

The Influence of Self-Awareness, Peer Selection, and Family Environment on Student Discipline at MTs Darussalam Saran Kabun

Firda Afa Yumni ^{1 a.1,*}, Khairil Anwar ^{2 b.2}

^{*ab} Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim, Indonesia.

^{*1} aufayumni99@gmail.com; ² khairil.anwar@uin-suska.ac.id;

^{*}Correspondent Author

Received: 21-08-2026

Revised: 27-09-2026

Accepted: 28-10-2026

KEYWORDS

Student Discipline;
Self-Awareness;
Peer Selection;
Family Environment;
Quantitative Correlational
Study.

ABSTRACT

Student discipline is a critical issue in education as it directly influences the success of the learning process and character development of learners. Phenomena commonly observed in schools indicate the persistence of undisciplined behaviors, such as tardiness, violations of school regulations, and low compliance with school rules. This condition suggests that student discipline is influenced not only by school regulations but also by internal factors and the social environment. This study aims to examine the influence of self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment on student discipline. The research was conducted at MTs Darussalam Saran Kabun with the entire student body as the population, while the research sample consisted of 85 students determined using purposive sampling technique. The research instrument was a questionnaire, a set of written statements used to measure research variables, each consisting of 10 items for the variables of self-awareness, peer selection, family environment, and student discipline, which had been tested for validity and reliability. The research design employed was a quantitative correlational field survey. Data analysis techniques utilized Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression. The results revealed significant positive correlations between self-awareness and student discipline ($r = 0.577$; $p < 0.05$), peer selection and student discipline ($r = 0.684$; $p < 0.05$), and family environment and student discipline ($r = 0.761$; $p < 0.05$). Regression analysis demonstrated that self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment simultaneously exerted a significant influence on student discipline with $R^2 = 0.632$, indicating that these three variables contributed 63.2%, with family environment as the most dominant variable. This research is expected to serve as a reference for schools, parents, and educators in designing comprehensive and sustainable strategies for fostering student discipline.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](#) license.



Introduction

Student discipline is one of the fundamental aspects of successful education. Discipline functions not only as a means of behavioral control but also as a vehicle for shaping students' character, responsibility, and moral awareness (Mustari, 2020). Highly disciplined students tend to be able to manage their study time, comply with school rules, and show consistency in carrying out their academic and social obligations. Conversely, low student discipline often disrupts the learning

process, lowers academic achievement, and gives rise to various deviant behaviors in the school environment (Sulistiyowati, 2021).

Low student discipline remains a fairly serious problem in Indonesian education. Violations such as arriving late to school, failing to complete assignments, breaking school rules, and showing a lack of compliance with school regulations indicate that discipline has not yet been fully internalized by students (Rachman, 2022). This condition suggests that discipline is influenced not only by external factors such as rules and sanctions but is also closely related to students' internal factors and social environment.

One internal factor that plays an important role in shaping student discipline is self-awareness. Self-awareness enables students to understand their roles, responsibilities, and the consequences of their actions (Goleman, 2020). Students with good self-awareness tend to be able to control their behavior, regulate their emotions, and act in accordance with prevailing values and norms. Without self-awareness, compliance with school rules is often only temporary and driven by fear of punishment rather than by personal understanding and willingness (Anwar, 2021).

In addition to internal factors, the social environment also has a significant influence on student discipline, one aspect of which is the selection of peers. Peers are a social group with whom students interact intensely, especially during adolescence (Santrock, 2020). Choosing friends who behave positively and are disciplined and responsible can have a constructive influence on the formation of students' attitudes and behavior. Conversely, associating with less disciplined peers may encourage students to imitate negative behaviors, including violations of school rules (Hurlock, 2021).

Furthermore, the family environment, as the first and foremost educational environment, also plays a strategic role in shaping student discipline. Parenting style, role modeling, consistent enforcement of rules, and a conducive family atmosphere greatly influence the cultivation of discipline from an early age (Djamarah, 2021). Families that instill the values of responsibility, orderliness, and commitment tend to raise children who are well disciplined at school. Conversely, a family environment that pays little attention to the cultivation of discipline can become an obstacle to the development of disciplined behavior in students (Helmawati, 2020).

Discipline is a condition that is created and formed through a series of behaviors demonstrating the values of obedience, compliance, loyalty, orderliness, and regularity (Tu'u, 2021). In the educational context, student discipline can be defined as students' awareness of, and willingness to comply with, all school regulations and prevailing social norms. Discipline is very important because, when it arises from self-awareness, students succeed in their studies and, after completing their education, will be more successful in their lives in society (Prijudarminto, 2020).

Self-awareness is an individual's ability to recognize and understand their own feelings, thoughts, and behavior, as well as their impact on others (Goleman, 2020). In the educational context, self-awareness helps students understand their strengths and weaknesses, manage their emotions, and make appropriate decisions. Students with high self-awareness tend to be better able to control impulsive behavior and act in accordance with the values they hold (Anwar, 2021).

Peers are children or adolescents of the same age or level of maturity (Santrock, 2020). Peer selection has a strong influence on the development of adolescent behavior, including discipline. Peer groups provide social support, shape identity, and influence individuals' attitudes and behavior through modeling and social reinforcement (Hurlock, 2021). Choosing appropriate

friends can encourage positive behavior, whereas choosing inappropriate friends can lead to negative behavior.

The family environment is the first and foremost educational environment for a child (Djamarah, 2021). The family plays an important role in shaping a child's personality and behavior, including discipline. Parenting style, communication within the family, and the overall family climate contribute significantly to the development of a child's discipline (Helmawati, 2020). Families that apply rules consistently, set a good example, and create a warm and supportive atmosphere tend to produce children with better discipline.

