

Psychoeducation and Resilience Building for Students from Broken Homes: an Intervention Study at SMKN 1 Girisubo

**Suratmi Lestari*, Nurhasanah Putri, Hanan Akilah, Yusriyyah Al Mufiidah, Nurul
Hidayah**

Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia

Email: 2507044004@webmail.uad.ac.id*, 2507044028@webmail.uad.ac.id,
2507044045@webmail.uad.ac.id, 25070440448@webmail.uad.ac.id,
nurul.hidayah@psy.uad.ac.id

Keywords:

Psychoeducation; Resilience;
Broken Home; Adolescents;
Psychological Intervention

ABSTRACT

The phenomenon of broken home families is a significant risk factor for adolescent mental health, particularly in terms of emotion regulation and resilience. This study aimed to test the effectiveness of a psychoeducation and resilience-building program for students from broken home families at SMKN 1 Girisubo. The study used a pre-experimental one-group pretest–posttest design involving 37 students. The intervention was carried out through psychoeducation, emotion regulation training, and the strengthening of coping strategies. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and a paired-samples t-test. The results showed no significant differences in the variables of broken home status ($p = 0.715$) and resilience ($p = 0.947$). However, descriptively, there was an increase in students' psychological understanding. These findings indicate that short-term interventions were not yet effective in increasing resilience; therefore, a more intensive and sustainable approach is needed.

INTRODUCTION

The family is the main system in the psychological development of individuals, especially during adolescence, which is a crucial phase in the formation of identity and emotion regulation (Santrock, 2018). However, not all adolescents grow up in harmonious families. The phenomenon of broken homes, which includes divorce, family conflict, and dysfunction in parental relationships, has been shown to contribute to an increased risk of psychological disorders in adolescents (Amato, 2010; Lansford, 2009).

Adolescents from broken homes tend to have difficulties with emotion regulation, low self-esteem, and increased anxiety and depression (Repetti et al., 2002). This condition also affects academic and social aspects, such as decreased learning motivation and difficulty establishing interpersonal relationships (Huurre et al., 2006).

One approach that can be used to address these problems is psychoeducation. Psychoeducation is an educationally based intervention that aims to improve an individual's understanding of psychological conditions and develop adaptive skills (Donker et al., 2009). In addition, strengthening resilience is important because resilience enables individuals to survive and recover from difficult situations (Masten, 2014).

This phenomenon is also evident in the SMKN 1 Girisubo environment, where several students come from incomplete families and show behavioral and emotional conditions that

require special attention (Eliawati et al., 2025; Gemilang et al., 2025; Hakim et al., 2022; Tarsono et al., 2025). Guidance and Counseling (Bimbingan dan Konseling [BK]) teachers reported that some students experienced decreased learning motivation, low self-confidence, difficulty interacting, irritability, and a tendency to be alone. This fact shows that there is an urgent need to provide interventions that can help students develop adaptive skills in dealing with the life problems they are experiencing (Khasawneh, 2024; Lunov & Rozhkova, 2024; Mohamed & Nadia, 2024; Weng et al., 2022).

One effective approach to helping students in such situations is psychoeducation, which is the process of providing psychological information and learning to improve students' understanding of the conditions they are experiencing (Awadai et al., 2022; King et al., 2023; Medellu et al., 2022; Oliveira & Dias, 2023; Padmanabhan, 2022). Psychoeducation allows students to understand the impact of broken homes, recognize their emotions, and learn appropriate strategies for dealing with life pressures. Psychoeducation can also improve students' awareness, self-functioning, and ability to make healthy decisions (Farrell, 2026).

In addition to psychoeducation, another important intervention is resilience building. Resilience is an individual's ability to survive and bounce back when facing difficult situations, pressure, failure, and trauma. Resilience does not only mean being "mentally strong"; it also involves the ability to regulate emotions, think positively, solve problems, build supportive relationships, and learn from negative experiences. Students from broken homes with good resilience are better able to adjust, continue to excel, and live with optimism even though they are in non-ideal family conditions.

The urgency of this research is based on the high need for mental health services for adolescents from broken homes, especially in the SMKN 1 Girisubo environment. Based on the results of initial identification and information from the Guidance and Counseling teacher, it was found that several students showed various indicators of psychological vulnerability, such as low learning motivation, difficulty interacting socially, low self-confidence, a tendency to withdraw from the environment, and difficulty managing emotions. If these conditions do not receive proper treatment, they can affect students' psychological, academic, and social development in the long term. Therefore, an intervention program is needed that not only focuses on solving immediate problems but also builds students' psychological capacity to deal with various life pressures in a more adaptive and sustainable manner.

