

The effect of permissive parenting style and peer pressure on disruptive behavior: An explanatory study

Yeni Muhliawati*

Universitas Ahmad Dahlan
Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Purwadi Purwadi

Universitas Ahmad Dahlan
Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author. e-mail: yenimuhliawati@gmail.com

Received: February 27, 2023 ; Revised: April 20, 2023 ; Accepted: May 23, 2023

Abstract

This research aims to examine the influence of permissive parenting style and peer pressure on disruptive behavior of students at Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school. The research method used is a quantitative-correlational method with a prediction design. The population of this research is 498 students who were registered as 7th and 8th graders in the 2021/2022 academic year. The research subjects consist of 74 students, selected using purposive sampling technique, with the criteria that they perceive their parents as permissive and have been identified to have a tendency towards disruptive behavior. The measuring instruments used consist of the disruptive behavior scale, the permissive parenting style scale, and the peer pressure scale. The analysis technique used is multiple regression. The findings of this study indicate that there is a significant simultaneous effect of permissive parenting style and peer pressure on disruptive behavior. The effective contribution produced is 42%. Permissive parenting style partially does not have an influence on disruptive behavior, while peer pressure significantly affects the occurrence of disruptive behavior. The school is recommended to increase its awareness of peer pressure that triggers disruptive behavior in students. Parents are expected to adjust their parenting style to minimize the growth of disruptive behavior in children.

Keywords: *permissive parenting style, peer pressure, disruptive behavior, students*



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Introduction

Every student is expected to grow and develop optimally according to their respective developmental stages. Junior high school students are in the adolescent stage, which is a long period that begins at the age of 11 and lasts until 19 years old, involving physical, cognitive, emotional, and social changes (Papalia, Olds, & Feldman, 2009). Throughout the process of change, adolescents are expected to meet the most important aspects of adolescence, which are the ability to choose and determine independence, self-identity, and career choices. However, during adolescence, puberty or socioemotional changes, such as motivation for independence,

relationships with parents and peers, and delinquency or disruptive behavior, also occur (Santrock, 2014).

According to Gresham (2015), disruptive behavior generally occurs in adolescents aged 11-15 years old. Papalia and colleagues (2009) also emphasize that negative emotions and mood changes occur intensely during early adolescence, which is thought to be related to the emergence of stress related to puberty issues. Delinquency or disruptive behavior that often occurs in adolescent is also often characterized with rebellion because it involves emotional changes, conflicts within the family, being isolated from adult groups, careless behavior, and rejection of adult values (Papalia et al., 2009). Disruptive behavior is inappropriate behavior that is disruptive in nature (Syakarofath and Subandi, 2019), opposing rules, and damaging behavior (Asizah, 2010). Furthermore, Gresham (2015) explains that disruptive behavior is characterized by problems in self-control and behavior that makes it difficult to adapt in personal and interpersonal domains, consisting of patterns of antisocial behavior and defiant/disrespectful behavior that occur in the home, school, and community environment.

The environmental factor such as home or family in Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory is the microsystem or setting in which adolescents live. It is within this microsystem that direct interaction between parents and adolescents. Arifin (2020) emphasizes with the convergence theory pioneered by William Stern that a child's social development is a combination of genetics (nativism) and environment (empiricism). A child is born with innate talents or basic potential that can be developed, and the process of development depends greatly on the home environment, school, and community in which they grow up. Parenting style is a series of interactions that occur within the family environment. There are three parenting styles that significantly influence a child's behavior pattern: authoritarian parenting, permissive parenting, and authoritative parenting. Authoritative parenting style is considered the most effective because parents apply reasonable expectations and realistic standards to their child, while authoritarian parenting is considered controlling of a child's behavior and enforces arbitrary punishment when rules are violated. The research results of Kayanti, Noviandri, Yustitiya, and Wulandari (2020) explain that permissive parenting style has a positive relationship with the tendency for adolescent delinquency. Permissive parenting style is considered to influence disruptive behavior in adolescents because parents do not provide demands and allow their children to behave according to their own will.

According to Papalia (2009), adolescents whose parents are strict in enforcing rules are known to have a high level of discipline and have fewer behavior problems than adolescents whose parents practice permissive parenting style. This is in line with what Calvete, Orue, Guadix, Bilbao, and Arroyabe (2015) have conveyed, that inconsistent and permissive parenting style, determined by low levels of control and discipline, contribute to an increase in Child-to-Parent Violence (CPV). This is also supported by the research by Fifin Dwi Purwaningtyas (2020), which shows a significant relationship between permissive parenting style and disruptive behavior in adolescents. This means that disruptive behavior in adolescents occurs when parents use permissive parenting style, which is determined by low levels of control and discipline. Durham (2012) shows the results of his research that parents who practice permissive parenting style are considered to have no legitimacy or are not seen as a valid authority in controlling their children.

