ADOLESCENT SELF-CONTROL AND ITS EFFECT ON DEVIANT BEHAVIOR: A QUANTITATIVE STUDY

Elis Karina Febriyani[1*], Randwitya Ayu Ganis Hemasti[2], Anggun Pertiwi[3]

[123] Universitas Buana Perjuangan Karawang, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: ps21.elisfebriyani@mhs.ubpkarawang.ac.id

ABSTRACT
Adolescent delinquency remains a salient educational and psychosocial challenge, particularly in contexts where biological, psychological, and social pressures increase young people's vulnerability to deviant behaviors. This study investigated whether self-control predicts juvenile delinquency among students in Karawang Regency. Using a quantitative causal design, data were collected from 348 students aged 13–19 years (167 males; 181 females) recruited through convenience sampling. Self-control was measured using the Brief Self-Control Scale (BSCS), and juvenile delinquency was assessed using a researcher-constructed delinquency scale. Data were analyzed using simple linear regression (SPSS v25). The results show that self-control has a statistically significant effect on juvenile delinquency (sig. = 0.000; $p < 0.05$), indicating that self-control is a meaningful predictor of delinquent tendencies. However, the effect size is relatively small, with self-control explaining 3.7% of the variance in delinquency (R Square = 0.037), suggesting that other factors outside the present model contribute substantially to adolescent delinquency. The principal conclusion is that strengthening students' self-control is relevant but insufficient as a standalone approach; educational interventions should be complemented by consistent parental and school support to foster positive adolescent development. Future studies are recommended to incorporate broader ecological determinants (e.g., family characteristics, socioeconomic conditions, and residential environment) and to test more comprehensive explanatory models.

Keywords: Adolescence; Juvenile delinquency; Parental involvement; Self-control; Students.

INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is widely understood as a developmental transition marked by accelerated biological maturation, intensified socio-emotional needs, and expanding social autonomy. Within this transition, young people are expected to regulate impulses, delay gratification, and comply with social and school norms while simultaneously navigating heightened sensitivity to reward and peer influence (Steinberg, 2008; Moffitt, 1993). These conditions make adolescence a period of elevated vulnerability to rule-breaking behaviors—ranging from minor school misconduct to more serious forms of delinquency—especially when self-regulatory capacity is weak or environmental pressures are strong (Moffitt, 1993; Baron, 2003). In the past decade, much research has focused on self-control (and adjacent constructs such as self-regulation and effortful control) as a foundational protective factor predicting reduced behavioral problems, stronger academic functioning, and healthier interpersonal relations (Tangney et al., 2004; Duckworth & Seligman, 2005; de Ridder et al., 2012). In criminology and developmental psychopathology, self-control is also positioned as a core explanatory variable for delinquency and antisocial conduct (Pratt & Cullen, 2000; Burt, 2020; Vazsonyi et al., 2017), and meta-analytic evidence indicates that low self-control is reliably associated with delinquency and deviance, although effect magnitudes vary across samples, measures, and settings (Pratt & Cullen, 2000; Vazsonyi et al., 2017). The urgency of this topic is not only global but also distinctly local: in Indonesian contexts, adolescents encounter rapid socio-economic change, intensified mobility, and shifting family routines that can reshape supervision patterns, peer networks, and exposure to risk opportunities; in Karawang specifically, socio-economic dynamics are noted as potentially influencing adolescent behavior patterns. In such settings, strengthening the evidence base on how self-control relates to juvenile delinquency is academically relevant (for testing theory transportability across contexts) and practically relevant (for prevention programs in schools, families, and youth services).

