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Abstract: In learning, students should possess the capability to manage their learning effectively to achieve optimal outcomes. Consequently, self-regulated learning becomes crucial for students, encompassing not only general subjects but also religious studies. This research investigates the influence of Personality Type, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support on Self-Regulated Learning at Al-Nahdlah Islamic Boarding School. Employing a quantitative method, this study adopts a correlation approach. The sampling technique utilized is probability sampling, specifically stratified random sampling. From 116 students at Al-Nahdlah Islamic Boarding School, a sample of 56 was chosen. For validation, this research employs Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using the Lisrel 8.7 software. Subsequent data analysis was conducted using multiple regression analysis in the SPSS software. Findings indicate a significant influence of Personality Type, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support on Self-Regulated Learning among Al-Nahdlah Islamic Boarding School students. The combined contribution of these independent variables to Self-Regulated Learning is 29.0%, leaving 71.0% influenced by other factors. Thus, Personality Type, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support significantly impact students' self-regulated learning capabilities. By enhancing students' spiritual intelligence, understanding their personality types, and strengthening their social support networks, institutions can better foster self-regulated learning capabilities, leading to improved academic outcomes and holistic student development.

INTRODUCTION

From an early age, education has been pivotal for human potential development. Individuals proficient in specific skills and abilities serve as key drivers in the wave of globalization (Fahmi & Ali, 2022; Purnomo et al., 2021; Siswanto et al., 2022). In today's rapidly globalizing world, particularly in technological realms (Dharmawan et al., 2018), the education sector is under pressure to produce competent and skilled human resources. Consequently, enhancing the quality of education in Indonesia becomes imperative (Allred et al., 2022; Daulay et al., 2021; Zajda, 2022).
Educational institutions in Indonesia often have strong religious affiliations, with Islamic boarding schools, or "Pesantren", being particularly noteworthy. In a Pesantren, students, often referred to as "santri", cohabit in a residential setting and receive instruction from a teacher, commonly known as a "Kiai". Contemporary Pesantrens can be categorized into two types: Salaf and Modern. Salaf Islamic boarding schools focus solely on imparting traditional Islamic religious teachings, such as studying the Kitab Kuning (the Yellow Book). In contrast, modern Islamic boarding schools provide a blend of both Islamic religious education and general subjects like mathematics and physics (Tolib, 2015; Syafe‘i, 2017).

The learning method in Islamic boarding schools typically emphasizes independent study for students. Consequently, the capacity for self-regulation becomes paramount. Self-regulated learning enables individuals to tackle and manage challenging tasks autonomously (Salmony & Kanbach, 2022; Vohs & Baumeister, 2016). This approach involves guiding one's learning journey, strategizing, seeking resources, and drafting materials pertinent to coursework (Boekaerts, 1999; Subchi, 2020). This learning model stands on three pillars: metacognition, motivation, and behavior. The Covid-19 pandemic underscored the importance of enhancing self-regulated learning, especially in bolstering face-to-face learning experiences (Darmawan et al., 2021). As such, proficient self-regulated learning is crucial for students.

Self-regulated learning is a learner's aptitude to effectively manage their learning experiences, optimizing outcomes. While Wolters et al. (2006) and Pintrich & De Groot (1990) highlight the active management and adaptability in varied conditions, Pintrich contextualizes it as effective self-management, cited in Yukselturk & Bulut (2009). Individual differences in learning management underscore the importance of personality dimensions. Personality affects motivation, driving actions. It shapes individual tendencies and habits in academic contexts, cognitive abilities, and motivations towards learning (Adams & Hyde, 2008; Saleem et al., 2021; Sung & Choi, 2013; Buju, 2013; Hazrati-Viari et al., 2012; Komarraju et al., 2011).

Personality is characterized by consistent emotions, thoughts, and behaviors (Akmal & To‘raqizi, 2022; Fleeson et al., 2014; Roberts & Yoon, 2022; Sarvinoz, 2022). It's a dynamic system influencing an individual's environmental adaptation, as outlined by Allport and Kemp (1950) and cited in Friedman & Schustack (2008). Personality types, including extroversion and introversion, stem from variances in interpersonal responses and behaviors (Almeida et al., 2022; Nguyen, 2021; Suryabrata, 2002; Urfa & Can, 2022). Furthermore, personality encompasses stable traits driving behaviors aligned with set objectives (Feist & Feist, 2008). McCrae and Costa’s Five Factor Model classifies personality into neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Pervin & John, 2001).