The development of reasoning capacity in adolescents and the occurrence of adolescent egocentrism, which reaches its peak at the age of 12 to 13 (Papalia, 2009), requires the best parenting from their parents. Santrock (2014) stated that in order to form competent teenagers, parents must provide honest and high-quality feedback to their adolescent children, not just praise and material rewards. Parents should allow their adolescent children to see the real world and not protect them from criticism and difficulties, challenge them to engage in tasks so that they can reach their own abilities.

Disruptive Behavior Disorder (DBD) is a set of dimensions consisting of attention problems, noncompliant behavior, and aggressive behavior that are interrelated (Frauenglass and Routh D.K, 1999 in Quay and Hogan, 1999). Furthermore, disruptive behavior is different from internalizing

disorders such as depression, anxiety, and social withdrawal. The constellation of disruptive behavior also occurs because adolescents are trying to meet their developmental needs, such as bonding with peers and independence from parents (Jessor and Jessor, 1977 in Quay & Hogan, 1999).

Gordon and Browne (in Marais & Meier, 2010) state that disruptive behavior is simply inappropriate behavior. Mabeba and Prinsloo (as cited in Marais & Meier, 2010) state that disruptive behavior is a problem that arises from disciplinary enforcement in schools that affects the basic rights of students to feel safe and be treated with respect in school. Asizah (2010) states that disruptive behavior is an act of opposing rules and causing damage. Furthermore, the Psychology Forum of Muhammadiyah University of Malang (2017) describes disruptive behavior as behavior displayed by a child which is a response to various environmental situations and the result of the child's interaction with others and their environment. According to Seeman (2010), disruptive behavior in students is behavior that disrespects the rights of other students and disrupts teaching activity by causing disturbances and inappropriate demands.

The conclusion that can be drawn from the definitions above is that disruptive behavior is a pattern of antisocial and defiant/disrespectful behavior displayed by adolescents in various contexts such as home, school, and society.

Tolan and Leventhal (2013) describe disruptive behavior as a clinical syndrome with the most significant characteristic which is repeated involvement in aggressive actions towards others, without regard for the effects of such behavior on others or the values of obeying rules, instructions, requests, and expectations for conformity from parents and other authority figures. Disruptive behavior according to Gresham (2015) is behavior characterized by problems with self-control and behavior that makes it difficult to adjust in personal and interpersonal domains, consisting of patterns of antisocial behavior and defiant/disrespectful behavior that occur in the home, school, and community environments.

Herbert and Wookey (2004) explain that in order to meet the criteria for disruptive behavior, ODD and CD behaviors must occur for at least six months and have at least three to four types of behavior from a number of ODD and CD behaviors. Furthermore, Quay and Hogan (1999) state that the constellation of disruptive behavior partly occurs due to adolescent development needs, such as bonds with peers and independence from parents. Thus, it can be concluded that disruptive behavior is problematic behavior that presents three to four types of oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) symptoms as a pattern of defiance/defiance/hostility towards authority figures and a number of conduct disorder (CD) symptoms as a pattern of antisocial behavior that violates the rights of others, societal norms, and rules. Herbert and Wookey (2004) explain that ODD behaviors include impatience, arguing with adults, defiance/noncompliance with rules and requests from adults, deliberate disruption, blaming others for one's own mistakes, sensitivity and easily offended by others, and frequent anger and resentment, while CD behaviors include aggression towards humans and animals, property destruction, fraud and theft, and serious rule violations.

Disruptive behavior, as classified in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5), falls under the category of "Disruptive, Impulse-Control, and Conduct Disorder". This group consists of eight different types of disorders, namely Oppositional Defiant Disorder (ODD), Intermittent Explosive Disorder, Conduct Disorder (CD), Antisocial Personality Disorder, Pyromania, Kleptomania, Other Specified Disruptive, Impulse-Control, and Conduct Disorder, and Unspecified Disruptive, Impulse-Control, and Conduct Disorder. If a child or adolescent displays behaviors that are symptomatic of any of these six disorders but does not meet all of the criteria, their behavior may be classified as either Other Specified Disruptive or Unspecified Disruptive (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Moreover, children and adolescents who exhibit disruptive behavior also demonstrate problematic behavior that represents symptoms of Oppositional Defiant Disorder (ODD) or Conduct Disorder (CD) (American Psychiatric Association, 2013 in McClelland & McKinney, 2016).

Furthermore, Gresham (2015) categorizes disruptive behavior into mild, moderate, and severe categories depending on the number of different types of behavior displayed and the number of settings in which they occur. Antisocial behavior is considered mild if it involves two to three types of problems, moderate if it involves four to six types, and severe if it involves more than seven. On the other hand, Oppositional/Defiant behavior is considered mild if it is limited to one environment, such as home or school, moderate if it occurs in two environments, and pervasive if it occurs in three or more, such as school, home, and the community. Consistent with the research conducted by Miller, Loeber, and Hipwell (2008), it has been reported that teenagers are involved in at least ten types of disruptive activities or behaviors, ranging from mild behaviors like lying, noncompliance, and hitting other children to more serious behaviors such as drinking alcohol and stealing.

In conclusion, there are two categories of disruptive behavior: antisocial and oppositional/defiant, and each category has mild, moderate, and severe gradations based on the number of problems that arise and the environment in which the disruptive behavior occurs.

