

# The Role of Peer Pressure and Parenting Style with Adolescent Delinquency in Junior High School Students: a Dimensional Analysis

Zuhrika

Departemen of Guidance and Counseling  
Universitas Negeri Padang  
zuhrikaika@gmail.com

Daharnis

Departemen of Guidance and Counseling  
Universitas Negeri Padang Indonesia  
daharnis@fip.unp.ac.id

## Abstract

This study was motivated by the phenomenon of juvenile delinquency observed among junior high school in Padang, where students engaged in behaviors that violated social norms and school regulations, including skipping school, fighting with peers, damaging school property, participating in brawls, and bullying. A quantitative correlational approach was employed. The sample consisted 190 students from two junior high school students in Padang using purposive sampling technique. Data was collected through a Likert-scale questionnaire assessing peer pressure, parental care, and juvenile delinquency. Analysis was conducted using multiple regression with Jamovi. The findings reveal that there is a significant positive relationship between parental care and juvenile delinquency, accounting for 25.8% of the variance; and a significant relationship between peer pressure and parental care with juvenile delinquency, accounting for 25.2% of the variance. With peer pressure identified as a factor in delinquent behavior, schools could introduce regular counseling sessions that address peer dynamics, self-esteem, and resistance to negative peer influence. Peer mentoring programs could also encourage positive peer interactions and role modeling.

**Keywords:** Peer pressure, parental care, juvenile delinquency.

Received 9 August 2024/Accepted 1 December 2024 ©Author all rights reserved

## Introduction

Adolescence is a crucial developmental stage in which young individuals begin to explore their identity and are highly influenced by both familial and social factors. According to Indonesia's Law No. 20 of 2003 on the National Education System, education encompasses formal, non-formal, and informal pathways designed to holistically support adolescent growth across academic, social, and emotional dimensions (Wardhani & Pujiono, 2022). However, the challenges adolescents face

during this period often extends beyond the structured education system, with significant influences coming from peer relationships and family dynamics. Research indicates that adolescents who lack adequate parental supervision and support may struggle to navigate these influences, potentially leading to delinquent behaviors (Nurmala, 2020; Karpika & Segel, 2021). Juvenile delinquency involves actions that violate social norms and may impede a teenager's development and harm others (Sumiati et al., 2009).

Multiple studies highlight the high prevalence of juvenile delinquency among junior high school students in Indonesia. For instance, Rahmadani and Okrifma (2022) found that 64.4% of surveyed students exhibited delinquent behaviors. Similarly, Suri (2022) and Nafisa & Savira (2021) reported high delinquency rates of 93.6% and 68.1%, respectively. These findings indicate that juvenile delinquency remains a persistent issue that requires targeted interventions. Research at SMPN 27 Padang provides additional insights, showing common delinquent behaviors in schools, including physical aggression, bullying, and various forms of rule-breaking such as skipping school, vandalism, and smoking. These behaviors underscore the need for a combined approach involving schools, families, and communities to effectively address and mitigate the factors contributing to adolescent delinquency (Warr, 1993).

The role of peer pressure is particularly significant in adolescence, as young individuals seek validation from their peers. Studies indicate that adolescents who spend unsupervised time with delinquent peers exhibit higher rates of aggression, substance use, and other problem behaviors compared to those under parental supervision (Flannery et al., 1999). Peer influence often leads adolescents to conform to group norms, which can include deviant behaviors. For example, Sim and Koh (2003) explored adolescent susceptibility to peer influence and found that those highly susceptible were more likely to engage in misconduct, often due to weak family involvement and low parental monitoring.

Parental involvement, however, can mitigate these risks. Effective parental monitoring and open communication reduce the likelihood of adolescents associating with delinquent peers (Habibi et al., 2023). Research shows that adolescents from households with proactive parental monitoring are

less likely to engage in risky behaviors, even if they experience peer pressure (Tilton-Weaver et al., 2013). Conversely, inadequate parental involvement or poor parent-child relationships often exacerbate delinquent behaviors, especially in male adolescents during early adolescence (Defoe et al., 2018).

The interaction between peer pressure and family dynamics is complex but significant in determining adolescent behavior outcomes. Adolescents who experience rejection from peers or lack emotional support from parents may develop negative self-perceptions, which are linked to delinquency and other psychological issues (Manzoni et al., 2011). Moreover, the presence of delinquent peer affiliations has been found to mediate the effects of aggressive behaviors and parental knowledge; thus, adolescents with limited parental involvement are at increased risk of adopting delinquent behaviors (Lin et al., 2018).

To address juvenile delinquency effectively, a holistic approach that incorporates both familial and peer-based interventions is necessary. Schools should collaborate with parents and community services to foster a supportive environment, enabling adolescents to develop resilience against negative peer influences (Dishion & Tipsord, 2011; Ray et al., 2017). Interventions such as parent training programs and peer mentoring initiatives could provide adolescents with positive role models and improve family relationships, thereby reducing susceptibility to delinquency (Pettit et al., 1999).

The prevalence of juvenile delinquency in junior high schools underscores the critical need for integrated approaches to mitigate peer pressure and strengthen parental care (Suri, 2022; Nafisa & Savira, 2021). Research consistently highlights the protective role of family involvement and effective parental monitoring in reducing delinquent behavior, suggesting that a comprehensive support system involving family, school, and community is essential for fostering positive adolescent development.

#### *Peer Pressure and Juvenile Delinquency*

Peer pressure refers to the influence exerted by friends, peers, or social groups, encouraging

individuals to adjust their thinking and behavior to align with the group's expectations. This alignment aims to ensure the individual is accepted within the group (Santrock, 2019). Peer pressure acts as a form of social influence that pushes individuals to conform to specific norms or behaviors to gain acceptance (Khadafi, 2014). Additionally, peer pressure can create a sense of obligation to engage in undesired behaviors due to the influence or expectations from peers. This type of negative peer pressure challenges students to build the courage to resist in order to avoid harmful behaviors (Nathaline & Silaen, 2020). Delinquent behaviors resulting from peer pressure can range from breaking school rules to engaging in risky activities, such as using alcohol, tobacco, or narcotics. Understanding the dynamics between peer pressure and juvenile delinquency is crucial for developing effective intervention strategies in both school and family settings. These interventions aim to help adolescents manage peer pressure positively, thereby reducing the likelihood of delinquent behaviors.