Santri, individuals who pursue Islamic studies at boarding schools, often exhibit heightened spiritual intelligence due to the daily application of Islamic values. Spiritual intelligence provides the cognitive tools to navigate issues of life's purpose and value, encompassing not just life goals but broader cosmic understanding (Adams & Hyde, 2008; Jannah, 2022; Shahaluddin & Waslah, 2022). This mental acumen is crucial for discerning meaning in both the temporal world and the afterlife. Delving into spiritual intelligence requires profound self-awareness and contemplation (Ma & Wang, 2022; Kessi et al., 2022; Varadwaj & Varadwaj, 2022). Research underscores its significance: Indrayani et al. (2021)
found a positive correlation between spiritual intelligence and self-regulated learning, indicating that as one's spiritual intelligence rises, so does their capacity for self-directed learning (Wibowo, 2017). Zohar & Marshall (2001) see spiritual intelligence as multifaceted, offering solutions to diverse challenges and providing perspectives to identify optimal outcomes in various situations.

Zimmerman (1989) identifies three influencers of self-regulated learning: the individual, behavior, and environment. Within the environmental context, social support plays a pivotal role. It embodies acceptance and assistance from others, often deriving from parents, teachers, and peers, bolstering feelings of love, care, and aid (Edisherashvili et al., 2022; Rodríguez et al., 2022; Sidianto & Heng, 2022; Sarafino & Smith, 2012; Doo et al., 2023).

Sarafino & Smith (2012) posits that when students receive substantial social support, they feel cherished and valued by their familial and social networks. This fosters confidence, enables better study management, and results in more diligent efforts toward academic goals. The added guidance helps students discern right from wrong, bolstering their self-regulated learning. Social support, encompassing resources from interpersonal relationships, not only benefits one's well-being but also remains crucial even when not under acute stress (Cohen S. et al., 1985; Ashshidieqy, 2018). Cohen and Hoberman identified various forms of this support, including appraisal, ownership, and real support. Broadly, social support is seen as emotional, informational, or practical help from one's network, either tangibly received or perceived as available when needed (Nurullah, 2012; Holland & Collins, 2022; Knight & Schatz, 2022; O'Toole et al., 2022; Stang et al., 2022; Thoits, 1986).

While each of these factors—self-regulated learning, personality type, spiritual intelligence, and social support—has been explored individually in preceding literature, there's a paucity of research delving into how these factors collectively impact self-directed learning within the context of Islamic boarding schools. This study seeks to bridge this gap by probing the interaction between these factors in the context of the Al-Nahdlah Islamic Boarding School. Through this approach, the research aims to proffer fresh insights into how faith-based educational institutions can more efficaciously foster self-directed learning among their students. Situated at the intersection of education, psychology, and religious studies within the extant literature, the outcomes of this study are anticipated to be pertinent not only to educators and researchers in the educational realm but also to practitioners in faith-based educational institutions globally.

METHOD
Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

This study targets students from the Al-Nahdlah Islamic Boarding School aged 12-18 years, out of a total of 116 students. Utilizing a probability sampling technique, specifically stratified random sampling, the research divides the population into distinct subgroups and selects samples from each stratum. A total of 56 students were chosen as samples, in line with the methodologies recommended by Mishra & Alok (2017) and Sugiyono (2011).

Data Analysis Technique

This research employs a quantitative method to investigate the impact of Personality Type, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support on Self-Regulated Learning. To ensure the construct validity of each item utilized in the research, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was implemented using the Lisrel 8.7 software. Subsequent to the validity testing, the data was subjected to
multiple regression analysis via the SPSS software to ascertain the influences. The sampling strategy adopted for this study was probability sampling, specifically using the stratified random sampling approach. This ensured that every member of the population had an equal chance of being included as a sample in the research (Agastya et al., 2022; Lanasa et al., 2009; Mueller et al., 1998; Saeed et al., 2022; Umar & Nisa, 2020).

**Variables Instruments**

This study uses two types of variables, namely the independent variable and the dependent variable. The dependent variable in this research is self-regulated learning. In addition, the independent variables in this study include personality type, spiritual intelligence, and social support. The following is an explanation of the variables used in detail:

1. **Dependent Variable: Self-Regulated Learning (Y)**
2. **Independent Variable: Personality type (X1)**
3. **Independent Variable: Spiritual Intelligence (X2)**
4. **Independent Variable: Social support (X3)**

**Data Collection Instruments**

This research used a structured questionnaire with a four-point Likert scale to collect data, consisting of Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree options. Omitting a neutral choice ensured clear responses from participants. Based on Supratiknya’s (2015) model, answers were classified as positive or negative, with scores assigned for data analysis based on their position on the scale.

