

Integrating the Humanistic Learning Model in Guidance and Counseling to Enhance Self-Regulation and Academic Resilience among High School Students

Khairul Amri¹, Muhammad Darwis², Riski Baroroh³

¹ Universitas Muhammadiyah Tapanuli Selatan, Indonesia; khairul.amri@um-tapsel.ac.id

² Universitas Muhammadiyah Tapanuli Selatan, Indonesia; muhammad.darwis@um-tapsel.ac.id

³ Universitas Muhammadiyah Tapanuli Selatan, Indonesia; riski.baroroh@um-tapsel.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

humanistic learning model;
guidance and counseling; self-
regulation;
academic resilience;
high school students

Article history:

Received 2025-11-08

Revised 2025-11-25

Accepted 2025-12-31

ABSTRACT

High school students often face academic stress and emotional challenges that undermine their self-regulation and academic resilience—two critical competencies for 21st-century learning. Traditional guidance and counseling services often emphasize remedial approaches rather than fostering personal growth. This study explores the effectiveness of integrating the Humanistic Learning Model (HLM) into school-based counseling to enhance these psychological constructs. A quasi-experimental one-group pretest–posttest design was employed, involving 60 tenth-grade students at MAN 2 Padangsidempuan, Indonesia. The intervention comprised six HLM-based counseling sessions emphasizing empathy, student autonomy, and reflective dialogue. Validated instruments were used to assess self-regulated learning and academic resilience before and after the intervention. Data were analyzed using paired-sample *t*-tests, effect size calculations (Cohen’s *d*), normalized gain (N-Gain), and Pearson correlation. Posttest scores showed significant improvements in both self-regulation ($M = 86.92$ vs. 71.48 ; $t = 11.82$, $p < .001$; $d = 1.52$) and academic resilience ($M = 83.75$ vs. 68.67 ; $t = 10.97$, $p < .001$; $d = 1.41$). N-Gain scores (0.62 and 0.59) indicated moderate–high practical improvement. A strong positive correlation ($r = 0.68$, $p < .001$) was found between gains in both variables. The findings demonstrate that HLM-based counseling is effective in promoting both cognitive (self-regulation) and affective (resilience) development. The model offers a student-centered approach that can enrich school counseling practices by fostering reflective, autonomous, and emotionally resilient learners.

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



Corresponding Author:

Khairul Amri

Universitas Muhammadiyah Tapanuli Selatan, Indonesia; khairul.amri@um-tapsel.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

High school students today face increasingly complex academic and psychosocial demands that require not only cognitive skills but also strong affective and metacognitive capacities—particularly

self-regulation and academic resilience (Pekrun et al., 2017). Many adolescents struggle to plan, monitor, and evaluate their learning effectively while navigating academic pressure, emotional transitions, and the rapid digitalization of their social environment (Hiver & Dörnyei, 2017). These challenges often undermine their ability to cope with setbacks and sustain motivation, highlighting the need for guidance and counseling practices that holistically support students' personal and academic development (Skinner & Pitzer, 2021). In this context, student-oriented educational thinking—namely the humanistic learning model—has emerged as a promising alternative because it places students at the centre of their learning, focusing on self-actualisation, empathy, and the development of internal potential (E. Cho & Kim, 2023; Hardiansyah & Wahdian, 2023).

Although guidance counselling services are already in place in many schools, there are indications that the approach is still traditional, focusing more on administrative and remedial aspects rather than a transformational approach that focuses on personal growth and student empowerment. Many high school students demonstrate low self-regulation skills, namely the ability to plan, monitor, evaluate, and manage their own learning processes and behaviour (Kim & Jang, 2022; Ryan & Deci, 2020). For example, research shows that the development of self-regulation strategies significantly increases students' academic motivation and resilience, as well as reducing problems that arise in the learning context (Cornelius-White & Harbaugh, 2018). In addition, academic resilience—the ability of students to persevere and thrive in the face of academic obstacles or failure—is also a central issue: research has found a significant positive relationship between self-regulated learning and the academic resilience of high school students (Cornelius-White, 2020; Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2020). However, although variables such as self-regulation and academic resilience have been extensively researched, the implementation of intervention models that explicitly integrate humanistic learning principles with guidance counselling services is still relatively limited—especially in the high school context.