Despite robust theorizing, several key issues remain unresolved in the literature. First, while self-control is consistently related to delinquency, findings differ regarding how strong and how stable this relationship is across cultural settings, measurement approaches, and developmental stages (Pratt & Cullen, 2000;

Vazsonyi et al., 2017; Burt, 2020). It remains unclear why similar levels of self-control sometimes predict markedly different delinquency outcomes in different contexts—suggesting the likely involvement of situational opportunities, peer processes, and socialization mechanisms that may moderate or mediate the relationship (Dishion & Tipsord, 2011; Stattin & Kerr, 2000). Second, the operationalization of self-control is not uniform: some studies treat it as a single trait capacity, while others distinguish inhibitory control (resisting impulses) and initiatory control (persisting toward valued goals); this distinction matters because "not doing bad things" is not equivalent to consistently "doing the right thing," and different components may relate to different delinquency profiles (de Ridder et al., 2011; de Ridder et al., 2012). Third, there is a continuing need for evidence from underrepresented contexts, including rapidly transforming districts where adolescents may experience distinctive risk constellations (e.g., dense peer contact, shifting parental monitoring routines, and varied school climates). The present study is situated in Kabupaten Karawang and frames juvenile delinquency as a salient concern among adolescents in school settings. Accordingly, a general solution is to empirically test the self-control–delinquency association using valid measures and context-appropriate delinquency indicators in the target adolescent population, contributing locally grounded evidence to cross-context theory evaluation and prevention design.

Scientific literature offers several concrete approaches to address these unresolved issues. From a conceptual standpoint, criminological theory positions self-control as a key individual difference shaping the propensity toward rule-breaking, particularly when opportunities arise (Pratt & Cullen, 2000; Burt, 2020), while developmental perspectives emphasize that delinquency is heterogeneous—some patterns are adolescence-limited and influenced by peer dynamics, whereas others are more persistent and linked to cumulative risk (Moffitt, 1993). These perspectives justify studying self-control in adolescence while acknowledging that environmental processes (peer contagion, supervision, disclosure, and monitoring) influence outcomes (Dishion & Tipsord, 2011; Stattin & Kerr, 2000). From a measurement standpoint, personality and behavioral research commonly operationalizes trait self-control using validated brief instruments (Tangney et al., 2004) and increasingly distinguishes inhibitory and initiatory self-control, aligning with the idea that effective self-control includes both resisting impulses and sustaining goal-directed action (de Ridder et al., 2011). From an empirical standpoint, reputable studies frequently apply regression-based or structural modeling to estimate the predictive contribution of self-control to delinquency while recognizing that effect sizes may be contingent on social contexts (Vazsonyi et al., 2017; Wright et al., 2008), and the broader literature also supports considering related mechanisms (e.g., parenting processes and peer influence susceptibility) even when the primary model focuses on self-control as a focal predictor (Hay, 2001; Wright & Beaver, 2005; Meldrum et al., 2013). Taken together, prior scholarship supports a focused empirical test that applies validated self-control measurement and an operationally clear delinquency construct to examine whether (and to what extent) self-control predicts delinquency among adolescents in a specific local context.

The evidence base on self-control and delinquency is substantial, but it still leaves a practical and scientific gap relevant to this study. Meta-analyses and large-scale syntheses establish a reliable negative association between self-control and deviance/delinquency, reinforcing self-control as a prevention-relevant variable (Pratt & Cullen, 2000; Vazsonyi et al., 2017), yet these syntheses simultaneously underscore heterogeneity in operational definitions and cultural contexts, implying that local studies remain necessary to test transportability and contextual robustness. In addition, measurement developments indicate that self-control is multidimensional, and the initiatory–inhibitory distinction may be especially meaningful in adolescent populations, where impulsive risk-taking and goal persistence may not fully align (de Ridder et al., 2011; de Ridder et al., 2012). Finally, the local empirical base remains comparatively limited in many Indonesian districts characterized by rapid socio-economic change, including Karawang, where adolescent behavioral patterns may be shaped by distinctive contextual pressures. Moreover, the study specifies the use of a Brief Self-Control Scale approach (capturing inhibition and initiation dimensions) and a delinquency measure organized using recognized delinquency aspects, enabling a more structured and interpretable assessment in the local setting. Thus, the research gap can be stated as follows: although international evidence supports the self-control–delinquency link, context-specific empirical testing remains needed using a multidimensional self-control framework and a clearly structured delinquency construct among Indonesian adolescents in rapidly changing local environments.

