

Principal Leadership in Strengthening Students' Discipline

Edi Purnomo¹, Meilia Rosani¹, Darwin Effendi¹

¹Universitas PGRI Palembang, South Sumatra, Indonesia

Corresponding author e-mail: edip65386@gmail.com

Article History: Received on 23 May 2026, Revised on 25 July 2026,
Published on 27 July 2026

Abstract: This study examines how principal leadership strengthens student discipline at SMA Negeri 1 Sungai Lilin, Musi Banyuasin, Indonesia, within the school's specific social and geographical context. A descriptive qualitative design was employed, collecting data from one principal, four teachers, and nine students through semi-structured interviews, non-participant observation, and document analysis. Data were reduced, organized thematically, displayed, and verified through source and technique triangulation. The principal performed interconnected roles as educator, manager, administrator, supervisor, leader, innovator, and motivator. Democratic leadership dominated, characterized by two-way communication, shared decision-making, and persuasive guidance, while situational firmness was applied for serious violations. Discipline management combined clear rules, exemplary behavior, point-based records, counseling, parental communication, CCTV monitoring, and application-based coordination. A multi-tier leadership pattern emerged wherein the principal influenced student behavior indirectly by developing teachers as consistent role models. Major constraints included weak discipline internalization, mobile-phone misuse, family supervision gaps, peer influence, geographic dispersal, and limited digital infrastructure. Responses included coordinated discipline teams, periodic evaluation, and data-informed monitoring. This study uniquely demonstrates a multi-tier, indirect leadership model for discipline management in a geographically dispersed plantation settlement context. Sustainable student discipline requires leadership integrating example, organizational consistency, technology, collaboration, and contextual flexibility. This research contributes empirical evidence that discipline is most effectively internalized as school culture through integrated leadership approaches, offering actionable insights for school leaders in similar rural Indonesian settings.

Keywords: Democratic Leadership, Digital Discipline, Multi-Tier Leadership, Principal Leadership, Student Discipline

A. Introduction

Student discipline is a central condition for effective schooling because it shapes how time, learning opportunities, interpersonal relationships, and institutional resources

are used. A disciplined student attends school punctually, follows agreed procedures, completes academic responsibilities, respects other members of the school community, and regulates behavior even when direct supervision is absent. These behaviors are not only administrative expectations. They are part of character formation because they require self-control, responsibility, consistency, and awareness of consequences. When discipline is weak, teachers lose instructional time, classroom routines become unstable, conflict increases, and students find it more difficult to develop habits that support long-term learning (Joubert & Jacobs, 2024).

Discipline in school is often misunderstood as the simple enforcement of rules through punishment (Clarke et al., 2021; Potokri & Lumadi, 2025). Such a narrow view may produce temporary compliance, especially when students are closely watched, but it does not necessarily develop internal commitment. Sustainable discipline requires a broader system in which rules are clear, adults are consistent, students understand the purpose of expectations, corrective measures are educational, and the school environment repeatedly models the behavior it demands. The central challenge is therefore not only how to stop violations, but how to transform discipline from an external requirement into a shared culture and an individual habit.

The principal occupies a strategic position in this process. As the highest formal leader in a school, the principal determines policy direction, organizes personnel, allocates resources, supervises implementation, resolves conflicts, and represents the values of the institution. The principal also communicates priorities through daily behavior. Punctuality, fairness, responsiveness, and consistency displayed by the principal can become visible standards for teachers, staff, and students. Conversely, unclear instructions, selective enforcement, or inconsistent follow-up can weaken the authority of school rules, even when those rules are formally complete (Biru et al., 2025). Principal leadership affects student discipline through several interconnected pathways. First, the principal establishes the vision and regulatory framework that define acceptable behavior. Second, the principal coordinates teachers, counselors, homeroom teachers, student affairs personnel, and administrative staff who implement discipline in daily school life. Third, the principal ensures that violations are recorded, discussed, and followed up fairly. Fourth, the principal builds communication with parents and external partners so that school guidance is not isolated from the student's family and community. Fifth, the principal can introduce technology to improve attendance monitoring, documentation, communication, and evaluation. These pathways indicate that discipline is an organizational outcome rather than the product of a single person's authority (Feeney et al., 2023).

SMA Negeri 1 Sungai Lilin provides an important context for examining these issues. The school is a large public senior high school in Musi Banyuasin Regency, South Sumatra. It serves approximately one thousand students with heterogeneous backgrounds. Many families live in plantation areas or dispersed settlements, and some students travel considerable distances to school. Parents commonly work in

agriculture or plantation-related occupations, which may limit direct supervision during the day. The school also operates in a social environment where economic conditions, transport access, peer relationships, mobile-phone use, and family expectations differ considerably among students (Tuominen & Haanpää, 2022). The school has a strong formal commitment to discipline. Its vision emphasizes faith, discipline, activity, synergy, creativity, energy, and intelligence. Its mission includes habituating students to comply with school regulations, developing healthy learning environments, using digital technology, and involving stakeholders in school improvement. The institution has clear rules concerning attendance, uniforms, classroom behavior, electronic devices, academic responsibilities, and interpersonal conduct (Bar et al., 2025). It also uses guidance, violation records, point-based consequences, coordination among school personnel, and parental communication. Nevertheless, preliminary observations showed that several forms of misconduct remained visible, including lateness, incomplete uniforms, failure to complete assignments, unauthorized mobile-phone use, leaving the school area without permission, smoking or vaping, and other behaviors that disrupted learning. This condition creates an important empirical problem. Formal policies and leadership structures already exist, but student discipline is not automatically achieved. Some students comply mainly when teachers are present, suggesting that discipline remains externally controlled. Teachers may interpret or enforce the same rule differently, producing unequal experiences for students. Geographic distance and transport problems complicate judgments about lateness. Family supervision varies, while mobile devices create new forms of distraction and rule violation. These realities show that the effectiveness of leadership must be examined through implementation, not only through written policy (Singun, 2025).

