

Teacher Discipline as an Integrated Managerial System: A Case Study of SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah and SDN Santosa

Cahyanti Yuni Astuti and S Sobari

Nusantara Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: cahyanti1986@gmail.com

Abstract. This study examines how principals manage teacher discipline as an integrated managerial system using the POAC/Fayol framework (planning, organizing, actuating, coordinating, controlling) in two elementary schools with distinct profiles: SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah (leveraging attendance digital nudging) and SDN Santosa (anchored in the 5S culture: Smile, Greet, *Salam*, Polite, Courteous). Employing a qualitative case study, participants included principals, grade coordinators, and homeroom teachers directly involved in discipline management. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, participant observation of arrival/class-start/transition/closing routines, and document analysis (SOPs, digital/manual attendance logs, meeting minutes, coaching notes). Analysis followed the Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña interactive model (data reduction, display, and conclusion drawing/verification) with combined deductive coding (management functions) and inductive coding (field-emergent themes). Findings show that teacher discipline improves when managed as a systemic cycle: (a) planning establishes standards, process–outcome indicators, and a data architecture; (b) organizing clarifies roles via SOPs/RASCI and distributed leadership; (c) actuating executes simple, consistent micro-routines (e.g., *bell-minus-5*, buffer coverage, 5S rituals) supported by digital nudges and micro-coaching; (d) controlling blends dashboards/quick recaps with formative feedback and a coaching-before-sanction escalation matrix; and (e) coordinating through brief, regular huddles/weekly meetings closes the POAC cycle, maintaining adaptiveness. The study concludes that system coherence, leadership role modeling, school culture, and parent partnerships are prerequisites for sustainability, shifting discipline from procedural compliance to a professional habit that protects instructional continuity.

Keywords: Digital Nudging, Elementary School, Instructional Leadership, Formative Assessment, Teacher Discipline

1 Introduction

Teacher discipline is a prerequisite for an effective learning ecosystem because it directly correlates with orderly processes, attendance, punctuality, and the consistency

of instructional services for students. From a quality perspective, discipline is not mere administrative compliance; it is a hallmark of professionalism that sustains the school's work culture and shapes student character. When discipline weakens e.g., tardiness, early departures, or inconsistent task execution the rhythm of instruction becomes unstable and curricular goals are harder to achieve [1]. In this context, the principal's leadership is strategic for structuring, mobilizing, and sustaining discipline as a professional standard[2], [3].

The principal is not only an administrator but also a visionary manager who designs systems, builds culture, and facilitates sustained behavioral change. In the digital disruption era, a data-informed yet humanistic managerial approach is needed to balance control mechanisms (e.g., digital attendance) with coaching, mentorship, and role modeling. This dual administrative-humanistic approach is relevant for fostering mindful compliance commitment-based rather than merely superficial[4].

National policy provides a normative mandate. Ministerial Regulation No. 13/2007 defines the core competencies of principals (personal, managerial, supervisory, entrepreneurial, social) that are directly intertwined with managing teacher discipline. Consistently, Ministerial Regulation No. 6/2018 underscores three principal roles managerial, entrepreneurial, and supervisory requiring the integration of planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling in daily practice. Accordingly, policy positions principals as instructional leaders who ensure discipline through coherent systems, culture, and ongoing professional support.

Theoretically, Henri Fayol's five management functions planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, controlling offer an operational guide still relevant to education (Fayol, 1949). Within this framework, teacher discipline is managed as a managerial cycle: (a) planning standards and indicators of discipline; (b) organizing roles and mechanisms; (c) directing through role modeling, communication, and motivation; (d) coordinating across units to align efforts; and (e) controlling via data-based monitoring and feedback. This framework drives school discipline governance that is systematic, accountable, and responsive to local context[5], [6].

Prior studies reinforce the principal's pivotal role. Communicative, democratic, and exemplary leadership correlates with improved discipline and teacher performance [7]. Principal management and work discipline significantly influence teacher performance, especially responsibility and productivity [8], [9]. School culture and work motivation further strengthen leadership effects. Transformational approaches emphasizing effective communication and role modeling help establish a sustainable discipline culture[10].

Nevertheless, much of the literature emphasizes leadership style or partial strategies and has yet to analyze comprehensively the integrated implementation of Fayol's five functions in the context of teacher discipline especially through a comparative lens of two elementary schools with distinct cultures and policy instruments. This gap opens room to examine how managerial functions are operationalized contextually, adaptively, and humanistically to produce sustainable discipline.