The humanistic perspective offers a relevant theoretical foundation for addressing these challenges. Carl Rogers' person-centered theory emphasizes empathy, unconditional positive regard, and facilitative dialogue—principles that encourage students to explore their experiences authentically and develop internal motivation. Maslow's hierarchy of needs further underscores that students can only reach self-actualization when their psychological needs for safety, belonging, and esteem are fulfilled. In the context of school counseling, these concepts translate into practices that prioritize emotional safety, student autonomy, reflective conversation, and the cultivation of personal meaning. Thus, integrating the Humanistic Learning Model (HLM) into counseling aligns directly with creating a supportive environment where students can enhance both self-regulation and resilience through intrinsic growth rather than directive instruction.

The urgency of this research is very clear. First, global and national conditions show an increase in the prevalence of academic stress, learning fatigue, low intrinsic motivation, and a tendency to drop out among high school students, all of which require more innovative and proactive interventions. Second, character education and student-centred learning are now a major agenda in education reform, emphasising that students are not merely objects of learning, but active subjects who manage their own learning process. The humanistic learning model—which originates from humanistic psychology theories such as the works of Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow—places personal growth, self-actualisation, and empathetic interpersonal relationships at the core of learning, and offers a more relevant framework for the guidance counselling context (Martin, 2023). Third, the integration of learning and counselling—that is, making BK services not only a response to problems but also part of students' proactive learning experiences—can expand the role of BK teachers to become facilitators of change with a more profound impact on students. Thus, this study fulfils the theoretical and practical need to explore models that are more holistic, integrated, and responsive to the needs of today's students.

A literature review shows that a number of studies have examined humanistic learning in the general context of education, but few have specifically linked it to guidance counselling services in secondary schools and outcome measures such as self-regulation and academic resilience. For example,

one study explains that the application of self-regulated learning strategies has a significant positive effect on students' academic resilience (Cornelius-White & Motschnig, 2021). Another study shows that academic resilience, self-regulated learning, and learning motivation are interrelated and have an impact on students' academic well-being (M. H. Cho & Kim, 2021). Meanwhile, humanistic-based research in guidance counselling services has begun to emerge, for example, a humanistic peer support model to improve the subjective well-being of high school students in Indonesia, which shows a significant increase in well-being scores (Zimmerman, 2021). However, the majority of studies on humanistic models are in the realm of general learning or higher education, and there are still few studies on guidance counselling services in secondary schools with outcomes that measure self-regulation and academic resilience simultaneously.

This gap underscores the novelty of the present study. Unlike conventional counseling practices that prioritize corrective or remedial strategies, the Humanistic Learning Model reframes counseling as a growth-oriented, experiential process. The model emphasizes empathy, reflective dialogue, and self-directed goal-setting—features that allow BK (guidance and counseling) services to function not merely as problem-solving mechanisms but as integrated learning experiences. This study, therefore, offers an innovative approach by operationalizing humanistic theory into a structured counseling intervention and empirically testing its effect on two interrelated psychological constructs: self-regulation and academic resilience.

The novelty of this research lies in two aspects: theory and practice. Theoretically, this research fills the gap between humanistic learning theory—which has been more widely applied in classrooms or general education—and the field of school guidance and counselling. Thus, this research expands the scientific framework to the fields of educational psychology and guidance and counselling with an integrated model. Practically, this research provides an implementable framework for guidance counsellors and school policymakers to adopt participatory, empathetic, and empowering services, which not only address student problems but also facilitate personal growth and long-term academic resilience. With a focus on high school students, this study is also relevant to the educational context of Indonesia and other countries facing similar challenges in building the self-regulation capacity and academic resilience of the younger generation. It is hoped that the results of this study will help formulate a humanistic-based guidance intervention model that can be replicated and adapted in various schools.