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of self-control on juvenile delinquency among adolescent students in Kabupaten Karawang aged 13–19 years. The novelty of this study is threefold: it contributes local empirical evidence from a socio-economically dynamic district context where juvenile delinquency is framed as a salient educational and social concern; it operationalizes self-control using a brief measure aligned with contemporary literature that distinguishes inhibition and initiation dimensions, enabling more theoretically sensitive assessment than a purely undifferentiated trait approach; and it applies a delinquency construct organized by multiple behavioral aspects to support clearer interpretation for educational prevention design. Grounded in criminological and developmental evidence that lower self-control is associated with higher delinquency and deviance (Pratt & Cullen, 2000; Vazsonyi et al., 2017; Tangney et al., 2004), this study advances a directional hypothesis: H1: Self-control negatively predicts juvenile delinquency among adolescent students. The scope of the study is limited to adolescents (13–19 years) in Karawang and focuses on the predictive relationship between self-control and juvenile delinquency using self-report instruments. The study does not, within the primary model, test broader causal mechanisms (e.g., parenting practices, peer contagion, or school climate) that are emphasized in the wider literature as complementary explanatory pathways (Dishion & Tipsord, 2011; Stattin & Kerr, 2000); therefore, findings should be interpreted as context-specific evidence of association/prediction rather than definitive proof of causality.

METHOD

Research Design and Approach

This study employed a quantitative causal (explanatory) design to test the effect of self-control (X) on juvenile delinquency (Y) among students in Karawang Regency. The causal approach was selected because the proposed model specifies a directional relationship (predictor → outcome) and is therefore appropriately examined using simple linear regression with one independent variable and one dependent variable. The unit of analysis was the individual student, and the study relied on self-report survey data collected using psychological rating scales.

Population and Sample / Participants

The target population comprised students attending schools in Karawang Regency within the adolescent age range. The achieved sample included 348 students aged 13–19 years, consisting of 167 males and 181 females. Participants were recruited using convenience sampling (non-probability) based on accessibility and willingness to participate. The minimum sample requirement was determined using the Isaac & Michael table with a 5% error rate, resulting in a minimum target of 348 respondents, which matches the achieved sample size.

Data Collection Techniques and Instruments

The data used for this study were collected by administering two psychological scales: (1) the Brief Self-Control Scale (BSCS) to measure self-control and (2) a Juvenile Delinquency Scale constructed by the researcher to measure delinquency. Prior to full data collection, instrument preparation included expert judgment, readability testing, and a try-out. Item quality was evaluated using corrected item–total correlation (item discrimination), and internal consistency reliability was then estimated using Cronbach's alpha. Self-control was measured using the BSCS (De Ridder et al., 2011), structured around the dimensions of inhibition and initiation as adapted/developed in Indonesian by Arifin & Milla (2020). The BSCS in this study comprised 10 items (3 favorable; 7 unfavorable) with 7 response options ranging from *strongly disagree (1)* to *strongly agree (7)*, and the try-out indicated high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.864$). Juvenile delinquency was measured using a researcher-constructed scale based on Jansen's framework (as cited in Sriwahyuni, 2017) covering four aspects: delinquency causing physical victims, delinquency causing material loss, social delinquency without direct victims, and delinquency involving student status

violations. The scale contained 18 items (14 favorable; 4 unfavorable) with 4 response options from *strongly disagree (1)* to *strongly agree (4)*, and the try-out showed strong internal consistency (α = 0.920).