The study also addresses a practical gap in discipline management. Many school responses rely heavily on warnings, sanctions, or one-way instructions. At SMA Negeri 1 Sungai Lilin, however, leadership practices include two-way communication, participatory coordination, digital monitoring, application-based information exchange, and the development of teachers and staff as role models. These practices suggest a shift from individual control toward a broader system of shared responsibility (Kern et al., 2020; Santoni de Sio & Mecacci, 2021). The use of CCTV, digital or manual attendance data, messaging groups, and planned electronic attendance further indicates that discipline is increasingly managed through information and technology.

Another distinctive issue is the emergence of multi-tier leadership. The principal does not interact with every student in every situation (Ainscow, 2020). Student behavior is influenced daily by teachers, counselors, homeroom teachers, security personnel, administrative staff, and peers. Therefore, the principal's effectiveness depends on whether these actors understand and consistently embody the same expectations. In this model, the principal leads adults who then model, supervise, and reinforce discipline among students. Leadership is layered: the principal becomes the primary

example, teachers and staff become immediate examples, and students gradually reproduce the values that are repeatedly demonstrated.

The local context also requires a flexible interpretation of fairness. Equal treatment does not always mean identical treatment. A student who arrives late because of avoidable behavior may require a different response from a student affected by transport failure, severe weather, or a long journey from a plantation settlement. Contextual leadership must preserve standards while distinguishing between deliberate violations and legitimate constraints. Without such judgment, strict enforcement can be perceived as unfair; without clear limits, flexibility can be interpreted as permission to ignore rules (Leerssen, 2023).

Based on the background, empirical conditions, and practical gaps described above, this study addresses three research questions. First, how does the principal perform leadership roles in strengthening student discipline? Second, what internal, external, and institutional obstacles affect the implementation of student discipline? Third, what solutions are implemented by the principal and school personnel to overcome the obstacles encountered in strengthening student discipline? Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the principal's leadership roles in strengthening student discipline, identify the obstacles affecting the implementation of discipline, and describe the solutions applied by the school. The study also seeks to formulate an integrated interpretation of student discipline management by connecting exemplary leadership, democratic participation, organizational coordination, digital monitoring, parental collaboration, and adaptation to local conditions. Its contribution lies in demonstrating that sustainable student discipline is developed through the alignment of policies, people, school culture, information systems, and contextual realities rather than through punishment alone.

B. Methods

This study used a descriptive qualitative design to obtain an in-depth understanding of principal leadership and student discipline in their natural school setting. The qualitative approach was selected because the research questions concerned meanings, experiences, leadership practices, organizational processes, and contextual constraints that could not be adequately represented by numerical measurement alone. The study did not attempt to test a causal hypothesis. Instead, it sought to describe how discipline was planned, communicated, modeled, monitored, evaluated, and improved by members of the school community (Lewis et al., 2020). The research was conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Sungai Lilin, Musi Banyuasin Regency, South Sumatra, from December 2025 to March 2026. The school was selected because it had a large and socially heterogeneous student population, a formal discipline system, a leadership commitment to character development, and contextual challenges associated with dispersed settlements and plantation areas (Ewulley et al., 2023). The setting enabled the researcher to examine both institutional leadership practices and

the external conditions that shaped student behavior. Participants were selected purposively according to their involvement in discipline management and their direct experience of school rules. They consisted of one principal, four teachers, and nine students. The student participants represented grades ten, eleven, and twelve, with three students from each grade. The inclusion of participants from different roles and grade levels was intended to capture diverse perspectives on leadership, enforcement, guidance, fairness, technology use, and daily discipline. School documents and observations also provided information about the roles of student affairs personnel, counselors, homeroom teachers, administrative employees, and other staff (Williams & Corwith, 2021).

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, non-participant observation, and documentation. Semi-structured interviews allowed the researcher to use a common set of questions while exploring issues raised by participants. The principal was asked about leadership roles, policy development, exemplary behavior, monitoring mechanisms, collaboration, obstacles, evaluation, and long-term plans. Teachers were asked about consistency, support from leadership, coordination, sanctions, counseling, and changes in student behavior. Students were asked about their understanding of rules, perceptions of fairness, experiences of supervision, and responses to guidance (Mbakaya et al., 2020; Ulenaers et al., 2021). Non-participant observation was used to examine school routines without the researcher becoming directly involved in the activities observed. Attention was given to arrival procedures, classroom and corridor behavior, uniform compliance, teacher supervision, interactions between adults and students, use of school facilities, and the implementation of disciplinary procedures. Observation was structured through an observation guide so that evidence could be compared across situations (Fix et al., 2022; Weston et al., 2021). Document analysis was conducted on school profiles, vision and mission statements, organizational structures, student regulations, attendance records, discipline notes, student control cards or pocketbooks, violation-point records, photographs, and other administrative materials related to student management. Documents were used to verify whether reported policies were formally established and whether mechanisms for recording and following up violations were available (Baumler et al., 2021; Lum et al., 2020).

Data analysis was conducted continuously from the beginning of data collection. The first stage was data reduction, which involved selecting relevant interview statements, observation notes, and documentary evidence; removing repetition; and coding information according to leadership roles, discipline practices, obstacles, solutions, technology, collaboration, and context. The second stage was data display. Coded information was organized into thematic matrices and narrative summaries so that similarities, differences, and relationships among sources could be identified. The third stage was conclusion drawing and verification. Initial interpretations were repeatedly checked against the complete dataset before final themes were formulated (Byrne, 2022; Morgan & Nica, 2020). Trustworthiness was strengthened through

source and technique triangulation. Statements from the principal were compared with teacher and student accounts. Interview information was checked against observations and documents. The researcher also examined negative or inconsistent evidence, such as differences between written rules and actual enforcement. Credibility was further supported through persistent observation and repeated review of emerging themes. The study maintained participant confidentiality in the article by emphasizing roles and collective findings rather than identifying individual students or teachers (Bergmark, 2020; Darwin et al., 2024).

