THE EFFECT OF PERMISSIVE PARENTING ON ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY THROUGH SOCIAL SUPPORT FOR PAI STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITAS AL-WASHLIYAH MEDAN

Susanti Nirmalasari[1], Hasanuddin[2], Salamiah Sari Dewi[3]
[1,2,3]Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia.
Email: susantinirmalasari06@gmail.com[1], hasanuddin@staff.uma.ac.id[2],
salamiahsaridewi@staff.uma.ac.id[3]

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to analyze the direct effect of permissive parenting on students' academic self-efficacy and to construct a model that is in accordance with the standard value of the fit index. This research method uses a quantitative method. The population in this study were all PAI students at Al-Washliyah University, Medan, totaling 488 students. The sampling technique used was the total sampling technique. This study uses a mediation model approach (Neuman, 2013). This study will look at the function of the social support variable (M) on the effect of permissive parenting on academic self-efficacy. Based on the results of the analysis, it is known that permissive parenting has a significant negative effect on academic self-efficacy, with an estimated value of β = -0.029 and p = 0.049. Based on the results of the analysis, it is known that there is an effect of family support on academic self-efficacy with an estimated value of β = 0.145 and p = 0.006. Next, there is an influence of friend support on academic self-efficacy with an estimated value of β = 0.229 and p = <0.001. Then, there is no significant influence of someone's support on academic self-efficacy, with an estimated value of β = -0.075 and p = 0.129. The determining factor for learning success is the students themselves, so based on the results of this research, advice that can be given to students is to always pay attention to their intelligence and personality.
Keywords: Permissive Parenting, Academic Self Efficacy, Social Support, College Students

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis pengaruh langsung pola asuh permisif terhadap *academic self-efficacy* mahasiswa, dan untuk mengkonstruksi model yang sesuai dengan nilai standar *indeks fit*. Metode penelitian ini menggunakan metode kuantitatif. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah seluruh mahasiswa PAI Universitas Al-Washliyah Medan dengan jumlah 488 mahasiswa. Adapun teknik pengambilan sampel yang digunakan adalah teknik total sampling. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan model mediasi (Neuman, 2013). Penelitian ini akan melihat fungsi variabel dukungan sosial (M) terhadap pengaruh dari pola asuh permisif terhadap *academic self-efficacy*. Berdasarkan hasil analisis diketahui bahwa pola asuh permisif memiliki pengaruh negatif yang signifikan terhadap *academic self-efficacy* dengan nilai estimasi β= -0.029 dan p= 0.049. Berdasarkan hasil analisis diketahui bahwa ada pengaruh dukungan keluarga terhadap *academic self-efficacy* dengan nilai estimasi β= 0.145 dan p= 0.006. Selanjutnya ada pengaruh dukungan teman terhadap *academic self-efficacy* dengan nilai estimasi β= 0.229 dan p= <0.001. Kemudian tidak ada pengaruh dukungan seseorang yang penting terhadap *academic self-efficacy* dengan nilai estimasi β= -0.075 dan p= 0.129. Faktor penentu keberhasilan belajar adalah siswa itu sendiri, sehingga berdasarkan hasil penelitian ini, saran yang dapat diberikan kepada siswa adalah agar selalu memperhatikan kecerdasan dan kepribadiannya.
Kata Kunci: Pola Asuh Permisif, *Academic Self Efficacy*, Dukungan Sosial, Mahasiswa

INTRODUCTION

Students are a group of young people who have the opportunity to gain knowledge in higher education and who have a self-identity. Student self-identity is formed and built from the self-image individuals possess as dynamic, social, independent, and religious beings. Based on the youth's self-identity, a sense of spiritual, intellectual, social, and individual responsibility as a citizen, nation, and servant of God will be reflected. Salim (Rohmatun, 2013)) also stated that students are intermediaries or connectors between the theoretical world and the empirical world, which means that they can map and find solutions to problems in the social environment and life according to their respective fields of expertise. Students have 3 roles and functions: intellectual, active in discussion, and a person who brings change and aspirations to society. Students basically have the ability within themselves to carry out an academic or non-academic activity. Bandura (1997) states that, in fact, the individual's belief in his ability to master his academic activities, which is a result of the cognitive abilities he controls, which can indirectly influence the way he thinks, how far the individual feels interested in activities in his academic environment and how the individual can complete his academic tasks.