#### *Parenting and Juvenile Delinquency*

Parenting encompasses nurturing, guiding, and helping children grow, including educating and supporting them toward becoming independent and responsible individuals (Lestari, 2019). Parental care involves attitudes and methods that encourage children to make independent decisions and gradually become self-reliant (Handayani, 2019). A parent's role in raising children extends beyond protecting their mental well-being; it also shapes their character and personality, encouraging them to adhere to positive values (Hente & Salam, 2021). Parents must actively observe and guide their children's development, especially during adolescence. The role of parents in a child's growth and development is critical (Rofiq & Nihayah, 2018). When there is open and frequent communication between parents and children, it fosters a positive relationship and mood. Conversely, limited communication can negatively impact a child's mood and behavior. Yulianti (2014) emphasizes that strong parental involvement and interaction lead to improved child-parent relationships, while poor communication may have adverse effects on a child's emotional well-being.

Parenting styles significantly shape adolescent behavior and can either deter or contribute to juvenile delinquency. Research shows that different parenting approaches yield varying levels of susceptibility to delinquent behaviors. Authoritative parenting, which balances responsiveness and

discipline, is generally associated with lower rates of juvenile delinquency, fostering communication and trust between parents and adolescents (Onsando et al., 2021). In contrast, authoritarian and permissive styles, which emphasize control and leniency respectively, correlate more strongly with delinquency, as these approaches can hinder open communication and contribute to rebellion or lack of self-regulation among youth (Amran & Basri, 2020).

Shifts in parenting styles during adolescence also play a critical role in delinquency. Studies indicate that transitions from a more structured style, like authoritative, to permissive or uninvolved styles are linked to higher rates of delinquent behavior as adolescents may perceive a lack of boundaries or guidance (Mowen, 2011). Conversely, shifts towards more supportive and involved parenting can reduce these tendencies, illustrating that parenting adaptability and attentiveness to the child's developmental stage are crucial in minimizing delinquency risks (Schroeder & Mowen, 2014).

Overall, parenting that combines warmth, clear boundaries, and involvement tends to foster resilience against delinquency in adolescents. The authoritarian and neglectful approaches, however, often foster environments where juvenile delinquency can thrive due to either excessive control or lack of guidance (Tuli & Hossain, 2023). The impact of parenting styles on delinquency underscores the importance of balanced parenting that maintains structure while supporting open communication and emotional support.

### *The gap of Knowledge*

Despite the well-documented relationships between peer pressure, parental care, and juvenile delinquency, there remains a significant gap in understanding how these dynamics specifically manifest among junior high school students in Padang (Reynolds, & Crea, 2015). Prior research has often focused on Western populations, leaving a knowledge gap regarding how these social and familial factors influence delinquent behavior in non-Western, culturally distinct settings (Chung & Steinberg, 2006; Dishion & Tipsord, 2011; Ray et al., 2017). Additionally, while existing studies have demonstrated that peer influence and parental care are critical factors, there is limited research that quantitatively assesses these factors within the specific context of junior high school students in Padang. Moreover, the interplay between peer pressure and parental involvement, and how these

factors jointly impact juvenile delinquency, remains underexplored.

There is a lack of research addressing juvenile delinquency in Indonesian contexts like Padang, which may have different cultural influences compared to Western settings, thereby limiting the generalizability of previous findings. Studies have highlighted the unique cultural dynamics that affect youth behavior in Southeast Asia, such as the influence of parental culture maintenance and peer dynamics on adolescents' social well-being (Sari et al., [2018](#)).

While qualitative studies have examined the influence of peer and parental factors, few have rigorously quantified these influences using correlational analysis in Indonesia. For instance, research conducted in Surabaya indicated prevalent delinquent behaviors among youth but lacked comprehensive analysis on causative factors like parental care and peer pressure (Indrijati et al., [2017](#)).

The interaction effect between peer pressure and parental care remains underexplored, especially in an Indonesian context. Studies have primarily examined these variables in isolation, not in combination, to assess their synergistic impact on delinquency. Research suggests that family and peer dynamics are both crucial and interrelated, influencing youth behavior differently based on cultural factors (Barnes et al., [2006](#)).

## **Method**

### *Design*

This research uses a quantitative approach with correlational methods to examine the relationship between peer pressure, parental care, and juvenile delinquency (Sagita, [2017](#)).

### *Participants*

This research involved a sample of 190 junior high school students selected from various classes VII and VIII. The sampling technique uses a non-random proportional sampling technique but is based on certain considerations. Conscious informed consent was obtained before participants were included in the research. Students participated voluntarily without coercion and were free

to withdraw from the study at any time.

### *Measurement*

This research uses the peer pressure scale, parental care scale, and juvenile delinquency scale as measuring tools. Validity is assessed using content validity through professional judgment, while reliability is measured using internal consistency through Cronbach's alpha statistics.

### *Peer Pressure*

The peer pressure scale is pressure from friends, including pressure in the school environment, pressure from peer group activities and pressure from peer norms. A Likert scale is used with response options ranging from very high, high, medium, low and very low. Respondents evaluated statements such as "My friends force me to play after school, so I'm late coming home" and "My friends make fun of me if I don't follow their habits." The peer pressure scale has an alpha reliability of  $\alpha=0.928$ .

### *Parental Care*

The scale of parental care is the process of educating in a demanding, authoritative, neglectful and pampering manner. A Likert scale is used with response options ranging from very good, good, quite good, not so good and very bad. Respondents evaluated statements such as "Parents do not give input or advice when I make mistakes" and "Parents limit my activities outside the home without clear reasons." The parental care scale has an alpha reliability of  $\alpha=0.995$ .

### *Juvenile Delinquency*

The scale of juvenile delinquency includes behavior that is not socially acceptable, including delinquency that causes physical victims, delinquency that causes material victims and delinquency that causes other people. A Likert scale is used with response options ranging from very high, high, medium, low and very low. Respondents evaluated statements such as "I act rudely because I'm afraid of being isolated from my friends" and "By compassing makes me look cool." The juvenile delinquency scale has an alpha reliability of  $\alpha=0.905$ .

### *Data Analysis*

This research uses regression analysis to test the relationship between research variables. Normality, linearity and multicollinearity tests were carried out before hypothesis testing. Data were analyzed using SPSS version 25.00.

## Results

In this results chapter, descriptive data for each variable will be presented. This descriptive data focuses on the overall level of high and low categories within the sample for each variable. [Table 1](#) presents the descriptive data for the peer pressure variable in the research sample.

Table 1  
*Description of average peer pressure*

Indicator	Number of items	Score					Category
		Maximum	Highest	Lowest	Mean	%	
Pressure on the school environment	8	40	27	8	17,62	44,05	Low
Group/ peer activity pressure	7	35	31	7	18,01	51.5	Low
Pressure from peer norms	12	60	51	17	32,52	54,2	Moderate
<b>Overall</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>70,34</b>	<b>52,10</b>	Moderate

The data in [Table 1](#) presents the average levels of peer pressure experienced by students across three different dimensions: pressure in the school environment, group or peer activity pressure, and pressure from peer norms. Each dimension reflects distinct ways in which peer influences impact student behavior, with the number of items, score ranges, and mean scores provided for each category. Peer pressure within the school environment, which comprises 8 items with a maximum score of 40, shows a mean score of 17.62, representing 44.05% of the total possible score. This low percentage indicates that peer pressure in school settings is not a significant factor for these students.