This study focuses on two sites with contrasting yet complementary features: SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah, noted for leveraging a digital attendance system combined with a humanistic communication approach, and SDN Santosa, which emphasizes the 5S

culture (Smile, Greet, Salam, Polite, Courteous) and community-based supervision. The comparison sharpens our reading of how management functions are enacted, adapted, and aligned with local school culture to cultivate consistent teacher discipline. In short, these contexts provide an empirical window into assessing both the strength of systems and the resilience of culture in managing discipline ().

Specifically, the study aims to: (1) analyze the planning of teacher-discipline standards, indicators, and enabling tools; (2) map the organizing of roles, workflows, and technological/social instruments that support discipline; (3) describe directing strategies that balance firmness with formative coaching; (4) assess cross-unit coordination mechanisms; and (5) evaluate monitoring systems, feedback, and proportionate follow-up procedures.

Theoretically, this research contributes to the operationalization of Fayol in contemporary primary education, showing how managerial functions can be fused with humanistic approaches to yield mindful compliance. Practically, the findings are intended as an actionable guide for principals to craft a data-informed discipline roadmap, strengthen positive culture, use technology proportionally, and build partnerships with the school community.

With this conceptual frame and set of objectives, the manuscript is designed to offer a deep, contextual, and evidence-based account of principal managerial practices in improving teacher discipline

2 Method

This study employed a qualitative case study design to examine how principals operationalize teacher discipline through integrated management functions in two contrasting elementary schools. A qualitative approach enables in-depth understanding of meanings, processes, and contextually embedded practices, while a case study design provides holistic insights when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are blurred [11]–[13].

Research was conducted at SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah (characterized by digital attendance combined with humanistic communication) and SDN Santosa (emphasizing the 5S culture and community-based supervision). Sites were selected purposefully for maximum variation and relevance to the research aims. Participants included principals and Grade-level homeroom teachers directly involved in discipline management, supplemented by administrative staff as needed. Inclusion criteria were: (1) active involvement in planning/monitoring discipline; (2) a minimum of one academic year at the school; and (3) willingness to participate.

Data were gathered using method triangulation: In-depth interviews (semi-structured) with principals and teachers to elicit narratives on standards, routines, monitoring tools, and follow-up procedures; Participant observation of daily rituals (e.g., arrivals, class transitions, digital check-in, 5S enactment), staff meetings, and coaching sessions; Document analysis of discipline policies/SOPs, attendance logs (digital and manual), meeting minutes, coaching notes, and teacher performance records [14], [15].

The researcher acted as the primary instrument, engaging directly with participants and field settings, supported by auxiliary tools: interview guides, observation checklists, document review forms, and a reflexive journal [16]

Data credibility and rigor followed Lincoln and Guba's four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was enhanced through triangulation across methods and sources, member checking of key interpretations, and prolonged engagement. Transferability was supported by thick description of context. Dependability and confirmability were ensured through an audit trail (protocols, coding memos, decision logs) and reflexive documentation [17]

Analysis used the interactive model (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña): (1) Data reduction selecting, condensing, and organizing raw field notes, transcripts, and documents; (2) Data display assembling matrices, process maps of discipline workflows, and brief analytic memos; (3) Conclusion drawing/verification iterative pattern seeking, rival-explanation checks, and verification against field evidence.

Coding combined deductive nodes (Fayol's functions: planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, controlling) with inductive codes emerging from field interactions (e.g., "digital nudges," "humanistic coaching," "community cues").

Prior to fieldwork, participants were informed about the study purpose, data handling, and confidentiality; informed consent was obtained, and pseudonyms are used in reporting. Data collection occurred February–April 2025, encompassing preparation, field immersion, and initial analysis cycles, followed by focused verification and write-up.

The chosen design aligns with the study's aim to explain processes and mechanisms rather than estimate population effects. The two-site strategy supports analytic generalization by contrasting a technology-enabled discipline system with a culture-centered one, while the POAC/Fayol lens offers a coherent scaffold to trace how managerial functions translate into everyday disciplinary practices [18].

3 Results

3.1 Planning Teacher Discipline

The findings indicate that both schools design teacher discipline as a managerial cycle beginning with the establishment of standards, indicators, performance targets, and follow-up plans. Annual work plans include core discipline items such as on-time arrival and departure, presence in class according to the timetable, preparedness of teaching materials, and participation in school activities. These plans are aligned with the academic calendar and routine agendas so that discipline is not a standalone effort but integrated into instructional processes.

At SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah, planning prominently integrates digital attendance (time stamps, geotags, automated recaps) with developmental support rather than mere control. Quarterly targets such as "zero late without notice" and "≥ 98% on-time teaching" are set. At SDN Santosa, planning emphasizes the 5S culture (Smile, Greet, Salam, Polite, Courteous) as a values framework guiding discipline indicators (punctual

presence, orderly teaching administration, in-class readiness). These patterns reflect adaptation of plans to each institution's context .

The formulation process is participatory. Principals convene key teachers/grade leaders and administrative staff to agree on measurement indicators, tolerance thresholds, and escalation pathways. This approach increases a sense of ownership and strengthens commitment-based compliance. As one teacher emphasized:

“We co-designed the discipline targets and the monitoring routines. Because we agreed on the rules, it feels fair and we are more committed to meeting them.”
(Homeroom Teacher, Interview, March 3, 2025)

Discipline plans are written into concise, operational SOPs clarifying who does what, when, and with which tools. In Cijerah, digital attendance is paired with manual cross-checks at vulnerable points (period changes, off-class activities). In Santosa, SOPs include daily opening rituals (brief assembly, 5S, five-minute briefing) as anchors of habit. This emphasis on role clarity aligns with actionable planning recommendations.

To maintain relevance, plans include process and outcome indicators. Process indicators comprise punctuality rates, on-time lesson starts, completeness of lesson plans/teaching modules, and responsiveness to official calls. Outcome indicators include schedule stability, minimized lost instructional minutes, and consistent implementation of assessment. Using dual indicators helps monitor not only formal compliance but also the impact on instructional service.

Planning also specifies the data architecture: weekly recap templates, monthly dashboards, and quarterly summaries for evaluation meetings. In Cijerah, digital attendance data are mapped into lateness patterns by hour/day, while in Santosa, class supervisors' notes record consistent/inconsistent 5S moments as qualitative feedback. This data-informed planning facilitates early detection and targeted interventions.

Preventive strategies are built in from the outset: automated reminders (notifications), timetable adjustments for teachers with dual responsibilities, and a five-minute buffer time between periods to reduce structural tardiness. Teachers perceive the plan as supportive rather than punitive:

“The plan doesn't just police us; it helps us be on time reminders, realistic buffers, and quick check-ins when patterns appear.” (Subject Teacher, Interview, March 10, 2025)

Plans also set a proportional coaching–escalation matrix: reflective personal admonition (coaching) → individual improvement plan → strengthened support (mentoring/time-management clinic) → administrative steps only if repeated. This sequence balances firmness with development, consistent with humanistic instructional leadership

Internal communication is structured: target launches at the start-of-semester meeting, SOP summaries distributed via official channels, and reminder posters in the staff room. In Santosa, the 5S agenda is posted as a shared commitment; in Cijerah, guidelines for the attendance app are socialized through technical clinics. Clear communication minimizes ambiguity and increases implementation consistency

Overall, teacher-discipline planning at both schools meets the clear measurable adaptive principle: clear standards and roles; measurable process/outcome indicators;

and adaptation to local culture and technological supports. Such planning forms a strong foundation for organizing, implementation, and monitoring phases, and is consistent with classical management frameworks operationalized in contemporary primary-school contexts.

3.2 Organizing Teacher Discipline

Both schools embedded teacher discipline within clear organizational structures that specify roles, workflows, and decision rights. Principals acted as strategic leads, setting expectations and aligning discipline with school goals; homeroom and subject teachers served as first-line implementers and models; administrative staff curated data flows (attendance, schedule integrity); and vice principals or senior teachers functioned as coordinators who translate policy into daily routines.

Role clarity was formalized through concise SOPs and RASCI charts (Responsible–Accountable–Support–Consult–Inform). In practice, this meant identifying who triggers reminders, who validates exceptions, who conducts coaching, and who consolidates monthly reports. The structure minimized ambiguity at bell times, class transitions, and duty shifts moments when discipline often falters.

Organizing also leveraged distributed leadership. Grade-level leaders convened brief, recurring huddles to review punctuality, lost-instructional-time, and readiness indicators, then coordinated peer support (class swaps, coverage, or micro-coaching) for teachers showing emerging patterns of delay. This horizontal coordination prevented problems from escalating and normalized mutual accountability.

At SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah, the digital attendance system was embedded in the organization as a service unit rather than a policing tool: an admin clerk monitored live dashboards, flagged anomalies, and notified the grade leader for supportive follow-up the same day. At SDN Santosa, a 5S marshal (rotating teacher role) observed corridor and entry routines, ensuring the smile–greet–salam etiquette anchored punctual starts and calm transitions an approach that tied discipline to visible culture.

Cross-unit coordination hinged on lightweight communication loops. Quick check-ins occurred before first period; a shared message channel recorded exceptions (official duties, traffic incidents), and weekly staff meetings reconciled data with context, turning numbers into improvement actions. As one coordinator noted:

“Our structure is simple: data first, then context, then support. We don’t argue about whether someone was late we ask what help is needed to prevent it next time.”
(Grade Coordinator, Interview, March 12, 2025)

Organizing explicitly included capacity-building lanes. New or repeatedly late teachers were paired with mentors for time-management clinics, route planning, and classroom set-up hacks (e.g., bell-minus-5 routines). These supports were scheduled not ad hoc and logged for follow-up, aligning discipline with professional growth rather than punishment.

Parent and community interfaces were also structured. Santosa’s organizing map assigned a liaison to communicate event-day adjustments and reinforce morning routines at home, reducing first-period delays. Cijerah’s admin shared monthly

punctuality snapshots with the teacher council to keep the conversation improvement-oriented and transparent.

Resources and contingencies were planned into the structure: buffer coverage for unavoidable delays, a rotating on-call teacher for sudden absences, and clearly defined thresholds for when issues move from supportive coaching to formal steps. Teachers perceived the arrangement as fair because escalation was predictable and preceded by documented support:

“It feels organized and humane. The steps are clear, and support comes before any formal action.” (Subject Teacher, Interview, March 18, 2025)

Overall, organizing teacher discipline combined role clarity, distributed coordination, supportive services, and cultural anchors. By designing who acts, when, and through which channels and by pairing data with rapid, humanistic follow-up the schools transformed discipline from a rule set into a shared operational system that sustains punctuality and instructional continuity

3.3 Implementing (Actuating) Teacher Discipline

Implementation at both sites centered on making discipline visible, habitual, and supported in the flow of daily work. Teachers and leaders operationalized plans through short, repeatable routines at arrival, class start, transitions, and closing time. These micro-routines converted written standards into concrete behaviors e.g., “bell-minus-5” classroom readiness, corridor sweep-ins by grade leaders, and quick readiness checks for teaching materials so punctuality and preparedness became the default rather than the exception.

At SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah, the digital attendance app functioned as a prompting and coaching tool: push notifications before first period, same-day summaries to teachers, and nudge messages when patterns emerged. The admin desk sent a one-line alert to the grade leader if a teacher had not checked in two minutes before class, triggering a supportive check-in rather than reprimand. Teachers reported the system felt facilitative:

“The app reminds me at the right moments, and if I slip, someone checks on me not to punish, but to help me fix the cause.” (Homeroom Teacher, Interview, March 10, 2025)

At SDN Santosa, implementation leaned on culture-first enactment of the 5S (Smile, Greet, Salam, Polite, Courteous) ritual at school gates and corridors. The first five minutes each morning featured a brief, friendly sweep by a rotating “5S marshal” to settle traffic, encourage greetings, and usher teachers into class calmly and on time. The visible courtesy ritual set the tone for punctual starts and respectful classroom climates, linking discipline with shared identity.

Classroom-level actuating emphasized preparation and smooth starts. Teachers kept a minimalist readiness checklist (attendance, objectives on board, materials placed) and used two-minute “focus openers” to begin instruction precisely at the bell. This curtailed lost instructional minutes and reinforced the expectation that teaching begins on time. Where delays were unavoidable, neighbor teachers activated pre-agreed buffer coverage, ensuring students were never left idle.

Implementation was developmentally framed, not merely corrective. When patterns of lateness appeared, leaders initiated micro-coaching: a 10–15 minute conversation to identify causes (commute constraints, caregiving duties, schedule conflicts) and craft practical fixes (route adjustments, earlier material prep, peer support). Teachers described the tone as respectful and problem-solving:

“When I struggled with first period, my coordinator helped me map my morning routine. We made tiny tweaks and the problem disappeared in a week.” (Subject Teacher, Interview, March 18, 2025)

Both schools embedded positive reinforcement into daily practice. Cijerah sent brief “on-time streak” messages to acknowledge consistent punctuality; Santosa highlighted week-long consistency during the Friday huddle. These recognitions, though modest, sustained motivation and normalized punctual conduct as professional pride rather than mere compliance.