One of the things that affects adolescents' beliefs is family support. How confident parents are in their children makes children have different academic self-efficacy. In late adolescence, around 18-21 years old, academic self-efficacy has emerged (Santrock, 2012). Academic self-efficacy is influenced by many things, including the influence of trust from parents, socioeconomic status, the influence of friends, and achievements obtained. Parents who believe in the abilities possessed by children will affect children's success. Bell & Kozlowski (2002) stated in their research that a person's goal orientation is strongly influenced by academic self-efficacy. Academic self-efficacy also affects adolescents' perseverance in solving their problems. The problems among adolescents while on campus are oriented toward the achievements that adolescents want, such as wanting the best grades compared to their friends, expecting to be able to complete the assignments and homework given, and many more. According to (Papalia et al., 2009), students with high academic self-efficacy believe that they can master tasks and regulate their own learning. These students will always feel capable of completing their academic tasks.

The research results of Nurhayanti & Novitasari (2013) indicate that most students in upper-middle-class families are educated with permissive parenting patterns (N = 38; 43.1%). In contrast, 25 secondary students were surveyed. The findings revealed that most parents employ permissive parenting styles (84%) (Purwaningsih & Setyaningsih, 2015). Kurniawan's (2017) research results in semi-urban environments also indicate that permissive parenting affects children's self-confidence. Specifically, 55 students (38%) exhibited a very high level of confidence, 81 students (55%) demonstrated a high level of confidence, and 10 students (7%) exhibited a moderate level of confidence.

This research is also supported by the findings of Yusuf (2019), which demonstrate a highly significant correlation between children's self-confidence and the application of permissive parenting styles. In particular, permissive parenting accounted for a 36% improvement in self-confidence effectiveness. The results of observations and interviews

based on aspects of academic self-efficacy found that a number of students feel they do not have confidence in making the recovery of both tasks, lecture presentations, and practicum tasks (micro-teaching). These students feel unsure that they can complete college assignments because the assignments given have the same level of difficulty and have deadlines that are very close together. Therefore, they have no confidence that they can complete them all at once.

When viewed from the aspect of strength when completing assignments, some students get sick while completing lecture assignments, and they experience both physical pain and mental fatigue because they appear confused about the given coursework. Then, in general, some students do not have confidence in themselves when working on their final project or thesis, and they delay working on their final project or thesis due to many shortcomings in finding reference sources and confusion about the research title. This is because most students do not get support from their parents or family. Students who have low academic self-efficacy will also have low autonomy, as seen from individuals who depend on the expectations and evaluations of others. In addition, individuals who have low academic self-efficacy will find it challenging to manage their daily lives, feel unable to change or improve the things around them, lack attention to the opportunities around them, and lack control over the surrounding environment.

Bandura (2012) suggests that "positive emotional factors are also said to affect academic self-efficacy". This means that students' ability to manage problems in their lectures with a positive mood also improves their academic self-efficacy. Students can obtain this if they are in a supportive social environment. Family social support can also function as a prevention strategy or reduce stress. Help from family can be in the form of direct assistance, including continuous and intermittent financial assistance, shopping, caring for children, physical care of the elderly, performing household tasks, and practical assistance during times of crisis. Because "family social support can improve an individual's mental health" (Ndore, 2017). In addition, parents who practice permissive parenting tend to believe that a combination of warm involvement and little restriction will result in creative and confident children. However, parents' policy of always giving complete freedom and fulfilling their children's every wish can cause children to have difficulty controlling theirbehavior in a public context, which will ultimately have an impact on their academic problems (Khairani et al.,2023).

Usually, permissive parenting does not guide children to socially approved behaviorpatterns and does not use punishment, so parents do not care and tend to give childrenthe widest possible opportunity and freedom. But in this case, the freedom given by parents is actually abused by children. A child thinks that this freedom can be utilized in things that lead to negative developments (Resti et al., 2023). The results of the freedom received by adolescents who are still undergoing academics will certainly have an impact on their learning process, such as a decrease in academic self-efficacy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Permissive Parenting

According to Farida Rohayani et al. (2023), permissive parenting, as an approach toraising children, involves the practice of allowing children to behave according to their wishes and giving children sufficient freedom to explore their world without parental interference. In this context, children's freedom takes priority, and parents tend to be reluctant to provide punishment or firm control when faced with undesirable behavior. This creates an environment where children feel free to express themselves without fear of severe consequences, allowing them to pursue their interests and exploration without fear or over-judgment more comfortably. This permissive parenting style is the opposite of authoritarian parenting. In an authoritarian parenting style, all the parents' wishes must be followed by the child,whether they agree or not.