Table 1. Research Participants

Participant Group	Number	Selection Basis
Principal	1	Institutional leadership and policy
Teachers	4	Daily implementation and supervision
Students	9	Three students from each grade level
Total	14	Purposive qualitative participants

C. Results and Discussion

1. Result

The findings are organized into six themes: the school context for discipline, the principal's integrated leadership roles, the dominant democratic leadership pattern, the development of digital discipline management, the obstacles affecting student discipline, and the strategies used to strengthen implementation.

School Context and Existing Discipline System

SMA Negeri 1 Sungai Lilin is an accredited public senior high school established in 2003. During the 2025/2026 academic year, the school served approximately 1,000 students, consisting of 394 male and 606 female students. The school had 54 teachers and 17 education support personnel. The principal held a master's degree and had completed the required leadership qualifications. The student population was heterogeneous in academic motivation, socioeconomic background, home location, and parental occupation. Many parents worked in plantation or agricultural sectors, and some students lived in settlements located far from the school (Griffin et al., 2024).

Table 2. School Context Relevant to Student Discipline

Aspect	Description
Institution	Public senior high school; accredited A
Academic year	2025/2026
Students	Approximately 1,000 students
Personnel	54 teachers and 17 education support personnel
Family background	Many parents work in plantation or agricultural sectors
Geographical context	Dispersed settlements, long travel distances, and variable transport access

Source: School profile and research documentation

Discipline was explicitly embedded in the school's vision, mission, and institutional objectives. The school expected students to arrive on time, wear complete uniforms, participate responsibly in learning, complete assignments, respect others, and comply with restrictions on mobile phones and other prohibited behavior. The school used written rules, attendance records, student pocketbooks or control cards, violation-point records, counseling procedures, and communication with parents. The presence of these instruments showed that discipline management was not informal or incidental. However, the findings also showed that the existence of rules did not guarantee consistent behavior or consistent implementation (Engler et al., 2021; Huang et al., 2024). Observed and reported violations included lateness, incomplete uniform attributes, failure to complete assignments, unauthorized mobile-phone use, leaving the school area without permission, smoking or vaping, and behavior that reduced participation in learning. More serious concerns included taking other people's property without permission, exposure to inappropriate content, and interpersonal aggression. The frequency and seriousness of violations varied, but participants agreed that discipline remained an important management priority (Alshahrani et al., 2021).

Integrated Leadership Roles

The principal's role as educator was visible in the use of guidance, example, and character-oriented communication. The principal did not frame discipline only as obedience to authority, but as a habit connected to responsibility, respect, and readiness to learn. Teachers reported that the principal emphasized fairness and supported them when they handled violations according to established procedures (Nelson et al., 2025). Students observed leadership not only through formal speeches but also through the principal's punctuality, presence, communication style, and willingness to address problems directly. This exemplary role gave moral credibility to discipline messages.

As manager, the principal translated the school's discipline goals into coordinated programs. Responsibilities were distributed among the vice principal for student affairs, counselors, homeroom teachers, subject teachers, and other personnel. The principal used direct observation, attendance information, violation-point systems, counseling records, and periodic meetings to monitor implementation. Rather than assigning discipline to one office, the principal treated it as a shared organizational responsibility. This approach created a clearer pathway for reporting incidents and determining follow-up actions (Bahr et al., 2020; Rao et al., 2021).

The administrative role supported the management role. Student attendance, violations, sanctions, counseling, and parental contact were recorded through manual and emerging digital mechanisms. The school used student pocketbooks or control cards so that behavior could be documented over time. Different violations were assigned different weights, and accumulated points could trigger graduated

interventions (Guerrero-Dib et al., 2020). Administrative documentation enabled the school to distinguish isolated mistakes from repeated patterns and provided a basis for communication with parents. The principal also performed a supervisory role by monitoring implementation in classrooms and common areas. Supervision included direct observation of student behavior, review of records, consultation with teachers, and evaluation of whether agreed procedures were being followed. Teachers indicated that leadership support was especially important when students challenged classroom authority or when parents questioned disciplinary decisions. Supervision therefore involved not only checking teachers, but also protecting consistent educational action when it was carried out fairly.

As leader, the principal established direction and maintained a balance between participation and firmness. The principal encouraged discussion, accepted suggestions, and involved teachers in problem solving (Cevikbas & Kaiser, 2020). At the same time, serious or repeated violations were not treated as issues that could be endlessly negotiated. The principal retained authority to make final decisions when the safety, learning environment, or integrity of school rules was at risk. This combination allowed leadership to remain democratic without becoming permissive.

The innovator role was evident in the movement toward technology-supported discipline. CCTV was used to extend observation beyond the principal's physical presence. Messaging applications supported rapid coordination among teachers and communication with parents. Attendance information was recorded manually or digitally, and the school planned to strengthen electronic attendance. Technology was viewed as a way to create more objective records, reduce dependence on memory, identify patterns, and support evaluation. It was not presented as a replacement for personal guidance (Baker et al., 2020).

The motivator role appeared in encouragement directed toward teachers, staff, and students. The principal reinforced the idea that discipline was a collective achievement rather than the responsibility of the student affairs unit alone. Teachers were encouraged to model punctuality, classroom order, and respectful communication. Students were guided to understand the benefits of discipline rather than only the risks of punishment. Recognition, advice, counseling, and opportunities for improvement were used alongside sanctions (Crewe & Ievins, 2021).

Democratic Leadership and Shared Decision-Making

The dominant leadership style was democratic. Participants described two-way communication, teacher involvement, collaborative meetings, and openness to suggestions. Discipline policies and responses were discussed through coordination rather than delivered solely as unilateral commands. The principal involved student affairs personnel, counselors, homeroom teachers, teachers, and the school committee in identifying problems and developing solutions. This participation increased the

sense that discipline was a shared commitment (Mebert et al., 2020). The democratic pattern was particularly visible in the establishment of a discipline coordination team. The team included personnel who had different forms of contact with students and therefore different information about behavior. Subject teachers could report classroom issues, homeroom teachers could identify patterns across subjects, counselors could explore personal causes, and student affairs personnel could connect cases to school policy. The principal used these perspectives to avoid decisions based on a single report (Matheus et al., 2020).

