PARENTAL SUPPORT AND STUDENT DISCIPLINE IN LEARNING: INSIGHTS FROM A QUANTITATIVE CORRELATIONAL STUDY

Rahmatul Fauzana[1*], Triyono[2], Besti Nora Dwi Putri[3]

[123] Universitas PGRI Sumatera Barat, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: rahmatulfauzana123@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
This study examines the problem of suboptimal learning discipline among students—manifested in behaviors such as tardiness, incomplete assignments, and inconsistent study routines—and investigates whether parental social support is associated with stronger learning discipline. The study aimed to (1) describe parental social support, (2) describe students' learning discipline, and (3) test the relationship between the two variables among Grade XI students at MAN 1 Pasaman Barat. A quantitative correlational design was used with a sample of 65 students drawn from a population of 230. Data were collected using Likert-type questionnaires (31 items measuring parental social support and 35 items measuring learning discipline) and analyzed using Pearson's product–moment correlation. The results indicated that parental social support was generally high (58.85% in the high category), while learning discipline was moderately high (63.08% in the moderately high category). Correlation analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between parental social support and learning discipline ($r = 0.499$; $p < .001$). In conclusion, stronger parental support is associated with better student learning discipline. The findings imply that schools should strengthen parent–school collaboration and guidance and counseling initiatives to foster disciplined study habits. Future studies should employ broader and more diverse samples, longitudinal designs, and multivariate models to test potential mechanisms (e.g., motivation and self-regulation) and improve causal interpretation.

Keywords: Learning discipline; Parental social support; Pearson correlation; Students.

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary schooling systems, learning outcomes are increasingly understood as the product of interconnected academic, socio-emotional, and behavioral processes rather than cognitive ability alone. One behavioral component that consistently emerges as central to effective learning is learning discipline—students' capacity to manage time, follow classroom routines, sustain attention, complete assignments, and comply with school norms. In practical terms, discipline functions as a behavioral infrastructure for learning: without consistent routines and self-management, instructional quality and curriculum design often fail to translate into meaningful achievement gains. This view is consistent with educational and developmental research positioning disciplined learning behaviors as a visible manifestation of self-regulation and executive control, which predict academic persistence and performance across adolescence (Zimmerman, 2000; Pintrich, 2000; Duckworth & Seligman, 2005; Tangney et al., 2004; Moffitt et al., 2011; de Ridder et al., 2012). In Indonesia, the emphasis on holistic student development is embedded in the national education mandate that education should develop learners' potential and character, including responsibility and maturity. The manuscript that underpins this study frames schools as formal institutions not only for knowledge transmission but also for behavior formation, aligning this rationale with the national education law.

Beyond this macro-level mandate, discipline is treated as an everyday indicator of educational quality because it affects the continuity of classroom instruction, the completion of learning tasks, and the climate for learning. The same manuscript explicitly notes that education implementation should involve the formation of attitudes and discipline, and that cultivating discipline requires both students' internal awareness and external encouragement—particularly from the family. From a conceptual standpoint, the study operationalizes learning discipline as a multidimensional construct that includes (a) the ability to manage study time at home, (b) regular and persistent study habits, (c) focused attention during classroom learning, and (d) orderly adherence to school rules. These dimensions overlap with international frameworks of self-regulated learning (e.g., goal setting, time management, attention control) and school