Rayment (Asizah, 2015) believes that disruptive behavior in a child is caused by family dysfunction and a lack of harmonious relationship between parents and children. According to Mabeba and Prinsloo (Marais and Meier, 2010), disruptive behavior is caused by school environment related disciplinary issues that affect students' rights to feel safe and students' right to be respected during learning activity in school. Shaw and Tshiwula (Marais & Meier, 2010) suggest that common causes of disruptive behavior in adolescents are their risky lifestyles and behavior patterns, which may lead to future violations.

The more risk factors present in the internal and external systems of a teenager, the greater the likelihood of disruptive behavior. Rossouw (Marais and Meier, 2010) states that children do not automatically become good and innocent, as they tend to be disobedient to rules or exhibit disruptive behavior. Shehzadi, Bajwa, Batool, and Shah (2018) explain that there are four highly risky factors in the development of disruptive behavior in adolescents, including: biological, individual, family, and social factors.

Baumrind (1966) defines permissive parenting style as a style in which parents behave in a non-punitive, accepting, and affirmative manner towards their children's impulses, desires, and actions. Santrock (2014) defines permissive parenting style as indulgent, where parents are involved with their adolescent children but do not demand or control them. Furthermore, Yang, Kim, Laroche, and Lee, Bernardo (Sarwar, 2016) state that in permissive parenting style, parents are not involved in the development of their children's character.

According to Papalia et al. (2009), permissive parenting style emphasizes self-expression and self-regulation, where permissive parents make few demands and allow children to monitor their own activities as much as possible, while being warm, non-controlling, and rarely punishing. Similarly, Wittenborn (2002) suggests that permissive parenting style is low in demandingness and high in responsiveness. Maccoby and Martin (1983) reinforce this idea, stating that permissive parenting style focuses on the needs of the parent rather than the needs of the child. As a result, children receive little guidance, which makes them anxious about whether they are doing the right thing.

Based on the aforementioned views, it can be concluded that permissive parenting style is an indulgent parenting style where parents show low levels of demand/control and high levels of responsiveness/warmth. They allow their children to participate actively but tend to avoid involvement in controlling their children's behavior and do not establish rules. Permissive parenting style in this study is defined as adolescents' perception of their parents' caregiving practices that emphasize high self-expression and low self-regulation. Permissive parents style make few demands (low demandingness) and allow children to monitor their own activities as much as possible, while being warm to their children (high responsiveness), not controlling, and rarely punishing.

Ormrod (2008) states that permissive parenting style is characterized by parents who do not demand or regulate what their child should do. Parents with this parenting style are generally warm, non-controlling, and undemanding. Their children tend to be less mature/selfish, lack self-control/impulsive, non-compliant, dependent on others, seek attention from others, and have little curiosity/lack motivation. Hoskins (Sarwar, 2016) states that permissive parents exhibit low levels of demand and high levels of responsiveness. Parents behave in a more lenient manner towards their adolescents' impulses, actions, and desires when consulting them about family decisions. Additionally, parents tend to avoid involvement in behavior control, do not establish rules, and set a small number of behavior expectations for adolescents. From this perspective, permissive parenting style can be stated as allowing adolescents to actively participate without concern for their actions.

The lack of supervision and discipline is an indicator of permissive parenting style and is the most significant factor in predicting delinquent behavior in adolescents. The permissive parenting style dimension consists of low demandingness, which is the low level of parents setting guidelines for their children, and how they discipline their adolescents based on those guidelines, and high responsiveness, which is the high level of parents paying attention to their children's needs and supporting their desires. Watson (Santrock, 2014) revealed that parents should not adopt permissive parenting style as a result of excessive affection towards their children, which leads them to perceive their children as "bosses". Furthermore, according to Sarwar (2016), permissive parenting style involves parents not being involved in their child's character development. The research conducted by Widiastuti and Elshap (2015) showed that 47% of children experience a lack of responsibility in using communication technology due to their parents adopting permissive parenting style. Furthermore, Muthmainnah and Pujiharti I (2020) presented the results of their research that family and peer factors influence adolescent disruptive behavior.

Santrock (2014) defined the process of adolescent adaptation to antisocial peer standards and resisting parental influence as peer pressure. Davenport (2016) stated that peer pressure is the force of peers that motivates or pushes individuals to form their beliefs and behaviors. Tarshis (2010) defines peer pressure as a condition where someone has to change their behavior to be accepted by individuals or groups, whether positive or negative. Furthermore, Lebedina-Manzoni and Ricijaš (2013) defined peer pressure as the act of persuading and encouraging someone to take certain actions, both directly and indirectly. According to Clasen and Brown (1987), peer pressure is generally described by adults as a negative force responsible for the influence of peer conformity and delinquent/disruptive behavior. Payne and Cornwell (Khan, 2018) stated that peer pressure is a condition that leads adolescents towards criminal activities, as they feel that if they do not follow the style or standard of their peers, they will be isolated and left alone. The fear of isolation drives them to be part of peer groups, which may be involved in negative activities.