**Table 1. Likert Scale Scoring Format.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measuring Tool of Self-Regulated Learning**

Self-Regulated Learning, as defined by Pintrich and Groot (1990), refers to the ability of students to navigate tasks under diverse conditions and the manner in which they process acquired knowledge and strategize future actions. In this study, the assessment of self-regulated learning was conducted using the MSLQ (Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire). This instrument, developed by Pintrich and Groot (1990), encompasses 22 items spanning two distinct dimensions: Cognitive Strategy Use and Self-Regulation in Learning.

**Table 2. Self-Regulated Learning Scale Blueprint.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cognitive Strategy Use</td>
<td>1,6,8,2,9,4,7,10,12,13,3*,5,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>15*,14,18,16,17,21,22,19*,20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unfavorable Item

**Measuring Tool of Personality Type**

Personality is defined by stable traits that influence individual behaviors and actions consistent with their goals and societal expectations (Feist & Feist, 2008). McCrae and Costa outlined the Five Factor Model of Personality, encompassing neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Pervin & John, 2001). This research utilized the Big Five Inventory-10 (BFI-10) by Rammstedt & John (2007) to assess these core personality dimensions.
Table 3. Personality Type Scale Blueprint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2, 1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3, 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5*, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>7*, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>9*, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unfavorable Item

Measuring Tool of Spiritual Intelligence

David B. King and De Cicco outlined four dimensions of spiritual intelligence: Critical Existential Thinking, the insight into life's meaning; Personal Meaning Production, the creation of personal purpose; Transcendental Consciousness, understanding life's spiritual facets; and Expansion of States of Consciousness, experiencing profound spiritual states while awake (King, 2008). This study used the SISRI-24 by King & DeCicco (2009) to assess these dimensions.

Table 4. Spiritual Intelligence Scale Blueprint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critical Existential Thinking</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personal Meaning Production</td>
<td>7, 11, 15, 19, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transcendental Awareness</td>
<td>2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 20, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conscious State Expansion</td>
<td>4, 8, 12, 16, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measuring Tool of Social Support

Social support, evident in interpersonal relationships, has a positive impact on health, even outside stressful situations (Cohen et al., 1985). Cohen et al. (1985) classify social support into: appraisal, belonging, and tangible support. This study utilized the ISEL-12 scale, a shortened 12-item version of the ISEL, to assess these support types.

Table 5. Social Support Scale Blueprint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appraisal Support</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belonging Support</td>
<td>6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tangible Support</td>
<td>9, 10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Validation Results

The instrument underwent validation using unidimensional items via Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). For the Self-Regulated Learning construct, 22 items were assessed. Out of these, 8 items emerged as significant, implying the potential removal of the remaining items. Likewise, within the Personality Type construct that consists of 10 items, 6 were deemed significant, suggesting the removal of the residual items. In the Spiritual Intelligence Construct, out of 24 items, 9 were found significant, leading to the recommendation of excluding the remaining items. During the validation of the Social Support construct, which encompassed 12 items, only one item was identified as significant from the initial three items presented. Throughout the constructs, an RMSEA value less than 0.05 consistently affirmed the specificity of items to their respective factors. Items with a t-value exceeding 1.96 were flagged as significant, whereas items with
a t-value below this criterion or those with a non-positive coefficient were categorized as unsuitable.

**Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis testing was performed using multiple regression in SPSS 16.0 to evaluate the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable. The analysis considered the R-square magnitude to understand the variance percentage explained by the independent variable, the overall significance of independent variables, and the significance of their regression coefficients. The initial step examined the R-square magnitude.

**Table 6. R-square Table for All Samples.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.539a</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>7.99953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 6, the R-Square value is presented. This indicates that 29.0% of the variance in Self-Regulated Learning can be explained by the independent variables: Personality Type, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support. The remaining 71.0% can be attributed to other variables considered in this study. Subsequently, the researchers assessed the impact of all the independent variables on the dependent variable, which in this context is technostress. The outcomes of the F-test are detailed in Table 7.

**Table 7. ANOVA Table for All Samples.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1257.219</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>179.603</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>.016a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3071.641</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63.993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4328.860</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 7, the significance column indicates a p-value less than 0.05. This leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis, which posits that there is no significant impact from all independent variables on the dependent variable. Therefore, the variables Personality Type, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support significantly influence Self-Regulated Learning. Subsequently, the researchers evaluated the regression of each independent variable. If the p-value is less than 0.05, the regression coefficient is deemed significant, signifying that the independent variable notably affects technostress. The regression results for each variable are delineated in Table 8.

