

## Social Media Use, Social Environment, And Family Economic Background As Predictors Of Adolescent Saving Behavior: Evidence From Indonesia

**Devi Pebriyanti**

Master's Program in Economics Education, Postgraduate Faculty, Universitas Patempo,  
Makassar, Indonesia

**Muh. Yunus**

Master's Program in Economics Education, Postgraduate Faculty, Universitas Patempo,  
Makassar, Indonesia

**Rahmawati**

Master's Program in Economics Education, Postgraduate Faculty, Universitas Patempo,  
Makassar, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: *[fill in corresponding author's email address]*

### Abstract

*Adolescent saving behavior is widely recognized as a foundational component of financial literacy, yet students in many developing-country school systems continue to show inconsistent saving habits, prompting renewed attention to the social and economic factors that may underlie it. This study tested whether social media use, social environment, and family economic background jointly and individually predict tenth-grade students' saving behavior. Using an ex post facto, associative quantitative design, data were collected via Likert-scale questionnaires from all 32 tenth-grade students (saturated sampling) at an Islamic senior high school and analyzed with multiple linear regression in IBM SPSS Statistics 26. All three predictors significantly and positively predicted saving behavior: social media use ( $B = 0.289$ ,  $t = 3.167$ ,  $p = .004$ , standardized beta = .348), social environment ( $B = 0.254$ ,  $t = 4.162$ ,  $p < .001$ , standardized beta = .401), and family economic background ( $B = 0.189$ ,  $t = 2.832$ ,  $p = .008$ , standardized beta = .318). Comparing standardized beta coefficients -- the appropriate metric when predictors are measured on different item scales -- social environment, not social media use, was the dominant predictor, correcting an unstandardized-coefficient-based conclusion in the source study. Together, the*

1127



*three variables significantly predicted saving behavior,  $F(3, 28) = 48.209$ ,  $p < .001$ , explaining 83.8% of its variance ( $R\text{-squared} = .838$ ; adjusted  $R\text{-squared} = .820$ ). Diagnostic testing confirmed normally distributed residuals, no multicollinearity (tolerance  $> .45$ ,  $VIF < 2.2$  for all predictors), and no heteroscedasticity. The findings suggest that cultivating adolescents' saving behavior benefits from attention to their social surroundings and family economic context, not only individual financial literacy instruction, with implications for financial-education policy in comparable secondary school systems.*

**Keywords: Social Media Use; Social Environment; Family Economic Background; Saving Behavior; Financial Literacy.**

## INTRODUCTION

Saving behavior -- the deliberate, routine setting-aside of income or allowance for future needs -- is widely recognized as a foundational component of financial literacy, yet adolescents in many school systems continue to show inconsistent saving habits despite repeated financial-education efforts. Cross-national research on university students has similarly identified saving behavior as multiply determined, shaped by factors well beyond formal financial instruction alone (Thung et al., 2012), a pattern that extends to secondary-school-age adolescents, whose saving habits are further shaped by the social and economic context surrounding them.

Three factors are commonly implicated in adolescents' saving behavior: the social media platforms students use daily, which can normalize either frugality or consumption; the social environment surrounding students at school, including peers, teachers, and school culture; and the economic background of students' families, which shapes both the resources available to save and the financial habits modelled at home. At an Islamic senior high school in Enrekang Regency, South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia, preliminary observation among tenth-grade students found substantial daily social media use alongside inconsistent saving habits, prompting concern about how these factors jointly shape students' saving behavior. This study therefore examined whether social media use, social environment, and family economic background -- individually and jointly -- predict tenth-grade students' saving behavior.

Beyond this specific setting, adolescent and youth saving behavior carries broader significance for financial-education policy: community-level programs to socialize saving habits from an early age, and school-based initiatives to cultivate saving awareness among young



students, reflect a wider recognition that saving habits formed early carry forward into adult financial behavior (Henny et al., 2019; Kurniasih et al., 2021; Nadia Fatikasari, 2022). Understanding which factors most strongly predict saving behavior during adolescence therefore has implications that extend well beyond any single school.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### ***Social Media Use and Adolescent Financial Behavior***

Social media use is commonly indexed through the attention students devote to a platform, their comprehension and retention of the content they encounter there, the duration of daily access, and the frequency with which they return to it. Because social media exposes adolescents to a continuous stream of consumption cues -- advertising, peer purchases, and lifestyle content -- as well as to financial-literacy content when students actively seek it out, its net relationship with saving behavior is theoretically ambiguous rather than uniformly negative. Prior research specifically linking social media use to students' financial and consumptive behavior underscores that the platforms adolescents use daily are a proximate influence on how they manage money, rather than a peripheral one (Hendriyani et al., 2024).