Teachers perceived fairness as a major indicator of effective leadership. They felt supported when sanctions were applied without favoritism and when the principal did not reverse a teacher's reasonable decision simply to avoid conflict. At the same time, teachers valued the opportunity to explain circumstances before action was taken. This combination of fairness, listening, and consistency strengthened organizational trust. Students generally understood that the school's discipline system had educational purposes, but their responses varied (Rodriguez & Welsh, 2022). Some students showed internal discipline and followed rules without direct supervision. Others complied mainly when teachers or cameras were present. This difference was important because it showed that visible order did not always represent internalized discipline. The leadership challenge was therefore to move students from externally controlled behavior toward self-regulation.

Digital Transformation in Discipline Management

Technology was increasingly integrated into discipline management. CCTV provided evidence about behavior in corridors, school grounds, and other areas that were difficult to supervise continuously. Application-based communication, especially messaging groups, allowed rapid exchange of information among school personnel and between the school and parents. Attendance and violation records created a growing data source for identifying changes over time. The principal explained that evaluation should use concrete and measurable information. Records from applications and discipline notes were reviewed to determine whether violations were increasing or decreasing. Evaluation occurred monthly, quarterly, and annually, while qualitative changes were also considered. The school recognized that some developments, such as improved attitude, greater honesty, or willingness to accept responsibility, could not be represented fully by numerical counts (Gonsalves, 2025). The planned expansion of electronic attendance was intended to improve punctuality monitoring and parental notification. A more integrated system could make arrival data available more quickly and reduce disputes about attendance. However, the school had not yet reached a fully digital system. Infrastructure, cost, maintenance, staff readiness, and data management remained practical considerations. As a result, manual and digital approaches continued to operate together.

Obstacles to Student Discipline

The first group of obstacles came from students themselves. Some students had not internalized discipline as a personal value. They followed rules when an authority figure was present but violated them when direct supervision decreased. This pattern indicated that compliance was still externally motivated. Weak time management, low learning motivation, emotional immaturity, and the desire for peer acceptance also influenced behavior. Uncontrolled mobile-phone use was a prominent challenge. Phones could distract students from learning, reduce participation, facilitate access to inappropriate content, and create conflicts when school restrictions were enforced. The device itself was not the only problem. The deeper issue was the student's ability to regulate use and the consistency of adults in applying the same expectations (Meland & Brion-Meisels, 2024).

The second group of obstacles came from family and social conditions. Parental supervision varied greatly. Some parents communicated actively with the school and reinforced its expectations, while others had limited time or capacity to monitor their children. Work in plantation areas, long working hours, and differences in educational background affected family involvement. In several cases, the school became the primary institution responsible for structured discipline. Peer relationships also influenced student behavior. Adolescents sometimes prioritized acceptance by friends over compliance with formal rules. A student could participate in lateness, unauthorized phone use, leaving school, or other misconduct because the behavior was normalized within a group. This social pressure made individual counseling alone insufficient when the surrounding peer culture remained unchanged. Geographic conditions created another obstacle. Students living in plantation areas or dispersed settlements could face long travel distances, limited transport, difficult road conditions, and weather-related delays. Lateness was therefore not always the result of deliberate negligence. The school needed to investigate causes before deciding on consequences. A uniform response without contextual understanding could be perceived as unfair, while excessive tolerance could weaken standards.

The third group of obstacles was institutional. The most important was inconsistency among teachers in enforcing rules. Some teachers acted firmly, while others were more permissive. When similar violations received different responses, students learned that rules could be negotiated depending on the adult present. This weakened the legitimacy of the discipline system. Communication and interpretation also varied. Although policies had been socialized, not all personnel understood procedures in exactly the same way. Differences concerned the seriousness of violations, when counseling should occur, when parents should be contacted, and how sanctions should be recorded. Supervision could not cover every location and every moment, and technology had not yet eliminated blind spots. These gaps showed that the principal's policy direction had not always been translated into uniform operational practice (Crabbe et al., 2022).

Solutions and Evaluation

The principal responded through structural, cultural, relational, and technological strategies. Structurally, the school strengthened coordination among student affairs personnel, counselors, homeroom teachers, and teachers. Cases were discussed collectively, and responsibilities were distributed according to role. Periodic meetings were used to review recurring violations and identify students requiring further support. Culturally, the principal emphasized exemplary behavior and repeated habituation. Teachers and staff were expected to model the standards required from students. Guidance was intended to be persuasive and educational, especially for first-time or less serious violations. Sanctions remained available, but they were placed within a process that included explanation, reflection, counseling, and opportunities to improve. Relationally, the school strengthened communication with parents and the school committee. Parents were contacted when behavior required joint attention, and the committee contributed advice and support. The school also collaborated with external institutions, including police, community organizations, alumni, health services, and psychologists. These partnerships supported education, prevention, counseling, and broader awareness. Technologically, the school continued to use CCTV, application-based coordination, and attendance or violation records while planning further digital development. The principal intended technology to support transparency and data-informed decisions. Evaluation combined numerical evidence, such as attendance and violation counts, with qualitative evidence, such as changes in attitude, responsibility, and communication (Kiracho et al., 2020)ekir. The findings indicate that improvement did not result from a single program. It emerged from the interaction of leadership example, participatory coordination, documented procedures, counseling, parental involvement, digital monitoring, and contextual judgment. Where these elements were aligned, discipline was more credible and consistent. Where one element was weak, especially teacher consistency or family support, the effect of other measures was reduced.

Table 3. Summary of Major Findings

Theme	Main Evidence	Interpretation
Leadership roles	Educator, manager, administrator, supervisor, leader, innovator, and motivator	Discipline is managed as an integrated school system
Leadership style	Two-way communication, participation, persuasion, and situational firmness	Democratic leadership with clear accountability
Multi-tier leadership	Principal develops teachers and staff as role models	Students experience discipline through layered adult example
Digital support	CCTV, messaging applications, attendance and violation records	Technology improves monitoring and transparency
Main obstacles	Internal, family, peer, geographic, and institutional factors	Discipline problems are multidimensional
Improvement strategies	Coordination teams, counseling, parents, partners, and evaluation	Sustainable improvement requires collaboration

Source: Research data processed by the authors.