**Table 8. Coefficient Regression Table.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>9.617</td>
<td>16.366</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreebleness</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscirntiousness</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurotism</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openess</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.1056.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Intelligence</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.1021.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 8 the regression coefficient can be explained: \[
\text{Self-Regulated Learning} = 9.617 + 0.106 (Extraversion) + 0.189 (Agreebleness) + 0.152 (Neurotism) - 0.276 (Openess) + 0.183 (Conscirntiousness) + 0.036 (Social Support) + e.
\]
In Table 8, it's evident that Personality Type (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness), Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support significantly influence Self-Regulated Learning. This can be deduced from the significance column in Table 4.6. If the value of $p < 0.05$, then the regression coefficient significantly affects Self-Regulated Learning and vice versa. The regression coefficient values for each independent variable are explained as follows:

1. The regression coefficient for Extraversion is 0.815, with a significance of 0.419 (sig > 0.05). This means that the null hypothesis, which posits that Extraversion does not significantly affect Self-Regulated Learning, is accepted. Consequently, Extraversion doesn't significantly influence Self-Regulated Learning. The positive coefficient direction suggests that as student enthusiasm increases, so does the level of Self-Regulated Learning.

2. The regression coefficient for Agreeableness is 1.588, with a significance of 0.119 (sig > 0.05). The null hypothesis, which suggests that Agreeableness doesn't significantly affect Self-Regulated Learning is accepted. This infers that Agreeableness doesn't considerably influence Self-Regulated Learning. The positive coefficient indicates that the higher the student's sincerity towards others, the higher the Self-Regulated Learning level.

3. Conscientiousness has a regression coefficient of 1.411 with a significance of 0.165 (sig > 0.05). The null hypothesis, which suggests that Conscientiousness doesn't significantly affect Self-Regulated Learning, is accepted. The positive coefficient direction denotes that as students' responsibility and diligence in tasks increase, so does their Self-Regulated Learning.

4. The regression coefficient for Neuroticism is 2.131, with a significance of 0.038 (sig < 0.05). This indicates that the null hypothesis, asserting no significant relationship between Neuroticism and Self-Regulated Learning, is rejected. Thus, Neuroticism has a substantial impact on Self-Regulated Learning. The positive coefficient direction suggests that higher levels of negative emotions in students, such as anxiety and tension, lead to higher Self-Regulated Learning.

5. Openness has a regression coefficient of -0.152 with a significance of 0.296 (sig > 0.05). The null hypothesis, stating that Openness does not have a significant effect on Self-Regulated Learning, is accepted. The negative coefficient direction implies that as students' insights increase, Self-Regulated Learning decreases.

6. The regression coefficient for Spiritual Intelligence is 1.021, with a significance of 0.312 (sig > 0.05). The null hypothesis, which claims no significant effect between Spiritual Intelligence and Self-Regulated Learning, is accepted. The positive coefficient direction denotes that higher spiritual intelligence corresponds to higher Self-Regulated Learning.

7. Social Support's regression coefficient is 0.215, with a significance of 0.830 (sig > 0.05). This means the null hypothesis that states there is no significant effect of Social Support on Self-Regulated Learning is accepted. The positive coefficient suggests that as a person's social support increases, so does their level of Self-Regulated Learning.
**Test the Proportion of Variance of Each Variable**

At this point, the researcher aims to determine the incremental variance each independent variable (Type of Nursing, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support) contributes to the dependent variable (Self-Regulated Learning). To do this, the researcher examines the R-square Change value, representing the collective contributions of the independent variables to the dependent variable. Additionally, the sig. F Change is observed to determine the significance of the R-Square Change (with a significance level set at $p < 0.05$).

**Table 9. Proportion of Variances for Each Variable.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.103a</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>8.90617</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>1 .54 .452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.312b</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>8.58520</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>5.113</td>
<td>1 .53 .028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>8.46885</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>2.466</td>
<td>1 .52 .122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>8.07969</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>6.130</td>
<td>1 .51 .017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>7.96099</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>1 .50 .118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>7.92131</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.502</td>
<td>1 .49 .226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>7.99953</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1 .48 .830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 9, the data can be interpreted as follows:

1. The Extraversion variable contributes 1.1% to Self-Regulated Learning with an R Square Change of 0.011. Its significant F-change value is 0.452 ($p > 0.05$), indicating that its contribution is not statistically significant.

2. Agreeableness contributes 9.8% to Self-Regulated Learning with an R-Square Change of 0.98. Its significant F-change value is 0.028 ($sig < 0.05$), denoting a statistically significant contribution.

3. Conscientiousness contributes 13.8% to Self-Regulated Learning with an R-Square Change of 0.138. Its significant F-change value is 0.122 ($p > 0.05$), indicating a non-statistically significant contribution.