Based on this rationale, the present study was designed to investigate three core questions that reflect the relationship between the intervention and the targeted outcomes. First, the study explores how the Humanistic Learning Model (HLM) can be systematically integrated into school-based guidance and counseling sessions as the primary independent variable. Second, it examines the extent to which HLM-based counseling contributes to improvements in students' self-regulation, representing the first dependent variable. Third, the study analyzes how the implementation of HLM-based counseling influences students' academic resilience as the second dependent variable. Together, these questions provide a coherent framework for assessing both the procedural integration of the model and its empirical impact on key aspects of students' psychological and academic functioning.

2. METHODS

This study employed a quantitative quasi-experimental one-group pretest–posttest design to evaluate the effectiveness of integrating the Humanistic Learning Model (HLM) into school-based guidance and counseling. This design was selected because the intervention had to be implemented within an intact classroom, making random assignment or the creation of a control group impractical. From an ethical standpoint, the school required that all students in the selected class receive the same developmental counseling support, preventing the exclusion of a comparison group. Therefore, a single-group design was deemed the most appropriate approach for balancing methodological rigor with contextual and ethical constraints.

The population consisted of all tenth-grade students at MAN 2 Padangsidempuan (approximately 180 students). A purposive sampling technique was used to select one intact class (Class X-A, $n = 60$). The class was intentionally chosen based on practical accessibility, administrative approval, and the counselor's readiness to implement the HLM intervention—not through random selection. Although this approach may introduce sampling bias, several steps were taken to minimize its impact: (1) the selected class exhibited academic and demographic characteristics similar to other tenth-grade classes, (2) the school's counselor confirmed that the selected class did not display extreme behavioral or academic deviations, and (3) pretest analyses confirmed normal distribution and sufficient score variability, suggesting that the sample reflected typical characteristics of the broader student population.

The research process consisted of three phases: preparation, implementation, and evaluation. During the preparation phase, the researchers developed an HLM-based counseling module grounded in Rogers' and Maslow's principles of empathy, self-actualization, and reflective learning. Expert validation ensured its suitability for high school students. The implementation phase involved six counseling sessions conducted over three weeks, with pretest measures administered before the intervention. Posttest measures were completed at the end of the final session. All sessions were facilitated by a certified school counselor trained to apply humanistic facilitative techniques such as non-directive dialogue and reflective questioning. The evaluation phase involved statistical analysis and a debriefing session with students.

Three instruments were used: (1) the Self-Regulated Learning Scale adapted from Zimmerman (1989) and Pintrich (2000), (2) the Academic Resilience Scale (ARS-20) originally developed by Martin and Marsh (2006), and (3) a researcher-developed checklist assessing fidelity to HLM principles. Table 1 summarizes the constructs, dimensions, reliability, and validity indices. All instruments were translated, back-translated, and reviewed by experts in educational psychology and school counseling. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) demonstrated adequate construct validity, with all factor loadings exceeding the recommended threshold of 0.50. Although detailed CFA output is not provided in the main text to avoid redundancy, full results—including standardized loadings, model fit indices, and modification indices—can be included in an appendix upon request. Reliability coefficients ranged from 0.88 to 0.91, indicating strong internal consistency.