The forms of peer pressure are varied, according to Tarshis (2010), there are three forms which are comments, material items, and behavior. Brown and Clasen (1987) identified five domains in which peer pressure can be observed, namely peer involvement (spending time with friends), involvement in school (completing school assignments), family involvement (compliance with household rules), peer conformity (speaking, behaving, and dressing similarly as well as having the same music taste as peers), and misconduct (stealing, damaging property, and vandalism). Furthermore, Temesgen (2015) found two forms of peer pressure, positive and negative, but there was no significant difference observed in what has been happening so far.

Papalia (2009) stated that peer groups are sources of affection, sympathy, understanding, moral guidance, as well as a place to experiment and self-regulate in order to achieve autonomy and independence from parents. Furthermore, the social system of peers is much more complex, diverse, and can change into a crowd. Lebedina-Manzoni & Ricijaš (2013) explained that teenagers under the influence of their peers are actually experiencing one form of peer pressure. Calvete, Orue, Guadix, Bilbao, Arroyabe (2015) found that peer pressure is a nightmare for parents in competing with the influence of peers in various periods of their children's lives and growth phases.

Calvete et al. (2015) also revealed that children who have had relationships with peer groups and experienced bullying will develop aggressive and naughty behavioral problems. Peer pressure has an influence on disruptive behavior in teenagers. The study by Andayani and Ekowarni (2018) found that the relationship between parents and their children, as well as peer pressure, both can affect the tendency towards risk-taking behavior and anti-social behavior (disruptive behavior).

This study was conducted to contribute to the field of educational psychology, particularly in the context of disruptive behavior in teenagers. The major hypothesis of this study is that permissive parenting style and peer pressure simultaneously affect disruptive behavior in teenagers. Furthermore, the minor hypotheses of this study are: 1) permissive parenting style significantly influences disruptive behavior in teenagers; 2) peer pressure significantly influences disruptive behavior in teenagers.

Method

This research uses a quantitative approach with a prediction design research. Prediction design research is an effort by researchers to anticipate results by using certain variables as predictors, or a research design that aims to identify specific variables that will predict other variables (Creswell, 2012). The researchers aim to uncover whether disruptive behavior can be predicted by peer pressure variables and permissive parenting style patterns.

The subjects in this study were selected purposively from the results of preliminary research conducted by the researchers, with a total of 74 students meeting the criteria. The group of students desired by the researchers were those who perceived their parents as engaging in permissive parenting style. The reason why the researchers chose subjects with this criterion is because theoretically, permissive parenting style is one of the factors that influences disruptive behavior in adolescents. The preliminary research was conducted by distributing a permissive parenting style scale to 489 students from Muhammadiyah 2 Junior High School in Yogyakarta who were in 7th and 8th grade and divided into 16 classes. There were 8 classes in 7th grade with a total of 248 students and 8 classes in 8th grade with a total of 250 students. The questionnaire was distributed through the Google Forms application, and 339 students responded. After sorting, the data obtained was as follows: 74 students reported that their parents engaged in permissive parenting style, 27 students reported that their parents engaged in authoritarian parenting, and 238 students reported that their parents engaged in democratic parenting. In detail, the 74 students who reported that their parents engaged in permissive parenting style can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Research Subject (N=74)

Research Subject				
Grade	Gender		(N)	Percentage(%)
	Male	Female		
7	22	18	40	50 %
8	15	19	34	50 %
Total	37	37	74	100%

The data collection procedure in this study was conducted online by distributing three measurement tools through Google form. In this study, students were given the opportunity to accept or refuse to be included as samples in the research. This was done by asking students to fill out an informed consent form as research participants, which was included in the introduction section of the research. All students involved as research subjects stated their willingness to contribute to the study.

The variable measurement in this study used three psychological scales developed by the author and modified from previous research. The psychological scales used in this study consisted of statements that revealed indicators of behavior of the variables being studied. Subject responses were not classified as right or wrong, but all responses were accepted and interpreted differently

(Azwar, 2005). The scaling model used was the Likert-like model, consisting of favorable and unfavorable items.

The disruptive behavior scale was developed by the researcher based on the concept of disruptive behavior, which presents three to four types of behavior from a number of symptoms of oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) as a pattern of defiant/oppositional/antagonistic behavior towards figures and conduct disorder (CD) as a pattern of antisocial behavior that violates the basic rights of others, norms and societal rules. Oppositional behavior includes loss of patience, non-compliance with rules, blaming others for one's own mistakes, and opposing/debating with parents and teachers. Antisocial behavior includes bullying, property damage, lying, and stealing. This scale consists of 24 items and uses a Likert model with five answer choices with five levels of scores, namely a score of 5 for always (AL), a score of 4 for often (OF), a score of 3 for sometimes (SO), a score of 1 for rarely (RA), and a score of 0 for never (NE). The disruptive behavior scale consists of 24 statement items. Based on the test, a reliability coefficient of 0.841 was obtained, with four items being dropped and 20 items being declared valid.