Meanwhile, in permissive parenting, parents must follow the child's wishes, whether they agree or not. The communication strategy in this parenting style is the same as that of authoritarian parenting. Namely, it is a win-lose solution. Thismeans that the child's wishes are always obeyed and permitted by the parents. In other words, the parents should follow all the child's wishes (Santrock, 2012).

Rahman et al. (2015) explain that permissive parenting has several aspects, namely as follows: (a) Lack of control over children, not directing children's behavior according to community norms, and not paying attention to who children associate with. (b) Neglect of decisions, letting children decide things themselves without any consideration from their parents. (c) Parents behave indifferently towards their children, and there is no punishment if children behave in violation of norms. (d) Education is free, children are free to choose the school of their choice, there is no advice if children make mistakes, and there is little attention to moral and religious education.

Academic Self-Efficacy

According to Ghufron & Risnawita (2016), academic self-efficacy is a student's belief regarding their ability to carry out tasks or actions needed to achieve certain results. This is because academic self-efficacy also influences individuals in determining the actions that will be taken to achieve goals, including estimates of events that will be faced. In addition, Schultz (2015) defines academic self-efficacy as feelings of adequacy, efficiency, and ability to cope with life. According to Bandura (2012) and Mawanti (2011), aspects of academic self-efficacy include magnitude, generality, strength, outcome expectancy, efficacy expectancy, and outcome value.

Social Support

According to King (Ani & Yuniawati, 2015), social support is information and feedback from other people that shows that someone is loved, cared for, appreciated, respected, and involved in a network of reciprocal communication and obligations. Social support is best thought of as a multidimensional construct consisting of functional and structural components. Social support refers to the actions that other people take when they assist (Kusrini & Prihartanti, 2014). Meanwhile, according to Johnson and Jhonson (Samputri & Sakti, 2015), social support is the presence of other people who can be relied

on to provide assistance, encouragement, acceptance, and attention so that it can improve the welfare of life for the individual concerned.

According to Sarafino, providing social support can take the form of (Tricahyani, 2016): (a) Emotional support or appreciation support, namely in the form of an empathetic attitude and giving positive appreciation to individuals. (b) Information support is in the form of advice, (c) Group support is in the form of joint efforts to build the lives of other individuals, and (d) Instrumental support is in the form of providing facilities such as food and other necessities. Based on the explanation above, the objectives of this study are as follows: (a) to analyze the direct effect of permissive parenting on academic self-efficacy of PAI Students of Al-Washliyah University; (b) To analyze the indirect effect of academic self-efficacy on academic self-efficacy through social support of PAI Students of Al-Washliyah University Medan. Based on the research objectives, it can be hypothesized that (a) permissive parenting has a direct effect on academic self-efficacy. (b) Social support influences the interaction of permissive parenting with academic self-efficacy.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This research method uses quantitative methods. This research uses quantitative with a mediation model approach (Neuman, 2013). This research has received permission from the psychology study program at Medan Area University. Each variable is measured on a scale of permissiveness, academic efficacy, and social support. This study will look at the function of social support variables (M) on the influence of permissive parenting on academic self-efficacy.

Data Collection

The population in this study was comprised of students from the early semester to the final semester, starting from semesters I to VII in the Islamic Religious Education Study Program of Islamic Education Students at Al-Washliyah University Medan, with a total of around 488 students. The sampling technique used is the total sampling technique. The total sampling technique is a technique used where the entire total population is used as a research sample. A large sample tends to provide or be closer to the real value of the population, or it can be said that the smaller the error or deviation from the population value is (Arikunto, 2013). The number of sample members must be calculated based on certain techniques so that the sample taken from the population can be accounted for. The sample in this study was 488 students.

Data Analysis

All data collected from the permissiveness, academic efficacy, and social support scales will be analyzed using mediation to look at direct and indirect effects, and full data analysis will be done using JASP software.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This study collected a sample of 488 students, but not all students filled inproperly, so there were outlier data. After removing all outlier data, the final sample that participated in the data analysis was 435 students, meaning that 53 students did not follow the procedures in the research administration or were deliberately removed for data normality. The sample of 435 students consisted of 128 male students (29.42%) and 307 female students (70.57%).

Table 1. Frequency of gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Men	128	29.425	29.425	29.425
Women	307	70.575	70.575	100.000
Missing	0	0.000		
Total	435	100.000		

The demographic data on the average age of students is 20.58 years with a deviation of 2.74, and 17 students choose not to answer.