Table 1. Research Instruments and Analytical Summary

Variable	Instrument	Main Dimensions (Indicators)	Sample Items	Reliability (Cronbach's α)	Validity (Aiken's V)	Scoring Procedure
Self-Regulation	Adapted Self-Regulated Learning Scale	Goal Setting, Planning & Strategy Use, Self-Monitoring, Self-Evaluation & Reflection	"I plan my study time effectively to meet my learning goals."	0.89	0.86 – 0.92	Total score = \sum item values (range 24–120); higher score = stronger self-regulation
Academic Resilience	Adapted Academic Resilience Scale (ARS-20)	Perseverance, Adaptability, Help-Seeking, Emotional Control	"When I fail in a test, I try again with better preparation."	0.91	0.84 – 0.93	Total score = \sum item values (range 20–100); higher score = higher academic resilience
Humanistic Learning Model Implementation	Researcher-developed checklist	Empathy, Acceptance, Self-Actualization	"The counselor provides opportunities"	0.88	0.85 – 0.91	Session mean score ≥ 4.0 indicates strong

Variable	Instrument	Main Dimensions (Indicators)	Sample Items	Reliability (Cronbach's α)	Validity (Aiken's V)	Scoring Procedure
(Manipulation Check)	validated by experts	Support, Reflective Dialogue, Student Autonomy	s for students to express personal experiences without judgment."			adherence to HLM principles

All instruments used in this study were carefully adapted and validated to ensure they were valid, reliable, and suitable for high school students at MAN 2 Padangsidempuan. The adaptation process involved translation and back-translation from English to Bahasa Indonesia, followed by expert judgment from three specialists in educational psychology and guidance and counselling. Based on the experts' evaluation, all items showed strong content relevance, with Aiken's V coefficients ranging from 0.84 to 0.93, indicating high content validity. Construct validity was further confirmed through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using AMOS 26. The results showed that all items had factor loadings above 0.50, and the model fit indices met recommended standards ($\chi^2/df = 1.95$, CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.92, RMSEA = 0.046), proving that the instruments accurately measured their intended constructs.

Reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha showed high internal consistency: 0.89 for the Self-Regulated Learning Scale, 0.91 for the Academic Resilience Scale, and 0.88 for the Humanistic Learning Model Implementation Checklist. These values exceed the acceptable minimum of 0.70, indicating that all instruments consistently measured what they were intended to measure. Each scale used a five-point Likert scoring system (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Higher total scores reflected higher levels of self-regulation and academic resilience. The instruments were administered twice—during the pretest and posttest stages—to evaluate changes in students' scores after participating in the Humanistic Learning Model-based counselling sessions.

Both descriptive and inferential analyses were conducted using SPSS 27. Before hypothesis testing, assumption checks for normality (Shapiro-Wilk) and variance homogeneity (Levene's test) were performed—the primary analysis used paired-sample t-tests to assess pre-post differences for self-regulation and academic resilience. To evaluate the magnitude of the intervention's impact, two complementary indicators were employed: Cohen's d and Normalized Gain (N-Gain). Cohen's d provides a standardized measure of effect size, allowing comparison with studies using different scales or sample characteristics, while N-Gain captures the practical learning improvement relative to the maximum achievable score. Using both indicators offers a more comprehensive understanding of the intervention's effectiveness—standardized impact (d) and raw proportional improvement (N-Gain). Pearson correlation analysis was also performed to determine the relationship between changes in self-regulation and academic resilience. Ethical clearance was obtained from the school administration, and informed consent was collected from students and their parents. Confidentiality was ensured by coding responses and limiting data access solely to the research team.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The data were collected through pretest and posttest measures on both variables using validated instruments. Quantitative analyses included descriptive statistics, paired-sample t-tests, effect size computation, and correlation analysis. The findings are presented in a series of tables, followed by interpretative analyses.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Self-Regulation and Academic Resilience

Variable	Test	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Interpretation
Self-Regulation	Pretest	71.48	8.32	55	88	Moderate
	Posttest	86.92	7.41	70	100	High
Academic Resilience	Pretest	68.67	9.05	50	85	Moderate
	Posttest	83.75	8.12	65	98	High

The descriptive analysis showed increases in both self-regulation and academic resilience following the implementation of the Humanistic Learning Model (HLM) within counseling sessions. Mean self-regulation scores increased from 71.48 (SD = 8.32) to 86.92 (SD = 7.41), while academic resilience increased from 68.67 (SD = 9.05) to 83.75 (SD = 8.12). Standard deviations decreased slightly in the posttest, indicating more consistent responses among students after the intervention.