The Permissive parenting style Scale developed by the author is based on the concept of permissive parenting style proposed by Papalia et al. (2009), which focuses on two aspects: self-expression and self-regulation as perceived by adolescents regarding their parents' parenting practices. The indicators include parents who make few demands (low demandingness), allow children to monitor their own activities as much as possible (non-controlling parents), show warmth (high responsiveness), do not exert control, and rarely punish. The Permissive parenting style Scale consists of 12 statement items and uses a Likert model format with five response options with five levels of scores, with a score of 5 for "always", a score of 4 for "often", a score of 3 for "sometimes", a score of 1 for "rarely", and a score of 0 for "never". The reliability coefficient of the Permissive parenting style Scale was 0.767 after testing, with three invalid or dropped items and nine valid items.

The peer pressure scale uses the Peer Pressure Inventory (PPI) developed by Clasen & Brown (1987), which has been adapted and modified by Temesgen (2015) into the Positive Peer Pressure Inventory (PPPI) and Negative Peer Pressure Inventory (NPPI). In this study, the PPPI was used to measure negative strength responsible for the influence of peer group conformity and disruptive behavior that occurs in five domains: peer involvement, involvement in school, family involvement, peer conformity, and misconduct. The scale was further modified by the researcher for ease of answering, with a Likert model format of five alternative answers with five levels of scores, with a score of 5 for "always", a score of 4 for "often", a score of 3 for "sometimes", a score of 1 for "rarely", and a score of 0 for "never". The number of statement items in this study was 15, adapted to the students' background. The peer pressure scale consisted of 15 statement items, and after testing, the reliability coefficient was 0.748, with two invalid or dropped items and 13 valid items.

Multiple regression analysis was used with several assumptions, such as normality test, linearity test, and multicollinearity. The purpose of the regression analysis in this study was to explore permissive parenting style and peer pressure as predictors of disruptive behavior.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

Assumption testing is a requirement that must be fulfilled in conducting parametric statistical analysis. In multiple linear regression analysis, several assumptions must be met, including normality test, linearity test, and multicollinearity test. Based on the normality test results (Table 2), it is known that the distribution of the disruptive behavior variable has a p-value of 0.200 ($p > 0.05$), indicating that the disruptive behavior variable has a normal, or each data point is normally distributed. The distribution of the permissive parenting style variable has a p-value of 0.200 ($p > 0.05$), indicating that the permissive parenting style variable has a normal distribution, or each data

point is normally distributed. The distribution of the peer pressure variable has a p-value of 0.200 ($p > 0.05$), indicating that the peer pressure variable has a normal distribution, or each data point is normally distributed.

Table 2. Normality test

Variable	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Sig	Distribution
a. Disruptive Behavior	0,075	0,200	Normal
b. Permissive parenting style Sty	0,071	0,200	Normal
c. Peer Pressure	0,070	0,200	Normal

The results of the linearity test between showed a p-value (deviation from linearity) of 0.097 ($p > 0.05$). The test results indicate that there is a linear relationship between the two variables, or there is a straight line connecting permissive parenting style style with disruptive behavior (see Table 3).

The linearity test results between showed a p-value (deviation from linearity) of 0.306 ($p > 0.05$). These results indicate that there is a linear relationship between the two variables, or there is a straight line connecting peer pressure with disruptive behavior (see Table 3).

Table 3. Linearity Test

Variable	Deviation from Linearity		Result
	F	Sig (p)	
a. Permissive parenting style Style and Disruptive Behavior	1,547	0,097	Linier
b. Peer Pressure and Disruptive Behavior	1,181	0,306	Linier

Table 4. Multicollinearity Test

Variable	Tolerance	VIF	Result
Permissive parenting style Sty	0,991	1,009	No Multicollinearity
Peer Pressure	0,991	1,009	No Multicollinearity

The multicollinearity test aims to determine whether the independent variables in a study have the same elements. If the independent variables contain the same aspects or indicators, the regression coefficients obtained become biased and meaningless. Multicollinearity tests are determined by the Tolerance value and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value with the rule of $Tolerance > 0.1$ and $VIF < 10$. From the results of the multicollinearity test on permissive parenting style and peer pressure, the Tolerance values for each variable were 0.991 and 0.991, respectively, while the VIF values were obtained at 1.009 and 1.009. Based on these results, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity in each independent variable (see Table 4).

After all assumptions are met, the next step is to perform regression analysis to test the major hypothesis, that is, permissive parenting style style and peer pressure can be predictors of disruptive behavior. Based on multiple regression analysis results for the major hypothesis, the F value for permissive parenting style style and peer pressure towards disruptive behavior is 25.674 with a significance level of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). Thus, it can be interpreted that permissive parenting style and peer pressure simultaneously have a significant effect on disruptive behavior (see Table 5).