4. Neuroticism contributes 21.3% to Self-Regulated Learning with an R-Square Change of 0.231. Its significant F-change value is 0.017 ($sig < 0.05$), denoting a statistically significant contribution.

5. Openness contributes 26.8% to Self-Regulated Learning with an R-Square Change of 0.268. Its significant F-change value is 0.118 ($sig > 0.05$), indicating its contribution is not statistically significant.

6. Spiritual Intelligence contributes 29.0% to Self-Regulated Learning with an R Square Change of 0.290. Its significant F-change value is 0.226 ($p > 0.05$), suggesting a non-statistically significant contribution.

7. Social Support also contributes 29.0% to Self-Regulated Learning with an R Square Change of 0.290. Its significant F-change value is 0.830 ($p > 0.05$), indicating its contribution is not statistically significant.

Based on the research findings, it is evident that Personality Type, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support significantly influence Self-Regulated Learning among students at Santri Al-Nahdollah Islamic Boarding School. Collectively, these independent variables contribute 29.0% to Self-Regulated Learning, leaving 71.0% influenced by other factors not captured in this study.

All of the independent variables, to varying degrees, contribute to the variance observed in Self-Regulated Learning. Of particular note is the Neuroticism variable, which explains a substantial portion of this variance. The
subsequent hypothesis tests that probed the regression coefficients further confirmed the significant impact of each independent variable on Self-Regulated Learning.

Higher Neuroticism levels, indicative of students experiencing emotions like worry and tension, correlate with elevated Self-Regulated Learning. This aligns with research by Bju (2013), Hazrati-Viari et al. (2012), and Komarraju et al. (2011), suggesting that individuals with higher neuroticism concurrently exhibit heightened self-regulation in their learning processes. This relationship underpins the theory positing a direct relationship between high neuroticism and improved self-regulation among students.

In examining other facets of Personality Type, positive t-values were observed across Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness. Specifically, t-values for Extraversion stood at 0.588, Agreeableness at 0.815, Conscientiousness at 1.588, and Openness at 2.131. This suggests that as students score higher in these personality traits, their Self-Regulated Learning also improves. This observation is consistent with previous studies by Bju (2013), Hazrati-Viari et al. (2012), and Komarraju et al. (2011), which posited that these personality types directly correlate with enhanced self-regulation in learning.

With a t-value of 1.021, Spiritual Intelligence emerges as another influential factor. A higher score in Spiritual Intelligence predicts increased self-regulation in learning, resonating with the findings of Indrayani et al. (2021). Drawing upon prior theoretical frameworks, it is evident that students possessing robust spiritual intelligence are likely to exhibit superior self-regulation in their learning strategies (as corroborated by Pujiastuti & Indriyani, 2021).

Lastly, the Social Support variable, with a t-value of 0.215, suggests that students with enhanced social support display improved self-regulated learning. This finding is congruent with Sarafino & Smith (2012) research, which argued that a strong social support system bolsters self-regulation in learning. Such conclusions reiterate the notion that external social support mechanisms play a pivotal role in shaping students' learning strategies.

However, this study is not without limitations. The exclusive focus on Santri Al-Nahdalah Islamic Boarding School students may limit its wider applicability. Furthermore, inherent self-report biases and the limitations of a cross-sectional design underscore the need for caution in drawing conclusions. Notably, factors like socio-economic background weren't considered, which could influence Self-Regulated Learning. These insights can guide pedagogical strategies, emphasizing the need to address the diverse needs of students, inclusive of their emotional, spiritual, and social dimensions. The relationship between high neuroticism and improved learning outcomes, in particular, should motivate educators to develop specialized interventions.

For future research, a more diverse sample, spanning different educational settings and regions, would be beneficial. Employing a longitudinal approach could offer deeper insights into the evolving nature of these relationships. Combining quantitative data with qualitative narratives can provide a richer understanding of how personality influences learning. Finally, exploring new variables can provide a more comprehensive view, helping to bridge the current gaps in our knowledge.
CONCLUSION
This study has demonstrated a significant influence of Personality Type, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support on Self-Regulated Learning among students at Santri Al-Nahdalah Islamic Boarding School. These three independent variables contribute 29.0% to Self-Regulated Learning, with the remaining 71.0% influenced by other variables not covered in this study. Based on these findings, it is recommended for future researchers to consider exploring other variables that might contribute to Self-Regulated Learning and to expand their research samples to other educational institutions. Additionally, for education practitioners, it’s crucial to consider training and interventions targeting Personality Type, Spiritual Intelligence, and Social Support to enhance the quality of students' Self-Regulated Learning.
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