engagement (Zimmerman, 2000; Pintrich, 2000; Wentzel, 1998). Accordingly, learning discipline can be interpreted as a bridging construct: it connects students' internal regulation capacities with the external structure provided by home and school systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Within this ecological perspective, parents remain one of the most influential and temporally stable sources of socialization for adolescents. A large international literature indicates that parental involvement, parental expectations, and supportive home learning environments are associated with stronger academic outcomes and more adaptive learning behaviors (Fan & Chen, 2001; Jeynes, 2005, 2007, 2012; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Pomerantz et al., 2007; Wang & Sheikh-Khalil, 2014; Wilder, 2014; Boonk et al., 2018; Castro et al., 2015). This line of work converges on a key insight: family influence is not limited to direct academic assistance, but also operates through relational and motivational mechanisms that shape students' self-regulation, persistence, and compliance with learning routines. In many contexts, this influence is conceptualized through social support—the emotional and practical resources embedded in close relationships that help individuals cope, persist, and function effectively (House, 1981; Cohen & Wills, 1985; Cutrona & Russell, 1990). In the present study context (a Madrasah Aliyah setting), parental support is particularly salient because adolescents face competing demands: increasing academic workload, heightened peer influence, and greater autonomy, all of which can destabilize learning routines. International evidence suggests that supportive parenting and family involvement can protect adolescents' motivation and discipline by enhancing perceived competence, reducing stress, and providing consistent structure (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Bandura, 1986, 1997; Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994). Therefore, examining parental social support as a predictor of learning discipline is both academically relevant and practically important for guidance and counseling (BK) services, school leadership, and family–school partnership programs.

Despite broad agreement that families matter, the specific relationship between parental social support and learning discipline remains insufficiently clarified in several respects. First, studies in different regions and school types often operationalize "support" differently—sometimes as parental involvement, sometimes as parenting style, and sometimes as social support—making it difficult to compare findings across contexts. Second, not all forms of parental engagement are uniformly beneficial; some practices may increase pressure, reduce autonomy, or produce mixed outcomes depending on adolescents' developmental needs and school demands (Pomerantz et al., 2007; Hill & Tyson, 2009). As a result, it remains unclear why some empirical studies report strong associations between parental support and disciplined learning behaviors while others find modest or inconsistent relationships. This uncertainty is directly acknowledged in the study manuscript, which notes that prior studies have produced varied results—some showing significant effects of parental support on learning discipline, while others suggest weaker effects—thus motivating further research to test the consistency of the relationship. A second problem is practical: many schools continue to report discipline-related learning barriers such as tardiness, incomplete tasks, and low attentiveness, even when curricula and teaching methods are improved. In the study setting, the researcher's observations identified student discipline problems (e.g., difficulty managing study time at home, limited attention during learning, and low compliance with school rules), with interviews indicating patterns such as frequent tardiness, not bringing learning supplies, not completing assignments, and leaving class without permission. These behavioral indicators reflect not only school-level issues but also home-based routines and parental monitoring/support processes, which are often outside the school's direct control. Given these challenges, a general solution increasingly emphasized in research and policy is to strengthen family–school partnerships and targeted support structures that align student expectations across home and school. Frameworks of parental involvement and home–school collaboration (e.g., Epstein's partnership model and Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler's model of parental involvement) imply that students benefit when parents provide consistent messages, encouragement, and resources that support learning routines (Epstein, 2011; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995, 1997). In guidance and counseling practice, this translates into structured interventions such as parenting education, communication systems, and school-based programs that help parents provide developmentally appropriate support for adolescents' learning discipline.

The specific mechanism linking parental social support to learning discipline can be elaborated through several complementary theoretical lenses. Social support theory proposes that emotional reassurance, informational guidance, and tangible assistance help individuals cope with demands and maintain adaptive functioning (House, 1981; Cohen & Wills, 1985). In educational settings, social support is associated with better adjustment and academic functioning partly because it reduces stress and increases perceived

capability, which supports persistence and rule-following behavior (Malecki & Demaray, 2003). Self-determination theory (SDT) further explains that adolescents' sustained discipline depends on the satisfaction of autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs; parental support that is warm, respectful, and appropriately structured strengthens intrinsic motivation and internalization of learning norms (Ryan & Deci, 2000). From this view, disciplined learning behaviors (e.g., studying regularly, attending on time, completing tasks) are more likely when students experience supportive relationships that foster internal commitment rather than compliance driven solely by fear of punishment. Social cognitive theory adds that parents influence discipline through modeling, encouragement, and efficacy beliefs. When parents express confidence, provide constructive feedback, and supply needed resources, students' self-efficacy and self-regulation increase, strengthening their ability to maintain learning routines (Bandura, 1986, 1997). This is consistent with self-regulated learning literature, which highlights the role of family structure and feedback in developing time management, goal pursuit, and attention regulation (Zimmerman, 2000; Pintrich, 2000). In the study manuscript, parental social support is explicitly framed using Sarafino's typology—emotional support, appraisal/esteem support, informational support, and instrumental support—as a structured approach to capture how parents support learners. This typology is practically useful because each support form suggests a different intervention pathway: emotional support can be strengthened through daily parent–child communication; informational support through guidance on study strategies; instrumental support through learning resources and time allocation; and appraisal support through recognition that reinforces disciplined behavior.