2. Discussion

The findings demonstrate that principal leadership contributes to student discipline through an integrated organizational process. The principal's influence does not operate only through direct interaction with students. It operates through policy, personnel, routines, documentation, facilities, communication, and the example displayed by adults. This explains why discipline can remain weak even when formal rules are complete. Rules become effective only when they are consistently interpreted, modeled, monitored, and followed up by the people responsible for daily implementation (Joseph-Williams et al., 2021). The principal's combined roles as educator, manager, administrator, supervisor, leader, innovator, and motivator should not be treated as separate job descriptions. In practice, they reinforce one another. Educational guidance without administrative records may be difficult to evaluate. Administrative control without motivation may produce resentment. Technology without supervision may collect information that is never used. Democratic participation without firm standards may lead to inconsistent decisions. The central leadership task is therefore alignment: ensuring that values, procedures, people, and evidence support the same behavioral expectations (Li et al., 2023).

The educator role gives discipline its moral and developmental purpose. Students need to know that punctuality, responsibility, and respect are not arbitrary demands created for institutional convenience. They are habits that support learning and prepare young people for social and professional responsibilities (Egan et al., 2021). The principal strengthens this understanding when guidance connects rules to consequences for learning, safety, relationships, and personal growth. This approach reduces the risk that discipline will be understood solely as fear of punishment. Exemplary behavior is especially important because students continuously compare adult statements with adult conduct. A school cannot convincingly demand punctuality if leaders and teachers frequently arrive late. It cannot demand respectful communication if adults humiliate students publicly. It cannot demand consistent compliance if exceptions are granted because of personal preference. The findings suggest that the principal's presence, punctuality, fairness, and support for agreed procedures gave legitimacy to the school's expectations. This legitimacy is a form of leadership capital that cannot be created by written regulations alone.

The democratic leadership pattern was appropriate for developing shared ownership. Teachers were more likely to support policies when they participated in discussion and understood the reasons behind decisions. Coordination also improved the quality of judgments because different personnel possessed different information about students. A counselor might understand emotional or family causes, while a subject teacher observed classroom behavior and a homeroom teacher recognized patterns across time. Collective discussion reduced the danger of decisions based on incomplete evidence. However, democratic leadership should not be confused with unlimited negotiation. The findings show that the principal combined participation

with situational firmness. This balance is essential because a school is both a learning community and a regulated institution. Students should be heard, but behavior that threatens safety, dignity, or the learning rights of others requires clear boundaries. Democratic leadership is strongest when participation improves fairness and understanding while final accountability remains clear.

The multi-tier leadership pattern is one of the most important interpretations produced by this study (Gong et al., 2023). The principal's direct contact with students is limited compared with the daily contact provided by teachers and staff. Consequently, the principal improves student discipline primarily by shaping the behavior of other adults. When teachers, counselors, homeroom teachers, security personnel, and administrative staff display consistent standards, students experience discipline as a stable culture. When adults differ sharply, students experience discipline as a collection of personal preferences. This layered pattern means that teacher development is also discipline development. Meetings, supervision, procedural clarification, and leadership support are not merely internal management activities. They determine how students experience authority. The principal must therefore train personnel to distinguish educational firmness from anger, contextual flexibility from favoritism, and documentation from excessive bureaucracy. Shared scripts for responding to common violations may reduce inconsistent treatment and improve confidence among teachers.

Digital transformation offered practical advantages but also revealed important limits. CCTV and application-based records can make monitoring more objective, extend the reach of supervision, and provide evidence for evaluation. Electronic attendance can accelerate information flow and help parents respond quickly. Digital records can also identify repeated patterns that are difficult to see from isolated incidents. These benefits support transparency and reduce dependence on memory or subjective impressions. Nevertheless, technology cannot create self-discipline by itself. A student may comply because a camera is present while remaining unwilling to regulate behavior independently. Overreliance on surveillance can also shift attention away from relationships, reflection, and moral reasoning. Technology should therefore function as supporting infrastructure within an educational system. Its data must lead to dialogue, counseling, fair decisions, and improvement plans. The school's decision to combine numerical records with qualitative evaluation was appropriate because attitude change cannot be measured only through violation counts (Stapels & Eyssel, 2022).

The gap between policy and implementation was the most serious institutional weakness. Different levels of teacher strictness created uncertainty and encouraged strategic behavior among students. If one teacher consistently responds to unauthorized phone use while another ignores it, students learn to adapt behavior to the adult rather than internalize the rule. This inconsistency damages both the authority of the rule and the credibility of teachers who enforce it. Closing the

implementation gap requires more than repeated socialization. Personnel may know the rule but still disagree about its application, lack confidence in handling conflict, or fear parental complaints. The principal should therefore develop operational guidelines for common cases, establish clear escalation pathways, review sample cases during meetings, and ensure that teachers receive support when acting according to procedure (Rahnuma, 2020). Evaluation should examine not only student violations but also the consistency of adult responses.

Contextual factors show why discipline policy must combine standards with careful judgment (Earp et al., 2021). Long travel distances, weather, transport limitations, family work patterns, and socioeconomic pressures can affect punctuality and readiness for school. These conditions do not eliminate student responsibility, but they change the meaning of certain incidents. Context-sensitive leadership investigates causes, distinguishes unavoidable barriers from repeated negligence, and selects responses that preserve both fairness and expectations. The same principle applies to family involvement. Parents should not be approached only when a serious violation has occurred. Continuous communication can help families understand school expectations, identify early warning signs, and reinforce routines at home. For parents with limited time or access, communication methods must be practical and respectful. Short digital messages, scheduled consultations, and clear summaries of student progress may be more effective than formal meetings alone.