Several recent empirical studies have examined student discipline from separate angles. Putri et al. (2026) reported a significant positive relationship between self-awareness and learning discipline among senior high school students, but self-awareness was the only factor they examined. Hadi (2023) found that parenting style and peer association significantly affected learning discipline among elementary school students, yet that study did not include students' own self-awareness, and its participants were at a developmental stage different from that of early adolescents. In a madrasah setting, Sulaiman et al. (2024) showed that madrasah culture significantly influenced student discipline at an Islamic junior high school in Makassar, which draws attention to school-level factors but leaves the roles of individual, peer, and family factors unexamined. Taken together, the studies reviewed here tend to treat internal and social factors in isolation, and little is known about their relative contribution when they are examined simultaneously among early adolescents in a madrasah. This study addresses that gap by testing self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment within a single model and by identifying which of the three is most strongly associated with student discipline at MTs Darussalam Saran Kabun. Its novelty lies in this integrated, simultaneous analysis and in its focus on peer selection, that is, students' active choice of friends, rather than on peer influence alone.

The rationale for examining the three variables within a single framework rests on two complementary theories. Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory holds that behavior results from the reciprocal interaction among personal factors, such as self-awareness and self-regulation, behavior, and the environment; internal and social determinants of discipline should therefore be studied together rather than separately. Bronfenbrenner and Morris's (2006) bioecological model adds that a developing adolescent is embedded in nested systems, with the family as the most proximal microsystem and the peer group as a further microsystem in which the adolescent takes an active part. Within this combined view, self-awareness represents the personal factor, peer selection the interpersonal environment, and family environment the primary developmental context. Each is expected to be associated with discipline both individually and jointly, and these premises guide the choice of variables and the interpretation of the results in this study.

Based on the background above, this study aims to: *first*, analyze the relationship between self-awareness and student discipline; *second*, analyze the relationship between peer selection and student discipline; *third*, analyze the relationship between the family environment and student discipline; *fourth*, analyze the simultaneous influence of self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment on student discipline; and *fifth*, identify the most dominant variable influencing student discipline.

Method

This study employed a quantitative approach with a correlational method. The correlational method is a research method used to determine the relationship or influence between two or more variables without manipulating those variables (Sugiyono, 2021). The research design was a

correlational design with an ex post facto approach, that is, research conducted to examine events that have already occurred and then trace back to identify the factors that may have caused them (Creswell & Creswell, 2020).

This study aims to analyze the relationship or influence between the independent variables (self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment) and the dependent variable (student discipline) through direct measurement of a single sample group. Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation to test the relationships among variables and multiple linear regression analysis to determine the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

This study was conducted at MTsS Darussalam Saran Kabun, Riau Province. The research site was chosen on the basis of accessibility and its suitability for the research objectives. The population comprised all students of MTsS Darussalam Saran Kabun in the 2024/2025 academic year. The sample was selected using purposive sampling, a sampling technique based on particular considerations aligned with the research objectives (Sugiyono, 2021). Using this technique, Grade VII students were selected as the research sample, totaling 85 students. Grade VII was chosen because the characteristics of its students suited the needs of the study, such as the heterogeneity of their backgrounds and the availability of access for data collection. The sample consisted of 39 male students (45.9%) and 46 female students (54.1%) from diverse ethnic backgrounds, including Malay (49.4%), Minang (23.5%), Javanese (20.0%), and Batak (7.1%). The respondents' parents' occupations included civil servants (50.6%), entrepreneurs (30.6%), and private-sector employees (18.8%).

Purposive sampling was chosen because the study targeted a specific group whose characteristics fit the research focus rather than the entire student body. Grade VII students are in early adolescence and in their first year at the madrasah, when peer groups are forming, adjustment to school rules is still under way, and the association of family and peers with disciplined behavior is therefore expected to be especially visible. Respondents were selected using three criteria: (1) students officially enrolled in Grade VII at MTsS Darussalam Saran Kabun in the 2024/2025 academic year; (2) students present at school on the day of data collection; and (3) students willing to complete the questionnaire in full. The resulting sample of 85 students exceeded the minimum of 74 recommended for multiple regression with three predictors ($N \geq 50 + 8m$, where m is the number of predictors; Green, 1991). Because the sample was not drawn at random from a single school, the findings are limited to students with similar characteristics.

Research Instruments

Data were collected with a closed-ended questionnaire consisting of four instruments, one for each variable (self-awareness, peer selection, family environment, and student discipline), with 10 statement items each, or 40 items in total. Each item was scored from 1 to 5, so that the total score for each variable ranged from 10 to 50 (see Table 14). The quality of the instruments was evaluated in two ways: item validity, using the correlation between each item score and its construct, and internal consistency reliability, using Cronbach's alpha. The criteria and results of both tests are presented in the subsections below.

Reliability and Validity of the Instruments

Reliability

The reliability test was conducted using Cronbach's alpha to measure the internal consistency of the research instruments. According to Nunnally and Bernstein (2020), an

instrument is considered reliable if its Cronbach's alpha is ≥ 0.60 . The reliability results for each variable are as follows:

The reliability and validity of the instruments for variables X1, X2, and X3 with respect to Y1 are as follows:

Table 1. Reliability of the Research Instruments

Instrument	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Self-Awareness Instrument	10	0.746%
Peer Selection Instrument	10	0.692%
Family Environment Instrument	10	0.805%
Student Discipline Instrument	10	0.830%

Based on Table 1 above, Cronbach's alpha test shows that the reliability of variable X1 is $\alpha = 0.746$, variable X2 is $\alpha = 0.692$, variable X3 is $\alpha = 0.805$, and variable Y is $\alpha = 0.830$.

Self-Awareness Instrument: $\alpha = 0.746$ (10 items) – reliable

Peer Selection Instrument: $\alpha = 0.692$ (10 items) – reliable

Family Environment Instrument: $\alpha = 0.805$ (10 items) – reliable

Student Discipline Instrument: $\alpha = 0.830$ (10 items) – reliable

All instruments showed good reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.692 to 0.830, indicating that the instruments have adequate internal consistency for measuring the intended constructs.