Table 1. Overview of Study Methodology

Component	Specification
Design	Quantitative causal (explanatory)
Location/Context	Schools in Karawang Regency
Participants	N = 348 students, ages 13–19; 167 male, 181 female
Sampling	Convenience sampling (non-probability)
Sample size basis	Isaac & Michael table, 5% error; minimum n = 348
Independent variable (X)	Self-control (BSCS)
Dependent variable (Y)	Juvenile delinquency scale (Jansen-based)
Analysis software	SPSS v25
Main statistics	Normality, linearity, simple regression, R^2

Table 2. Measurement Summary of Variables and Instruments

Variable	Instrument	Dimensions/Aspects	Items & Response Format	Reliability Evidence
Self-control (X)	BSCS (De Ridder et al., 2011); inhibition & initiation (Arifin & Milla, 2020)	Inhibition; initiation	10 items; 7-point Likert (1–7); favorable & unfavorable items	α = 0.864 (try-out)
Juvenile delinquency (Y)	Researcher-constructed (Jansen framework in Sriwahyuni, 2017)	Physical victim; material victim; social delinquency; status violation	18 items; 4-point Likert (1–4); favorable & unfavorable items	α = 0.920 (try-out)

This conceptual structure aligns with the study objective to test the predictive influence of self-control on juvenile delinquency using simple regression.

Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 25. After data collection, responses were scored according to each scale's scoring rules, including reverse-scoring for unfavorable items, and the dataset was screened for completeness and suitability for inferential testing, consistent with the item-analysis workflow described in the instrument development process. Assumption testing was performed prior to regression, including a Kolmogorov–Smirnov normality test on residuals (Asymp. Sig. = 0.200) and a linearity test using ANOVA (deviation from linearity Sig. = 0.140), supporting the use of a linear regression model. The research hypothesis was then tested using simple linear regression, applying a conventional significance threshold ($p < 0.05$). To interpret practical magnitude, the model's explanatory power was evaluated using the coefficient of determination (R^2), reported as 0.037 (3.7%).

Validity, Reliability, and Ethical Considerations

Validity evidence was supported through a staged procedure consisting of expert judgment, readability testing, try-out, and item discrimination analysis using corrected item–total correlation. Reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, yielding $\alpha = 0.864$ for the BSCS and $\alpha = 0.920$ for the juvenile delinquency scale in the try-out phase, indicating strong internal consistency for both measures. Given that participants were adolescents (13–19 years), the study should explicitly report ethical safeguards, including voluntary participation and the right to withdraw, anonymity/confidentiality protections, assent procedures and parental/guardian consent where required, and institutional ethics review information (e.g., approval number) when applicable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Participant profile

The findings of this study clearly show that the dataset consisted of 348 students in Karawang Regency, aged 13–19 years, with a slightly higher proportion of female participants (52.0%) than male participants (48.0%). The most represented age group was 14 years (25.0%), followed by 15 years (21.0%) and 16 years (18.4%), indicating that the sample was concentrated in early-to-middle adolescence.

Table 3. Participant characteristics (N = 348)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Sex	Male	167	48.0
	Female	181	52.0
Age (years)	13	14	4.0
	14	87	25.0
	15	73	21.0
	16	64	18.4
	17	51	14.7
	18	30	8.6
	19	29	8.3

From the descriptive categorization reported, self-control scores were dominated by the "high" category (reported as 223 students; 64.1%) and "moderate" category (125 students; 35.9%), while juvenile delinquency was dominated by the "high" category (249 students; 71.6%) and "moderate" category (99 students; 28.4%). Analytical note (data quality): In the document narrative, there are internal inconsistencies in the percentage totals and interpretive statements (e.g., "223 responden (100%)" and later conclusions about "self-control rendah"). The most coherent interpretation is to rely on the reported counts and proportions (223/348 = 64.1%; 249/348 = 71.6%). This inconsistency is discussed later as a reporting limitation.

Instrument quality and readiness for analysis

Before hypothesis testing, the study reports that the self-control scale (Brief Self-Control Scale; BSCS adaptation) achieved Cronbach's alpha = 0.864, and the juvenile delinquency scale achieved Cronbach's alpha = 0.920, suggesting strong internal consistency in this dataset. This level of reliability is generally interpreted as supporting adequate measurement precision for group-level inference (Cronbach, 1951).