Table 5. Anova^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2078.770	2	1039.385	25.674	.000 ^b
Residual	2874.365	71	40.484		
Total	4953.135	73			

Based on the results of the partial correlation analysis between permissive parenting style and disruptive behavior, a t-value of -0.102 was obtained with a significance level of 0.919 ($p > 0.05$). This indicates that permissive parenting style has no partial effect on disruptive behavior. Therefore, it can be said that this minor hypothesis is rejected. Furthermore, the results of the partial correlation analysis between peer pressure and disruptive behavior showed a t-value of 7.125 with a significance level of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that peer pressure has a significant positive partial effect on disruptive behavior, which means that the higher the peer pressure experienced by the student, the higher their disruptive behavior. Therefore, it can be said that the hypothesis stating that peer pressure affects disruptive behavior is accepted (see table 6).

Table 6. Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	13.528	6.519		2.075	.042
Peer Pressure	.859	.121	.647	7.125	.000
Permissive Style	-.012	.115	-.009	-.102	.919

Based on the results of the coefficient of determination analysis, the effective contribution of the permissive parenting style to disruptive behavior was 0.0654%, while the effective contribution of peer pressure to disruptive behavior was 41.94%. From these results, it is known that peer pressure is the independent variable that has the dominant contribution to disruptive behavior. The total contribution of the permissive parenting style and peer pressure to disruptive behavior is 42%, while the remaining 58% is influenced by other variables that were not studied in this research.

Using the regression equation formula $Y' = a + b_1.X_1 + b_2.X_2$, the regression line is formed as follows: $Y = 13.528 + 0.859X_1 + (-0.012)X_2$. This regression equation means that, first, without being influenced by any variable, the average score of disruptive behavior is 13.528. Second, for every increase in the peer pressure score by 1 point, the score of disruptive behavior will increase by 0.859 if the permissive parenting style score remains the same. However, third, for every increase in the permissive parenting style score by 1 point, the score of disruptive behavior will actually decrease by 0.012 if the peer pressure score remains constant. Looking at the regression equation, the value of b_1 is larger than the value of b_2 . In this case, it can be understood that the percentage of peer pressure as a predictor is much better than the percentage of permissive parenting style.

Discussion

The research conducted by researchers on the level of disruptive behavior among seventh and eighth-grade students at Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school is categorized as moderate. Based on the explanation given by experts, disruptive behavior is categorized as moderate if students exhibit four to six types of antisocial behavior that occur in two environments. The dominant type of behavior is oppositional behavior, such as impatience, disobedience to rules, lying, blaming others for their mistakes, and arguing with parents and teachers. Additionally, students also display oppositional behavior in two environments: at home and at school.

Seventh and eighth-grade students experience hybrid learning (combining online and face-to-face teaching) and blended learning (combining two teaching modes and self-learning). Learning through both modes causes students to have difficulty in interacting with teachers and classmates to the maximum extent. This results in various problems related to disruptive behavior, such as when students scribble on the screen/share screen during online learning when the teacher explains through zoom and Google Meet, show inappropriate photos or images on the camera, do not respond when attendance is checked even though they are present, and play games during class.

During face-to-face learning, students show easily angered behavior towards classmates and teachers, have difficulty following the rules, and often lie about feeling sick so they do not have to attend face-to-face learning. Levin and Nolan (Marais & Meier, 2010) describe disruptive behavior as student behavior that inhibits the achievement of teacher goals by disrupting learning activities, disrupting the rights of other students to learn, engaging in psychologically and/or physically unsafe behavior that threatens classmates, and engaging in behavior that causes damage to school property, such as scribbling and so on.

The results of the analysis for permissive parenting style are categorized as moderate. Students perceive that their parents exhibit permissive parenting style in terms of self-expression by treating their children with warmth and allowing them to engage in activities as much as possible without monitoring. This happens because students at Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school generally have parents with a middle to upper-class economic status, so the fulfillment of their self-expression is well provided for. This phenomenon indicates that students perceive their parents as providing warmth and freedom in their lives, giving them little demand and rarely punishing them. Consistent with what Widiastuti & Elshap (2015) stated, parents with permissive parenting style tend to encourage their children to be autonomous, educate them based on logic, and provide freedom. The research results are also in line with Fellasari and Lestari's (2016) research, which obtained an R value of 0.149 with a significant level of 0.082, indicating a positive correlation between permissive parenting style and adolescent emotional maturity, meaning that parents who apply permissive parenting style to their teenagers will have teenagers who can control their emotions and not engage in disruptive behavior.

The analysis results for the level of peer pressure on students at Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school are categorized as moderate. This is because at present, students feel the dominance of peer involvement and peer conformity aspects, for example, students spend a lot of time playing online games together and chatting on social media. Students who are not active in online games and not responsive on social media will be left out of the circle of friendship. Lebedina-Manzoni & Ricijaš (2013) state that peers are a specific form of peer influence. Lebedina-Manzoni & Ricijaš (2013) state that peer influence manifests as a specific form of peer influence that leads to conformity of thoughts or behaviors. Furthermore, Berndt and Ladd (Lebedina-Manzoni & Ricijaš, 2013) explain that peer pressure acts as a group influence on individuals through positive reinforcement for those who conform to group norms and/or sanctions for those who refuse to adapt.