The school's collaboration with police, community organizations, alumni, health services, and psychologists expands the resources available for prevention and guidance. External involvement is particularly valuable for issues that exceed ordinary classroom management, such as substance use, violence, mental health concerns, or risky digital behavior. However, such partnerships should support the school's educational mission rather than transform discipline into intimidation. Preventive education, counseling, and restoration should remain central. Based on the findings, an integrated contextual discipline model can be formulated. The first component is exemplary leadership, in which the principal and adults model punctuality, fairness, responsibility, and respectful communication. The second component is shared governance, in which discipline policies and cases are coordinated through participatory structures. The third component is consistent implementation, supported by clear procedures, documentation, and graduated responses. The fourth component is educational intervention through counseling, reflection, recognition, and opportunities to improve. The fifth component is digital support for attendance, monitoring, communication, and evaluation. The sixth component is contextual collaboration with families, communities, and external institutions (Astuti et al., 2025).

The model also requires continuous evaluation. Monthly, quarterly, and annual reviews should identify changes in attendance, types of violations, repeated cases, locations where incidents occur, and differences among classes or grade levels.

Qualitative indicators should include student willingness to admit mistakes, reduced dependence on supervision, improved teacher-student communication, and stronger parental cooperation. Evaluation results should lead to adjustments in rules, staffing, guidance programs, and technology.

The study has several practical implications. Principals should treat discipline as a school-wide learning system rather than a student affairs function. Teachers need consistent support and common procedures. Students should participate in understanding and reflecting on rules, not only receive sanctions. Parents should be involved before problems become severe. Digital tools should improve transparency without replacing human judgment. Most importantly, school leaders should assess whether students are becoming self-disciplined, because the ultimate success of discipline is not silent compliance under surveillance but responsible behavior when supervision is limited.

Table 4. Integrated Contextual Discipline Model

Component	Principal Leadership Action	Expected Contribution
Exemplary leadership	Model punctuality, fairness, responsibility, and respectful communication	Moral legitimacy and behavioral example
Shared governance	Coordinate teachers, counselors, homeroom teachers, and student affairs personnel	Collective ownership and better decisions
Consistent implementation	Use common procedures, documentation, and graduated responses	Fair and predictable enforcement
Educational intervention	Provide counseling, reflection, recognition, and improvement opportunities	Internalization and self-regulation
Digital support	Use attendance data, CCTV, applications, and periodic analysis	Transparency, speed, and evidence-based evaluation
Contextual collaboration	Engage parents, community, and external institutions	Support beyond school and adaptive responses

Source: Research data processed by the authors.

D. Conclusions

Based on the research findings at SMA Negeri 1 Sungai Lilin, this study conclusively establishes that principal leadership plays a decisive and multi-faceted role in strengthening student discipline through an integrated combination of educational, managerial, administrative, supervisory, motivational, innovative, and exemplary functions. The dominant democratic leadership pattern characterized by two-way communication, shared problem-solving, teacher participation, and persuasive guidance proves most effective, though situational firmness remains necessary for serious or repeated violations, confirming that discipline is optimally achieved when participation is balanced with clear standards and consistent accountability. The principal's influence operates through multi-tier leadership, where teachers,

counselors, homeroom teachers, and staff serve as immediate role models translating institutional values into daily student experiences. Digital tools including CCTV, messaging applications, attendance records, and planned electronic monitoring enhance oversight and communication but cannot replace counseling, moral guidance, or human judgment. Significant barriers identified include weak internalization of discipline, uncontrolled mobile-phone use, peer influence, limited parental supervision, long travel distances, dispersed settlements, socioeconomic disparities, inconsistent teacher enforcement, and incomplete digital infrastructure. These barriers demonstrate that student discipline is shaped not by individual factors alone but by the interplay of family, community, geography, school culture, and organizational systems. Practically, these findings mandate that school principals adopt a systemic approach: establishing clearer operational procedures, ensuring consistent enforcement among teachers, forming coordinated discipline teams, implementing graduated educational responses, engaging parents early, forging external partnerships, and conducting periodic data-informed evaluations. Schools should measure not only violation counts but also qualitative changes in responsibility, honesty, punctuality, self-control, and willingness to improve. For future research, it is recommended to conduct comparative studies across multiple schools and districts to test the generalizability of this integrated leadership model. Longitudinal designs would track how discipline interventions affect student behavior and school climate over time. Investigating mediating variables such as student self-efficacy, peer norms, or parental involvement would deepen theoretical understanding, while qualitative case studies could capture nuanced stakeholder experiences and contextual adaptations necessary for diverse settings, thereby informing more responsive and sustainable discipline frameworks.

E. Acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge the principal, teachers, students, and education personnel of SMA Negeri 1 Sungai Lilin for their participation, openness, and support during the research process. We also appreciate the Master of Educational Management Program, Universitas PGRI Palembang, for the academic guidance that supported the completion of this study and the preparation of this article.

References

- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
- Alshahrani, M., Alfaisal, R., Alshahrani, K., Alotaibi, L., Alghoraibi, H., Alghamdi, E., Almusallam, L., Saffarini, Z., Alessa, S., Alwayel, F., Saffarini, L., Alrawdhan, A., Mapusao, C., Asonto, L. P., Alsulaibikh, A., & Aljumaan, M. (2021). Incidence and prevalence of violence toward health care workers in emergency departments: a multicenter cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Emergency Medicine*,