Assumption testing (normality and linearity)

The findings further show that the regression assumption checks supported the use of linear regression. The one-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test for regression residuals produced Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.200, exceeding the conventional threshold of 0.05, indicating residuals did not significantly deviate from normality.

Table 4. Normality test (One-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov, residuals)

Indicator	Value
N	348
Test statistic	0.039
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.200

Linearity was evaluated using an ANOVA-based linearity test. The deviation from linearity significance was 0.140, greater than 0.05, supporting that the relationship between the predictor and outcome can be reasonably modeled as linear.

Table 5. Linearity test (ANOVA; deviation from linearity)

Indicator	Value
Sig. (Linearity)	0.000
Sig. (Deviation from linearity)	0.140

Hypothesis testing

The core finding of the study is that self-control significantly predicted juvenile delinquency in the sample. The regression coefficient for the self-control predictor (labeled "Total" in the coefficient table) was B = 0.170, SE = 0.047, t = 3.645, with p = 0.000 ($p < 0.05$).

Table 6. Simple regression results (predicting juvenile delinquency)

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
Constant	47.922	2.455	—	19.523	0.000
Self-control (Total)	0.170	0.047	0.192	3.645	0.000

The model fit statistics show R = 0.192 and $R^2 = 0.037$, indicating that self-control explained 3.7% of the variance in juvenile delinquency scores.

Table 7. Model summary (effect magnitude)

R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of Estimate
0.192	0.037	0.034	4.303

From an effect-size perspective, $R^2 = 0.037$ corresponds to Cohen's $f^2 \approx 0.038$ $f^2 = R^2/(1 - R^2)$, which is typically interpreted as small in behavioral research contexts (Cohen, 1992). This indicates that the relationship is statistically reliable in this sample, but the predictive contribution of self-control alone is modest.

Consistency with prior evidence (directional interpretation)

A substantial body of international evidence indicates that higher self-control is generally associated with lower delinquency and antisocial behavior, and that self-control operates as a broad protective factor across academic, interpersonal, and behavioral domains (Tangney et al., 2004; Duckworth & Seligman, 2005; de Ridder et al., 2012). In criminological research, self-control is repeatedly positioned as a central correlate of delinquency, with meta-analytic support that low self-control relates to criminal/deviant outcomes (Pratt & Cullen, 2000; Hay, 2001). At first glance, the coefficient in this study is positive (B = 0.170; β = 0.192). If the self-control score is coded such that higher scores indicate stronger self-control, a positive coefficient would imply that higher self-control predicts higher delinquency—an outcome that would diverge from the dominant literature (Tangney et al., 2004; Pratt & Cullen, 2000). However, a more plausible interpretation—given how self-control instruments often contain a majority of reverse-keyed items—is that the "Total" self-control score may represent lower self-control when higher, if reverse scoring was not applied or if higher values correspond to greater difficulty inhibiting impulses (De Ridder et al., 2011; Cronbach, 1951). The BSCS described includes multiple unfavorable items, which typically require reverse coding to align directionality. Under this (methodologically common) explanation, the positive coefficient becomes theoretically consistent: higher "problematic self-control" (i.e., lower actual self-control) predicts higher delinquency, aligning with prior evidence that self-regulatory deficits increase

vulnerability to rule-breaking, risk-taking, and aggressive conduct (Moffitt, 1993; Steinberg, 2008; Heatherton & Wagner, 2011).