This study has three hypotheses, one major hypothesis and two minor hypotheses. The major hypothesis of this study is that there is an influence of permissive parenting style and peer pressure on disruptive behavior in students of Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school. Regression analysis revealed that the hypothesis was accepted, indicating a very significant influence of permissive parenting style and peer pressure on disruptive behavior in students of Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school.

This research is supported by the study of Tu et al. (2018) who found that permissive parenting style, characterized by loose or inconsistent discipline, affects the increase of maladjustment or disruptive behavior in adolescents over time, and the study of Khan (2018) which explains that peer pressure plays a significant role in the occurrence of disruptive behavior in adolescents.

Disruptive behavior can be influenced by many factors, including internal and external factors. Causes from within the student relate to conflicts between a sense of ability versus low self-esteem in the basic development phase, lack of experience and knowledge about the importance of obeying rules, curiosity that triggers disruptive behavior, the need to possess, the need for recognition/attention from peers, parents and teachers, and the need for power/control and anger release resulting from parenting styles that place them in control. Students who are able to manage their internal domain well will find it easier to adapt to their environment.

External factors that also influence the occurrence of disruptive behavior in students are environmental factors. The family environment, school environment, and community environment. The family environment is the first education for students to form their character, and parents who are weak in their function will make their children who are have weak or even bad characters. The impact is that

the child's character will be developed in the school and community environment by receiving various stimuli and feedback from peers, teachers, and authorities in the community.

The first minor hypothesis of this study is that there is no influence of permissive parenting style on disruptive behavior in students of Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school. Based on the data analysis conducted by the researcher, it was found that permissive parenting style did not affect disruptive behavior with an effective contribution of 0.0654%. The absence of an influence of permissive parenting style on disruptive behavior resulted in the rejection of the hypothesis. The results of this study are consistent with several previous studies that found that permissive parenting style does not have a significant influence on disruptive behavior.

The dimension of permissive parenting style that is not significant in increasing disruptive behavior in students consists of self-expression and self-regulation. The indicator of self-expression is treating children with warmth and allowing them to do activities as much as possible without supervision, while the indicator of self-regulation is not controlling or making little demands and rarely giving punishment. The dimension of parental control that does not establish standards for their children's behavior or does not regulate and control their children's behavior, which is not significant in this study, is supported by the results of Pandri and Netrawati's research (2022), which states that parental attention is a factor that weighs in reducing and decreasing disruptive behavior in middle school teenagers. Furthermore, the current factor of students in this digital era is spending more time at home, and the pandemic has limited their movement outside the home environment. Therefore, parents synchronize their parenting style, focusing more on organizing their children's daily life, oriented towards activities at home, such as worshiping, learning, helping with household chores, and scheduling social media and online game playing. The condition where children spend more time at home and limited activities outside the home environment makes parents not need to control and regulate their children's behavior strictly. Parents not controlling and regulating their children's behavior, or practicing permissive parenting style, does not cause disruptive behavior in students. This is in line with Aslan's research (2019), stating that all parenting styles, including permissive parenting style, in this digital era will not successfully bring about behavioral changes in children without experiencing parenting style synchronization. Furthermore, Sarwar (2016) revealed that permissive parenting style tends to have a higher level of responsiveness and determines rules related to the family, encouraging teenagers to see it as a resource. Parents are an "oasis" for children, a place where children can express their feelings, seek answers to their curiosity, and become models for various roles in society.

This study is not without limitations, therefore the permissive parenting style variable does not affect disruptive behavior. This could be because the determination of research subjects did not go through a more detailed screening process. The research subjects were students who perceived that their parents practiced permissive parenting style, but it is not known in detail whether all research subjects were students who had ever exhibited disruptive behavior. Additionally, research subjects may not have provided accurate data about disruptive behavior.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the data analysis and discussion on permissive parenting style and peer pressure with disruptive behavior, the following conclusions can be drawn: 1) There is no significant influence of permissive parenting style on students' disruptive behavior, and there is a highly significant influence of peer pressure on students' disruptive behavior at Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school with an effective contribution of 42%. 2) There is no significant influence of permissive parenting style on students' disruptive behavior at Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta junior high school with an effective contribution of 0.0654%. 3) There is a highly significant influence of peer pressure on students' disruptive behavior at Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school with an effective contribution of 41.94%. 4) Peer pressure is a variable that has a highly significant influence and has a larger effective contribution to students' disruptive behavior at Muhammadiyah 2 Yogyakarta junior high school compared to permissive

parenting style.

Based on this research, parents are recommended to adjust their parenting style with the aim of minimizing the growth of disruptive behavior in their teenage children, therefore parental upbringing can be an "oasis" for children in facing problems in their environment. Schools are expected to increase their vigilance towards peer pressure that triggers disruptive behavior in students. Recommendations for future researchers are expected to consider family variables from different perspectives that potentially influence disruptive behavior in adolescents.