- 14(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12245-021-00394-1>
- Astuti, S. J. W., Suindyah Dwiningwarni, S., & Atmojo, S. (2025). Modeling environmental interactions and collaborative interventions for childhood stunting: A case from Indonesia. *Dialogues in Health*, 6(September 2024), 100206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dialog.2025.100206>
- Bahr, R., Clarsen, B., Derman, W., Dvorak, J., Emery, C. A., Finch, C. F., Häggglund, M., Junge, A., Kemp, S., Khan, K. M., Marshall, S. W., Meeuwisse, W., Mountjoy, M., Orchard, J. W., Pluim, B., Quarrie, K. L., Reider, B., Schwellnus, M., Soligard, T., ... Chamari, K. (2020). International Olympic Committee Consensus Statement: Methods for Recording and Reporting of Epidemiological Data on Injury and Illness in Sports 2020 (Including the STROBE Extension for Sports Injury and Illness Surveillance (STROBE-SIIS)). *Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine*, 8(2), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2325967120902908>
- Baker, R., Xu, D., Park, J., Yu, R., Li, Q., Cung, B., Fischer, C., Rodriguez, F., Warschauer, M., & Smyth, P. (2020). The benefits and caveats of using clickstream data to understand student self-regulatory behaviors: opening the black box of learning processes. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00187-1>
- Bar, E., Radunz, M., Galanis, C. R., Quinney, B., Wade, T. D., & King, D. L. (2025). Student perspectives on banning mobile phones in South Australian secondary schools: A large-scale qualitative analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 167(January), 108603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2025.108603>
- Baumler, R., Bhatia, B. S., & Kitada, M. (2021). Ship first: Seafarers' adjustment of records on work and rest hours. *Marine Policy*, 130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104186>
- Bergmark, U. (2020). Rethinking researcher–teacher roles and relationships in educational action research through the use of Nel Noddings' ethics of care. *Educational Action Research*, 28(3), 331–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2019.1567367>
- Biru, A., Arenius, P., Bruton, G., & Gilbert, D. (2025). Firm Formalization Strategy: The Interaction of Entrepreneurs and Government Officials in the Enforcement of Regulation. *Journal of Management*, 51(4), 1586–1618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063231224332>
- Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality and Quantity*, 56(3), 1391–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y>
- Cevikbas, M., & Kaiser, G. (2020). Flipped classroom as a reform-oriented approach to teaching mathematics. *ZDM - Mathematics Education*, 52(7), 1291–1305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-020-01191-5>
- Clarke, M., Haines Lyon, C., Walker, E., Walz, L., Collet-Sabé, J., & Pritchard, K. (2021). The banality of education policy: Discipline as extensive evil in the neoliberal era. *Power and Education*, 13(3), 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17577438211041468>
- Crable, E. L., Benintendi, A., Jones, D. K., Walley, A. Y., Hicks, J. M., & Drainoni, M. L. (2022). Translating Medicaid policy into practice: policy implementation

- strategies from three US states' experiences enhancing substance use disorder treatment. *Implementation Science*, 17(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-021-01182-4>
- Crewe, B., & Ievins, A. (2021). 'Tightness', recognition and penal power. *Punishment and Society*, 23(1), 47-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474520928115>
- Darwin, Rusdin, D., Mukminatien, N., Suryati, N., Laksmi, E. D., & Marzuki. (2024). Critical thinking in the AI era: An exploration of EFL students' perceptions, benefits, and limitations. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2290342>
- Earp, B. D., Lewis, J., Dranseika, V., & Hannikainen, I. R. (2021). Experimental philosophical bioethics and normative inference. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 42(3-4), 91-111. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11017-021-09546-z>
- Egan, S. M., Pope, J., Moloney, M., Hoyne, C., & Beatty, C. (2021). Missing Early Education and Care During the Pandemic: The Socio-Emotional Impact of the COVID-19 Crisis on Young Children. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 49(5), 925-934. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-021-01193-2>
- Engler, S., Brunner, P., Loviat, R., Abou-Chadi, T., Leemann, L., Glaser, A., & Kübler, D. (2021). Democracy in times of the pandemic: explaining the variation of COVID-19 policies across European democracies. *West European Politics*, 44(5-6), 1077-1102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2021.1900669>
- Ewulley, F., Anlimachie, M. A., Abreh, M. K., & Mills, E. E. (2023). Understanding the nexus of school types, school cultures and educational outcomes and its implication for policy and practice. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 121(August), 102237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102237>
- Feeney, M., Grohnert, T., Gijsselaers, W., & Martens, P. (2023). Organizations, Learning, and Sustainability: A Cross-Disciplinary Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 184(1), 217-235. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05072-7>
- Fix, G. M., Kim, B., Ruben, M. A., & McCullough, M. B. (2022). Direct observation methods: A practical guide for health researchers. *PEC Innovation*, 1(March), 100036. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecinn.2022.100036>
- Gong, Y., Jiang, Y., & Jia, F. (2023). Multiple multi-tier sustainable supply chain management: a social system theory perspective. *International Journal of Production Research*, 61(14), 4684-4701. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2021.1930238>
- Gonsalves, C. (2025). Addressing student non-compliance in AI use declarations: implications for academic integrity and assessment in higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 50(4), 592-606. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2415654>
- Griffin, C., Sirimorok, N., Dressler, W. H., Sahide, M. A. K., Fisher, M. R., Faturachmat, F., Muin, A. V. F., Andary, P. M., Batiran, K. B., Rahmat, Rizaldi, M., Toubmourou, T., Suwarso, R., Salim, W., Utomo, A., Akhmad, F., & Clendenning, J. (2024). The persistence of precarity: youth livelihood struggles and aspirations in the context of truncated agrarian change, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 41(1), 293-311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-023-10489-5>