Table 2. Frequency of semester

Semester	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
I	123	28.276	28.276	28.276
III	109	25.057	25.057	53.333
V	106	24.368	24.368	77.701
VII	97	22.299	22.299	100.000
Missing	0	0.000		
Total	435	100.000		

Furthermore, the semester demographic data consists of first-semester students with 123 students (28.27%), third-semester students with 109 students (25.05%), fifth-semester students with 106 students (24.36%), and seventh-semester students with 97 students (22.29%). Furthermore, this study uses construct validity with *confirmatory factor analysis* techniques carried out on each variable. The permissiveness scale is known to consist of 20 items with unfit values, so items with factor loading below 0.3 will be removed from factor analysis. There were 15 items (1.2.4.5.6.7.9.10. 11.13.15.16.17.19.20) removed from the analysis because they did not have the power to form a permissive scale. After the items are removed, the scale has a fit index value and can be declared valid for use. The items involved (3.8.12.14.18) have fit values (GFI= .99, SRMR= .01).

The social support scale was found to consist of 12 items with a good fit (GFI= .99, SRMR= .05). All items were involved in the study without any omissions. *The academic self-efficacy* scale is known to consist of 25 items with values that do not fit, so items with factor loading below 0.3 will be removed from factor analysis. There are 6 items

(1.9.14.15.21.22) removed from the analysis because they do not have the strength to form an *academic self-efficacy* scale. After the items were removed, the fit value was not in accordance with the existing standards, so the R value^2 was seen to determine the best item to form an *academic self-efficacy scale*.

There are 8 items (3.8.12.16.17.18.19.20) that have high R^2 values. So that the *academic self-efficacy* scale has a fit value (GFI = .99, SRMR = .04). The reliability used in this study is internal reliability. The formula used refers to *Cronbach Alpha*. On the permissive scale, it is known that overall, it has a fairly consistent value (α = .653) with a total of 5 items, and each item has a high discriminant value. The social support scale consists of 3 dimensions that make up the social support variable. The friend support dimension has a consistent value (α = .840) with a total of 4 items, and each item has a high discriminant value. The family support dimension has a consistent value (α= .777) with a total of 4 items, and each item has a high discriminant value. The important person support dimension has a consistent value (α= .866) with a total of 4 items, and each item has a high discriminant value. But overall, social support has a high-reliability value (α=.843).

On the *academic self-efficacy* scale, it is known that overall, it has a consistent value (α = .790) with a total of 5 items, and each item has a high discriminant value. Based on the assumptions made, there is a direct effect of permissive parenting on *academic self-efficacy* with an estimated value of β = -0.029 and p = 0.049.

Table 3. The direct effect of permissiveness on *academic self-efficacy*

		Estimate	Std. Error	z-value	p
Permissive	*Academic Self-Efficacy*	-0.029	0.015	-1.968	0.049

This means that there is a direct negative influence between permissive parenting and academic self-efficacy, with a value that is not large. It means that in the context of the research sample, the higher the value of permissive parenting, the lower the value of academic self-efficacy owned by students. Based on the second assumption built, namely the influence of social support on the interaction of permissive parenting with academic self-efficacy. Family support provides the least influence on the interaction of permissive parenting with academic self-efficacy, with a decrease in the estimated value of β = -0.017 and p = 0.009.

Table 4. Indirect effect of permissiveness on academic self-efficacy

			Estimate	Std. Error	z-value	p
Permissive	Family	Academic Self-Efficacy	-0.017	0.006	-2.627	0.009
Permissive	Friend	Academic Self-Efficacy	-0.008	0.004	-2.128	0.033
Permissive	Someone Important	Academic Self-Efficacy	0.0009	0.001	0.754	0.451

Friend support has a moderate influence on changes in the interaction of permissive parenting with academic self-efficacy, with a decrease in the estimated value of β = -

0.008 and p = 0.033. The support of someone important does not influence the changes in the interaction of permissive parenting with academic self-efficacy, *with* a decrease in the estimated value of β = -0.0009 and p = 0.451. However, this support is notsignificant, so friend support is the biggest influence on changes in the interaction of permissive parenting with academic self-efficacy. Based on the third assumption that there is an influence of social support on academic self-efficacy, the assumption is that the more social support there is, the higher the value of academic self-efficacy.