Validity

The validity test was conducted using Pearson's product-moment correlation to measure the extent to which the items in the instrument measure the construct they are intended to measure (Azwar, 2021). An item was considered valid if its correlation coefficient (r) was > 0.30 and its significance value was $p < 0.05$.

Table 2. Item Validity of the Self-Awareness Instrument

Item	Validity (r)	p	Valid
X1.1	0.044	0.69	Invalid
X1.2	0.583	0.00	Valid
X1.3	0.131	0.23	Invalid
X1.4	0.626	0.00	Valid
X1.5	0.500	0.00	Valid
X1.6	0.710	0.00	Valid
X1.7	0.699	0.00	Valid
X1.8	0.692	0.00	Valid
X1.9	0.421	0.00	Valid
X1.10	0.312	0.00	Valid

Based on Table 2 above, the product-moment test shows the validity of the X1 instrument items as follows: X1.1 ($r = 0.044$, $p > 0.05$), X1.2 ($r = 0.583$, $p < 0.05$), X1.3 ($r = 0.131$, $p > 0.05$), X1.4

($r = 0.626$, $p < 0.05$), X1.5 ($r = 0.500$, $p < 0.05$), X1.6 ($r = 0.710$, $p < 0.05$), X1.7 ($r = 0.699$, $p < 0.05$), X1.8 ($r = 0.692$, $p < 0.05$), X1.9 ($r = 0.421$, $p < 0.05$), and X1.10 ($r = 0.312$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 3. Item Validity of the Peer Selection Instrument

Item	Validity (r)	p	Valid
X2.1	0.615	0.00	Valid
X2.2	0.592	0.00	Valid
X2.3	0.648	0.00	Valid
X2.4	0.696	0.00	Valid
X2.5	0.487	0.00	Valid
X2.6	0.642	0.00	Valid
X2.7	0.741	0.00	Valid
X2.8	0.585	0.00	Valid
X2.9	0.705	0.00	Valid
X2.10	0.644	0.00	Valid

Based on Table 3 above, the product-moment test shows the validity of the X2 instrument items as follows: X2.1 ($r = 0.615$, $p < 0.05$), X2.2 ($r = 0.592$, $p < 0.05$), X2.3 ($r = 0.648$, $p < 0.05$), X2.4 ($r = 0.696$, $p < 0.05$), X2.5 ($r = 0.487$, $p < 0.05$), X2.6 ($r = 0.642$, $p < 0.05$), X2.7 ($r = 0.741$, $p < 0.05$), X2.8 ($r = 0.585$, $p < 0.05$), X2.9 ($r = 0.705$, $p < 0.05$), and X2.10 ($r = 0.644$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 4. Item Validity of the Family Environment Instrument

Item	Validity (r)	p	Valid
X3.1	0.646	0.00	Valid
X3.2	0.625	0.00	Valid
X3.3	0.698	0.00	Valid
X3.4	0.522	0.00	Valid
X3.5	0.731	0.00	Valid
X3.6	0.784	0.00	Valid
X3.7	0.540	0.00	Valid
X3.8	0.548	0.00	Valid
X3.9	0.798	0.00	Valid
X3.10	0.737	0.00	Valid

Based on Table 4 above, the product-moment test shows the validity of the X3 instrument items as follows: X3.1 ($r = 0.646$, $p < 0.05$), X3.2 ($r = 0.625$, $p < 0.05$), X3.3 ($r = 0.698$, $p < 0.05$), X3.4 ($r = 0.522$, $p < 0.05$), X3.5 ($r = 0.731$, $p < 0.05$), X3.6 ($r = 0.784$, $p < 0.05$), X3.7 ($r = 0.540$, $p < 0.05$), X3.8 ($r = 0.548$, $p < 0.05$), X3.9 ($r = 0.798$, $p < 0.05$), and X3.10 ($r = 0.737$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 5. Item Validity of the Family Environment Instrument

Item	Validity (r)	p	Valid
Y1.1	0.621	0.00	Valid
Y1.2	0.435	0.00	Valid
Y1.3	0.639	0.00	Valid
Y1.4	0.483	0.00	Valid
Y1.5	0.603	0.00	Valid
Y1.6	0.660	0.00	Valid
Y1.7	0.648	0.00	Valid
Y1.8	0.652	0.00	Valid
Y1.9	0.416	0.00	Valid
Y1.10	0.360	0.00	Valid

Based on Table 5 above, the product-moment test shows the validity of the Y1 instrument items as follows: Y1.1 ($r = 0.621$, $p < 0.05$), Y1.2 ($r = 0.435$, $p < 0.05$), Y1.3 ($r = 0.639$, $p < 0.05$), Y1.4 ($r = 0.483$, $p < 0.05$), Y1.5 ($r = 0.603$, $p < 0.05$), Y1.6 ($r = 0.660$, $p < 0.05$), Y1.7 ($r = 0.648$, $p < 0.05$), Y1.8 ($r = 0.652$, $p < 0.05$), Y1.9 ($r = 0.416$, $p < 0.05$), and Y1.10 ($r = 0.360$, $p < 0.05$).

Validity of the Self-Awareness Instrument: Of the 10 items tested, 8 items were declared valid (items X1.2, X1.4, X1.5, X1.6, X1.7, X1.8, X1.9, and X1.10), with correlation values ranging from 0.312 to 0.710. Two items (X1.1 and X1.3) were declared invalid because their correlation values were below 0.30 and $p > 0.05$.

Validity of the Peer Selection Instrument: All 10 items were declared valid, with correlation values ranging from 0.487 to 0.741 and $p < 0.05$, indicating that all items measure the peer selection construct well.

Validity of the Family Environment Instrument: All 10 items were declared valid, with correlation values ranging from 0.522 to 0.798 and $p < 0.05$, indicating excellent validity for measuring the family environment construct.

Validity of the Student Discipline Instrument: All 10 items were declared valid, with correlation values ranging from 0.360 to 0.660 and $p < 0.05$, indicating that the instrument accurately measures student discipline.