For group or peer activity pressure, consisting of 7 items with a maximum score of 35, the mean score is slightly higher at 18.01, translating to 51.5% of the possible score. Although this score is still categorized as "Low," it suggests that pressure related to participation in peer activities may be more influential than pressure related to the school environment. This type of peer influence often



pertains to participation in social or extracurricular activities and highlights how peers may impact choices regarding involvement in group events.

The highest peer pressure category is pressure from peer norms, with a mean score of 32.52 out of a possible 60 (54.2%), categorized as "Currently." This result suggests that students experience moderate pressure to conform to peer norms, which could include expectations around behavior, appearance, or attitudes. The overall peer pressure score, considering all three dimensions, is 70.34 out of 135, equating to 52.1% and also categorized as "Currently." This score indicates that while peer pressure is present in students' lives, particularly regarding conformity to norms, it is not overwhelmingly high across all areas.

Table 2  
*Description of average parenting style*

Indicator	Number of items	Score					Category
		Maximum	Highest	Lowest	Mean	%	
Demands	11	55	55	26	44,14	80,26	High
Authoritative	9	45	38	17	27,85	61,90	Moderate
Neglectful	8	40	37	16	27,58	68,97	High
Indulgent	3	15	15	5	9,61	64,07	Moderate
<b>Overall</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>108,70</b>	<b>70,12</b>	<b>High</b>

The [table 2](#) provides a summary of average parenting styles based on various indicators and their scores. The "Demands" category has 11 items and demonstrates a high level of demand from parents, with an average score of 44.14 out of a maximum of 55, which translates to 80.26% in the "High" category. This indicates that parents tend to set clear expectations and guidelines for their children, reflecting a structured approach to parenting that likely emphasizes rules and responsibilities.

The "Authoritative" and "Pampering" styles have moderate scores, at 61.90% and 64.07% respectively, suggesting a balanced approach in these areas. Authoritative parenting, with 9 items and an average score of 27.85 out of 45, reflects a style that values both expectations and responsiveness, supporting children's independence while providing guidance. In contrast, the

“Pampering” style, with only 3 items and an average score of 9.61 out of 15, indicates a moderate tendency to indulge children, offering comfort and emotional support without excessive control.

Overall, the table reveals a dominant “High” category in the parenting style average, with an overall score of 108.7 out of 155, or 70.12%. This implies that the general parenting approach within the sample is highly structured, with a tendency toward high demands and guidance. However, elements of moderate authoritative and pampering styles suggest that while expectations are high, there is also an allowance for emotional support and autonomy within a structured framework.

Table 3  
*Description of average juvenile delinquency*

Indicator	Number of items	Score					Category
		Maximum	Highest	Lowest	Mean	%	
Misconduct that results in physical casualties	8	40	34	8	18,53	46,32	Low
Misconduct that causes material casualties	7	35	29	7	17,16	49,02	Low
Misconduct that results in victims of other people	14	70	51	14	30,34	43,33	Low
<b>Overall</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>12545</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>66,03</b>	<b>45,53</b>	<b>Low</b>

The [table 3](#) provides a summary of average juvenile delinquency scores across different categories, indicating the prevalence and intensity of misconduct among adolescents. The table measures three main indicators of delinquent behavior: misconduct resulting in physical casualties, misconduct causing material casualties, and misconduct involving other victims. Each category includes the number of survey items used to evaluate that type of misconduct, along with the maximum, highest, lowest, and mean scores achieved. The percentage column represents the mean score as a percentage of the maximum possible score, with all categories falling within a “low” delinquency range.

The first indicator, "misconduct resulting in physical casualties," shows a mean score of 18.53 out of a maximum score of 40, translating to 46.32% of the highest possible score. This indicates that physical misconduct behaviors among adolescents are relatively infrequent, with an average

occurrence level rated as “low.” Similarly, the category of "misconduct causing material casualties" records a mean score of 17.16 out of 35, or 49.02% of the maximum. This score suggests that behaviors causing material harm, such as theft or vandalism, are present but remain at a low prevalence among the adolescents surveyed.

The overall average score for juvenile delinquency across all categories is 66.03 out of a maximum of 145, with a mean percentage of 45.53%, which also falls in the low category. This combined score indicates that while there is a range of delinquent behaviors observed, the overall level of misconduct remains low across the surveyed population. The low percentages across all indicators suggest that severe delinquent behaviors, whether physical, material, or involving other victims, are not prevalent. This pattern points to an overall low incidence of significant juvenile delinquency among the adolescents evaluated.

#### *Hierarchical Regression Result*

This section provides a detailed explanation of the hierarchical regression test. All test assumptions were met, including data normality, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, and autocorrelation, which were all within acceptable limits.

The results presented in [Table 4](#) outline the fit measures for two linear regression models evaluated in this analysis. For Model 1, the R value is 0.258, indicating a modest correlation between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The R-squared ( $R^2$ ) value of 0.0666 suggests that approximately 6.66% of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the model. Additionally, the adjusted  $R^2$ , which accounts for the number of predictors, is slightly lower at 0.0616. The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) values are 1611 and 1621, respectively, indicating the model's fit in relation to its complexity. The root mean square error (RMSE) is reported at 16.5, suggesting the average distance between predicted and observed values, while the overall model test shows a statistically significant result ( $p < .001$ ), confirming the model's relevance.

**Table 4**  
*Linear Regression of Model Fit Measures*

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	AIC	BIC	RMSE	Overall Model Test			
							F	df1	df2	P
1	0.258	0.0666	0.0616	1611	1621	16.5	13.4	1	188	<.001
2	0.329	0.1085	0.0990	1604	1617	16.2	11.4	2	187	<.001

*Noted: Model 1 peer pressure; Model 2 parenting style*

In Model 2, there is an improvement in fit measures, with an R value of 0.329. This increase in correlation indicates a stronger relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable compared to Model 1. The R<sup>2</sup> value rises to 0.1085, meaning that approximately 10.85% of the variance in the dependent variable is now accounted for by the model, a notable increase that suggests the inclusion of additional predictors has enhanced the explanatory power. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> for Model 2 is also improved at 0.0990, reinforcing that the additional variables contribute meaningfully to the model.

Both models show significant results ( $p < .001$ ), indicating that the independent variables significantly predict the dependent variable. The reduction in AIC and BIC from Model 1 to Model 2 suggests a better model fit with the addition of predictors, with AIC decreasing to 1604 and BIC to 1617. Furthermore, the RMSE decreases to 16.2 in Model 2, reflecting a closer alignment of predicted values with the observed data. Overall, the progression from Model 1 to Model 2 demonstrates an improvement in model fit and predictive capability, highlighting the importance of considering additional predictors in regression analyses.