Based on these problems, this study aims to test the effectiveness of psychoeducation programs and resilience building for students from broken home families at SMKN 1 Girisubo. In particular, this study aims to determine changes in the psychological condition of participants before and after the intervention, measure students' level of resilience after participating in the program, and evaluate the extent to which psychoeducational approaches and resilience building can serve as relevant mentoring strategies in the educational context. The results of the study are expected to provide empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of psychological interventions applied to adolescents with disharmonious family backgrounds.

METHODS

This study used a pre-experimental design with a one-group pretest–posttest approach. The research was conducted among students of SMKN 1 Girisubo, Gunungkidul Regency, who came from broken home families. The sample consisted of 37 students selected based on

identification results and recommendations from Guidance and Counseling (Bimbingan dan Konseling [BK]) teachers.

The intervention consisted of psychoeducation and resilience-building programs conducted in one training session. The materials covered the dynamics of broken home families, emotion regulation, adaptive coping strategies, problem-solving, and self-strength recognition. The activity was delivered through interactive lectures, group discussions, role-play, and self-reflection. Data were collected using pretest and posttest questionnaires administered before and after the intervention. The instruments consisted of resilience and broken home questionnaires adapted from the scale developed by Husna Hidayati (2022).

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to describe the data characteristics and a paired-samples t-test to examine differences in scores before and after the intervention. The test was performed at a 5% significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) using IBM SPSS Statistics software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The psychoeducation and resilience strengthening program is carried out on SMKN 1 Girisubo students who come from *broken home* families. This activity aims to increase participants' understanding of the impact of family conditions on psychological development, while equipping them with emotion regulation skills, adaptive *coping* strategies, and resilience-building skills.

A total of 37 students participated in a series of activities consisting of psychoeducational sessions, group discussions, simulations, self-reflection, and evaluation through *pre-tests* and *post-tests*. During the activity, participants showed enthusiasm and active involvement in each given session. The results of the program evaluation are presented in the following table.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Broken Home Scores Before and After Intervention

Measurement	N	Red	SD
Pre-test	37	38,03	10,39
Post-test	37	37,16	8,09
Measurement	N	Red	SD
Pre-test	37	38,03	10,39

Source: SPSS data processing results (2026)

Table 1 shows the results of descriptive statistics of broken home scores before and after the implementation of psychoeducation and resilience strengthening programs. Before the intervention, the participants' broken home score had an average of 38.03 with a standard deviation of 10.39, a minimum score of 18.00, and a maximum score of 60.00. After the intervention, the average score decreased to 37.16 with a standard deviation of 8.09, a minimum score of 20.00, and a maximum score of 52.00.

The decrease in the average score from 38.03 to 37.16 indicates a change for the better after participants participated in the program. In addition, the decrease in the standard deviation value from 10.39 to 8.09 indicates that the variation in participants' scores after the intervention became more homogeneous than before the intervention. However, the relatively small average difference indicates that the changes that occur are not so large descriptively that further testing is needed to determine the significance of these differences.

After descriptive statistical analysis was carried out, the next step was to test whether there was a significant difference between broken home scores before and after the implementation of the psychoeducation program and resilience strengthening. The test was carried out using a paired sample t-test because the data came from the same group which was measured at two different times, namely before (pre-test) and after (post-test) intervention. The test results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Paired Sample T-Test Test Broken Home Variable Test

Variable	Mean Difference	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-test Broken Home – Post-test Broken Home	0,865	14,299	2,351	-3,903	5,632	0,368	36	0,715

Source: SPSS data processing results (2026)

Based on Table 2, the mean *difference* value was 0.865 with a standard deviation of 14.299. The results of *the paired sample t-test* showed a t-value of 0.368 with a degree of freedom (*df*) of 36 and a significance value (*Sig. 2-tailed*) of 0.715. The significance value was greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), so there was no significant difference between *pre-test* and *post-test scores on the broken home variable*.

These findings show that the psychoeducational and resilience strengthening programs provided have not been able to produce significant changes in the *broken home* variable. Although there was a descriptive decrease in the mean score after the intervention, the change was still relatively small and not strong enough to show a statistically significant effect. These results indicate that changes in psychological conditions related to the experience of a *broken home* require more intensive and sustained interventions so that the impact can be seen more optimally.