Based on these results, it can be explained that there is an effect of family support on academic self-efficacy with an estimated value of θ = 0.145 and p = 0.006. Furthermore, there is an effect of friend support on academic self-efficacy with an estimated value of β = 0.229 and p = <0.001. Then, there is no effect of someone's important support on academic self-efficacy with an estimated value of β = -0.075 and p = 0.129.

Discussion

Providing appropriate treatment and care will increase the child's efficacy. Through a good family environment, the initial formation of children's efficacy can be improved. It is also closely related to the source of efficacy, which states that children will tend to follow social models and social support from the people closest and most attached to the child's life, namely parents. Parents will be the first figures that children will observe.

If the figure observed is successful and supports the child, it will tend to have high efficacy. Conversely, academic self-efficacy will decrease if the figure observed by the child fails and does not support the child. Academic self-efficacy can be increased and decreased by the support and role of parents. Furthermore, several factors influence the child's efficacy, namely the culture adopted by those closest to the child who can provide an assessment of the child's efficacy, whether the child is high or low (Laksmi et al., 2018).

Mulyadi et al. (2016) stated that parenting patterns are all forms and processes of interaction that occur between parents and children, which constitute a particular parenting pattern in the family that will influence the development of the child's personality. Parenting patterns and good interactions with family members are one of the supporting factors for the formation of positive academic self-efficacy in children. Teaching and care can form good independence in children.

States that teenagers who live in permissive homes have high self-confidence, but at the same time, they show higher levels of drug abuse and bad behavior at school and are less committed to school. The study of permissive parenting becomes important in the context of society because of cultural changes in society, the concept of parent-child relationships, or because conflicts between parents give rise to competition for the love of children, boundaries, and control that children need to develop internal control, trust, self, and lagging self-efficacy beliefs (Llorca et al., 2017).

Parents who apply a permissive parenting style tend to believe that a combination of warm involvement and few restrictions will produce children who are creative and full of self-confidence. However, parental policies that always provide complete freedom and

fulfill every child's wishes can cause children to experience difficulties in controlling their behavior in a general context, which, in the end, will have an impact on their academic problems (Khairani et al., 2023).

Usually, permissive parenting does not conform children to socially approved behavior patterns and does not use punishment, so parents do not care and tend to give children the widest opportunities and freedom. However, in this case, the freedom given by the parents is actually misused by the child. A child thinks that this freedom can be used for things that lead to negative development (Resti et al., 2023). The results of the freedom received by teenagers who are still pursuing academics will certainly have an impact on their learning process, such as a decrease in academic self-efficacy.

According to Alwisol (2014), the source of behavior control is the reciprocal relationship between the environment, behavior, and personality. Academic self-efficacy is an important personal variable that, combined with specific goals and an understanding of achievement, will be an important determinant of future behavior. Each individual has different academic self-efficacy in different situations, depending on (1) The abilities required by the different situations. (2) The presence of other people, especially rivals, in the situation. (3) Physiological and emotional states, fatigue, anxiety, apathy, depression. High or low efficacy, combined with a responsive or unresponsive environment, will result in possible predictions of behavior.

The negative results of permissiveness on academic self-efficacy indicate that there is an influence that reduces a student's self-confidence during the academic year. Democratic parenting has high demands with low responsiveness. On the other hand, permissive parenting has low demands and high responsiveness.

It is characterized by a lack of supervision, control, and discipline while remaining warm and nurturing. Permissive parents try to behave non-punitively, accept their children's desires and actions, and let their children regulate their activities as much as possible (Baumrind, 1971).

Permissive parenting occurs when parents fail to set limits and do not expect developmentally appropriate behavior for their children. As a consequence, this type of parenting tends to be negatively related to children's psychosocial development, and children of permissive parents show characteristics such as narcissistic tendencies, social irresponsibility, and selfish motivations.

As a result, authoritarian and permissive disciplinary styles have the potential to harm children's psychosocial development. Furthermore, such parenting styles have been consistently associated with a variety of negative developmental outcomes, including behavioral problems over time (Fernandez, 2009). Even in Asia, permissive parenting patterns contribute to behavioral problems in children (Hosokawa & Katsura, 2018).

Parenting styles have a relationship with academic self-efficacy. This shows a positive relationship: the higher the responsiveness and demandingness of parents, the higher the academic self-efficacy of teenagers. This relationship is said to be significant because the quality of the relationship between parents and adolescents is of good quality. Most of the research subjects had parents whose majority implemented balanced responsiveness and demandingness.