Data Analysis Techniques

The data analysis techniques used in this study included the following:

Descriptive Analysis: to describe the characteristics of the respondents and the distribution of the research variable data; Pearson Correlation Test: to analyze the strength and direction of the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable; and Multiple Linear Regression Analysis: to determine the simultaneous and partial influence of the independent variables (self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment) on the dependent variable (student discipline). All data analyses were performed using SPSS version 25 with a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

The analysis proceeded in four steps. First, descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation) were computed for the respondents' characteristics and for each variable. Second, Pearson product-moment correlations between each independent variable and student discipline were calculated and interpreted by their direction, magnitude, and significance ($p < 0.05$). Third, multiple linear regression with the three predictors entered simultaneously was used to estimate the joint model: the overall model was evaluated with the F test and the coefficient of determination (R^2), and the contribution of each predictor was evaluated with the t test and the standardized regression coefficient (β). Fourth, all tests were interpreted at the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. Because the design is correlational, the coefficients are interpreted as the strength of association between variables and not as proof of causal effects.

Result

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of Gender

Gender	F	%
Male	39	45.9
Female	46	54.1
Total	85	100.0

Table 6 above presents the demographic profile of the students. The results show that female respondents (54.1%) outnumbered male respondents (45.9%).

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Hobbies

Hobby	F	%
Reading	32	37.6
Sports	42	49.4
Arts	11	12.9
Total	85	100.0

Table 7 above presents the demographic profile of the students with respect to their hobbies. The results show that sports was the most common hobby at 49.4% (42 respondents), followed by reading at 37.6% (32 respondents), while reading had the lowest percentage at 12.9% (11 respondents) of the 85 respondents who participated in this study.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Ethnic Group

Ethnic Group	F	%
Malay	42	49.4
Minang	20	23.5
Batak	6	7.1
Javanese	17	20.0
Total	85	100.0

Table 8 above shows the ethnic distribution of the 85 respondents. The Malay ethnic group was the majority with 42 respondents (49.4%), nearly half of the total. This shows the dominance of the Malay ethnic group in the research sample, which is reasonable given that the research was conducted in Pekanbaru, Riau, an area with a significant Malay population. The Minang ethnic group ranked second with 20 respondents (23.5%), reflecting the geographical proximity of Riau to West Sumatra and the mobility of the Minangkabau people. There were 17 Javanese respondents (20.0%), indicating the long-standing transmigration programs and urbanization from Java to Riau. The Batak ethnic group was the smallest with 6 respondents (7.1%), although it still represents the ethnic diversity of the region.

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of Parents' Occupations

Parents' Occupation	F	%
Entrepreneur	26	30.6
Private-sector employee	16	18.8
Civil servant	43	50.6
Total	85	100.0

Table 9 above describes the occupational profile of the parents of the 85 respondents. Civil servants (ASN, Aparatur Sipil Negara) predominated with 43 respondents (50.6%), more than half of the total. This indicates that the majority of respondents came from civil servant families, which generally enjoy economic stability and better access to educational facilities. Entrepreneurs ranked second with 26 respondents (30.6%), showing that a considerable number of respondents had parents who were self-employed or owned their own businesses. Private-sector employees were the smallest group with 16 respondents (18.8%), namely parents who work as employees of private

companies. This occupational distribution may have implications for the families' socioeconomic status, which may in turn influence the variables examined in this study.

Table 10. Frequency of Levels of the Self-Awareness Variable

Self-Awareness	F	%
Low (score 10–23)	-	-
Moderate (score 24–37)	18	21.2
High (score 38–50)	67	78.8
Total	85	100.0

Table 10 above shows that the categorization results indicate that most respondents had a **high level** of self-awareness, namely 67 students (78.8%), while 18 students (21.2%) were at a moderate level. No students had a low level of self-awareness. With a mean of 41.88 (SD = 5.36), these data indicate that, overall, the students have a good understanding of themselves, including their strengths, weaknesses, emotions, and personal values.

Table 11. Frequency of Levels of the Peer Selection Variable

Peer Selection	F	%
Low (score 10–23)	-	-
Moderate (score 24–37)	15	17.6
High (score 38–50)	70	82.4
Total	85	100.0

Table 11 above shows that the peer selection variable yielded very positive results, with **82.4% of students (70 students)** at a high level and only 17.6% (15 students) at a moderate level. No students were at a low level. The mean of 43.09 (SD = 5.47) was the highest among all variables, indicating that students tend to be selective and wise in choosing their friends, which is an important factor in the formation of character and behavior.

Table 12. Frequency of Levels of the Family Environment Variable

Family Environment	F	%
Low (score 10–23)	-	-
Moderate (score 24–37)	31	36.5
High (score 38–50)	54	63.5
Total	85	100.0

Table 12 above shows that the distribution of the family environment variable follows a slightly different pattern. A total of **63.5% of students (54 students)** came from family environments with a high level of support, while 36.5% (31 students) were at a moderate level. With a mean of 40.48 (SD = 6.42), this variable had the highest standard deviation, indicating **greater variation** in the quality of the family environment than the other variables. This indicates considerable differences in parenting style, support, and family conditions among the respondents.

Table 13. Frequency of Levels of the Student Discipline Variable

Student Discipline	F	%
Low (score 10–23)	-	-
Moderate (score 24–37)	25	29.4
High (score 38–50)	60	70.6
Total	85	100.0

Table 13 above shows encouraging results for student discipline, with **70.6% of students (60 students)** at a high level of discipline and 29.4% (25 students) at a moderate level. The mean of 41.23 (SD = 5.34) indicates that most students display good disciplined behavior at school, in terms of attendance, punctuality, and compliance with regulations.