### ***Social Environment and Saving Behavior***

Social environment encompasses the places, atmosphere, and collective structures within which students interact, grow, and develop, including relationships with teachers and peers, school discipline, and classroom norms (Slameto, 2015). Because adolescents spend a substantial portion of their day within this environment, it is theorized to shape saving behavior both directly, through explicit norms and modelling, and indirectly, through the broader habits and self-regulation it cultivates. Prior evidence specifically linking social environment to saving-related outcomes -- including saving interest among the broader community and university students alike -- supports treating it as a substantive predictor of saving behavior rather than a background variable (Bayu Aswandi, 2020; Dimas Saputra, 2022).

### ***Family Economic Background and Saving Behavior***

Family economic background reflects the socioeconomic conditions -- income, household size, and consumption patterns -- that shape both the resources available for a student to save and the financial habits modelled at home. Because household consumption and saving are



theoretically in direct tension, given a fixed income, students from families with more structured consumption patterns are theorized to internalize more deliberate saving habits themselves. Prior research linking family economic literacy and background to students' saving and consumptive behavior supports this view, finding that economic conditions at home measurably shape how adolescents and young adults manage their own money (Erin & Ayuningtyas, 2021; Novitasari & Septiana, 2021).

### ***Saving Behavior and Research Hypotheses***

Saving behavior itself is commonly indexed through students' ability to manage their own money, their understanding of spending priorities, the value they place on money, and the independence and consistency they show in pursuing saving goals (Mella Anggita Putri et al., 2021). Prior school-based research has identified a range of factors shaping student saving behavior specifically, from self-control and parental socialization to broader economic literacy (Gabriella et al., 2022; Manurung, 2018), and this pattern holds across education levels, from elementary school pupils (Deviana Marniasih, 2019) through university students (Wahana, 2014), reinforcing that saving behavior is best understood as a jointly determined outcome that emerges well before, and persists well beyond, adolescence. Based on the foregoing review, this study tested four hypotheses: social media use positively and significantly predicts saving behavior (H1); social environment positively and significantly predicts saving behavior (H2); family economic background positively and significantly predicts saving behavior (H3); and social media use, social environment, and family economic background jointly and significantly predict saving behavior (H4).

## **METHOD**

### ***Research Design and Participants***

This study used an ex post facto, associative quantitative design, examining relationships among variables as they naturally occurred rather than through experimental manipulation (Sugiyono, 2010). Data were collected in April-May 2026 at an Islamic senior high school in Enrekang Regency, South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. The study population comprised all tenth-grade students at the school, totaling 32 students; because a saturated sampling technique was applied, all 32 students in the population served as the study sample.



***Instruments and Data Analysis***

Four closed-ended, five-point Likert questionnaires measured social media use, social environment, family economic background, and saving behavior (Sugiyono, 2010). Item validity was assessed through Pearson product-moment item-total correlation, with every item found valid, and reliability, assessed through Cronbach's alpha, likewise met the accepted threshold of .60 for all instruments (alpha = .800 for social media use, .731 for social environment, .830 for family economic background, and .714 for saving behavior; Sugiyono, 2015). Prior to hypothesis testing, classical assumption testing covered residual normality (One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test), multicollinearity (tolerance and VIF), and heteroscedasticity (visual inspection of the standardized residual scatterplot). Hypotheses were then tested through multiple linear regression, evaluated via the t-test for each predictor's partial effect, the F-test for the simultaneous effect, the coefficient of determination (R-squared), and comparison of standardized beta coefficients to identify the dominant predictor, all computed in IBM SPSS Statistics 26.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION*****Classical Assumption Testing***

Residuals were normally distributed: Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance values were .200 for all four variables (social media use, social environment, family economic background, and saving behavior). Multicollinearity testing showed tolerance values of .481, .625, and .459 and VIF values of 2.080, 1.601, and 2.180 for social media use, social environment, and family economic background respectively, well within the accepted thresholds (tolerance > .10, VIF < 10). The standardized residual scatterplot showed no systematic pattern, indicating no heteroscedasticity.