Responsive parents are parents who are directly involved in their children's lives; there are open discussions, and there is take and giving. From the correlation test results, the responsiveness aspect has a significant relationship with academic self-efficacy, and this explains that parents always support their children. The responsiveness given by parents also produces a strong bond with the child. The responsiveness that parents give to their children results in a warm and trusting relationship with each other, which leads to a high and persistent curiosity.

Bandura (2012) stated that "positive emotional factors are also said to influence academic self-efficacy". This means that students' ability to manage problems during their studies with a positive mood means that students also have good academic self-efficacy. It can be achieved by students if they are in a supportive social environment. Family social support can also function as a strategy to prevent or reduce stress. Assistance from the family can take the form of direct assistance, including ongoing and intermittent financial assistance, shopping, child care, physical care for the elderly, performing household tasks, and practical assistance during times of crisis. Because "family social support can improve individual mental health" (Ndore, 2017).

This is different for individuals with low support who feel less comfortable in their social life and receive less support, which can reduce their self-confidence in their abilities and make individuals give up easily and put less effort into achieving the desired goals. This is in line with Benight & Bandura's (2004) statement that "social support has a function that allows it to increase academic self-efficacy scores. High support can increase academic self-efficacy score, while low support can reduce self-efficacy scores."

Social support is an important factor in improving students' academic performance and reducing their emotional exhaustion. Social support refers to the social and psychological support that individuals receive or feel in their environment, such as respect, attention, and assistance. Received social support is defined as the existence and acceptance of support, while perceived social support is defined as the perception and availability of support. Much literature shows that perceived social support is more predictive and functional than received social support (Brouwer, Jansen, Flache, & Hofman, 2016).

Even though social support has the power to change a person's psychology, this research shows that the power of social support has not been able to change the negative influence of permissive parenting patterns. The permissive influence, which was quite large in the sample, could not be lost with the presence of support from their environment and even from their families.

Those with stronger social support will be more embedded in supportive networks and more socially integrated within their university's academic environment, so they are better positioned to improve their academic performance. Several studies have found that students with higher perceived social support report better attendance and college adjustment. Social support is an important factor in predicting student academic achievement, and there is a positive relationship between social support and student grade point average (GPA) (DeBerard, Spielmans & Julka, 2004).

Research conducted by Hanapi & Agung (2018) shows that there is a significant

relationship between peer support and self-efficacy, with a significant correlation value of 0.538 and a significance level of 0.000 (p<0.05). These results show that there is a positive correlation between the two variables, indicating that the more social support they receive from peers, the higher their level of self-efficacy. This means that those who receive strong social support from their peers tend to have higher self-confidence. These results also confirm the hypothesis proposed by previous researchers who found a positive relationship between social support from peers and students' level of self-efficacy.

Social support can increase an individual's positive psychological state, such as positive affect and a sense of well-being. It could also be that social support acts as a stress buffer (SB), which states that social support acts as a buffer against stress. Additionally, cross-cultural studies conducted by Asians (including Asian Americans) and European Americans used social support to cope with stress in ways appropriate to their culture (Li et al., 2018).

Social support can provide solutions for individuals facing stressful problems, reduce the perception of the importance of the problem, or facilitate positive psychological reactions and behavioral responses. In other words, social support is considered a protective resource that allows people to overcome stress, distress, and depression. Individuals may suffer worse effects of stress if social support is lacking. Additionally, social support provides individuals with positive social contact with others, which contributes to emotional balance and reduces fatigue. Thus, students who have these resources are more susceptible to emotional exhaustion than students who do not have these resources. In conclusion, social support serves as an effective remedy to improve college students' academic stress resilience, which may be especially helpful in overcoming emotional exhaustion (Li et al., 2018). So, the results of this research are in accordance with the results of previous research.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis, it is known that permissive parenting has a significant negative effect on academic self-efficacy, with an estimated value of $\beta =-0.029$ and p = 0.049. This means that the greater the value of permissive parenting, the smaller the value of academic self-efficacy. Based on the results of the analysis, it is known that family support provides the least influence on the interaction of permissive parenting with academic self-efficacy, with a decrease in the estimated value of $\beta = -0.017$ and p = 0.009. Friend support influences changes in the interaction of permissive parenting with academic self-efficacy with a decrease in the estimated value of $\beta = -0.008$ and p = 0.033. The support of someone important does not influence changes in the interaction of permissive parenting with academic self-efficacy, with a decrease in the estimated value of $\beta = -0.0009$ and p = 0.451. Based on the results of the analysis, it is known that there is an effect of family support on academic self-efficacy with an estimated value of $\beta = 0.145$ and p = 0.006. Furthermore, there is an influence of friend support on academic self-efficacy with an estimated value of $\beta = 0.229$ and p = <0.001. Then, there is no effect of someone important's support on academic self-efficacy with an

estimated value of $\beta = -0.075$ and $p = 0.129$.