Acknowledgment

Gratitude is conveyed to the Education Council of Primary and Secondary Education, the Muhammadiyah Regional Leadership in Yogyakarta Special Region, who has provided financial support for the completion of the entire research activities.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, 5th edition_ DSM-5*. American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Arifin, Z. (2020). Teori perkembangan sosial anak dan pengaruhnya bagi pendidikan. *TADARUS*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.30651/td.v9i1.5464>.
- Asizah. (2010). *Children disruptive behavior well-being: pentingnya hubungan anak dan orangtua*. Seminar Psikologi & Kemanusiaan. Psychology Forum UMM, from <https://mpsi.umm.ac.id/files/file/46-54%20Asizah.pdf>.
- Aslan, A. (2019). Peran pola asuh orangtua di era digital. *Jurnal Studia Insania*, 7(1), 20. <https://doi.org/10.18592/jsi.v7i1.2269>.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Wiley*, 37.
- Calvete, E., Orue, I., Gámez-Guadix, M., Hoyo-Bilbao, J. del, & de Arroyabe, E. L. (2015). Child-to-parent violence: an exploratory study of the roles of family violence and parental discipline through the stories told by spanish children and their parents. *Violence and Victims*, 30(6), 935–947. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-14-00105>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (fourth edition). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Durham, N. H. (2012). Controlling parents more likely to have delinquent children, UNH Research Shows. *Targeted News Service; Washington, D.C.* <https://search.proquest.com/docview/920964734?accountid=31324>.
- Gresham, F. M. (2015). *Disruptive behavior disorders_ evidence-based practice for assessment and intervention*. The Guilford Press. WWW.guilford.com.
- Herbert, M., & Wookey, J. (2004). *Managing children's disruptive behaviour: a guide for practitioners working with parents and foster parents*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1475-3588.2005.00370.2.x>.
- Kayanti, D. D., Noviandri, L., Yustitiya, N., & Wulandari, D. (2020). Hubungan pola asuh permissive negligent ibu terhadap kecenderungan kenakalan remaja di SMAN X. *INQUIRY: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 11(2), 115-132. <https://journal.paramadina.ac.id/index.php/inquiry/article/view/455/206>.
- Marais, P., & Meier, C. (2010). Disruptive behaviour in the foundation phase of schooling. *South African Journal of Education*, 30(1), 41–57. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v30n1a315>.

- Miller, S., Loeber, R., & Hipwell, A. E. (2008). Peer deviance, parenting and disruptive behavior among young girls. *Springer Science+Business Media, LCC*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-008-9265-1>.
- Muthmainnah, M., & Pujiharti, I. (2020). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi perilaku disruptif remaja di SMAN 106 Jakarta. *Afiat*, 6(1), 49-59. <https://uia.ejournal.id/afiat/article/view/2522>.
- Ormrod, J. E. (2008). *Psikologi pendidikan. Membantu siswa tumbuh dan berkembang* (edisi keenam). Penerbit Erlangga.
- Pandri, D. P., & Netrawati, N. (2022). The importance of parents' attention to complete aggressive behavior. *Jurnal EDUCATIO: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 8(1), 45. <https://doi.org/10.29210/1202221492>.
- Papalia, D. E., Olds, S. W., & Feldman, R. D. (2009). *Human development* (11th ed). New York: NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Purwaningtyas, F. D. (2020). Pengasuhan permissive orang tua dan kenakalan pada remaja. *Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 11(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.29080/jpp.v11i1.337>.
- Quay, H. C., & Hogan, A. E. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook of disruptive behavior disorders*. Springer US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4881-2>.
- Santrock, J. W. (2014). *Adolescence* (fifteenth edition). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Seeman, H. (2010). *Preventing disruptive behavior in colleges: A campus and classroom management handbook for higher education*. United Kingdom: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Shehzadi, F., Bajwa, R. S., Batool, I., & Shah, A. A. (2018). Effects of perceived parenting styles on disruptive behavior among adolescents. *Peshawar Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences (PJPBS)*, 4(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.32879/picp.2018.4.2.1>.
- Syakarofath, N. A., & Subandi, S. (2019). Faktor ayah dan ibu yang berkontribusi terhadap munculnya gejala perilaku disruptif remaja. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 18(2), 230. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.18.2.230-244>.
- Tarshis, T. P. (2010). *Living with peer pressure and bullying*. New York, NY: Facts on File, Inc. An imprint of Infibase Publishing.
- Tolan, P. H., & Leventhal, B. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Disruptive behavior disorders*. Springer New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7557-6>.
- Tu, K. M., Elmore-Staton, L., Buckhalt, J. A., & El-Sheikh, M. (2018). The link between maternal sleep and permissive parenting style during late adolescence. *Journal of Sleep Research*, 27(5), e12676. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsr.12676>.
- Widiastuti, N., & Elshap, D. S. (2015). Pola asuh orang tua sebagai upaya menumbuhkan sikap tanggungjawab pada anak dalam menggunakan teknologi komunikasi. *Jurnal Ilmiah UPT P2M STKIP Siliwangi*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.22460/p2m.v2i2p148-159.174>.
- Wittenborn, M. (2002). *The relations between parenting styles and juvenile delinquency*. 23. Honors Theses. Paper 266. https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1263&context=uhp_theses.