To maintain momentum, implementation paired real-time data with same-week action. Quick analytics (e.g., heat maps of late check-ins by day/period) informed targeted supports the following week. This short feedback loop exemplified assessment for improvement in a managerial context timely, specific, and growth-oriented

Crucially, actuating aligned discipline with instructional quality. Teachers linked punctual starts to clearer learning targets, tighter transitions, and more time for feedback. Grade teams noted fewer rushed endings and more complete formative checks when classes began precisely. Framing discipline as a learning-quality lever helped teachers see it as part of pedagogy, not parallel to it.

Overall, implementation worked because routines were simple, human, and iterative: simple enough to execute under pressure, human enough to respect circumstances, and iterative enough to improve week by week. By treating discipline as a practiced craft supported by nudges, coaching, and cultural rituals both schools shifted behavior from rule-following to professional habit, sustaining punctuality and instructional continuity over time.

3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation (Controlling) of Teacher Discipline

Monitoring and evaluation in both schools combined structured data systems with relational follow-up, turning discipline from episodic enforcement into a continuous-improvement cycle. Routine evidence streams included digital or manual attendance logs, bell-time start checks, lesson-readiness notes, and brief incident memos. These were compiled weekly and reviewed against plan targets to detect patterns early rather than react to isolated breaches.

At SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah, a live attendance dashboard flagged anomalies (late, no check-in, early leave) and generated same-day summaries for grade leaders. The dashboard supported tiered responses: an immediate supportive check-in, followed by micro-coaching if patterns persisted. Teachers perceived the system as fair because data were transparent and context was sought before any formal step.

At SDN Santosa, monitoring emphasized culture-linked observations. A rotating “5S marshal” recorded brief notes on morning gates, corridor transitions, and class starts, capturing consistency of the 5S ritual alongside punctuality. These qualitative

snapshots complemented attendance figures, ensuring that what gets measured included visible culture, not only minutes.

Both schools used dual indicators process (on-time starts, completeness of teaching tools) and outcomes (reduced lost instructional time, steadier lesson closure) to avoid narrow compliance metrics. This balanced scorecard improved the validity of conclusions about instructional continuity and student learning time.

Monitoring culminated in short, cadence-based meetings: five-minute huddles for immediate fixes; weekly team reviews for pattern analysis; and monthly staff sessions for system tweaks. As one leader explained:

“Data first, context second, support third. We verify what happened, ask why, and decide the lightest help that can work next week.” (Vice Principal, Interview, March 22, 2025)

Documentation underpinned dependability and confirmability. Schools kept audit trails of alerts, coaching notes, and agreed actions, allowing follow-up and preventing ad hoc decisions. Teachers noted that predictability reduced anxiety:

“Because steps are documented, it never feels arbitrary. If I slip, I know we’ll review it, find the cause, and fix it together.” (Subject Teacher, Interview, March 19, 2025) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985;)

The escalation matrix was proportional and improvement-oriented: reflective conversation → individual improvement plan → targeted supports (mentoring, schedule adjustments) → formal measures only after repeated non-response. This sequence safeguarded professional dignity while preserving instructional time for students.

Parent interfaces were activated when punctuality affected class starts (e.g., repeated late arrivals tied to family routines). Santosa used a designated liaison to communicate expectations and share weekly tips for morning preparation; Cijerah appended succinct punctuality snapshots to teacher-council updates, keeping the dialogue constructive and community-based.

4 Discussion

The findings demonstrate that teacher discipline can be strengthened when it is framed not as a stand-alone rule set but as a managerial system integrated across planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling. Positioning discipline within Fayol’s classic functions enables schools to translate abstract expectations (punctuality, readiness, continuity of instruction) into concrete standards, workflows, and feedback loops that are visible and repeatable in everyday practice. In both cases, discipline became an operational property of the school, not merely an individual virtue of teachers.