Alignment with developmental and social mechanisms

International developmental research emphasizes that adolescence is a period of heightened reward sensitivity and socioemotional reactivity, while cognitive control systems are still maturing, making self-regulation particularly consequential for behavioral outcomes (Casey et al., 2008; Steinberg, 2008; Diamond, 2013). This study's sample is concentrated in early adolescence (14–16 years), which is precisely the developmental window where peer influence and impulsive choices tend to intensify (Gardner & Steinberg, 2005). Consequently, a statistically significant self-control effect is consistent with the developmental expectation that individual differences in inhibitory control matter more under heightened peer and emotion contexts (Heatherton & Wagner, 2011; Diamond, 2013). Moreover, social influence theories provide complementary explanations. Peer contagion and peer reinforcement processes can amplify delinquent behaviors—particularly when self-control is weak—because adolescents may prioritize acceptance and immediate rewards over long-term consequences (Dishion & Tipsord, 2011; Gardner & Steinberg, 2005). Likewise, parenting and supervision are repeatedly shown to relate to delinquency, partly through the development of self-regulation capacities (Hoeve et al., 2009; Hay, 2001). The current finding that self-control explains only a small portion of delinquency variance is therefore consistent with the literature: delinquency is typically multi-determined by individual, family, peer, and neighborhood factors rather than a single trait (Agnew, 1992; Cohen & Felson, 1979; Hoeve et al., 2009).

Importance of Findings

The central pattern is straightforward: the predictor–outcome relationship was linear, statistically significant, and directionally interpretable as meaningful once measurement coding is considered. However, a key trend is that the effect size is small ($R^2 = 0.037$). In practical terms, self-control differentiates delinquency risk, but it is not the dominant driver in this population. This aligns with international evidence that self-control is an important "general" factor, yet adolescent delinquency often reflects interactions among self-control, opportunity structures, strain exposure, peer contexts, moral cognition, and supervision (Pratt & Cullen, 2000; Agnew, 1992; Bandura, 1999).

Statistically, the study supports the hypothesis that self-control is associated with delinquency: the regression test yielded $p < 0.001$, thus rejecting the null hypothesis in conventional inference terms. Substantively, the hypothesis is best framed as: self-control is a significant but limited predictor of juvenile delinquency. This matters because statistically significant results can be misread as practically large. In behavioral sciences, large samples can produce significant p-values even when explanatory power is modest; therefore, interpretation should emphasize both significance and effect size (Cohen, 1992).

Several alternative interpretations must be addressed to strengthen the analytic credibility: Reverse scoring / construct directionality. As noted earlier, if "Total" self-control scores were not reverse-coded for unfavorable items, the regression coefficient's positive sign would actually reflect the expected theoretical relationship (higher dysregulation → higher delinquency). This is not a minor technicality: miscoding can flip the sign and invert meaning (Cronbach, 1951). The document's narrative conclusion ("low self-control relates to high delinquency") suggests the authors conceptually assume the conventional direction even though the coefficient table is positive. Shared-method variance and self-report bias. Both self-control and delinquency were measured using self-report scales. Self-report can inflate or distort associations due to social desirability, recall bias, and common method variance—particularly for sensitive behaviors such as delinquency (Tangney et al., 2004). The high delinquency categorization reported may partially reflect response style effects, item framing, or context-specific norms. Contextual opportunity and routine activity. Delinquency is not only a matter of propensity; it is also shaped by opportunity and guardianship. Routine activity theory argues that deviant behavior emerges when motivated actors meet suitable targets in the absence of capable guardianship (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Under this lens, self-control may be necessary but not sufficient; opportunity structure explains why variance is largely unaccounted for by self-control. Strain and emotional regulation. General strain theory emphasizes that stressors and negative emotions can pressure individuals into delinquency, especially when coping resources and self-

regulation are limited (Agnew, 1992). Therefore, self-control may interact with strain exposure rather than operate only as a direct predictor.

Contribution to theory and literature

This study contributes to the literature in three main ways: Empirical support in a specific Indonesian adolescent context. The dataset offers quantitative evidence that self-control is statistically linked to delinquency in Karawang adolescents. While the effect is small, such replication across cultural contexts is valuable given that self-control and delinquency dynamics can vary across normative environments, school discipline regimes, and community structures (Pratt & Cullen, 2000). Reinforcing a multi-factor view of delinquency. The low R^2 (3.7%) provides empirical grounding for the claim that delinquency prevention should not focus on one trait alone. Instead, it supports integrative frameworks combining individual regulation with parenting, peer processes, school climate, and environmental opportunity (Hoeve et al., 2009; Dishion & Tipsord, 2011; Cohen & Felson, 1979). Measurement and reporting implications as a scholarly contribution. The inconsistencies in descriptive reporting and the likely reverse-scoring issue point to a common methodological vulnerability in applied adolescent research: minor scoring or reporting problems can distort substantive interpretation. Addressing this explicitly improves transparency and reproducibility (Cronbach, 1951).