- Guerrero-Dib, J. G., Portales, L., & Heredia-Escorza, Y. (2020). Impact of academic integrity on workplace ethical behaviour. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-0051-3>
- Huang, X., Ruan, W., Huang, W., Jin, G., Dong, Y., Wu, C., Bensalem, S., Mu, R., Qi, Y., Zhao, X., Cai, K., Zhang, Y., Wu, S., Xu, P., Wu, D., Freitas, A., & Mustafa, M. A. (2024). A survey of safety and trustworthiness of large language models through the lens of verification and validation. In *Artificial Intelligence Review* (Vol. 57, Number 7). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-024-10824-0>
- Joseph-Williams, N., Abhyankar, P., Boland, L., Bravo, P., Brenner, A. T., Brodney, S., Coulter, A., Giguère, A., Hoffman, A., Körner, M., Langford, A., Légaré, F., Matlock, D., Moumjid, N., Munro, S., Dahl Steffensen, K., Stirling, C., & van der Weijden, T. (2021). What Works in Implementing Patient Decision Aids in Routine Clinical Settings? A Rapid Realist Review and Update from the International Patient Decision Aid Standards Collaboration. *Medical Decision Making*, 41(7), 907–937. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X20978208>
- Joubert, C., & Jacobs, S. (2024). Exploring the ripple effect: learner psycho-social challenges, teacher emotional fatigue, and the role of school social work in South Africa—an interview-based qualitative study using Bronfenbrenner’s framework. *Discover Education*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00245-0>
- Kern, M. L., Williams, P., Spong, C., Colla, R., Sharma, K., Downie, A., Taylor, J. A., Sharp, S., Siokou, C., & Oades, L. G. (2020). Systems informed positive psychology. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 15(6), 705–715. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2019.1639799>
- Kiracho, E. E., Namuhani, N., Apolot, R. R., Aanyu, C., Mutebi, A., Tetui, M., Kiwanuka, S. N., Ayen, F. A., Mwesige, D., Bumbha, A., Paina, L., & Peters, D. H. (2020). Influence of community scorecards on maternal and newborn health service delivery and utilization. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 19(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-020-01184-6>
- Leerssen, P. (2023). An end to shadow banning? Transparency rights in the Digital Services Act between content moderation and curation. *Computer Law and Security Review*, 48, 105790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105790>
- Lewis, C. C., Boyd, M. R., Walsh-Bailey, C., Lyon, A. R., Beidas, R., Mittman, B., Aarons, G. A., Weiner, B. J., & Chambers, D. A. (2020). A systematic review of empirical studies examining mechanisms of implementation in health. *Implementation Science*, 15(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-020-00983-3>
- Li, W., Abdalla, A. A., Mohammad, T., Khassawneh, O., & Parveen, M. (2023). Towards Examining the Link Between Green HRM Practices and Employee Green in-Role Behavior: Spiritual Leadership as a Moderator. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 16, 383–396. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S396114>
- Lum, C., Koper, C. S., Wu, X., Johnson, W., & Stoltz, M. (2020). Examining the Empirical Realities of Proactive Policing Through Systematic Observations and Computer-Aided Dispatch Data. *Police Quarterly*, 23(3), 283–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611119896081>

- Matheus, R., Janssen, M., & Maheshwari, D. (2020). Data science empowering the public: Data-driven dashboards for transparent and accountable decision-making in smart cities. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(3), 101284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2018.01.006>
- Mbakaya, B. C., Kalembo, F. W., Zgambo, M., Konyani, A., Lungu, F., Tveit, B., Kaasen, A., Simango, M., & Bvumbwe, T. (2020). Nursing and midwifery students' experiences and perception of their clinical learning environment in Malawi: a mixed-method study. *BMC Nursing*, 19(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-020-00480-4>
- Mebert, L., Barnes, R., Dalley, J., Gawarecki, L., Shafer, G., Slater, J., Yezbick, E., Mebert, L., Barnes, R., Dalley, J., & Gawarecki, L. (2020). Fostering student engagement through a real- world , collaborative project across disciplines and institutions. *Higher Education Pedagogies*, 5(1), 30-51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23752696.2020.1750306>
- Meland, E. A., & Brion-Meisels, G. (2024). An integrative model for culturally sustaining SEL in the classroom. *Social and Emotional Learning: Research, Practice, and Policy*, 3(February), 100042. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sel.2024.100042>
- Morgan, D. L., & Nica, A. (2020). Iterative Thematic Inquiry: A New Method for Analyzing Qualitative Data. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920955118>
- Nelson, J. L., Ahn, J., & Hegtvedt, K. A. (2025). Fair Across the Board? Relating Teacher Commitment to Teachers' Perceptions of Principal Versus Assistant Principal Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 61(1), 104-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X241300623>
- Potokri, O. C., & Lumadi, R. I. (2025). Insights for female teachers on managing learner discipline from perceptions of teachers and parents in Vuwani, Limpopo, South Africa. *Management in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08920206251320183>
- Rahnuma, N. (2020). Evolution of quality culture in an HEI: critical insights from university staff in Bangladesh. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 32(1), 53-81. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-019-09313-8>
- Rao, S. V., Vidovich, M. I., Gilchrist, I. C., Gulati, R., Gutierrez, J. A., Hess, C. N., Kaul, P., Martinez, S. C., & Rymer, J. (2021). 2021 ACC Expert Consensus Decision Pathway on Same-Day Discharge After Percutaneous Coronary Intervention: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Solution Set Oversight Committee. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 77(6), 811-825. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2020.11.013>
- Rodriguez, L. A., & Welsh, R. O. (2022). The Dimensions of School Discipline: Toward a Comprehensive Framework for Measuring Discipline Patterns and Outcomes in Schools. *AERA Open*, 8(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584221083669>
- Santoni de Sio, F., & Mecacci, G. (2021). Four Responsibility Gaps with Artificial Intelligence: Why they Matter and How to Address them. *Philosophy and Technology*, 34(4), 1057-1084. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00450-x>
- Singun, A. J. (2025). Unveiling the barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: a systematic literature review. In *Discover Education* (Vol.

- 4, Number 1). Springer International Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00430-9>
- Stapels, J. G., & Eyssel, F. (2022). Robocalypse? Yes, Please! The Role of Robot Autonomy in the Development of Ambivalent Attitudes Towards Robots. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 14(3), 683–697.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-021-00817-2>
- Tuominen, M., & Haanpää, L. (2022). Young People's Well-Being and the Association with Social Capital, i.e. Social Networks, Trust and Reciprocity. *Social Indicators Research*, 159(2), 617–645. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-021-02762-z>
- Ulenaers, D., Grosemans, J., Schrooten, W., & Bergs, J. (2021). Clinical placement experience of nursing students during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, 99(November 2020).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2021.104746>
- Weston, L. E., Krein, S. L., & Harrod, M. (2021). Using observation to better understand the healthcare context. *Qualitative Research in Medicine and Healthcare*, 5(3), 9821.
<https://doi.org/10.4081/qrmh.2021.9821>
- Williams, K. M., & Corwith, A. (2021). Beyond Bricks and Mortar: The efficacy of online learning and community-building at College Park Academy during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(5), 5055–5076.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10516-0>