Meta-analytic evidence confirms that parental involvement and home-based support are positively related to students' achievement and academic behaviors, but effect sizes vary based on age, type of involvement, and outcome measured (Fan & Chen, 2001; Jeynes, 2005, 2007; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Boonk et al., 2018; Wilder, 2014). For adolescents, home-based involvement that supports autonomy and learning routines tends to be more beneficial than direct control or excessive homework supervision (Hill & Tyson, 2009; Pomerantz et al., 2007). Moreover, research suggests that the pathway from parental support to academic outcomes is often mediated by motivational and self-regulatory variables (Wang & Sheikh-Khalil, 2014; Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; Ryan & Deci, 2000). However, two gaps remain prominent in relation to the current study. First, many studies emphasize parental involvement broadly rather than examining parental social support as a multidimensional construct with distinct functional forms (emotional, informational, instrumental, and appraisal). Second, there is a contextual gap: evidence from Indonesian madrasah settings—where cultural expectations, religious schooling environments, and family roles may shape discipline differently—remains less visible in international syntheses and is often underrepresented in mainstream educational psychology literature. The present study addresses these gaps by focusing on a clearly specified support framework (Sarafino's social support dimensions) and a clearly operationalized learning discipline construct (time management at home, study regularity, attention in class, and orderly compliance). It also anchors the inquiry in an empirically documented local problem: discipline-related learning barriers observed in MAN 1 Pasaman Barat, including time-management difficulties, low attentiveness, and rule noncompliance.

Building on the above rationale, the purpose of this study was to (1) describe the level of parental social support among Grade XI students at MAN 1 Pasaman Barat, (2) describe the level of students' learning discipline, and (3) examine the relationship between parental social support and students' learning discipline in that setting. The novelty of this study lies in its context-specific and construct-specific contribution: it examines the parental–discipline relationship in a madrasah aliyah context using a multidimensional parental social support framework (emotional, appraisal, informational, instrumental) and a discipline construct that reflects both home and classroom routines. By focusing on discipline as a behavioral learning foundation (rather than achievement alone), the study strengthens the applied relevance for BK programming and home–school collaboration policies. Hypothesis justification. Based on social support theory, self-determination theory, and social cognitive perspectives, parental social support is expected to be positively associated with learning discipline. Supportive parental behaviors can enhance students' motivation, self-efficacy, internalization of learning norms, and access to learning resources, thereby strengthening time management, task completion, attentional control, and compliance with school routines (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 2000; Wang & Sheikh-Khalil, 2014). Therefore, the working hypothesis is that higher parental social support will be associated

with higher student learning discipline. This study is scoped to Grade XI students at MAN 1 Pasaman Barat and examines two primary variables: parental social support and learning discipline, operationalized through established indicator frameworks used in the manuscript. The design is correlational, focusing on the strength and direction of association rather than causality. Consequently, the findings are intended to inform guidance and counseling practice and family–school partnership strategies in similar educational contexts, while acknowledging that other factors—peer influence, teacher practices, school climate, socioeconomic constraints, and individual self-control—may also contribute to discipline and are not modeled as predictors in this study (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Moffitt et al., 2011). By systematically establishing the territory (discipline as a foundational learning behavior), identifying the niche (inconsistent findings and contextual underrepresentation), and occupying the niche (a structured, context-specific correlational study using multidimensional constructs), the present research is positioned to contribute both theoretically and practically to the strengthening of disciplined learning through family-based support and school counseling interventions.