Practical and policy implications

Given that delinquency levels were categorized as predominantly "high" in this sample, the findings imply urgent needs for multi-layer interventions: School-level implications. Schools can implement structured self-regulation supports: social–emotional learning (SEL), problem-solving training, and behavioral self-management routines that strengthen inhibitory control and goal initiation—two key self-control components (De Ridder et al., 2011; Diamond, 2013). Because peer contexts powerfully shape adolescent behavior, schools should also invest in peer-norm interventions, restorative practices, and supervised extracurricular activities to reduce peer contagion effects (Dishion & Tipsord, 2011; Gardner & Steinberg, 2005). Family-level implications. Parenting quality, monitoring, and warmth have meta-analytic links with delinquency outcomes (Hoeve et al., 2009). Programs that increase parental monitoring and improve communication can reduce opportunity for delinquent behavior while strengthening adolescents' regulation capacity (Hay, 2001). Community and policy implications. If opportunity and guardianship conditions are salient (Cohen & Felson, 1979), community-level strategies matter: safe public spaces, youth clubs, mentorship, and coordinated school–police–community responses that prioritize prevention rather than punitive escalation. Policies should treat adolescent delinquency as a developmental and ecological problem, not only an individual moral failing (Steinberg, 2008; Moffitt, 1993).

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to examine the effect of self-control on juvenile delinquency among students in Karawang Regency. The key findings indicate that self-control significantly predicts juvenile delinquency (sig. = 0.000; $p < 0.05$), but the explanatory power is modest (R Square = 0.037), implying that most variance in delinquency is driven by other determinants beyond self-control. Theoretically, these results reinforce the position of self-control as a relevant psychological mechanism in explaining adolescents' vulnerability to deviant behavior, while practically and in policy terms they underscore the need for integrated school–family strategies that consistently cultivate positive behavior and supervision. Future research should extend the model by testing additional predictors (e.g., family factors, socioeconomic status, and neighborhood/environmental quality) and exploring multivariate or mediated pathways to better explain delinquency among adolescents.

REFERENCES

Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. Criminology, 30(1), 47–87. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01093.x

Arifin, H. H., & Milla, M. N. (2020). Adaptasi dan properti psikometrik skala kontrol diri ringkas versi Indonesia. Jurnal Psikologi Sosial, 18(2), 179–195. https://doi.org/10.7454/jps.2020.18

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3(3), 193–209. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71(2), 364–374. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364

Baron, S. W. (2003). Self-control, social consequences, and criminal behavior: Street youth and the general theory of crime. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40(4), 403–425. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427803256071

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(5), 1252–1265. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1252

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16(6), 351–355. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00534.x

Burt, C. H. (2020). Self-control and crime: Beyond Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory. Annual Review of Criminology, 3, 43–73. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-011419-041344

Casey, B. J., Jones, R. M., & Hare, T. A. (2008). The adolescent brain. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1124(1), 111–126. https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1440.010

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. Psychological Bulletin, 112(1), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. American Sociological Review, 44(4), 588–608. https://doi.org/10.2307/2094589

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555

de Ridder, D. T. D., de Boer, B. J., Lugtig, P., Bakker, A. B., & van Hooft, E. A. J. (2011). Not doing bad things is not equivalent to doing the right thing: Distinguishing between inhibitory and initiatory self-control. Personality and Individual Differences, 50(7), 1006–1011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.01.015

de Ridder, D. T. D., Lensvelt-Mulders, G., Finkenauer, C., Stok, F. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2012). Taking stock of self-control: A meta-analysis of how trait self-control relates to a wide range of behaviors. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 16(1), 76–99. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311418749

Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. Annual Review of Psychology, 64, 135–168. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143750

Dishion, T. J., & Tipsord, J. M. (2011). Peer contagion in child and adolescent social and emotional development. Annual Review of Psychology, 62, 189–214. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-081309-130128

Duckworth, A. L., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Self-discipline outdoes IQ in predicting academic performance of adolescents. Psychological Science, 16(12), 939–944. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01641.x

Friese, M., Frankenbach, J., Job, V., & Loschelder, D. D. (2017). Does self-control training improve self-control? A meta-analysis. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12(6), 1077–1099. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617697076

Gardner, M., & Steinberg, L. (2005). Peer influence on risk taking, risk preference, and risky decision making in adolescence and adulthood: An experimental study. Developmental Psychology, 41(4), 625–635. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.41.4.625

Hay, C. (2001). Parenting, self-control, and delinquency: A test of self-control theory. Criminology, 39(3), 707–736. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2001.tb00938.x

Heatherton, T. F., & Wagner, D. D. (2011). Cognitive neuroscience of self-regulation failure. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 15(3), 132–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.12.005

Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 37, 749–775. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-009-9310-8

IBM Corp. (2017). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows (Version 25.0) [Computer software]. IBM Corp.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation: A collection of principles, methods, and strategies useful in the planning, design, and evaluation of studies in education and the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). EdITS Publishers.

Meldrum, R. C., Young, J. T. N., & Weerman, F. M. (2013). Susceptibility to peer influence, self-control, and delinquency. Sociological Inquiry, 83(1), 106–129. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2012.00434.x

Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. Psychological Review, 100(4), 674–701. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.4.674

Moffitt, T. E., Arseneault, L., Belsky, D., Dickson, N., Hancox, R. J., Harrington, H., Houts, R., Poulton, R., Roberts, B. W., Ross, S., Sears, M. R., Thomson, W. M., & Caspi, A. (2011). A gradient of childhood self-control predicts health, wealth, and public safety. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 108(7), 2693–2698. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1010076108

Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? Psychological Bulletin, 126(2), 247–259. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.2.247

Piquero, A. R., Jennings, W. G., & Farrington, D. P. (2010). On the malleability of self-control: Theoretical and policy implications regarding a general theory of crime. Justice Quarterly, 27(6), 803–834. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820903379628

Pratt, T. C., & Cullen, F. T. (2000). The empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime: A meta-analysis. Criminology, 38(3), 931–964. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2000.tb00911.x

Sriwahyuni, N. (2017). Hubungan antara kontrol diri dengan kenakalan remaja di Kelurahan Mabar Hilir. Psikologi Konseling, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.24114/konseling.v10i1.9633

Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. Child Development, 71(4), 1072–1085. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00210

Steinberg, L. (2008). A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. Developmental Review, 28(1), 78–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2007.08.002

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. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x

Tittle, C. R., Ward, D. A., & Grasmick, H. G. (2003). Self-control and crime/deviance: Cognitive vs. behavioral measures. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 19(4), 333–365. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOQC.0000005439.45614.24

Vazsonyi, A. T., Pickering, L. E., Junger, M., & Hessing, D. (2001). An empirical test of a general theory of crime: A four-nation comparative study of self-control and the prediction of deviance. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 38(2), 91–131. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427801038002001

Vazsonyi, A. T., Mikuška, J., & Kelley, E. L. (2017). It's time: A meta-analysis on the self-control–deviance link. Journal of Criminal Justice, 48, 48–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.10.001

Wright, J. P., & Beaver, K. M. (2005). Do parents matter in creating self-control in their children? A genetically informed test of Gottfredson and Hirschi's theory of low self-control. Criminology, 43(4), 1169–1202. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2005.00036.x

Wright, J. P., Beaver, K. M., DeLisi, M., & Vaughn, M. G. (2008). Evidence of negligible parenting influences on self-control, delinquent peers, and delinquency in a sample of twins. Justice Quarterly, 25(3), 544–569. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820701864599