***Regression Results and Hypothesis Testing***

Multiple linear regression, entering social media use (X1), social environment (X2), and family economic background (X3) simultaneously, is summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Multiple Regression Coefficients**

| Variable   | B     | Std. Error | Beta | t     | Sig. | Tolerance | VIF |
|------------|-------|------------|------|-------|------|-----------|-----|
| (Constant) | 0.207 | 1.090      | -    | 0.190 | .851 | -         | -   |



|                                 |       |       |      |       |       |      |       |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| Social Media Use (X1)           | 0.289 | 0.091 | .348 | 3.167 | .004  | .481 | 2.080 |
| Social Environment (X2)         | 0.254 | 0.061 | .401 | 4.162 | <.001 | .625 | 1.601 |
| Family Economic Background (X3) | 0.189 | 0.067 | .318 | 2.832 | .008  | .459 | 2.180 |

**Table 2. Model Summary and Simultaneous (F) Test**

| R    | R-squared | Adjusted R-squared | F      | Df    | Sig.  |
|------|-----------|--------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| .915 | .838      | .820               | 48.209 | 3, 28 | <.001 |

All three predictors significantly and positively predicted saving behavior (X1:  $t = 3.167$ ,  $p = .004$ ; X2:  $t = 4.162$ ,  $p < .001$ ; X3:  $t = 2.832$ ,  $p = .008$ ), supporting the first three hypotheses. The source thesis identified social media use as the dominant predictor on the basis of its unstandardized coefficient ( $B = 0.289$ , the largest of the three). Because the three predictors were measured on different item scales, however, standardized beta coefficients are the appropriate basis for comparison: by this criterion, social environment was in fact the dominant predictor ( $\beta = .401$ ), followed by social media use ( $\beta = .348$ ) and family economic background ( $\beta = .318$ ), a correction adopted throughout this article. Tested simultaneously, the three variables significantly predicted saving behavior,  $F(3, 28) = 48.209$ ,  $p < .001$  (Table 2), supporting the fourth hypothesis; the model explained 83.8% of the variance in saving behavior ( $R\text{-squared} = .838$ ; adjusted  $R\text{-squared} = .820$ ), leaving 16.2% attributable to factors outside the model.

## DISCUSSION

Social environment's status as the dominant predictor is consistent with the view that the places, relationships, and norms students encounter daily at school -- teacher and peer relations, classroom discipline, and school culture -- exert a broad, cumulative influence on students' habits that a single instructional intervention cannot easily replicate (Slameto, 2015). Because students spend the majority of their waking hours within this environment, its influence on saving behavior is plausibly more pervasive than that of any single predictor measured in isolation.

This finding is consistent with prior evidence linking social environment to saving-related outcomes among both community members and students (Bayu Aswandi, 2020; Dimas Saputra, 2022), and it reframes the source thesis's practical implications: interventions aimed at



strengthening students' social environment -- peer norms, teacher modelling, and school culture around saving -- may carry more leverage than the source study's original emphasis on social media suggested.

Social media use's significant, second-largest effect is consistent with the view that the platforms students access daily function as an active influence on financial behavior rather than a neutral backdrop, exposing them simultaneously to consumption cues and, when actively sought, financial-literacy content (Hendriyani et al., 2024).

Because social media use nonetheless predicted saving behavior positively rather than negatively in this sample, its net effect for these students appears to run through exposure to saving-related content and peer financial discussion rather than through consumption pressure alone, an interpretation that merits direct testing in future research.

Family economic background's significant, if comparatively smaller, effect is consistent with the view that household income, size, and consumption patterns shape both the resources available for a student to save and the financial habits modelled at home (Erin & Ayuningtyas, 2021; Novitasari & Septiana, 2021).

That its effect was the smallest of the three predictors suggests that, at least among this sample, students' immediate social context did more to shape saving behavior than the economic conditions they were born into, a pattern consistent with broader evidence that saving behavior among students and young adults is shaped jointly by social and economic factors rather than by economic circumstance alone (Manurung, 2018; Tyas & Rahayu, 2021).

That all three predictors remained significant when entered jointly, together explaining 83.8% of the variance, supports treating social media use, social environment, and family economic background as complementary rather than substitutable factors in adolescent saving behavior, consistent with cross-national evidence that student saving behavior is a multiply determined outcome rather than a product of any single influence (Thung et al., 2012).

Taken together, these results also carry a methodological lesson beyond this particular sample: because unstandardized and standardized coefficients can point to different dominant predictors whenever items or scales differ across variables, as they did here, studies that report a dominant predictor without specifying which coefficient the ranking is based on risk misdirecting the practical interventions that follow from their conclusions -- in this case, toward social media literacy rather than the school social environment that this reanalysis identifies as the stronger lever.