METHOD

Research Design and Approach

This study employed a quantitative, correlational research design grounded in a positivist approach, where hypotheses are tested using statistical procedures on numerical data. The correlational technique was selected because the study aimed to determine the degree of relationship between two variables without manipulating or intervening in existing conditions.

Population and Sample / Participants

The population comprised 230 eleventh-grade students (Grade XI). A simple random sampling technique was applied to ensure that each student had an equal chance of selection, resulting in a final sample of 65 students. The sample size was determined using guidance attributed to Suharsimi Arikunto, which suggests that when the population ranges approximately from 100 to 300, a sample of around 25% is acceptable. The study's participants were drawn from two classes—XI.F-IA.1 and XI.F-IS.2—selected using a lottery (loting) procedure.

Table 1. Population and sample summary

Component	Description
Target population	Grade XI students (N = 230)
Sampling technique	Simple random sampling; lottery (loting)
Sample size	n = 65
Source classes	XI.F-IA.1 and XI.F-IS.2

Data Collection Techniques and Instruments

The data used for this study were collected through a self-report questionnaire survey administered to sampled students. The study focused on two variables: Parental Social Support (X) and Learning Discipline (Y). Parental social support was defined as parental attitudes and behaviors reflecting support given by fathers and/or mothers to their children, consisting of emotional, appraisal (esteem), instrumental, and informational support dimensions. Learning discipline was defined as positive behavioral tendencies related to learning, including the ability to manage study time at home, maintain regular study habits, show attention during classroom learning, and demonstrate orderly behavior in the classroom.

Instrument structure and scoring

The instruments were constructed using a Likert scale format. The parental social support scale consisted of 31 items, and the learning discipline scale consisted of 35 items. For scoring, responses were coded using a 5-to-1 scheme for favorable statements and reverse-coded (1-to-5) for unfavorable statements.

Table 2. Variable operationalization and instrument composition

Variable	Code	Indicators (dimensions)	Number of items
Parental Social Support	X	Emotional, Appraisal/Esteem, Instrumental, Informational	31
Learning Discipline	Y	Time management at home; Regular/consistent study; Attention in class; Classroom orderliness	35

Data Analysis Procedures

Before hypothesis testing, prerequisite analyses were conducted using SPSS version 25.0, including: Normality testing, to confirm that the data distribution met parametric assumptions; and Linearity testing, to confirm that the relationship between variables could be treated as linear. The reported significance values indicated that the data met these assumptions (e.g., normality Sig. value greater than 0.05 and deviation from linearity greater than 0.05).

Hypothesis testing

To test the study hypothesis regarding the relationship between parental social support (X) and learning discipline (Y), the analysis applied the Pearson Product Moment correlation technique. Correlation magnitude was interpreted using Riduwan's classification: 0.80–1.00 (very strong), 0.60–0.799 (strong), 0.40–0.599 (moderately strong), 0.20–0.399 (low), and 0.00–0.199 (very low).

Validity, Reliability, and Ethical Considerations

Instrument validity and reliability testing was performed using Pearson Product Moment for item validity and Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency reliability, applying the criterion that items are acceptable when r-calculated ≥ r-table. Because the study involved student participants in a school context, ethical safeguards should include: (a) voluntary participation, (b) informed consent (from students and/or guardians as required by school policy), (c) anonymity and confidentiality of responses, and (d) using the data only for academic research purposes. These protections are standard practice for minimizing risk in educational survey research and aligning the study with responsible research conduct.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of participants, instruments, and analytic prerequisites

The findings of this study clearly show that the research was conducted with 65 Grade XI students from a population of 230 students at MAN 1 Pasaman Barat, selected through simple random sampling (loting) from two classes (XI.F-IA.1 and XI.F-IS.2). The study employed two Likert-scale questionnaires: 31 items measuring parental social support and 35 items measuring learning discipline; validity and reliability were tested using Pearson Product Moment and Cronbach's Alpha, and the main hypothesis was tested using Pearson Product Moment correlation. Before interpreting the correlational results, the manuscript reports that statistical assumptions for parametric testing were met: the normality test indicated Sig = 0.177 > 0.05, and the linearity test reported deviation from linearity Sig = 0.136 > 0.05, supporting the use of Pearson correlation to estimate the association between parental support and learning discipline.