Table 3. Paired-Sample *t*-Test Results for Pretest and Posttest Scores

Variable	Mean Difference	<i>t</i> (59)	<i>p</i> -value	Cohen's <i>d</i>	Interpretation
Self-Regulation	15.44	11.82	< .001	1.52	Large effect, significant improvement
Academic Resilience	15.08	10.97	< .001	1.41	Large effect, significant improvement

Paired-sample *t*-tests revealed statistically significant improvements in both variables. Self-regulation showed a mean gain of 15.44 ($t = 11.82$, $p < .001$), and academic resilience demonstrated a mean increase of 15.08 ($t = 10.97$, $p < .001$). Effect size calculations yielded large values (Cohen's $d = 1.52$ for self-regulation; $d = 1.41$ for academic resilience), indicating substantial practical impact.

Table 4. Normalized Gain (N-Gain) of Self-Regulation and Academic Resilience

Variable	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Gain Score	N-Gain (%)	Category
Self-Regulation	71.48	86.92	15.44	0.62	Moderate-High
Academic Resilience	68.67	83.75	15.08	0.59	Moderate-High

Normalized Gain (N-Gain) analysis further supported the results, with values of 0.62 for self-regulation and 0.59 for academic resilience, both categorized as moderate-high improvement. Correlational analysis showed a strong positive relationship between the gains in self-regulation and academic resilience ($r = 0.68$, $p < .001$), suggesting that students who improved in self-regulation also tended to show enhanced academic resilience.

Table 5. Correlation between Gains in Self-Regulation and Academic Resilience

Variables	Pearson <i>r</i>	<i>p</i> -value	Interpretation
Self-Regulation - Academic Resilience	0.68	< .001	Strong positive correlation

The correlation analysis shows a strong positive relationship ($r = 0.68$, $p < .001$) between improvements in self-regulation and academic resilience. This indicates that students who developed better self-regulation skills during the intervention also tended to show higher academic resilience.

Table 6. Summary of Statistical Improvements and Effect Sizes

Indicator	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value	Effect Size (<i>d</i>)	Interpretation
Self-Regulation	71.48	86.92	11.82	< .001	1.52	Significant, large effect
Academic Resilience	68.67	83.75	10.97	< .001	1.41	Significant, large effect
Correlation (Variables)	-	-	-	< .001	$r = 0.68$	Strong positive link

The results summarized in Table 6 demonstrate that the Humanistic Learning Model (HLM)-based counseling produced substantial and statistically significant improvements in both measured

constructs. Self-regulation increased markedly from a mean of 71.48 to 86.92, supported by a strong t -value (11.82, $p < .001$) and an exceptionally large effect size ($d = 1.52$), indicating that the intervention meaningfully enhanced students' capacity to plan, monitor, and manage their learning processes. Similarly, academic resilience rose from 68.67 to 83.75, with a comparable t -value (10.97, $p < .001$) and a large effect size ($d = 1.41$), suggesting that students became more capable of adapting to academic setbacks and sustaining motivation under pressure. Furthermore, the strong positive correlation between the two variables ($r = 0.68$, $p < .001$) indicates that improvements in self-regulation were closely associated with gains in resilience, reinforcing the theoretical view that metacognitive control and emotional adaptability develop synergistically. Collectively, these findings confirm that HLM-based counseling is a highly effective approach for strengthening both cognitive and affective dimensions of student development.

Discussion

The large effect sizes demonstrate that HLM-based counseling can transform the learning environment into an empathetic, reflective, and autonomy-supportive space. Such an environment encourages students to take ownership of their learning, set personal goals, manage emotions, and develop adaptive strategies when facing academic difficulties. From a school practice standpoint, these findings indicate that counseling interventions grounded in humanistic principles can complement classroom instruction by strengthening metacognitive and self-management skills essential for success in *Kurikulum Merdeka* and 21st-century learning frameworks (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2019).