Table 14. Descriptive Statistics of the Variables

	Mean	S.D
Self-Awareness	41.88	5.36
Peer Selection	43.09	5.47
Family Environment	40.48	6.42
Student Discipline	41.23	5.34

Table 14 above, based on descriptive statistics, shows that all four research variables fell into the high category, with means ranging from 40.48 to 43.09 (on a scale of 10–50). Peer selection had the highest score (43.09) and family environment the lowest (40.48). Standard deviations ranged from 5.34 to 6.42. Family environment showed the greatest variation (SD = 6.42), indicating heterogeneity in the respondents' family conditions, whereas student discipline was the most consistent (SD = 5.34), reflecting the effectiveness of the school's disciplinary system. Overall, the data show a good distribution with relatively small variation, indicating that most students have good self-awareness, peer selection ability, family support, and discipline, although the family environment showed the most pronounced differences among respondents.

Table 15. Correlation

Independent Variable	Student Discipline	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Self-Awareness	.577**	.000
Peer Selection	.684**	.000
Family Environment	.761**	.000

Table 15 above, based on Pearson correlation, shows that there is a relationship between self-awareness and student discipline ($r = 0.577$ and $p < 0.05$), a relationship between peer selection and student discipline ($r = 0.684$ and $p < 0.05$), and a relationship between the family environment and student discipline ($r = 0.761$ and $p < 0.05$). This means that all of the independent variables are significantly related to the dependent variable.

Table 16. Regression

Independent Variable	Student Discipline				
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	p
Self-Awareness	.144	.088	.145	1.644	.104
Peer Selection	.218	.101	.223	2.155	.034
Family Environment	.433	.082	.520	5.293	.000

$R^2 = 0.632$ (63.2%) with $F_{(3, 81)} = 46.419$ and $p < 0.05$

Table 16 above, based on multiple linear regression, shows that self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment influence student discipline, as seen in the F value of 46.419 with $p < 0.05$. The combined influence of self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment on student discipline is 63.2% ($R^2 = 0.632$). In terms of the partial contribution of each variable, the family environment has the greatest influence on student discipline ($\beta = 0.520$), followed by peer selection ($\beta = 0.223$) and self-awareness ($\beta = 0.145$).

Discussion

This study examined the influence of self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment on student discipline at MTsS Darussalam Saran Kabun. The results show that all three variables were significantly and positively correlated with student discipline and collectively accounted for 63.2% of the variance in student discipline in this sample. These findings provide empirical evidence that disciplined behavior is shaped by both internal psychological factors and external social influences. Because the study used a correlational cross-sectional survey, the findings are interpreted as associations; terms such as "influence" and "contribution" refer to statistical prediction and not to demonstrated causation.

Self-Awareness and Student Discipline

The correlation analysis showed a significant positive relationship between self-awareness and student discipline ($r = 0.577$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that students with high self-awareness tend to display better disciplined behavior. The mean of 41.88 (SD = 5.36) shows that most students (78.8%) had a high level of self-awareness, indicating a good understanding of their strengths, weaknesses, emotions, and personal values.

These results are consistent with Goleman's (1995) work on emotional intelligence, which emphasizes self-awareness as the foundation of self-regulation and responsible behavior. Bandura's (1991) social cognitive theory also holds that self-awareness enables individuals to monitor and regulate their behavior in accordance with internal standards and external expectations. When students have strong self-awareness, they are better able to recognize the consequences of their actions, understand the importance of following rules, and adjust their behavior accordingly.

However, the regression analysis showed that self-awareness made the weakest individual contribution to student discipline ($\beta = 0.145$, $p = 0.104$) and was not statistically significant after controlling for the other variables. The contrast between its significant zero-order correlation ($r = 0.577$) and its non-significant regression coefficient indicates that much of the variance self-awareness shares with discipline overlaps with the variance shared by peer selection and family environment. This pattern is consistent with the reciprocal interaction between personal and environmental factors described in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), and it suggests that the association of self-awareness with discipline may partly operate together with, or through, peer relationships and family support; a mediation test would be needed to confirm this. This interpretation differs from studies that position self-awareness as the primary determinant of behavioral outcomes (Brown & Ryan, 2003). The relatively weak unique contribution may also reflect the developmental stage of the participants: early adolescents, whose behavior is highly susceptible to social influence from peers and family members.

Peer Selection and Student Discipline

The relationship between peer selection and student discipline was substantial, with a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.684$ ($p < 0.05$). This moderate-to-strong correlation indicates that students who are selective in choosing their friends tend to show higher levels of discipline. The descriptive statistics show that 82.4% of students had a high level of selectivity in choosing friends (mean = 43.09, SD = 5.47), the highest mean among all variables.

This finding supports previous research on the influence of peers in adolescent development. Steinberg and Monahan (2007) showed that peer relationships during adolescence

significantly shape behavioral norms and decision-making processes. Brown et al. (2008) found that adolescents who associate with prosocial peers are more likely to internalize positive behavioral standards, including compliance with school rules.

The regression analysis confirmed that peer selection made a significant independent contribution to student discipline ($\beta = 0.223$, $p = 0.034$), even after accounting for the effects of self-awareness and family environment. This finding underscores the unique role of peer relationships in shaping disciplined behavior during adolescence. The mechanism underlying this relationship can be explained by social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), which holds that individuals learn behavior through observation and modeling.

What distinguishes this finding from previous research is its emphasis on the *selection* of peers rather than merely peer influence. While many studies focus on how peers influence behavior (Dishion & Tipsord, 2011), this study highlights students' agency in choosing their social environment. This distinction is important because it suggests that interventions aimed at improving student discipline should not only address peer pressure but also enhance students' capacity to make informed decisions about their friendships.

Family Environment and Student Discipline

The most striking finding was the strong correlation between the family environment and student discipline ($r = 0.761$, $p < 0.05$), the highest among all variables. The regression analysis identified the family environment as the most dominant predictor of student discipline ($\beta = 0.520$, $p < 0.001$). The descriptive data show that 63.5% of students came from family environments with a high level of support (mean = 40.48, SD = 6.42), although the higher standard deviation indicates greater variability in family conditions.