The determining factor for learning success is the student himself, so based on the results of this research, a possible suggestion for students is to always focus on their intelligence and personality. Parenting patterns will be difficult to change because they have a positive influence on self-efficacy. Therefore, continuous learning is a focus point that must be maintained throughout the academic year. The child is not free from parental supervision, and parents are expected to do more care for the child when a child has a determined choice, like giving support to a child who wants to learn, listening, and giving input when children ask for help.

REFERENCES

Alwisol. (2014). *Psikologi Kepribadian* (Edisi Revi). Malang: UMM Press.

Ani, & Yuniawati, R. (2015). Empathy : jurnal fakultas psikologi. *Empathy*, *3*(1), 1–7. https://www.neliti.com/publications/241730/hubungan-antara-dukungan-sosial-dengan-penerimaan-diri-pada-lansia-di-panti-wred

Arikunto, S. (2013). *Research procedures a practical approach*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy - the exercise of control* (Fifth Pri). New York: W. H. Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived academic self-efficacy revisited. *Journal of Management*, *38*(1), 9–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410606.

Bell, B. S., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2002). Goal orientation and ability: Interactive effects on self-efficacy, performance, and knowledge. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(3), 497–505. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.497

Benight, C. C & Bandura, A. (2004).). Social cognitive theory of posttraumatic recovery: the role of perceived academic self-efficacy. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, *Vol. 42*(10), 1129–1148. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2003.08.008

Brouwer, J., Jansen, E., Flache, A., & Hofman, A. (2016). The impact of social capital on self-efficacy and study success among first-year university students. *Learning and Individual Differences, 52,* 109–118. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.09.016

D., B. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, *4*, 1–103. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030372

DeBerard, M. S., Spielmans, G. I., & Julka, D. L. (2004). Predictors of academic achievement and retention among college freshmen: A longitudinal study. *College Student Journal*, *38,*(1), 66-80. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2004-12729-009

Dena Laksmi, P. P., Suniasih, N. W., & Ngurah Wiyasa, K. (2018). Pengaruh Pola Asuh Orang Tua Terhadap Efikasi Diri Siswa Kelas V Sd. *Mimbar Ilmu*, *23*(1), 83–94. https://doi.org/10.23887/mi.v23i1.16410

Dr. Seto Mulyadi, M.Psi., Dr. Wahyu Rahardjo, M.Si., Prof. Dr. A. M. Heru Basuki, M. S. (2016). *Psikologi pendidikan akan pendekatan teori-teori baru dalam psikologi*. Depok: Rajawali Press.

Fernandez E. (2009). Children's wellbeing in care: Evidence from a longitudinal study of outcomes. *Child Youth Serv*, *31*(10), 1092–1100.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2009.07.010

Farida Rohayani, Wahyuni Murniati, Tirta Sari, & Annida Ramdhani Fitri. (2023). Pola Asuh Permisif dan Dampaknya Kepada Anak Usia Dini (Teori dan Problematika). *Islamic EduKids*, *5*(1), 25–38.
https://doi.org/10.20414/iek.v5i1.7316

Ghufron, N. M., & Risnawita, R. (2016). *Teori-teori psikologi.* (Cet. 3.). Sleman: Ar-Ruzz Media.

Hanapi, I., & Agung, I. M. (2018). Dukungan sosial teman sebaya dengan self efficacy dalam menyelesaikan skripsi pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal RAP Riset Aktual Psikologi Universitas Negeri Padang Padang*, *9*(1), 37–45.
https://doi.org/10.24036/rapun.v9i1.10378

Hosokawa, R. & Katsura, T. (2018). Role of parenting style in children's behavioral problems through the transition from preschool to elementary school according to gender in Japan. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health.*, *16*(1), 21.
https://doi.org/DOI:10.3390/ijerph16010021

Khairani, N. Z., Juwitaningrum, I., & Kasasih, E. (2023). The Effect of Permissive Parenting on Consumptive Behavior on. *Journal of Sociology Education Journal*, *13*(2), 155–161.
https://doi.org/10.17509/sosietas.v13i1