In addition to measuring changes in the *broken home variable*, program evaluation was also carried out on the level of resilience of participants. Resilience is an individual's ability to adapt, survive, and bounce back when facing life pressures and difficulties. Measurements were carried out through *pre-tests* and *post-tests* to determine changes in students' resilience levels after participating in psychoeducation and resilience strengthening programs. The results of descriptive statistical analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Resilience Scores Before and After Intervention

Measurement	N	Red	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Pre-test	37	51,97	8,11	39	70
Post-test	37	51,86	7,43	39	70

Source: SPSS data processing results (2026)

Based on Table 3, it is known that the average resilience score before intervention was 51.97 with a standard deviation of 8.11. After participating in the program, the average resilience score became 51.86 with a standard deviation of 7.43. The comparison of pre-test and post-test scores shows a very small decrease, which is 0.11 points. In addition, the slightly

decreased standard deviation value showed that the variation in participants' scores after the intervention became more homogeneous than before the intervention.

Descriptively, the change in resilience score that occurred was relatively small, so it did not show a significant increase in resilience in participants. Therefore, further analysis using a paired sample t-test is needed to find out whether the difference in score is statistically significant.

To determine the effectiveness of psychoeducation programs and strengthening resilience to changes in the level of student resilience, testing was carried out using a paired sample t-test. This test was used to compare the average resilience scores before and after the intervention in the same group of participants. The test results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of the Paired Sample T-Test of Resilience Variables

Variable	Mean Difference	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Resilience Pre-test – Resilience Post-test	0,108	9,820	1,614	-3,170	3,380	0,067	36	0,947

Source: SPSS data processing results (2026)

Based on Table 4, the mean difference value was 0.108 with a standard deviation of 9.820 and a standard error mean of 1.614. The 95% confidence interval is in the range of –3.170 to 3.380, which indicates that the value of zero is still within the range of the interval.

The results of the paired sample t-test showed a t-value of 0.067 with a degree of freedom (df) of 36 and a significance value of 0.947. Because the significance value was greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), there was no significant difference between the resilience score before and after the intervention. Thus, psychoeducation and resilience strengthening programs have not had a significant influence on increasing the resilience of participants.

Nevertheless, during the implementation of the activities participants showed active participation in the discussion sessions, self-reflection, and psychological skills exercises given. These results indicate that short-term interventions in the form of one-time training are not sufficient to produce statistically measurable changes in resilience. Building resilience is a process that takes time, continuous practice, and consistent environmental support so that changes can last in the long term.

The results of the study showed that the psychoeducation and resilience strengthening programs had not provided a significant increase in resilience in the participants. The results of the paired sample t-test showed that there was no significant difference between the resilience score before and after the intervention ($p > 0.05$). These findings indicate that the interventions provided have not been sufficient to produce measurable changes in a relatively short period of time.

According to Masten, resilience is an adaptation process that develops gradually through the interaction between individual and environmental factors (Masten, 2014). In line with that, Reivich and Shatté explain that emotion regulation, problem-solving, and adaptive coping strategies require repeated practice in order to develop optimally. Therefore, the

implementation of the program in one activity is suspected to be insufficient to produce significant changes in resilience (Reivich & Shatté, 2002).

In addition to the limited duration of the intervention, differences in participants' psychosocial backgrounds can also affect the effectiveness of the program. Family conditions, social support, and diverse life experiences allowed each participant to respond differently to the intervention provided. Nevertheless, this program still provides benefits as a first step in improving students' understanding of broken home conditions, emotional regulation, and the importance of resilience in facing various life challenges. In the future, similar programs need to be implemented more intensively and sustainably in order to be able to have a more optimal impact on the development of student resilience.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, the main objective of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of psychoeducation and resilience-building programs in helping students from broken home families develop better psychological adaptation skills. The results of the analysis showed that the intervention provided did not produce statistically significant changes in the level of resilience or perceptions related to broken home conditions. These findings confirm that psychological problems arising from family dynamics cannot be optimally addressed through short-term interventions; rather, they require a more comprehensive, structured, and sustainable mentoring process. Nevertheless, the active involvement of participants during the activity indicated that the program had potential as an initial step in improving self-awareness, psychological understanding, and the ability to recognize adaptive strategies for dealing with life stressors.

This study contributes to the development of literature on psychological interventions for adolescents from broken home families, particularly by showing that increased resilience is influenced not only by the provision of information and short training but also by environmental factors, social support, the quality of family relationships, and the consistency of psychological skill practice in daily life. These findings reinforce the view that resilience is a capacity that develops gradually and takes time to form optimally. Thus, this research has practical significance for schools, counselors, and families in designing mentoring programs that focus more on long-term processes than on short-term interventions.