**Table 5**  
*Omnibus ANOVA Test*

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Peer pressure	2503	1	2503	9.45	0.002
Parenting style	2332	1	2332	8.80	0.003
Residuals	49562	187	265		

Note. Type 3 sum of squares

**Table 5** presents the results of an Omnibus ANOVA test, which is used to determine if there are statistically significant differences in means across groups for the variables of peer pressure and parenting styles (Pola asuh). The table includes the sum of squares, degrees of freedom (df), mean square, F-statistic, and p-values for each of these independent variables. The values show that both peer pressure and parenting styles have significant effects on the dependent variable, as indicated by their respective p-values (0.002 for peer pressure and 0.003 for parenting styles), both of which are below the conventional threshold of 0.05.

The significant F-statistics of 9.45 for peer pressure and 8.80 for parenting styles suggest that the variability explained by these predictors is substantially greater than the variability due to residual error. Specifically, the large sum of squares (2503 for peer pressure and 2332 for parenting styles) indicates that these variables contribute meaningfully to the overall model. In practical terms, this means that changes in peer pressure and parenting styles are associated with changes in the outcome being measured, suggesting their importance in understanding the dynamics at play in the study.

Lastly, the residuals section, with a sum of squares of 49,562 and 187 degrees of freedom, highlights the remaining unexplained variability in the model after accounting for peer pressure and parenting styles. The mean square for residuals is 265, which indicates the average variability that is not explained by the independent variables. The low p-values and significant F-statistics reflect strong evidence that peer pressure and parenting styles should be further explored as influential factors in

the study, warranting deeper analysis into how these variables interact and affect the outcome of interest.

**Table 6**  
*Model Coefficients for Juvenile Behavior*

Predictor	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		t	p	Stand. Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper				Lower	Upper
Intercept	75.592	11.7642	52.384	98.799	6.43	< .001			
Peer pressure	0.250	0.0812	0.0894	0.4098	3.07	0.002	0.217	0.077	0.355
Parenting style	-0.250	0.0841	-0.415	-0.084	-2.97	0.003	-0.209	-0.348	-0.070

**Table 6** presents the model coefficients for the variable relating to juveniles' behavior during their teenage years. The intercept is estimated at 75.592, indicating the baseline level of the dependent variable when all predictors are held at zero. This value is statistically significant, as evidenced by a t-value of 6.43 and a p-value less than 0.001. This suggests that the model provides a good starting point for understanding the influences on juvenile behavior.

The variable "peer pressure" shows a positive coefficient of 0.250, with a standard error of 0.0812. This indicates that for each unit increase in peer pressure, the juvenile behavior score increases by 0.250, holding other factors constant. The confidence interval ranges from 0.0894 to 0.4098, and the statistical significance is confirmed with a t-value of 3.07 and a p-value of 0.002. This suggests a meaningful relationship between peer pressure and juvenile behavior, highlighting that higher levels of peer influence are associated with more pronounced juvenile behavior tendencies.

Conversely, the "parenting style" variable has a negative coefficient of -0.250, indicating an inverse relationship with juvenile behavior. The standard error for this estimate is 0.0841, with a confidence interval ranging from -0.4155 to -0.0836. This negative relationship is statistically significant, as indicated by a t-value of -2.97 and a p-value of 0.003. This suggests that a more

authoritative or less permissive parenting style is associated with lower scores in juvenile behavior, emphasizing the importance of parenting approaches in mitigating negative behavior in adolescents. Overall, the table underscores the contrasting influences of peer pressure and parenting style on juvenile behavior, with peer pressure encouraging more behavioral issues while effective parenting can help reduce them.

The next analysis examines the role of each dimension of the peer pressure and parenting style variables on each dimension of juvenile behavior. Table 7 and 8 present the results of the hierarchical regression analysis conducted.

Table 7  
*Omnibus ANOVA Test for Misconduct in Others*

Dimension	Sum of squares	Df	Mean squares	F	p
Peer pressure activity	24.8	1	24.8	0.292	0.590
Peer pressure norms	222.0	1	222.0	2.609	0.108
Peer pressure in school	46.0	1	46.0	0.541	0.463
The demanding parenting	102.8	1	102.8	1.209	0.273
The authoritative parenting	45.3	1	45.3	0.532	0.467
The indulgent parenting	31.7	1	31.7	0.372	0.543
The neglectful parenting	423.9	1	423.9	4.982	0.027

Note. Type 3 sum of squares

Table 7 presents the results of an Omnibus ANOVA test examining the effects of various dimensions of peer pressure and parenting styles on misconduct among others. Each predictor dimension's contribution to misconduct is represented through sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean squares, F-values, and p-values. The findings reveal that only one predictor reached statistical significance, suggesting differential impacts among the dimensions on misconduct.

The peer pressure dimensions—activity, norms, and school—did not yield significant results, with p-values of 0.590, 0.108, and 0.463, respectively. Although "Peer pressure norms" had the highest F-value among these (2.609), it did not meet the threshold for significance ( $p < 0.05$ ), indicating that these aspects of peer pressure may not strongly influence misconduct behaviors in this sample.

Among the parenting styles, only "The neglectful parenting" dimension showed a statistically significant effect on misconduct ( $F = 4.982, p = 0.027$ ). This result suggests that neglectful parenting

may contribute to increased misconduct, whereas other parenting styles—demanding, authoritative, and indulgent—did not reach significance, as reflected in their respective p-values above 0.05. This implies that of all dimensions examined, neglectful parenting may have a more impactful role in shaping misconduct behaviors in this group.

In [Table 8](#), the model coefficients for “Misconduct in Others” show the estimated effects of various predictors, such as peer pressure dimensions and parenting styles, on the dependent variable. The intercept, with an estimate of 32.967, is statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ), indicating a baseline level of misconduct that would exist without the influence of other predictors. However, the peer pressure predictors (activity, norms, and in-school influence) all have non-significant estimates, meaning they do not significantly predict misconduct in this model. For instance, peer pressure norms, with an estimate of 0.165, has a confidence interval that crosses zero (-0.037 to 0.367), suggesting limited influence.

Parenting styles also display mixed effects on misconduct. While demanding, authoritative, and indulgent parenting styles show non-significant estimates, with p-values greater than 0.05, neglectful parenting emerges as a significant predictor. Its estimate of -0.484, with a confidence interval from -0.912 to -0.056, indicates that neglectful parenting has a statistically significant negative association with misconduct ( $p = 0.027$ ). This suggests that increased levels of neglectful parenting are related to reduced misconduct, though this counterintuitive result warrants further investigation.