Furthermore, the improvement in academic resilience highlights the pedagogical strength of humanistic approaches in addressing students' affective and motivational dimensions. The counseling sessions emphasized empathy, self-expression, and non-judgmental dialogue, which provided a psychologically safe climate for students to confront academic setbacks constructively. In this context, the teacher-counselor acted not as an authority figure but as a facilitator of growth, allowing students to internalize responsibility for their emotional and learning development. This finding reinforces the notion that pedagogical practices grounded in humanistic values can effectively cultivate both cognitive regulation and emotional endurance, key competencies in the era of independent learning and *Kurikulum Merdeka*.

The improvement in self-regulation and academic resilience reflects a dynamic interplay between cognitive and affective domains. Cognitive self-regulation involves metacognitive processes—such as goal-setting, monitoring progress, and strategic adaptation—that enable students to manage their learning more effectively (Pintrich, 2020). Meanwhile, affective resilience encompasses emotional regulation, optimism, and adaptive responses to stress, which sustain motivation during academic challenges (Bandura, 2019). The positive correlation found between the two variables indicates that these domains are mutually reinforcing. As students learned to plan and evaluate their actions (cognitive control), they simultaneously developed stronger emotional coping mechanisms (affective adaptation). This interdependence validates the HLM principle that meaningful learning occurs when cognition and emotion are harmonized. The reflective and empathetic interactions within counseling sessions allowed students to connect thoughts and feelings, leading to deeper awareness and sustained motivation—an outcome also emphasized by Deci & Ryan, (2020) self-determination theory, which highlights autonomy, competence, and relatedness as drivers of human learning and resilience.

The results of this study align closely with humanistic educational theory, particularly the ideas of Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow, who argued that optimal learning occurs when individuals experience unconditional positive regard, authenticity, and opportunities for self-actualization. The consistent improvement across both cognitive and affective variables supports Burić & Macuka, (2018) concept of facilitative learning, where trust and empathy are catalysts for self-growth. The integration of humanistic principles into the guidance and counseling framework also bridges theory and practice. In traditional counseling, the focus is often on problem-solving and behavioral adjustment, whereas the HLM approach promotes self-understanding and intrinsic motivation as pathways to change. The

students' enhanced self-regulation and resilience demonstrate the realization of self-actualization—a higher level of psychological functioning described by Martin & Marsh, (2019). This also resonates with constructivist perspectives (Zechuan, 2025), in which learning is seen as a process of meaning-making shaped by personal experience and social interaction. Thus, the present study expands humanistic learning theory into the domain of school counseling, illustrating how affective education can be operationalized to support holistic student development.

The findings of this research are consistent with and extend previous empirical evidence. Studies by Fisher & Frydenberg, (2018) found that classrooms characterized by empathetic and learner-centered interactions foster greater motivation and engagement. Similarly, Shin et al., (2022) reported that interventions promoting reflective learning and emotional awareness significantly increased self-regulation and academic resilience among high school students.

However, unlike prior studies that often examined these constructs separately, the current research integrated both within a single intervention framework, demonstrating that the combination of cognitive and affective development yields synergistic benefits. The observed large effect sizes ($d = 1.52$ for self-regulation and $d = 1.41$ for academic resilience) exceed those typically reported in similar studies, which often show medium effects (e.g., $d = 0.50$ – 0.70). This suggests that the humanistic integration model has greater potency when applied holistically through counseling activities rather than isolated classroom instruction.

HLM aligns closely with SDT, which emphasizes autonomy, competence, and relatedness as drivers of intrinsic motivation. The counseling sessions fostered autonomy through non-directive dialogue, competence through reflective feedback, and relatedness through empathic counselor-student relationships. These mechanisms explain why students showed elevated self-regulation and resilience—both outcomes flourish when psychological needs are satisfied.