This study had several limitations, including the use of a pre-experimental design without a control group, a relatively limited sample size, an intervention implemented in only one activity, and the absence of follow-up evaluations to measure the sustainability of the program's impact. These limitations may affect the ability of the study to capture psychological changes in greater depth. Therefore, further research is recommended to use a more robust experimental design, involve a larger number of participants, extend the duration of the intervention, and integrate the roles of families, teachers, and the social environment as part of a resilience-building program. A more holistic approach is expected to produce more meaningful and sustainable changes in improving the mental health and self-adjustment of adolescents from broken home families.

REFERENCE

- Amato, P. R. (2010). Research on divorce: Continuing trends and new developments. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 650–666. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00723.x>
- Awadai, M. A. M., Al-Gaseem, M. M., Al-Adwan, L. A. Y., Abdulwahab, S., Jaradat, Y. N. A. S., & Ayasrah, M. N. (2022). The effectiveness of psychoeducational learning strategies and stress management in students. *Clinical Schizophrenia & Related Psychoses*, 16(2), 1–4.
- Donker, T., Griffiths, K. M., Cuijpers, P., & Christensen, H. (2009). Psychoeducation for depression, anxiety and psychological distress: A meta-analysis. *BMC Medicine*, 7(79), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-7-79>
- Eliawati, N., Rahayu, D. S., Wandani, E., & Nuraidah, E. (2025). Psychological analysis of delinquent behavior among students from broken homes at SMK Ma'arif Cijulang. *OASES: International Journal of Education, Culture, Society and Technology*, 1(3), 171–183.
- Farrell, K. A. (2026). *Stigma, knowledge, and labeling in obsessive-compulsive personality disorder: Identifying persistent barriers to understanding*.
- Gemilang, C., Siahaan, A., & Rohman, F. (2025). Boarding school management strategies in developing student character at State Islamic Senior High School (MAN) 2 Tanjung Pura. *Journal of General Education and Humanities*, 4(3), 1205–1216.
- Hakim, A., Misbahuddin, A. A., Munir, M., Rahman, H., & Rijal, A. S. (2022). School environment and parents' motivation on learning outcomes through student learning behavior at UPT vocational schools. In *Proceedings of the 1st Australian International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*.
- Huurte, T., Junkkari, H., & Aro, H. (2006). Long-term psychosocial effects of parental divorce: A follow-up study from adolescence to adulthood. *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, 256(4), 256–263. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00406-006-0641-y>
- Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2024). The efficacy of a programme utilizing digital learning technology in fostering the life skills of students with learning disabilities. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(4), 18–33.
- King, S., Ritchie, K. C., McGonnell, M., & Green, J. R. (2023). Don't do more do different: A qualitative description of teachers' perceptions of and experiences with the psychoeducational assessment process. *Psychology in the Schools*, 60(9), 3169–3187.
- Lansford, J. E. (2009). Parental divorce and children's adjustment. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(2), 140–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01114.x>
- Lunov, V., & Rozhkova, I. (2024). *Enhancing student resilience during times of war: Strategies and interventions*. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4751355>
- Masten, A. S. (2014). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. Guilford Press.
- Medellu, G. I. R., Issom, F. L., & Sy, V. R. (2022). The role of psychoeducation in raising awareness about gifted children towards teachers. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Madani (JPMM)*, 6(1), 151–163.
- Mohamed, K., & Nadia, K. (2024). Adapting to the transformation of education: New challenges for teachers. *Journal of Languages and Translation*, 4(1), 80–88.
- Oliveira, C. T. de, & Dias, A. C. G. (2023). How can psychoeducation help in the treatment of mental disorders? *Estudos de Psicologia (Campinas)*, 40, e190183.
- Padmanabhan, S. (2022). Psychoeducation intervention for the mental health of college students. *Sci Front*, 3(1), 17.
- Reivich, K., & Shatté, A. (2002). *The resilience factor: 7 essential skills for overcoming life's inevitable obstacles*. Broadway Books.
- Repetti, R. L., Taylor, S. E., & Seeman, T. E. (2002). Risky families: Family social

- environments and the mental and physical health of offspring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(2), 330–366. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.2.330>
- Santrock, J. W. (2018). *Adolescence* (17th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Tarsono, T., Kurnia, N., Hamidah, S., & Mubarak, Y. Z. (2025). The influence of family environment on students' academic achievement at Al Ihsan Islamic Boarding School. *Strata International Journal of Social Issues*, 2(1), 19–28.
- Weng, X., Cui, Z., Ng, O.-L., Jong, M. S. Y., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2022). Characterizing students' 4C skills development during problem-based digital making. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 31(3), 372–385.