The standardized estimates provide further insights into the relative influence of each predictor. Among them, neglectful parenting has the strongest standardized effect (-0.2430), aligning with its statistical significance. The other predictors have standardized estimates near zero, highlighting their relatively weak influence on misconduct. This suggests that, within this model, neglectful parenting is the only predictor that notably contributes to variations in misconduct, while other forms of peer pressure and parenting styles do not show significant effects.



Table 8  
*Model Coefficients for Misconduct in Others*

Predictor	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		t	p	Stand. Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper				Lower	Upper
Intercept	32.967	7.345	18.475	47.458	4.489	< .001			
Peer pressure activity	0.097	0.180	-0.258	0.453	0.540	0.590	0.0474	-0.126	0.221
Peer pressure norms	0.165	0.102	-0.037	0.367	1.615	0.108	0.1329	-0.029	0.295
Peer pressure in school	0.117	0.160	-0.197	0.432	0.735	0.463	0.0593	-0.099	0.218
Demanding parenting	0.166	0.151	-0.132	0.464	1.099	0.273	0.0997	-0.079	0.278
Authoritative parenting	-0.152	0.208	-0.563	0.259	-0.729	0.467	-0.0667	-0.247	0.114
Indulgent parenting	-0.165	0.270	-0.696	0.367	-0.610	0.543	-0.0513	-0.217	0.115
Neglectful parenting	-0.484	0.217	-0.912	-0.056	-2.232	0.027	-0.2430	-0.457	-0.028

The results in [Table 9](#) summarize the effects of various peer pressure dimensions and parenting styles on physical misconduct, assessed using an Omnibus ANOVA test. For each factor, the table lists the sum of squares, degrees of freedom (df), mean square, F-ratio, and significance level (p-value). Most of the factors in this analysis did not reach statistical significance. The F-ratios for “Peer Activity Pressure,” and various parenting styles, such as demanding, authoritative, and indulgent, were relatively low, with p-values all well above the 0.05 threshold. This indicates that these factors did not significantly explain variance in physical misconduct.

**Table 9**  
*Omnibus ANOVA Test for Misconduct in physical casualties*

	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
Peer pressure in activity	24.2	1	24.2	0.683	0.410
Peer pressure in norm	45.4	1	45.4	1.282	0.259
Demanding parenting	13.0	1	13.0	0.368	0.545
Authoritative parenting	12.6	1	12.6	0.357	0.551
Indulgent parenting	25.2	1	25.2	0.713	0.400
Neglectful parenting	238.0	1	238.0	6.727	0.010
Peer pressure in school	32.0	1	32.0	0.906	0.343
Residuals	6438.8	182	35.4		

Note. Type 3 sum of squares

One exception stands out: the "Neglectful" parenting style, with an F-ratio of 6.727 and a p-value of 0.010. This finding suggests a statistically significant relationship between neglectful parenting and increased physical misconduct, as the p-value falls below the 0.05 significance level. The high F-ratio and low p-value imply that neglectful parenting may play a meaningful role in explaining the physical misconduct of juveniles, potentially more so than other parenting styles or peer pressure factors considered in this analysis.

The residuals, representing the variance in physical misconduct not explained by the model, account for a sum of squares of 6438.8 across 182 degrees of freedom, with a mean square of 35.4. This substantial residual variance suggests that while neglectful parenting is a significant factor, other unexplored variables may also contribute to physical misconduct. Overall, the analysis highlights the importance of neglectful parenting as a factor, while peer and other parenting influences appear to have a less direct association with physical misconduct in this sample.

The results in [Table 10](#) present a hierarchical regression analysis testing the model coefficients for misconduct in the form of physical casualties, using both peer pressure and parenting style as predictors. The intercept has a significant positive estimate of 20.86 ( $p < .001$ ), suggesting that the base level of misconduct in physical casualties is relatively high when controlling for all other predictors in the model. None of the peer pressure variables—activity, norms, or school-based

pressure—showed significant relationships with misconduct, as their p-values were all above 0.05. This indicates that peer pressure, in this context, may not strongly influence physical misconduct outcomes.

Table 10  
*Model Coefficients Test for Misconduct in physical casualties*

Predictor	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		t	p	Stand. Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper				Lower	Upper
Intercept	20.8625	4.7361	11.5178	30.2072	4.405	< .001			
Peer pressure in activity	0.0961	0.1163	-0.1334	0.3256	0.826	0.410	0.0730	-0.1012	0.247
Peer pressure in norms	0.0748	0.0661	-0.0555	0.2052	1.132	0.259	0.0938	-0.0696	0.257
Peer pressure in school	0.0980	0.1030	-0.1052	0.3011	0.952	0.343	0.0772	-0.0829	0.237
Demanding parenting	0.0592	0.0975	-0.1331	0.2515	0.607	0.545	0.0554	-0.1248	0.235
Authoritative parenting	-0.0803	0.1344	-0.3455	0.1849	-0.597	0.551	-0.0550	-0.2366	0.126
Indulgent parenting	0.1467	0.1738	-0.1962	0.4897	0.844	0.400	0.0715	-0.0956	0.238
Neglectful parenting	-0.3627	0.1398	-0.6386	-0.0868	-2.594	0.010	-0.2842	-0.5004	-0.068

Regarding the parenting styles, demanding and authoritative styles were not significant predictors of physical misconduct, as indicated by p-values of 0.545 and 0.551, respectively. Interestingly, indulgent parenting also failed to show a significant association with misconduct ( $p = 0.400$ ). These results suggest that, contrary to expectations, these parenting styles do not contribute significantly to the prediction of physical misconduct in this sample, with each style having confidence intervals that include zero, indicating minimal influence on the outcome variable.

Neglectful parenting, however, stands out as a significant predictor. It has an estimate of -0.3627 with a confidence interval that does not include zero (-0.6386 to -0.0868) and a significant p-value of 0.010.

This negative association suggests that neglectful parenting is inversely related to physical misconduct, meaning that as neglectful behaviors increase, misconduct decreases. This result could imply that in cases where children experience neglect, there may be a reduction in observed

misconduct in physical contexts, possibly due to less engagement or different behavioral influences compared to more involved parenting styles.