These results are highly consistent with extensive research on the influence of the family on child and adolescent development. Baumrind's (1991) parenting style framework has consistently shown that authoritative parenting, characterized by warmth, clear expectations, and consistent discipline, produces the most positive outcomes in children, including self-discipline and behavioral regulation. Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory emphasizes the family as the primary microsystem shaping children's development, with family dynamics serving as the foundation for all subsequent social interactions and behavioral patterns.

The dominance of the family environment in predicting student discipline can be interpreted through several mechanisms. First, the family serves as the primary agent of socialization, where children first learn about rules, consequences, and behavioral expectations (Grusec & Davidov, 2010). Parents who set clear boundaries, provide consistent consequences, and model disciplined behavior create a template that children bring into the school environment. Second, family support for and involvement in education have been linked to student motivation, engagement, and compliance with school norms (Hill & Tyson, 2009).

The finding that the family environment made the largest individual contribution to student discipline ($\beta = 0.520$, the largest standardized coefficient in the model) is in line with meta-analytic evidence showing that family factors are the strongest predictors of child and adolescent behavioral outcomes (Rothbaum & Weisz, 1994). However, the relatively high standard deviation (SD = 6.42) indicates considerable heterogeneity in family conditions among the participants, reflecting

differences in parenting style, family structure, socioeconomic status, and the quality of the parent–child relationship.

The demographic data show that 50.6% of the students' parents were civil servants, followed by 30.6% entrepreneurs and 18.8% private-sector employees. This distribution may explain the generally positive family environment scores, since civil service positions in Indonesia typically provide stable income and benefits, potentially reducing family stress and enabling more consistent parenting. However, the fact that one-third of the students still scored at a moderate level on the family environment indicates that economic stability alone does not guarantee supportive family dynamics, highlighting the importance of relational factors such as communication, emotional warmth, and parental involvement.

Collective Influence of the Variables on Student Discipline

The combined association of self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment with student discipline was substantial, with an R^2 value of 0.632 indicating that the three variables together account for 63.2% of the variance in discipline scores in this sample. The F statistic ($F = 46.419$, $p < 0.05$) indicates that the model as a whole is statistically significant, meaning that the three variables jointly predict student discipline better than would be expected by chance.

This finding addresses the research objective of examining multiple factors related to student discipline simultaneously, which gives a more comprehensive picture than studies that examine these factors separately. The size of R^2 suggests that the framework adopted in this study, which integrates an internal psychological factor (self-awareness), an interpersonal factor (peer selection), and a family factor (family environment), is supported by the data in this sample.

The relative size of the standardized coefficients (family environment: $\beta = 0.520$; peer selection: $\beta = 0.223$; self-awareness: $\beta = 0.145$) reveals a hierarchical pattern in which proximal family relationships show the strongest association with discipline, followed by peer relationships, and then individual psychological characteristics. Standardized coefficients indicate relative strength of association and should not be read as percentages of variance. The pattern is consistent with Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, which holds that more proximal environmental systems have stronger direct effects on development than distal factors.

However, it is important to note that 36.8% of the variance in student discipline remains unexplained by this model. This residual variance likely reflects the influence of other factors not examined in this study, such as school climate, teacher–student relationships, individual personality traits (e.g., conscientiousness and self-control), prior experiences with discipline, cognitive ability, and broader sociocultural factors.

Correlation, Causation, and the Interpretation of R^2

Because this study used a correlational cross-sectional design, the relationships reported here are associations and cannot establish causal influence. The direction may plausibly run in either or both ways: disciplined students may, for example, choose friends who are also disciplined and may in turn elicit more supportive responses from their parents. The word "influence" in the title and the research objectives is therefore used in the statistical sense of explained variance (prediction), not in the sense of demonstrated cause and effect. A third variable not measured here, such as school climate or personality, could also account for part of the observed associations. Establishing causal direction would require longitudinal or experimental designs.

The coefficient of determination should likewise be interpreted with caution. An R^2 of 0.632 means that the three predictors account for 63.2% of the variance in discipline scores in this sample of 85 students; it does not mean that 63.2% of student discipline is caused by these factors. The adjusted R^2 computed from the reported values ($R^2 = 0.632$, $n = 85$, three predictors) is approximately 0.618, only slightly lower, which suggests that the model is not greatly inflated by the number of predictors. However, because all variables were measured with the same self-report questionnaire at the same time, shared method variance may have raised the observed relationships, and the estimate comes from a single school. The value should therefore be treated as specific to this sample and not as a population parameter, and replication in other schools is needed before it is generalized.

Demographic Considerations

The demographic characteristics of the sample provide important context for interpreting the findings. The study included a balanced gender distribution (54.1% female, 45.9% male), with ethnic diversity reflecting the regional composition of Riau Province (49.4% Malay, 23.5% Minangkabau, 20% Javanese, 7.1% Batak). These demographic factors may influence how students experience and respond to expectations of discipline.

Previous research has shown that cultural background can shape attitudes toward authority, collectivism versus individualism, and behavioral norms (Triandis, 1995). The predominance of the Malay ethnic group is relevant because Malay culture emphasizes respect for parents, social harmony, and compliance with social norms, values that align with schools' expectations of discipline.

Data on students' hobbies show that sports (49.4%) was the most common interest, followed by reading (37.6%) and arts (12.9%). This distribution may have implications for student discipline, since participation in organized sports has been linked to discipline, teamwork, and goal-oriented behavior (Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005).

Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study have several important theoretical implications. First, they provide empirical support for an integrated multilevel model of student discipline that combines individual, interpersonal, and family-level factors. This holistic approach is consistent with contemporary developmental theory, which emphasizes the interconnectedness of multiple systems in shaping behavior (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006).