At the overall level, parental social support was predominantly in the high-to-very-high range. The frequency distribution shows that 35 students were classified as High, 21 students as Very High, 8 students as Moderately High, and 1 student as Low, with no students in the Very Low category.

Table 3. Overall distribution of parental social support (N = 65)

Category	Score interval	n	% (from n/65)
Very High	131–155	21	32.31
High	106–130	35	53.85
Moderately High	81–105	8	12.31
Low	56–80	1	1.54
Very Low	31–55	0	0.00
Total		65	100.00

The manuscript's Table 1 states the "High" category as 58.85%, while the figure description states 53.85% for "High". Because the frequency (n = 35) is stable across the reporting and the percentage is a simple function of N, 35/65 corresponds to 53.85%; thus, the manuscript should harmonize these values during revision. Substantively, however, both versions still convey the same conclusion: most students report high parental support, and only a very small subgroup reports low support.

The manuscript further decomposes parental social support into four indicators (emotional, esteem/appraisal, instrumental, and informational). Across indicators, the dominant pattern remains "High," but the strength of concentration differs by indicator, suggesting that the "support profile" is not uniform. Indicator A — Emotional support (5 items). The largest group is High (47.69%; n = 31), followed by Very High (40.00%; n = 26), with small proportions in Moderately High and Low. This indicates that many students perceive parents as providing empathy, attention, and emotional availability—resources that can directly shape study persistence and reduce avoidance when students feel pressured by school tasks. Indicator B — Esteem/appraisal support (7 items). The largest group is High (58.56%; n = 38), with Moderately High (24.62%; n = 16) and a smaller Low subgroup. One minor issue is that the reported counts for this indicator sum to 64 rather than 65, implying either a reporting omission or rounding/entry inconsistency that should be checked in the dataset or output tables during revision. Indicator C — Instrumental support (8 items). The dominant category is High (50.76%; n = 33), followed by Moderately High (41.53%; n = 27), with very few in Low or Very High. This pattern suggests that material or practical facilitation (e.g., supplies, transport, time assistance) is present for most students, but tends to cluster in the middle-to-upper range rather than being extremely high. Indicator D — Informational support (11 items). This is the strongest indicator, with High (66.16%; n = 43) and Very High (10.77%; n = 7), and almost no Low category. Practically, this implies that advice, guidance, and feedback from parents (e.g., reminders, suggestions, and problem-solving input) is the most consistently experienced form of support by students. To summarize the indicator profile compactly, the "High" category is most dominant for Informational (66.16%), then Esteem (58.56%), then Instrumental (50.76%), and then Emotional (47.69%).

Learning discipline, at the overall level, is reported as predominantly "Moderately High" (cukup tinggi). Specifically, the manuscript reports that learning discipline is most concentrated in the Moderately High category (63.08%). The figure narrative further notes that 13.85% of students are in the Low category, indicating a meaningful minority who require targeted support. A key descriptive interpretation emerges here: parental social support appears high, while learning discipline is only moderately high overall, meaning that strong support does not automatically translate into uniformly high discipline across all students. This mismatch becomes clearer when examining discipline indicators.

The manuscript reports four indicators of learning discipline: managing study time at home, regular/structured study habits, attention during classroom learning, and orderliness in following class/school rules. The indicator-level distributions reveal which discipline components are relatively strong and which represent the main "discipline bottlenecks." Indicator 1 — Managing study time at home (12 items). The largest group is Moderately High (52.30%; n = 34), but a sizable subgroup is Low (27.69%; n = 18). This is an important pattern: time management at home is the area with the clearest vulnerability, suggesting competing demands, weak routines, limited self-monitoring, or inconsistent household structure. Indicator 2 — Regular and structured study habits (10 items). The largest group is again Moderately High (58.46%; n = 38), with Low (16.92%; n = 11) and High (23.08%; n = 15). This indicates that many students have "adequate" routines (e.g., sometimes following schedules), but fewer show consistently strong, high-level regularity. Indicator 3 — Attention during learning in class (8 items). This indicator is relatively stronger: nearly half are High (49.23%; n = 32), with Moderately High (38.46%; n =