Kurniawan, A. (2017). Pengaruh Pola Asuh Permisif Terhadap Rasa Percaya Diri Siswa Kelas V SD Se-Gugus 1 Wates Kabupaten Kulon Progo. *Skripsi*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan. Diakases pada tanggal 14 November 2023 dari https://eprints.uny.ac.id/52103/

Kusrini, W., & Prihartanti, N. (2014). Hubungan dukungan sosial dan kepercayaan diri dengan prestasi bahasa Inggris siswa kelas VII SMP Negeri 6 Boyolali. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, *15*(2), 131–140.
https://journals.ums.ac.id/index.php/humaniora/article/view/673/411

Li, J., Han, X., Wang, W., Sun, G., & Cheng, Z. (2018). How social support influences university students' academic achievement and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of self-esteem. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *61*(November), 120–126.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.11.016

Llorca, A., Richaud, M. C., & Malonda, E. (2017). Parenting, peer relationships, academic self-efficacy, and academic achievement: Direct and mediating effects. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*(DEC), 1–11.
https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02120

Ndore, S. (2017). Family support is associated with social interaction satisfaction. *Journal of Care*, *5*(2). 256- 262.
https://jurnal.unitri.ac.id/index.php/care/article/view/554

Mawanti D., (2011). *Studi efikasi diri mahasiswa yang bekerja pada saat penyusunan skripsi di Jurusan PBA, Fakultas Tarbiyah, IAIN Walisongo, Semarang: laporan penelitian individu*. Semarang: DIPA IAIN Walisongo.

Neuman, W. L. (2013). *Social research methodology qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th edition). London: Pearson Education.

Nurhayanti, R., & Novitasari, D. (2013). Tipe Pola Asuh Orang Tua yang berhubungan dengan Perilaku Bullying di SMA Kabupaten Semarang. *Jurnal Keperawatan Jiwa, 1*(1), 49-59.
https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/JKJ/article/view/912

Papalia, D. E., Old, S., & Feldman, R. D. (2009). *Human development.Human*

development. 10th (edition, b). Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.

Purwaningsih, E., & Setyaningsih, R. T. (2015). Hubungan Pola Asuh Orang Tua Dengan Kejadian Pernikahan Usia Dini Di Desa Jambu Kidul, Ceper, Klaten. *INVOLUSI Jurnal Ilmu Kebidanan*, *4*(7), 1-12.
https://typeset.io/pdf/hubungan-pola-asuh-orang-tua-dengan-kejadian-pernikahan-usia-yuw3cd6lue.pdf

Rahman, U., Mardhiah, & Azmidar. (2015). Hubungan Antara Pola Asuh Permisif Orangtua Dan Kecerdasan Emosional Siswa Dengan Hasil Belajar Matematika Siswa. *AULADUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Islam*, *2*(1), 116–130.
https://journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/auladuna/article/view/871

Rohmatun. (2013). The relationship between academic self-efficacy and parental authoritarian parenting with academic procrastination in college students. *Thesis* (unpublished). Surakarta: Master of Psychology Study Program, Postgraduate School UMS Surakarta.

Resti, N., Sardin, S., & Utami, N. F. (2023). Pengaruh Pola Asuh Permisif Terhadap Pelaku Tawuran Pelajar SMA di Sukabumi. *Dimensia: Jurnal Kajian Sosiologi*, *12*(1), 25–30.
https://doi.org/10.21831/dimensia.v12i1.60865

Samputri, S. K., & Sakti, H. (2015). Dukungan sosial dan subjective well-being Pada tenaga kerja wanita. *Jurnal Empati*, *4*(4), 208–216.
https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/empati/article/view/14321%0Ahttps://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/empati/article/viewFile/14321/13853

Santrock, J. (2012). *Life span development. Life span development* (volume 1). Jakarta: Erlangga.

Schultz, D., & Schultz, S. E. (2015). *Psychology Work Today* (9 Edition). London: Pearson Education, Inc.

Tricahyani, I. (2016). Hubungan antara dukungan sosial dengan penyesuaian diri pada remaja awal di panti asuhan kota Denpasar. *Jurnal Psikologi Udayana*, (Edisi Khusus), 168-176.
https://jurnal.harianregional.com/psikologi/full-28068

Yusuf, R. N. (2019). Hubungan Antara Pola Asuh Permisif Dengan Kepercayaan Diri Remaja Di Smp Negeri 35 Bandar Lampung. *Doctoral dissertation*. Lampung: UIN Raden Intan Lampung.
http://repository.radenintan.ac.id/8849/