Second, the observed hierarchical pattern of influence, with the family environment exerting the strongest effect, reinforces attachment theory and family systems perspectives, which position early family experiences as the foundation for later social and behavioral development (Bowlby, 1969). The finding that family influence remains paramount even during adolescence highlights the importance of enduring family relationships.

Third, the relatively modest direct contribution of self-awareness suggests that internal psychological factors may operate primarily through, or together with, social influences. This finding supports social-cognitive models that emphasize the reciprocal interaction among personal factors, behavior, and the environment rather than viewing individual characteristics as isolated determinants of behavior (Bandura, 1986).

Practical Implications

The results of this study have significant practical implications for educators, parents, and policymakers. Given that the family environment showed the strongest association with student discipline, schools may prioritize parent education and family support programs. Schools should develop comprehensive parent involvement initiatives, including workshops on effective parenting strategies and communication skills, and on creating a home environment that supports learning and discipline.

Parent education programs can focus on authoritative parenting practices that combine warmth and support with clear expectations and consistent consequences. Training may include strategies for establishing routines, monitoring children's activities, communicating expectations clearly, and applying age-appropriate consequences for rule violations.

The significant role of peer selection suggests that schools should implement programs that help students develop critical thinking skills about friendships. Guidance counselors can facilitate workshops on recognizing healthy versus unhealthy friendships, resisting negative peer pressure, and actively seeking friends who share prosocial values. Schools can also create structured opportunities for students to interact with positive peer role models through mentoring programs, peer tutoring, and collaborative learning activities.

Although self-awareness showed the smallest direct effect, its development should not be neglected because it provides the foundation for self-regulation. Schools should incorporate social-emotional learning curricula that explicitly teach self-awareness skills, including emotion recognition, self-reflection, and mindfulness practices.

Comparison with Previous Research

The findings of this study are largely consistent with the existing literature on the factors influencing student discipline. The strong relationship between the family environment and student discipline ($r = 0.761$) is in line with meta-analytic evidence showing that parenting practices and family functioning are robust predictors of child behavior problems and prosocial behavior (Hoeve et al., 2009; Pinquart, 2017). Recent Indonesian studies point in the same direction: Putri et al. (2026) found a significant positive relationship between self-awareness and learning discipline, and Hadi (2023) reported that parenting style and peer association significantly affected learning discipline. The present study extends these findings by examining the three factors together and showing that, once they are considered jointly, the unique contribution of self-awareness is no longer significant.

However, the relatively weak direct effect of self-awareness on discipline when controlling for social factors differs from several studies that emphasize individual psychological characteristics as the main determinants of behavioral self-regulation. For example, Tangney et al. (2004) found strong associations between self-control and a variety of positive outcomes. The divergent finding in this study may reflect methodological differences or suggest that the influence of individual factors varies across cultural contexts. In addition, Sulaiman et al. (2024) showed that school-level madrasah culture significantly influenced student discipline, which suggests that part of the variance left unexplained by the present model may reflect institutional factors that were not measured here.

One explanation is the collectivist orientation of Indonesian culture, in which social relationships and group harmony are emphasized over individual autonomy (Hofstede, 2001). In collectivist cultures, behavior may be regulated more strongly by external social expectations and

relationships than by internal psychological states. This cultural context may explain why family and peer influences showed stronger effects than self-awareness in this study.

Another difference worth noting is the very high R^2 value (0.632) obtained in this study. Many previous studies examining similar constructs report more modest R^2 values, typically ranging from 0.30 to 0.50 (e.g., Ryan & Deci, 2000). The higher explanatory power should be interpreted cautiously; it may be attributable to the comprehensive operationalization of the predictor variables, the use of validated instruments, shared method variance from a single self-report questionnaire, or characteristics specific to the sample or setting.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Although this study makes important contributions, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional design precludes causal inferences about the relationships among the variables. A longitudinal research design that tracks students over time would provide stronger evidence of causal relationships and reveal how these factors interact dynamically across development.

Second, the study relied exclusively on self-report questionnaires, which are susceptible to social desirability bias. Future research should incorporate multiple assessment methods, including teacher reports, behavioral observations, school records (e.g., attendance, tardiness, and disciplinary referrals), and parent reports, to provide convergent validation of the findings.

Third, the sample was drawn from a single school (MTsS Darussalam Saran Kabun), which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other educational settings. Replication studies involving multiple schools across different regions, socioeconomic levels, and school types (public versus private, secular versus religious) would strengthen confidence in the generalizability of these findings.

Fourth, although the study explained 63.2% of the variance in student discipline, the remaining 36.8% is attributable to factors not examined. Future research should explore additional variables that may influence student discipline, such as:

- a. **School-level factors:** School climate, teacher–student relationships, consistency of disciplinary policies, administrative support, and the availability of student support services
- b. **Individual psychological factors:** Personality traits (especially conscientiousness and agreeableness), self-control capacity, motivation, goal orientation, and executive function
- c. **Cognitive factors:** Moral reasoning development, understanding of rules and their purposes, and beliefs about the consequences of rule violations
- d. **Broader contextual factors:** Neighborhood characteristics, exposure to community violence, media influence, and broader sociocultural values regarding authority and conformity

Fifth, the study measured the family environment as a single composite construct, whereas family influence on child behavior is multifaceted and may encompass distinct dimensions such as parenting style, parent–child attachment, family structure, parental monitoring, parental involvement in education, and family stressors. Future research should disaggregate these components to identify which specific aspects of the family environment are most critical for promoting student discipline.

Future research should also explore potential moderation and mediation relationships among the variables examined in this study. For example, self-awareness may moderate the

relationship between peer selection and discipline, such that students with higher self-awareness are better able to resist negative peer influence. Testing these more complex models would provide a more nuanced understanding of how multiple factors interact to shape student discipline.