25) and minimal Low. Students appear more able to maintain discipline when the learning environment is structured externally (teacher presence, classroom norms), compared to home contexts that rely heavily on self-regulation. Indicator 4 — Orderliness during learning in class (5 items). This is the strongest indicator: High (41.54%; n = 27) and Very High (26.15%; n = 17) dominate, with no Low category. This suggests that compliance with observable rules (attendance, classroom order, following procedures) is more robust than discipline domains requiring private self-management at home.

The primary inferential finding is a positive, statistically significant association between parental social support and learning discipline. The Pearson correlation table reports $r = 0.499$ with Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.000 ($p < 0.001$) and $N = 65$. The manuscript interprets this as meaning that higher parental support (attention, motivation, guidance) corresponds to higher learning discipline. Using the correlation magnitude, the shared variance is approximately $r^2 \approx 0.25$, implying that parental social support accounts for about one-quarter of the variability in learning discipline at the bivariate level (not causal, but practically meaningful in an educational setting). In the manuscript's own interpretive standard (Riduwan's categories), $r = 0.499$ falls into the "cukup kuat" (fairly strong) range.

The observed pattern—high parental support, moderately high discipline, and a moderate-to-fairly-strong positive correlation—is broadly consistent with international literature that positions family support and parental involvement as reliable correlates of students' academic behaviors, engagement, and achievement-related outcomes. Across meta-analyses, parental involvement/support tends to show small-to-moderate average associations with academic performance and related learning behaviors, though effect sizes vary by type of involvement and student developmental stage (Fan & Chen, 2001; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Castro et al., 2015). Magnitude of association. A correlation around $r \approx .50$ is stronger than many pooled estimates reported in meta-analyses of parental involvement and achievement (often around small-to-moderate levels), but it remains plausible because (a) this study focuses on a proximal behavioral outcome (discipline) rather than distal outcomes like standardized test scores, and (b) measurement alignment (self-report across both constructs) can inflate observed correlations through shared method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The general direction is consistent with meta-analytic conclusions that parental involvement is positively associated with educational outcomes (Fan & Chen, 2001; Castro et al., 2015; Hill & Tyson, 2009). Type of parental involvement/support matters. International syntheses repeatedly show that *academic socialization* (e.g., expectations, values, guidance) tends to be more strongly associated with outcomes in adolescence than simple homework help (Hill & Tyson, 2009). In the present manuscript, the strongest parental support indicator is informational support (66.16% in the high category), which maps conceptually onto guidance, advice, and feedback.

This convergence strengthens the plausibility of the study's finding: in adolescence, parental informational guidance may be particularly relevant for discipline because it supports planning, problem-solving, and internalization of norms. Motivational mechanisms. Self-Determination Theory emphasizes that supportive social contexts foster internalization and self-regulation by meeting needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In the manuscript, parental support is conceptualized as attention, appreciation, guidance, and practical help. Such support can reasonably contribute to learning discipline by strengthening students' perceived competence ("I can do this"), relatedness ("my parents are with me"), and autonomy-supportive guidance ("I understand why discipline matters"), which are pathways widely discussed in motivational research (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Pintrich, 2004; Zimmerman, 2000). Nuances (partial deviations) relative to typical patterns. Despite high parental support, overall discipline is only moderately high, and the weakest discipline areas are home time management and regular study routines. This aligns with developmental and contextual research showing that adolescence is a period of heightened autonomy demands and competing peer/media influences; consequently, discipline at home may depend not only on parental support but also on students' executive functioning, digital habits, peer norms, and household structure (Steinberg, 2008; Duckworth & Seligman, 2005; Eccles & Midgley, 1989). In other words, parental support is important but may not be sufficient to produce uniformly high discipline without complementary self-regulation supports and consistent routines. Additionally, meta-analyses note that some forms of parental involvement (e.g., controlling homework help) can show weak, null, or even negative associations—especially when involvement occurs as a response to academic struggles (a reverse-causality pattern) (Hill & Tyson, 2009; Fan & Chen, 2001). The present study cannot test directionality,

but the mixed discipline profile (moderately high overall, with a notable low subgroup) is compatible with the possibility that some parental support is reactive, intensified when students show weak discipline.