A central mechanism behind this shift is distributed instructional leadership. Rather than locating discipline exclusively in the principal’s authority, the work was shared among grade leaders, homeroom teachers, administrative staff, and designated marshals. Such distribution converted expectations into collective routines (e.g., bell-minus-5 readiness, corridor sweep-ins, daily opening rituals), which research associates

with stronger organizational learning and more resilient implementation[19]–[21]. By normalizing small team huddles and rapid coordination, the schools made discipline a shared craft.

Equally important, discipline practices were embedded in school culture symbols, rituals, and language that make norms tangible. The 5S ritual at SDN Santosa illustrates how a visible, identity-laden routine can anchor punctual starts and calm transitions, linking behavioral expectations to communal meaning[22]. Culture here does not replace systems; it amplifies them by making the desired behavior socially legible and emotionally resonant.

The contrasting models technology-enabled nudging at SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah and culture-first enactment at SDN Santosa suggest that multiple pathways can converge on the same goal when they are coherent with local context. Digital dashboards, timely notifications, and anomaly flags can serve as prompts for supportive follow-up rather than surveillance, provided the organizational response is coaching-oriented. Conversely, culture-forward routines can deliver punctuality at scale when codified in SOPs and monitored with light, qualitative logs.

The schools' emphasis on formative control short feedback cycles, coaching micro-conversations, improvement plans aligns with the assessment for learning paradigm. Treating discipline data like instructional data shifts the aim from policing to improvement, which tends to enhance accuracy (because context is considered), fairness (because support precedes sanction), and sustainability (because capacity is built) [23]. This reframing helps teachers experience monitoring as professional stewardship, not punitive oversight.

Motivational quality also matters. The supportive cadence recognizing on-time streaks, pairing struggling teachers with mentors, and solving logistical constraints likely nurtures autonomous motivation (ownership, competence, relatedness) rather than mere compliance, consistent with Self-Determination Theory [24]. When teachers perceive procedures as fair, predictable, and developmentally oriented, they are more inclined to internalize the norms and sustain them under pressure.

Another throughline is the role of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Weekly reviews and brief huddles served not only to reconcile numbers with context but to surface practical know-how (e.g., route planning, classroom set-up hacks) and to distribute that know-how horizontally. The PLC lens helps explain why small, actionable adjustments buffer times, coverage protocols, minimal readiness checklists delivered outsized effects on lost instructional minutes [25]

The home school interface further reduced value and routine dissonance. Liaison roles, concise punctuality snapshots, and family-facing tips aligned morning preparations with school expectations turning first-period starts into a joint project rather than a school-only burden [26]. In settings where external constraints (traffic, caregiving) are real, such boundary work is not ancillary; it is core to equitable implementation.

From a theoretical standpoint, the study integrates management systems, leadership distribution, and cultural embedding into a complementary account of how discipline becomes a professional habit. Systems make behavior easy to do; leadership makes it everyone's job; culture makes it matter. The dual case technology-first at Cijerah and

culture-first at Santosa shows that the mix can vary as long as the alignment across system, leadership, and culture is maintained [18].

Practically, the implications are clear: design clear, measurable, and adaptive plans; distribute roles via simple RASCI-style maps; implement micro-routines that protect bell-time starts; run short, regular PLC huddles; monitor with dual indicators (process and outcomes); and sustain coaching-before-sanction escalation. Such a package is modest in cost yet high in reliability, especially when reinforced by cultural rituals or lightweight digital nudges[27].

5 Conclusion

This study shows that teacher discipline improves materially when it is managed as an integrated managerial system planned with clear standards and indicators, organized through distributed roles (principal–coordinator–teacher–admin), enacted via simple, consistent micro-routines (bell-minus-5, 5S, buffer coverage), and monitored with process and outcome indicators interpreted through both data and context. Two contrasting models digital nudging at SDN 214 Perumnas Cijerah and the 5S culture ritual at SDN Santosa demonstrate that tools may differ, but success hinges on the coherence of systems, instructional leadership, and school culture pulling in the same direction.

Sustainability rests on coaching before sanction, brief but regular PLCs, a light and orderly data architecture, and parent partnerships to close morning-routine gaps. Practical recommendations are: (1) set a discipline roadmap that is clear–measurable adaptive; (2) use a simple RASCI to clarify who does what and when; (3) deploy reminders and realistic buffer times; (4) run a monthly PDCA cycle to keep the system responsive; and (5) maintain consistent leadership role modeling. With this policy operational package, discipline moves from procedural compliance to a professional habit that protects instructional continuity.

