacher welfare. These results emphasize that the existence of a supportive foundation policy—both in terms of administration, welfare, and professional development—will have a real impact on the psychological comfort, sense of appreciation, and work enthusiasm of teachers. Teacher wellbeing is not only determined by physical condition or workload, but also by how educational institutions through their basic policies provide real support to educators. Thus, good foundation policies can be an important foundation for creating a healthy, harmonious, and productive work environment among teachers.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion that have been carried out in this study, it can be concluded that: The research instrument is declared valid and reliable. All items have item-total correlation values above r table (0.444), with a significance of <0.05 , which means that all instrument items can be used. The reliability value (Cronbach's Alpha) of 0.805 indicates that this instrument has high internal consistency. Foundation Policy has a significant influence on Teacher Performance. The F test results show a significance of 0.002 (<0.05), while the t test shows a calculated t value of 3.653 with a significance of 0.002. The regression coefficient value of 0.587 and R Square of 0.426 indicate that 42.6% of the variation in Teacher Performance can be explained by Foundation Policy. This shows that the better the foundation policy, the higher the teacher performance. Foundation policies also have a significant effect on Teacher Wellbeing. The F test produces a significance value of 0.000 (<0.05), and the t test produces a t count of 4.263 with a significance of 0.000. The regression coefficient value of 0.564 and R Square of 0.503 indicate that foundation policies explain 50.3% of the variation in teacher wellbeing. This indicates that institutionally supportive policies can increase teacher comfort, motivation, and job satisfaction. In general, this study emphasizes the importance of the role of foundation policies in building a healthy education ecosystem. Well-designed policies not only impact teachers' work performance, but also their psychological well-being. Therefore, foundations as education providers need to pay attention to policy directions as part of a strategy to strengthen the quality of teacher human resources.

REFERENCE

- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.
- Dachfolpany, M. I., & Wawan Saputra. (2023). Pengaruh Persepsi Manajerial Kepala Sekolah dan Iklim Organisasi terhadap Kinerja Guru SMK Kecamatan Baradatu Kabupaten Way Kanan Lampung. *JiIP - Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 6(1), 25–31. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v6i1.1251>

- Fezahra Syafiari, A., & Hanani, R. (n.d.). *IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT STANDARDS BY NON-FORMAL EDUCATION UNITS AT PKBM BANGKIT, NGALIYAN*. www.fisip.undip.ac.id
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *Frequencies. SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Harrison, M. G., Wang, Y., Cheng, A. S., Yi Tam, C. K., Pan, Y.-L., & King, R. B. (2025). School climate and teacher wellbeing: The role of basic psychological need satisfaction in student- and school-related domains. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 153*, 104819. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104819>
- Hidayat, Y., Syamsudin, T. A., Khoeriah, D., & Iriantara, Y. (2021). *Strategy for Improving the Quality of Non-Formal Education in the Field of Equality Programs in the Context of Policy and Implementation*. 7(02), 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.32678/tarbawi.v7i02.4515>
- Komitmen Organisasi Dan Etos Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Guru Pada SDN Cikampek Selatan, P., Rahadian, Z., Jamaludin, A., & Buana Perjuangan Karawang, U. (2025). The Influence Of Organizational Commitment And Work Ethic On Teacher Performance At SDN Cikampek Selatan 1. In *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal* (Vol. 6, Issue 3). <http://journal.yrpiipku.com/index.php/msej>
- Wiharjo, S. M., & Wulandari, D. (2024). Non-Formal Education Policy in Indonesia. *Journal of Multi-Disciplines Science (ICECOMB)*, 2(2), 89–95. <https://doi.org/10.59921/icecomb.v2i2.39>
- Yuliani, Y., & Ekhsan, M. (2024). PENGARUH EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT DAN WORK-LIFE BALANCE YANG DI MEDIASI OLEH JOB SATISFACTION TERHADAP TURNOVER INTENTION. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 8(1), 31–46. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmieb.v8i1.28170>