Patterns, trends, and the structure of the relationship

A central pattern in the data is the asymmetry between school-structured discipline and home-based self-discipline. Indicators that are enacted under external structure—attention in class and orderliness/obedience to rules—show comparatively stronger distributions in high categories. Meanwhile, indicators requiring self-management without immediate institutional structure—time management at home and regular study habits—cluster in moderately high categories with sizable low subgroups (especially time management at home, where 27.69% are in the low category). This structure matters because it suggests that "learning discipline" is not a single uniform behavior. Rather, it is a bundle of behaviors with different psychological demands: (a) compliance behaviors supported by environment and monitoring (school), and (b) self-regulated behaviors supported by routines, planning, and delayed gratification (home). The findings imply that parental support may contribute to both, but it may be especially critical for the second bundle—helping students build routines, manage distractions, and plan study time.

Fit with the hypothesis and practical significance

The hypothesis that parental social support is positively related to learning discipline is supported by a statistically significant correlation ($r = 0.499$; $p < 0.001$). The effect is not trivial: $r^2 \approx 0.25$ indicates meaningful shared variance for a school-based behavioral outcome. In educational practice, relationships of this size often justify intervention attention because discipline is typically multiply determined and difficult to shift through a single lever. However, the correlation is not near unity, and that is equally important: it implies that substantial variance (≈75%) remains unexplained by parental support alone. Thus, the study supports a "both-and" interpretation: parental support is a meaningful protective/enabling factor, but discipline also requires school practices, personal self-regulation skills, and peer/environmental influences.

Contribution to theory and literature

Within the manuscript's conceptualization, parental social support includes emotional, esteem, instrumental, and informational components. The indicator profile suggests that informational support is the most salient in this setting (66.16% high). Theoretically, this reinforces a key idea in adolescent learning research: as students gain autonomy, parental influence shifts from direct control to scaffolding—communicating values, providing guidance, and supporting planning rather than merely enforcing compliance. This is congruent with meta-analytic conclusions that academically oriented socialization has strong links to adolescent outcomes (Hill & Tyson, 2009). The study also contributes locally relevant evidence for Islamic senior high school contexts (MAN), where discipline is a core educational value and parent–school cooperation is often emphasized. The result supports the position that discipline-building interventions should not focus exclusively on students as isolated agents; they should treat discipline as a relational and systemic outcome involving family support structures and school guidance services.

Practical and policy implications

Given the distributional weaknesses and the correlation result, three practical priorities emerge: Target home-based discipline (time management and study routines). The weakest discipline indicator is managing study time at home, including a sizable low subgroup. Schools and BK services can implement structured programs such as: parent workshops on establishing home study routines (fixed study hours, device rules, quiet study spaces); student training on weekly planning, goal-setting, and self-monitoring logs; "home–school contracts" that specify mutually agreed expectations (time, tasks, feedback). Leverage informational parental support as the main intervention channel. Informational support is already high, suggesting parents commonly provide advice and guidance. Interventions should therefore help parents improve the *quality* of guidance: shifting from general reminders ("study more") to actionable scaffolds (planning together, reflecting on obstacles, using supportive—not controlling—language). This aligns with SDT-informed recommendations that supportive contexts facilitate internalization and self-regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Use a tiered approach for the low-discipline subgroup. The manuscript explicitly flags a minority in