## CONCLUSION

This study found that social media use, social environment, and family economic background each significantly and positively predicted the saving behavior of tenth-grade students, both individually and jointly. Correcting the source thesis's use of unstandardized coefficients, social environment -- not social media use -- was the dominant predictor, followed by social media use and family economic background, and the three variables together explained 83.8% of the variance in saving behavior. These findings support treating adolescent saving behavior as a socially and economically grounded outcome, with implications for financial-education policy in comparable secondary school settings.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Schools and educators are encouraged to complement individual financial-literacy instruction with structured peer and classroom norms around saving, alongside continued attention to social media literacy and family-level financial education, treating these as complementary rather than independent levers for strengthening student saving behavior. Future research should extend this design with larger, multi-school samples and longitudinal designs capable of testing whether improvements in the social environment produce lasting gains in saving behavior over time.

## REFERENCES

- Bayu Aswandi. (2020). Pengaruh lingkungan sosial terhadap minat masyarakat menabung di bank syariah (Studi kasus di Desa Bujak Kecamatan Batukliang Kabupaten Lombok Tengah NTB) [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram].
- Deviana Marniasih. (2019). Analisis perilaku menabung di kalangan siswa Sekolah Dasar Negeri Ngulanan 1 Dander kelas III [Undergraduate thesis, IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro].
- Dimas Saputra. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan sosial dan pengetahuan produk tabungan terhadap minat menabung mahasiswa di bank syariah [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo Semarang].
- Erin, N., & Ayuningtyas, T. (2021). Analisis ekonomi keluarga dan literasi ekonomi terhadap perilaku menabung mahasiswa pendidikan ekonomi. *Jurnal Riset Pendidikan Ekonomi*, 6(1), 33.



- Gabriella, I. B., Widyastuti, W., & Fawaiq, M. (2022). Pengaruh kontrol diri, sosialisasi orang tua dan literasi keuangan terhadap perilaku menabung siswa SMK. *Jurnal Bisnis, Manajemen dan Keuangan*, 3(2).
- Hendriyani, S., Matsum, J. H., Ulfah, M., Asriati, N., & Syahrudin, H. (2024). Pengaruh literasi keuangan dan media sosial terhadap perilaku konsumtif di Desa Kubu Kabupaten Kubu Raya. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi (JURKAMI)*, 9(3).
- Henny, Z. L., Syahputri, D., Alwi, A. M. L. M., Dwi, N. A., & Mahareza, W. (2019). Tingkatan kesadaran siswa melalui budaya menabung sejak dini di Desa Sidourip Kecamatan Beringin Kabupaten Deli Serdang. *Seminar Nasional Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 194-199.
- Kurniasih, N., Ananda, M., Putri, A., Lestari, K. E., & Olivia, V. (2021). Sosialisasi gerakan gemar menabung (Gemabung) sejak dini dan meningkatkan kreativitas dengan membuat celengan dari bahan kertas. 1, 105-112.
- Manurung, N. (2018). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi perilaku siswa dalam menabung (Studi kasus siswa SMA Negeri di Kota Lubuk Pakam) [Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Sumatera Utara].
- Mella Anggita Putri, Weti, Lis Utami, & Retno Rahayu, S. (2021). Edukasi bagi anak-anak mengenai manfaat menabung sejak dini di Desa Mekar Mulya. *Jimakukerta*, 1, 64-68.
- Nadia Fatikasari. (2022). Sosialisasi menabung sejak dini dalam upaya meningkatkan minat menabung siswa kelas 6 SD Negeri Senden 2. *Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 2(2).
- Novitasari, A. T., & Septiana, A. (2021). Pengaruh pendidikan ekonomi dalam lingkungan keluarga terhadap perilaku konsumtif siswa. *JEKPEND: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Pendidikan*, 4(1), 64.
- Slameto. (2015). Belajar dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhinya. Rineka Cipta.
- Sugiyono. (2010). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2015). Metode penelitian pendidikan (Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D). Alfabeta.
- Thung, C. M., et al. (2012). Determinants of saving behaviour among the university students in Malaysia. Faculty of Business and Finance, Department of Commerce and Accountancy, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman.
- Tyas, A. R., & Rahayu, I. Y. (2021). Faktor-faktor yang memengaruhi perilaku menabung di kalangan mahasiswa (Studi pada mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis di Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman dan Universitas Wijaya Kusuma). *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Terapan*, 1(1), 11-22.



Wahana, A. (2014). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi perilaku mahasiswa dalam menabung (Studi kasus mahasiswa S1 FEB UNDIP Tembalang) [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Diponegoro].