In addition, intervention studies are needed to translate these findings into practical applications. Experimental studies evaluating the effectiveness of family-based interventions, peer mentoring programs, and self-awareness training on student discipline outcomes would provide evidence-based guidance for schools and families.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationship of self-awareness, peer selection, and family environment with student discipline among 85 Grade VII students at MTsS Darussalam Saran Kabun. All three variables correlated positively and significantly with student discipline, with the family environment showing the strongest correlation ($r = 0.761$; $p < 0.05$), followed by peer selection ($r = 0.684$; $p < 0.05$) and self-awareness ($r = 0.577$; $p < 0.05$). Together, the three variables accounted for 63.2% of the variance in student discipline ($R^2 = 0.632$; $F = 46.419$; $p < 0.05$). Partially, the family environment ($\beta = 0.520$; $p < 0.001$) and peer selection ($\beta = 0.223$; $p = 0.034$) were significant predictors, whereas self-awareness was not significant once the other two variables were controlled ($\beta = 0.145$; $p = 0.104$). Because the design is correlational, these results indicate associations and not causal effects.

The findings imply that efforts to strengthen student discipline are likely to be most effective when they involve the family and the peer environment and do not rely on school rules alone. In practice, schools can develop parent engagement programs, such as parenting workshops and regular communication between school and home; help students choose positive peer groups through counseling, mentoring, and peer tutoring; and embed the development of self-awareness in character education and social-emotional learning, where it can support discipline together with these social factors.

These conclusions should be read in light of several limitations. The sample was small, was drawn through purposive sampling from Grade VII of a single madrasah, and relied on self-report questionnaires collected at one point in time, which limits generalizability and rules out causal inference.

Future studies are recommended to use larger and more varied samples from multiple schools and grade levels; to apply longitudinal or mixed-method designs and multi-informant data, such as teacher and parent reports and school records; to test mediating or moderating relationships, for example the role of self-awareness in the link between peer selection and discipline; and to include additional variables such as school climate and personality traits.

References

- Anwar, S. (2021). *Psikologi Pendidikan: Kesadaran Diri dan Regulasi Emosi* [Educational psychology: Self-awareness and emotion regulation]. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Azwar, S. (2021). *Reliabilitas dan Validitas* (4th ed.) [Reliability and validity]. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 248–287.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56–95.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brechwald, W. A., & Prinstein, M. J. (2011). Beyond homophily: A decade of advances in understanding peer influence processes. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1), 166–179.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., pp. 793–828). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brown, B. B., Bakken, J. P., Ameringer, S. W., & Mahon, S. D. (2008). A comprehensive conceptualization of the peer influence process in adolescence. In M. J. Prinstein & K. A. Dodge (Eds.), *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents* (pp. 17–44). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(4), 822–848.
- Conger, R. D., & Donnellan, M. B. (2007). An interactionist perspective on the socioeconomic context of human development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 175–199.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2020). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Dishion, T. J., & Tipsord, J. M. (2011). Peer contagion in child and adolescent social and emotional development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62, 189–214.
- Djamarah, S. B. (2021). *Pola Asuh Orang Tua dan Komunikasi dalam Keluarga* [Parenting style and communication in the family]. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Fraser-Thomas, J. L., Côté, J., & Deakin, J. (2005). Youth sport programs: An avenue to foster positive youth development. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 10(1), 19–40.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (2020). *Emotional Intelligence: Kecerdasan Emosional*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Green, S. B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26(3), 499–510. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2603_7
- Grusec, J. E., & Davidov, M. (2010). Integrating different perspectives on socialization theory and research: A domain-specific approach. *Child Development*, 81(3), 687–709.

- Hadi, P. R. (2023). The effect of parenting style and peer association on student's learning discipline. *Elementary School: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran ke-SD-an*, 10(1), 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.31316/esjurnal.v10i1.3417>
- Helmawati. (2020). *Pendidikan Keluarga: Teoretis dan Praktis* [Family education: Theoretical and practical]. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Hill, N. E., & Tyson, D. F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(3), 740–763.
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 37(6), 749–775.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hurlock, E. B. (2021). *Psikologi Perkembangan: Suatu Pendekatan Sepanjang Rentang Kehidupan* (5th ed.) [Developmental psychology: A life-span approach]. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Mustari, M. (2020). *Nilai Karakter: Refleksi untuk Pendidikan* [Character values: Reflections for education]. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (2020). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pinquart, M. (2017). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with externalizing problems of children and adolescents: An updated meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 53(5), 873–932.
- Prijodarminto, S. (2020). *Disiplin Kiat Menuju Sukses* [Discipline: The way to success]. Jakarta: Pradnya Paramita.
- Putri, E., Handayani, P. G., Netrawati, & Febriani, R. D. (2026). Hubungan self-awareness dengan disiplin belajar siswa di sekolah. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 11(2), 150–164. <https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v11i02.45778>
- Rachman, F. (2022). *Manajemen Kedisiplinan Siswa di Sekolah* [Student discipline management in schools]. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Rothbaum, F., & Weisz, J. R. (1994). Parental caregiving and child externalizing behavior in nonclinical samples: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(1), 55–74.
- 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.
- Santrock, J. W. (2020). *Psikologi Pendidikan* (6th ed.) [Educational psychology]. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Steinberg, L., & Monahan, K. C. (2007). Age differences in resistance to peer influence. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(6), 1531–1543.
- Sugiyono. (2021). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D* (3rd ed.) [Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods]. Bandung: Alfabeta.

- Sulaiman, U., Djafar, H., Mihrani, & Mundzir, C. (2024). The influence of madrasah culture on student discipline at an Islamic junior high school in Makassar. *Lentera Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*, 27(2), 480–498. <https://doi.org/10.24252/lp.2024v27n2i12>
- Sulistyowati, E. (2021). *Implementasi Pendidikan Karakter dalam Pembelajaran* [Implementation of character education in learning]. Yogyakarta: Cakrawala Ilmu.
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying? Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 38–47.
- Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72(2), 271–324.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Tu'u, T. (2021). *Peran Disiplin pada Perilaku dan Prestasi Siswa* [The role of discipline in student behavior and achievement]. Jakarta: Grasindo