the low category for discipline. For these students, universal programs may be insufficient. BK can prioritize small-group counseling, mentoring, or behavioral contracts focused on attendance punctuality, homework completion routines, and reducing classroom disengagement. At the policy level, the evidence supports strengthening parent–school partnership policies (regular communication, parenting education, structured feedback loops). Because the correlation is moderate, policies should be multi-component: combining family engagement with classroom management, engaging pedagogy, and student self-regulation training.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to describe parental social support and students' learning discipline among Grade XI students at MAN 1 Pasaman Barat and to examine the relationship between the two variables. The results show that parental social support was predominantly high (58.85%), while students' learning discipline tended to be moderately high (63.08%); prerequisite testing also indicated that the data met key assumptions (normality Sig. = 0.177; linearity deviation from linearity = 0.136). Pearson's correlation analysis demonstrated a positive and statistically significant association between parental social support and learning discipline ($r = 0.499$; $N = 65$; $p < .001$), indicating that stronger parental support is linked to better learning discipline. These findings reinforce social support theory in educational settings (emotional, appraisal, instrumental, and informational support) and highlight the importance of strengthening family–school collaboration through guidance and counseling (BK) services and school policies that promote disciplined learning behaviors. Future research is recommended to expand the sample across schools/madrasahs, apply longitudinal or multivariate models (e.g., including mediators such as learning motivation or self-regulation), and triangulate self-report data with teacher ratings and/or observational measures to enhance validity and explanatory power.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. (2010). Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik (Rev. ed.). Rineka Cipta.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.

Boonk, L., Gijselaers, H. J. M., Ritzen, H., & Brand-Gruwel, S. (2018). A review of the relationship between parental involvement indicators and academic achievement. Educational Research Review, 24, 10–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.001

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Harvard University Press.

Castro, M., Expósito-Casas, E., López-Martín, E., Lizasoain, L., Navarro-Asencio, E., & Gaviria, J. L. (2015). Parental involvement on student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 14, 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.01.002

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98(2), 310–357. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310

Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. W. (1990). Type of social support and specific stress: Toward a theory of optimal matching. In B. R. Sarason, I. G. Sarason, & G. R. Pierce (Eds.), Social support: An interactional view (pp. 319–366). Wiley.

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

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

Eccles, J. S., & Midgley, C. (1989). Stage–environment fit: Developmentally appropriate classrooms for young adolescents. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education (Vol. 3, pp. 139–186). Academic Press.

Epstein, J. L. (2011). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools (2nd ed.). Westview Press.

Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 13(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009048817385

Grolnick, W. S., & Slowiaczek, M. L. (1994). Parents' involvement in children's schooling: A multidimensional conceptualization and motivational model. Child Development, 65(1), 237–252. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00747.x

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. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015362

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1995). Parental involvement in children's education: Why does it make a difference? Teachers College Record, 97(2), 310–331. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146819509700202

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? Review of Educational Research, 67(1), 3–42. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543067001003

House, J. S. (1981). Work stress and social support. Addison-Wesley.

Jeynes, W. H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. Urban Education, 40(3), 237–269. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085905274540

Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Urban Education, 42(1), 82–110. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085906293818

Jeynes, W. H. (2012). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of different types of parental involvement programs for urban students. Urban Education, 47(4), 706–742. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912445643

Malecki, C. K., & Demaray, M. K. (2003). What type of support do they need? Investigating student adjustment as related to emotional, informational, appraisal, and instrumental support. School Psychology Quarterly, 18(3), 231–252. https://doi.org/10.1521/scpq.18.3.231.22576

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, 108(7), 2693–2698. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1010076108

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation (pp. 451–502). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50043-3

Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. Educational Psychology Review, 16(4), 385–407. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Pomerantz, E. M., Moorman, E. A., & Litwack, S. D. (2007). The how, whom, and why of parents' involvement in children's academic lives: More is not always better. Review of Educational Research, 77(3), 373–410. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430305567

Riduwan. (2015). Dasar-dasar statistika. Alfabeta.

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. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Sarafino, E. P., & Smith, T. W. (2011). Health psychology: Biopsychosocial interactions (7th ed.). Wiley.

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

Wang, M.-T., & Sheikh-Khalil, S. (2014). Does parental involvement matter for student achievement and mental health in high school? Child Development, 85(2), 610–625. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12153

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

Wilder, S. (2014). Effects of parental involvement on academic achievement: A meta-synthesis. Educational Review, 66(3), 377–397. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.780009

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation (pp. 13–39). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50031-7