Table 11  
*Omnibus ANOVA Test for Misconduct in Others*

Dimension	Sum of squares	df	Mean squares	F	p
Peer pressure in activity	0.536	1	0.536	0.0269	0.870
Peer pressure in norms	87.145	1	87.145	4.3850	0.038
Peer pressure in school	4.539	1	4.539	0.2284	0.633
The demanding parenting	19.835	1	19.835	0.9981	0.319
The authoritative parenting	3.494	1	3.494	1.765	0.997
The indulgent parenting	7.128	1	7.128	0.3587	0.550
The neglectful parenting	74.574	1	74.574	3.7524	0.054

Note. Type 3 sum of squares

The results in [Table 11](#) present the Omnibus ANOVA test for the impact of various dimensions of peer pressure and parenting styles on misconduct in others. The "Peer pressure norms" dimension shows a significant effect with an F-value of 4.385 and a p-value of 0.038, indicating that this dimension of peer pressure is statistically associated with misconduct in others. This suggests that normative peer pressure, or the pressure to conform to peer behaviors and expectations, may play a role in influencing misconduct behaviors. The other two dimensions of peer pressure—activity and pressure in school—do not show statistically significant results, with p-values of 0.870 and 0.633, respectively.

Regarding parenting styles, none of the individual styles reached conventional levels of statistical significance. The demanding parenting style yielded an F-value of 0.998 and a p-value of 0.319, suggesting no meaningful association with misconduct in others. Similarly, the authoritative and indulgent parenting styles had F-values of 1.765 and 0.3587 with corresponding p-values of 0.997 and 0.550, indicating no significant influence on misconduct in others for these parenting dimensions.

The neglectful parenting style, however, approached significance with an F-value of 3.7524 and a p-value of 0.054. While this does not meet the conventional  $p < 0.05$  threshold for statistical

significance, it suggests a possible trend that could warrant further exploration. This trend indicates that neglectful parenting may be somewhat associated with misconduct in others, though additional research would be needed to confirm this potential relationship. Overall, peer pressure norms emerge as the most significant factor influencing misconduct, while parenting styles generally show limited association.

Table 12  
*Model Coefficients Test for Misconduct in material casualties*

Predictor	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		t	p	Stand. Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper				Lower	Upper
Intercept	15.035	3.549	8.0314	22.039	4.235	< .001			
Peer pressure in activity	-0.014	0.087	-0.186	0.15770	-0.164	0.870	-0.0149	-0.194	0.164
Peer pressure in norms	0.104	0.049	0.006	0.20140	2.094	0.038	0.1781	0.011	0.346
Peer pressure in school	0.037	0.077	-0.116	0.18912	0.477	0.633	0.0398	-0.125	0.204
Demanding parenting	0.073	0.097	-0.133	0.2515	0.607	0.545	0.0554	-0.125	0.235
Authoritative parenting	-4.224	0.134	-0.345	0.1849	-0.597	0.551	-0.0550	-0.236	0.126
Neglectful parenting	-0.203	0.174	-0.196	0.4897	0.844	0.400	0.0715	-0.096	0.238
Indulgent parenting	0.078	0.139	-0.638	-0.0868	-2.594	0.010	-0.2842	-0.501	-0.068

The results in [Table 12](#) display the model coefficients for predicting "Misconduct in Material Casualties" based on various factors such as dimensions of peer pressure and parenting styles. The intercept value is 15.035, with a statistically significant  $t$  value (4.24,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that without considering the predictors, there is a baseline level of misconduct. Among the predictors, "Peer Pressure Norms" has a positive estimate (0.104) with a significant  $t$  value of 2.09 ( $p = 0.038$ ), suggesting that stronger peer pressure related to normative beliefs is associated with higher levels of misconduct. The standardized estimate for this predictor is 0.178, indicating a moderate effect size.

The other peer pressure dimensions, "Peer Pressure Activity" and "Peer Pressure in School," show non-significant relationships with misconduct in material casualties. "Peer Pressure Activity" has a

near-zero estimate (-0.014), a  $t$  value of -0.164, and a high  $p$ -value (0.870), suggesting it does not contribute meaningfully to predicting misconduct. Similarly, "Peer Pressure in School" yields a positive but small estimate (0.037), with non-significant  $t$  and  $p$ -values, indicating little to no association with misconduct. These findings imply that not all dimensions of peer pressure equally impact material misconduct.

Among the parenting styles, only "Indulgent Parenting" has a statistically significant negative relationship with misconduct (estimate = -0.284,  $t = -2.594$ ,  $p = 0.010$ ), suggesting that higher levels of indulgent parenting are associated with lower misconduct. Other parenting styles, such as "Demanding," "Authoritative," and "Neglectful," show non-significant estimates, with  $p$ -values well above the threshold. This result suggests that parenting styles that are highly demanding or neglectful do not significantly contribute to misconduct, while indulgent parenting might act as a protective factor.

## Discussion

This study aims to examine the role of peer pressure and parenting styles on juvenile delinquency. Hierarchical regression results show that peer pressure has a significant positive influence on adolescent behavior. This indicates that the higher the peer pressure, the more likely adolescents are to engage in deviant behaviors. This aligns with research stating that adolescents are heavily influenced by the norms and standards of their peer groups, especially because, at this stage, peer acceptance is considered crucial for the formation of their social identity (Steinberg et al., 2006). When peers engage in less positive behaviors, the urge to follow the group can lead adolescents to mimic those behaviors in an effort to maintain social status among friends (Ford et al., 2012).

Conversely, parenting styles show a negative relationship with adolescent behavior, meaning that supportive and democratic parenting tends to protect adolescents from negative behaviors. Democratic parenting, which combines control with freedom, creates a safe and supportive environment for adolescents to develop strong self-control and self-confidence (Baeg et al., 2020). Emotional support and supervision from parents equip adolescents with the skills to resist negative peer pressure, enabling them to uphold the principles taught by their families (Chapple et al., 2005).

From a psychological perspective, the interaction between peer pressure and parenting style illustrates the dynamics of internal conflict in adolescents. Peer pressure often creates a psychological dilemma for adolescents between the desire to be accepted in a group and the values taught by their families. This conflict is part of the internalization process, where adolescents adopt external norms into their own value system. The internalization of these values is greatly influenced by parental support or supervision, where positive parenting helps adolescents develop resistance to negative peer norms (Simkins & Katz, 2002; Reid & Sullivan, 2009).

Overall, these findings underscore the importance of a holistic approach in understanding adolescent behavior by considering both peer and parenting influences. Supportive parenting acts as a protective factor that helps adolescents resist negative peer influences. Conversely, peer pressure that is not counterbalanced by family support can increase the risk of negative behaviors. This interaction indicates that effective interventions need to strengthen family support during adolescent development, particularly in facing high social pressures (Ryan, 2006; Barra et al., 2017).

These findings indicate that neglectful parenting and peer pressure norms have significant impacts on various types of adolescent deviant behaviors. Specifically, neglectful parenting, which tends to disregard children's needs and supervision, correlates with misconduct in terms of disrespect towards others (misconduct in other) and involvement in physical acts that may cause injury or accidents (misconduct in physical casualties). Meanwhile, peer pressure norms are associated with the tendency of adolescents to engage in property damage or material misconduct.