References

- [1] M. Kristiawan, D. Safitri, and R. Lestari, *Manajemen pendidikan*. Deepublish, 2017.
- [2] A. Farmaniyah, S. C. Sida, and A. H. Mattone, “Peranan Kompetensi Manajerial Kepala Sekolah Dalam Meningkatkan Kedisiplinan Guru Di SDN 123 Banti Kecamatan Baraka Kabupaten Enrekang,” *KENDALI Econ. Soc. Humanit.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 20–27, 2023.
- [3] D. Iku, S. S. Niha, and H. A. Manaf, “Pengaruh Manajerial Kepala Sekolah dan Supervisi Kepala Sekolah Melalui Disiplin Kerja sebagai Variabel Mediasi terhadap Kinerja Guru (Suatu Kajian Studi Literatur Manajemen Pendidikan).,” *J. Manaj. Pendidik. dan Ilmu Sos.*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2022.
- [4] A. E. Ibrahim, R. I. Pratiwi, and A. Nadjib, “Fungsi Pengawasan dalam Meningkatkan Kedisiplinan Guru di MTs Hasyim Asy’ari Bangsri Sukodono,” *J. Adm. Pendidik. Islam*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 83–98, 2021.
- [5] H. Fayol, *General and industrial management*. Ravenio Books, 2016.
- [6] maya novita Sari *et al.*, *Manajemen Pendidikan*. 2022.
- [7] K. Hutauruk and W. Irawati, “Pedagogical Competence of Christian Teachers as Facilitators in the Process of Developing 21st Century Thinking Skills,” *Didache J. Christ.*

- Educ.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 142–167, 2024.
- [8] M. Daheri, “The effect of principal leadership and work discipline on teacher performance,” *Nidhomul haq*, 2023.
 - [9] H. Sriyono, “The Influence of School Principal Leadership and Work Discipline on Performance,” *J. World Sci.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 428–439, 2024.
 - [10] M. Asmira, “The role of information technology in teaching English to Islamic higher education learners: Assessing digital literacy skills,” *English Lang. Lit. Educ. J.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 74–88, 2024.
 - [11] J. W. Creswell and V. L. P. Clark, *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications, 2017.
 - [12] R. K. Yin, *Case study research and applications*. SAGE Publications US., 2017.
 - [13] Adrias and A. Ruswandi, *Desain Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Mix Method*. Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2025.
 - [14] M. Q. Patton, *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage publications, 2014.
 - [15] A. Tashakkori and J. W. Creswell, “The new era of mixed methods,” *J. Mix. Methods Res.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–7, 2007, doi: 10.1177/2345678906293042.
 - [16] Y. Lincoln and B. Guba, “Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.” Inc, 1985.
 - [17] M. B. Miles, A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldaña, *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*, Third edit. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc, 2014.
 - [18] I. Smith and T. Boyns, “British management theory and practice: the impact of Fayol,” *Manag. Decis.*, vol. 43, no. 10, pp. 1317–1334, 2005.
 - [19] A. Harris, “Distributed leadership and school improvement: leading or misleading?,” *Educ. Manag. Adm. Leadersh.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 11–24, 2004.
 - [20] P. Hallinger and R. H. Heck, “Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning,” *Sch. Leadersh. Manag.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 95–110, 2010, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632431003663214>.
 - [21] K. S. Louis, K. Leithwood, K. L. Wahlstrom, and S. E. Anderson, “Investigating the links to improved student learning,” *Wallace Found.*, pp. 2009–2023, 2010.
 - [22] K. D. Peterson and T. E. Deal, *The shaping school culture fieldbook*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
 - [23] V. Griggs, M. Blackburn, and J. Smith, “The educational scorecard: The Start of our Journey,” *Electron. J. Bus. Res. Methods*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 121–131, 2012.
 - [24] E. L. Deci and R. M. Ryan, “Self-determination theory,” *Handb. Theor. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 1, no. 20, pp. 416–436, 2012.
 - [25] R. DuFour and R. Eaker, *Professional learning communities at work tm: best practices for enhancing students achievement*. Solution Tree Press, 2009.
 - [26] J. L. Epstein, C. L. Galindo, and S. B. Sheldon, “Levels of leadership: Effects of district and school leaders on the quality of school programs of family and community involvement,” *Educ. Adm. Q.*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 462–495, 2011.
 - [27] L. Darling-Hammond, “Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice?,” *Eur. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 291–309, 2017.