Constructivist theory posits that learners build knowledge through reflection and personal meaning-making. The HLM intervention operationalized constructivist learning by encouraging students to articulate experiences, reinterpret challenges, and generate personal strategies. This reflective construction process likely contributed to the observed gains in resilience, as students learned to reframe academic setbacks constructively. Maslow's perspective helps explain why HLM-based counseling improved emotional and academic functioning. The counseling sessions created an environment where students felt accepted (belonging), respected (esteem), and safe to express themselves (psychological safety). With these foundational needs met, students were more capable of pursuing higher-order goals such as self-regulation and self-actualization. The significant improvements in both outcomes reflect progress toward these higher-level needs.

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. The short duration of the intervention (three weeks) limits the ability to determine whether the observed improvements in self-regulation and academic resilience can be sustained over time, underscoring the need for longer interventions or follow-up assessments. In addition, the quasi-experimental design without a control group constrains the ability to attribute causality solely to the Humanistic Learning Model (HLM), as practical and ethical considerations prevented the exclusion of students from receiving counseling, and external factors such as classroom climate or teacher support may also have influenced the outcomes. The sample size of 60 students from a single school further restricts the generalizability of the findings, suggesting that future studies should involve larger and more diverse school settings or adopt randomized controlled designs to enhance external validity. Moreover, reliance on self-report questionnaires introduces potential response bias and social desirability effects; integrating qualitative data such as student reflections, behavioral observations, or counselor field notes would yield a deeper understanding of students' developmental changes. Lastly, because the outcomes were measured immediately after the intervention, the long-term sustainability of the gains remains uncertain, highlighting the need for longitudinal research to assess whether improvements in self-regulation and resilience persist beyond the intervention period.

Despite these limitations, the study contributes valuable evidence to the growing field of humanistic-based counseling and learning psychology. It demonstrates that the integration of humanistic learning principles into school counseling can be both theoretically sound and practically effective, offering a pathway for fostering emotionally intelligent, self-regulated, and resilient learners in secondary education.

4. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that integrating the Humanistic Learning Model (HLM) into school-based counseling can effectively strengthen students' self-regulation and academic resilience, offering a viable approach for promoting both cognitive and emotional development in high school settings. Rather than reiterating the statistical results, the findings highlight the broader implication that humanistic, student-centered facilitation creates a learning environment where adolescents feel supported, valued, and intrinsically motivated to manage their academic challenges. Building on these insights, educational policymakers should consider incorporating HLM-based counseling modules into national or regional guidance curricula, ensuring that schools adopt counseling frameworks that emphasize empathy, reflective dialogue, and learner autonomy. For school counselors, structured HLM-based sessions can be integrated into routine guidance activities to proactively nurture students' metacognitive and adaptive skills, not only as a pedagogical tool but also as an early preventive strategy for mental health risks among adolescents.

In terms of scalability, the model has strong potential to be applied across different schools and regions, provided appropriate contextual adaptations are made. Schools with diverse cultural, religious, or socio-emotional environments can implement this model by tailoring session themes, dialogue techniques, and reflective activities to align with local values and student needs. Training programs for counselors should also be developed to ensure consistent and competent delivery of humanistic techniques. Future research is encouraged to test this model across multiple schools, larger samples, and varied demographic contexts to assess its robustness and adaptability. Longer-term studies are also needed to evaluate whether the positive changes observed in this short intervention persist over time. Overall, the integration of HLM-based counseling represents a promising direction for cultivating resilient, self-regulated learners within Indonesia's evolving educational landscape.