Neglectful parenting, where parents give minimal attention or neglect children's emotional and physical needs, is often linked to various forms of deviant behavior in children and adolescents. Adolescents raised in unsupportive environments tend to seek validation and attention outside the home, which can lead to risky and socially unacceptable behaviors. Research shows that neglectful parenting causes children to feel unvalued and more likely to display aggressive or deviant behaviors outside the home (Steinberg et al., 2006). These findings align with studies indicating that parental neglect correlates with aggressive acts among adolescents (Ryan et al., 2013).

Meanwhile, strong peer pressure norms are a major factor in deviant behavior related to property damage. During adolescence, the need for group acceptance is so significant that they may disregard social rules or even damage property to gain approval or avoid rejection from peers. Studies show that peer pressure can alter risk perception and weaken adolescents' decision-making abilities, especially related to vandalism or property destruction (Ford et al., 2012). Similarly, other research found that group norms that permit antisocial behavior can push adolescents to engage in destructive acts, particularly regarding material damage (Chapple et al., 2005).

Psychologically, these two factors—neglectful parenting and peer pressure norms—illustrate that both internal and external factors work together to influence adolescent behavior. Adolescents who lack parental attention and guidance may be more susceptible to internalizing negative norms from their environment. This process is known as "social learning," where adolescents learn from the behavior modeled by their peers, especially in the absence of parental guidance (Reid & Sullivan, 2009). Other studies affirm that behavior learned from peer groups has the same or even stronger influence than family norms during adolescence (Simkins & Katza, 2002).

Understanding the impact of peer pressure and neglectful parenting on deviant behavior requires considering interventions that can strengthen the role of the family in shaping positive norms and behavior in adolescents. Interventions focusing on increasing parental involvement in children's lives can help prevent deviant behavior by creating a supportive and structured environment. Additionally, social education programs emphasizing the importance of healthy decision-making and resistance to peer pressure may help reduce the risk of adolescents engaging in behavior that harms others or damages property (Barra et al., 2017; Baeg et al., 2020).

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the findings highlight the significant impact of both neglectful parenting and peer pressure norms on adolescent deviant behaviors. Neglectful parenting, characterized by a lack of emotional and physical support, is linked to increased aggression and misconduct, as adolescents often seek external validation to compensate for their unmet needs. On the other hand, peer pressure plays a critical role in influencing behaviors related to material damage, as adolescents are driven by a



strong desire for social acceptance, which can impair their judgment and risk assessment. Psychologically, these influences work together, demonstrating that both internal and external factors shape adolescent behavior. Effective interventions should involve strengthening family involvement and providing adolescents with the skills to resist negative peer influence, creating a balanced and supportive environment that fosters positive behavioral outcomes.

#### **Acknowledgment**

We thank to all research subjects who significantly contributed to the research.

#### **Conflict of Interest**

The researchers declare that this paper has no conflicts of interest.

#### **Author Contribution**

All authors have contributed equally to the study's conceptualization, interpreting data, reviewing, and editing the manuscript.

#### **Data Availability**

Data can be provided upon request to the author.

#### **Declarations Ethical Statement**

The study followed the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki.

#### **Informed Consent Statement**

Informed consent was obtained from all persons involved in the study.

## **References**

- Amran, M. S., & Basri, N. A. (2020). Investigating the relationship between parenting styles and juvenile delinquent behaviour. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(11A), 25-32. doi : [10.13189/ujer.2020.082104](https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.082104)
- Baeg, S., Lee, B., & Park, H. J. (2020). The effect of supervisory neglect on adolescent peer victimization: Mediating role of self-esteem and internalizing problems. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 111, 104839. doi : [10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104839](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104839)
- Barnes, G. M., Hoffman, J. H., Welte, J. W., Farrell, M. P., & Dintcheff, B. A. (2006). Effects of parental monitoring and peer deviance on substance use and delinquency. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(4), 1084-1104. doi : [10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00315.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00315.x)
- Barra, S., Bessler, C., Landolt, M., & Aebi, M. (2017). Patterns of adverse childhood experiences in juveniles who sexually offended. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 30(7), 803-827. doi : [10.1177/1079063217697135](https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063217697135)
- Chapple, C., Tyler, K., & Bersani, B. (2005). Child neglect and adolescent violence: Examining the effects of self-control and peer rejection. *Violence and Victims*, 20(1), 39-53. doi :

[10.1891/vivi.2005.20.1.39](https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.2005.20.1.39)

- Chung, H., & Steinberg, L. (2006). Relations between neighborhood factors, parenting behaviors, peer deviance, and delinquency among serious juvenile offenders. *Developmental psychology*, 42(2), 319-331. doi : [10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.319](https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.319)
- Defoe, I., Dubas, J., & Aken, M. (2018). The relative roles of peer and parent predictors in minor adolescent delinquency: Exploring gender and adolescent phase differences. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 6(242), 1-13. doi : [10.3389/fpubh.2018.00242](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00242)
- Dishion, T., & Tipsord, J. (2011). Peer contagion in child and adolescent social and emotional development. *Annual review of psychology*, 62, 189-214. doi : [10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100412](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100412)
- Flannery, D., Williams, L., & Vazsonyi, A. (1999). Who are they with and what are they doing? Delinquent behavior, substance use, and early adolescents' after-school time. *The American journal of orthopsychiatry*, 69(2), 247-53. doi : [10.1037/H0080426](https://doi.org/10.1037/H0080426)
- Ford, J., Chapman, J., Connor, D., & Cruise, K. (2012). Complex trauma and aggression in secure juvenile justice settings. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39, 694-724. doi : [10.1177/0093854812436957](https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812436957)
- Habibi, F., Nurfarhanah., Netrawati., & Sukma, D. (2023). Improving self-concept through effective interpersonal communication. *Iqra' Journal: Educational Science Review* 8(2), 1-16. doi : [10.25217/ji.v8i2.2710](https://doi.org/10.25217/ji.v8i2.2710)
- Handayani, R. (2019). The influence of living environment and parenting patterns on elementary school students' learning motivation. *Journal Tunas Bangsa*, 6(1), 15-26.
- Hente, M. A., & Salam, A. (2021). Parenting patterns in shaping early childhood personality in group b paud citra lestari. *Journal Collaborative of Science*, 4(3), 146-14. doi : [10.56338/jks.v4i3.1798](https://doi.org/10.56338/jks.v4i3.1798)
- Indrijati, H. (2017). Juvenile delinquency of senior high school students in surabaya, indonesia. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 11, 184-188.
- Karpika, I. P., & Segel, N. W. W. (2021). Quarter life crisis for case study students at the faculty of teacher training and education, PGRI Mahadewa university, indonesia. *Widyadari*, 22(2), 513-527.
- Khadafi, R. M. (2014). *Hubungan antara model peer pressure dengan perilaku konsumtif produk makanan pada remaja*. Skripsi Program Studi Psikologi, Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang.
- Lestari, E. S. (2019). *Cooperative learning management for school students*. 2(2), 217-227.
- Lin, S., Yu, C., Chen, W., Tian, Y., & Zhang, W. (2018). Peer victimization and aggressive behavior among chinese adolescents: Delinquent peer affiliation as a mediator and parental knowledge as a moderator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(1036), 1-8. doi : [10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01036](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01036)
- Manzoni, M., Lotar, M., & Ricijaš, N. (2011). Peer pressure in adolescence. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Psychology and Gender*. doi : [10.4135/9781483384269.n430](https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483384269.n430)
- Mowen, T. J. (2011). Shifting parenting styles and the effect on juvenile delinquency. *Electronic*

*Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1017. doi : [10.18297/etd/1017](https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1017)

- Nafisa, A. K. K., & Savira, S. I. (2021). The relationship between religiosity and juvenile delinquency. *Character: Journal of Psychological Research*, 8(7), 34-44.
- Nathaline, G., & Silaen, S. M. J. (2020). Self-control and peer pressure with juvenile delinquency among teenagers in klender village. *Ikra-lth Humaniora: Journal of Social and Humanities*, 4(3), 1-7.
- Nurmala, I. (2020). *Mewujudkan remaja sehat fisik, mental dan sosial: (Model intervensi health educator for youth)*. Airlangga University Press.
- Onsando, E., Mwenje, M. K., & Githui, P. (2021). The influence of parenting style on male juvenile delinquency: A case of kamiti youth correction and training center (kyctc), kiambu county, kenya. *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(3), 21–29. doi : [10.24018/ejsocial.2021.1.3.44](https://doi.org/10.24018/ejsocial.2021.1.3.44)
- Pettit, G., Bates, J., Dodge, K., & Meece, D. (1999). The impact of after-school peer contact on early adolescent externalizing problems is moderated by parental monitoring, perceived neighborhood safety, and prior adjustment. *Child development*, 70(3), 768-78. doi : [10.1111/1467-8624.00055](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00055).
- Rahmadani, S., & Okrifma, R. (2022). Hubungan kontrol diri dengan kenakalan remaja. *Psyche 165 Journal*, 74-79.
- Ray, J., Frick, P., Thornton, L., Myers, T., Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (2017). Callous–unemotional traits predict self-reported offending in adolescent boys: The mediating role of delinquent peers and the moderating role of parenting practices. *Developmental Psychology*, 53(2), 319–328. doi : [10.1037/dev0000210](https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000210)
- Reid, J., & Sullivan, C. (2009). A latent class typology of juvenile victims and exploration of risk factors and outcomes of victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(10), 1001-1024. doi : [10.1177/0093854809340621](https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854809340621)
- Reynolds, A., & Crea, T. (2015). Peer influence processes for youth delinquency and depression. *Journal of adolescence*, 43(1), 83-95. doi : [10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.05.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.05.013)
- Rofiq, A., & Nihayah, I. (2018). *Communication as parents' main capital in forming children's personalities*.
- Ryan, J. (2006). Dependent youth in juvenile justice: Do positive peer culture programs work for victims of child maltreatment?. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 16(5), 511-519. doi : [10.1177/1049731506288458](https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731506288458).
- Ryan, J., Williams, A., & Courtney, M. (2013). Adolescent neglect, juvenile delinquency and the risk of recidivism. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42, 454-465. doi : [10.1007/s10964-013-9906-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9906-8)
- Sagita, D. D., Daharnis, D., & Syahniar, S. (2017). Relationship between self efficacy, achievement motivation, academic procrastination and student academic stress. *Bikotetik (Guidance and Counseling Theory and Practice)*, 1(2), 43. doi : [10.26740/bikotetik.v1n2.p43-52](https://doi.org/10.26740/bikotetik.v1n2.p43-52)
- Santrock, J. W. (2019). *Life span development*. Mc Graw-Hill Education
- Sari, B., Chasiotis, A., Vijver, F., & Bender, M. (2018). Parental culture maintenance, bilingualism, identity, and well-being in Javanese, Batak, and Chinese adolescents in Indonesia. *Journal of*

*Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(10), 853-867. doi :  
[10.1080/01434632.2018.1449847](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1449847)

Schroeder, R., & Mowen, T. (2014). Parenting style transitions and delinquency. *Youth & Society*, 46(2), 228-254. doi : [10.1177/0044118X12469041](https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X12469041)

Sim, T., & Koh, S. (2003). A domain conceptualization of adolescent susceptibility to peer pressure. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13(1), 57-80. doi : [10.1111/j.1532-7795.1301002](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.1301002)

Simkins, S., & Katz, S. (2002). Criminalizing abused girls. *Violence Against Women*, 8(12), 1474-1499. doi : [10.1177/107780102237966](https://doi.org/10.1177/107780102237966)

Steinberg, L., Blatt-Eisengart, I., & Cauffman, E. (2006). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful homes: A replication in a sample of serious juvenile offenders. *Journal of research on adolescence: The official journal of the Society for Research on Adolescence*, 16(1), 47-58. doi : [10.1111/j.1532-7795.2006.00119.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2006.00119.x)

Sumiati, dkk. (2009). *Kesehatan jiwa remaja & konseling*. Jakarta: Trans Info Media.

Suri, S. I. (2022). The relationship between self control and juvenile delinquency at pembina bangsa vocational school, bukittinggi city. *'AFIYAH*, 9(1).

Tilton-Weaver, L., Burk, W., Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2013). Can parental monitoring and peer management reduce the selection or influence of delinquent peers? Testing the question using a dynamic social network approach.. *Developmental psychology*, 49(11), 2057-70 doi : [10.1037/a0031854](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031854)

Tuli, M., & Hossain, S. (2023). Exploring factors influencing problem behavior of rural secondary students in bangladesh. *Teacher's World: Journal of Education and Research*, 48(2), 142-156. doi : [10.3329/twjer.v48i2.67557](https://doi.org/10.3329/twjer.v48i2.67557)

Wardhani, D. A., & Pujiono, A. (2022). The influence of formal education level on sunday school teachers' teaching competence. *Discreet: Journal of Didache of Christian Education*, 2(1), 10-21. doi : [10.52960/jd.v2i1.109](https://doi.org/10.52960/jd.v2i1.109)

Warr, M. (1993). Parents/peers, and delinquency. *Social Forces*, 72(1), 247-264. doi : [10.1093/SF/72.1.247](https://doi.org/10.1093/SF/72.1.247)

Yulianti, T. R. (2014). The role of parents in developing early childhood creativity. *Empowerment: Scientific Journal of Out-of-School Education Study Program*, 3(1).