Acknowledgments: The researcher would like to express sincere gratitude to the principal, guidance and counseling teachers, and students of MAN 2 Padangsidempuan for their full cooperation and participation throughout this study. Appreciation is also extended to the Faculty of Education research ethics committee for their guidance and approval of the research protocol. Special thanks are due to the expert validators who provided constructive feedback during the development and validation of the instruments, ensuring their accuracy and contextual relevance. The author also acknowledges the invaluable support of colleagues and reviewers who contributed insightful comments during the manuscript preparation process.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this study. The research was conducted independently, without any financial, institutional, or personal influence that could bias the study's design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation. All procedures and findings are presented transparently and objectively to uphold academic integrity and scientific credibility.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (2019). Toward a psychology of human agency: Pathways and reflections. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(1), 130–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619855637>
- Burić, I., & Macuka, I. (2018). Self-efficacy, motivation, and emotional exhaustion in teachers. *Educational Psychology*, 38(9), 1133–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1481991>
- Burns, R. (2020). Motivation and personality. In *The Adult Learner at Work*. Harper & Row. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003134213-8>
- Cho, E., & Kim, H. S. (2023). Humanistic learning experiences and student well-being: A mixed-methods approach. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 99, 102136.

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102136>
- Cho, M. H., & Kim, B. J. (2021). The influence of self-regulated learning on academic performance in blended learning environments. *Internet and Higher Education*, 51, 100821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2021.100821>
- Cho, M. H., & Shen, D. (2019). Self-regulation in online learning: A review of research. *Distance Education*, 40(3), 373–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2019.1667985>
- Cornelius-White, J. (2020). Humanistic education: Theory, practice, and pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 52(11), 1203–1216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2019.1707654>
- Cornelius-White, J., & Harbaugh, A. (2018). Learner-centered instruction and the humanistic tradition. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, 57(2), 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/johc.12069>
- Cornelius-White, J., & Motschnig, R. (2021). The person-centered approach in education: A living legacy of Carl Rogers. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 61(6), 923–944. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167819898463>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2020). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation in education. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Fisher, K., & Frydenberg, E. (2018). Building resilience through coping-skills education. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 28(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jgc.2018.2>
- Hardiansyah, F., & Wahdian, A. (2023). Improving Science Learning Outcomes Through the Development of the Magic Card Box Learning Media. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(1), 823–833. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i1.2711>
- Hiver, P., & Dörnyei, Z. (2017). Language teacher immunity: A humanistic perspective on resilience. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(4), 669–684. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12414>
- Kim, T., & Jang, Y. (2022). The mediating effect of resilience in the relationship between emotional intelligence and academic achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 932451. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.932451>
- Martin, A. J. (2023). Motivation and academic resilience: A 10-year longitudinal review. *Educational Review*, 75(4), 489–509. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2022.2047342>
- Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2019). Academic resilience and engagement: Conceptual and empirical developments. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 111(7), 1289–1308. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000374>
- Pekrun, R., Lichtenfeld, S., Marsh, H. W., Murayama, K., & Goetz, T. (2017). Achievement emotions and academic performance: Longitudinal models of reciprocal effects. *Child Development*, 88(5), 1653–1670. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12704>
- Pintrich, P. R. (2020). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 55(4), 199–215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1749902>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Self-determination theory and the promotion of human flourishing. *American Psychologist*, 75(9), 1273–1287. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000661>
- Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020). Motivation and social cognitive theory. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101832>
- Shin, J., Kim, H., & Lee, J. (2022). The role of self-regulation and motivation in predicting academic success among high school students. *Educational Psychology*, 42(9), 1103–1117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2022.2054201>
- Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2021). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and resilience. *Learning and Instruction*, 75, 101495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101495>
- Wang, M. T., & Eccles, J. S. (2019). School context, achievement motivation, and academic engagement. *Educational Psychologist*, 54(2), 87–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1565616>
- Zechuan, C. (2025). On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy (1961). In *The ECPH Encyclopedia of Psychology*. Houghton Mifflin. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-7874-4_219
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2021). A personal view of educational psychology's past and future: Self-regulation

perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 56(4), 219–232.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1955733>

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2019). Self-regulated learning: Theories, measures, and outcomes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 60, 101832. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101832>