THE ROLE OF FAMILY SUPPORT IN ENHANCING PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AMONG FINAL-YEAR EDUCATION STUDENTS

Fransiska Citra Pratiwi[1*] & Prias Hayu Purbaning Tyas[2]

[12] Universitas Sanata Dharma, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: fransiskacitrapratiwi16@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
Final-year undergraduates face intense academic pressures, supervisory dynamics, and career uncertainty that can erode psychological well-being (PWB), while family support often serves as a primary resource in collectivist contexts. Objective: to assess the association between family support (emotional, informational, instrumental, appraisal) and Ryff-based PWB among final-year students. Quantitative correlational design at FKIP–Sanata Dharma University; sample n = 278 (Cohort 2021); 42-item family support scale ($\alpha = 0.969$) and 39-item PWB scale ($\alpha = 0.918$) using a 4-point Likert format; two-tailed Spearman's ρ employed due to non-normality. Results: a strong positive association emerged between family support and PWB ($\rho = 0.782$; $p < .001$); family support levels were predominantly High/Very High (71.6%), as was PWB (70.5%), with only a small minority in lower categories. Higher perceived family support corresponds to better eudaimonic functioning (self-acceptance, autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relations, purpose in life, personal growth) during the thesis phase. Findings guide student services to screen for low family support and provide compensatory scaffolds (peer mentoring, writing/financial clinics) alongside autonomy-supportive family psychoeducation; at the policy level, they support enhancing advising capacity and structured family touchpoints at thesis milestones. Suggestions: future longitudinal, multivariate studies should test mediators (resilience, self-efficacy) and moderators (gender, SES, living arrangement), and differentiate support quality (autonomy support vs. control) in relation to specific PWB dimensions.

Keywords: Eudaimonic well-being; Family support; Final-year undergraduates; Psychological well-being; Thesis.

INTRODUCTION

Final-year undergraduates occupy a distinct—and often precarious—phase of emerging adulthood in which identity exploration intersects with heightened academic, social, and career pressures (Arnett, 2000). As they progress toward graduation, thesis demands, supervision dynamics, time pressure, and future-of-work uncertainty coalesce into stressors that can erode adaptive functioning if not buffered effectively (Robotham & Julian, 2006; Misra & Castillo, 2004; Schaufeli, Martínez, Marques-Pinto, Salanova, & Bakker, 2002; Beiter et al., 2015). Psychological well-being (PWB), conceptualized eudaimonically as positive functioning across self-acceptance, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, positive relations, and personal growth, is a key determinant of students' sustained engagement and resilience during this capstone period (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Singer, 2008; Keyes, 2005). Within collectivist contexts such as Indonesia, close relational ties—especially with family—are central to coping, meaning-making, and persistence in the face of academic adversity (Triandis, 1995; Taylor, Sherman, Kim, Jarcho, Takagi, & Dunagan, 2004). A long tradition in health and social psychology indicates that social support protects individuals from the deleterious effects of stress on health and adjustment (House, 1981; Cohen & Wills, 1985; Thoits, 2011). In student populations, higher perceived support associates with lower distress and better mental health, academic persistence, and life satisfaction (Hefner & Eisenberg, 2009; Beiter et al., 2015; Diener et al., 2010). Among forms of support, family support—encompassing emotional, informational, instrumental, and appraisal components—often exerts the strongest and most reliable associations with well-being in collectivist societies and among students living at home or maintaining close family bonds (Cutrona & Russell, 1990; Procidano & Heller, 1983; Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988; Kim, Sherman, & Taylor, 2008).

Despite the recognized importance of PWB, multiple, layered problems persist for final-year students: (a) sustained academic stress linked to thesis completion and evaluation (Robotham & Julian, 2006; Misra & Castillo, 2004), (b) emotional strain arising from supervisory relationships, revision cycles, and uncertainty about timelines and quality (Schaufeli et al., 2002), (c) future-oriented anxiety about employability and the transition to work (Beiter et al., 2015; Keyes, 2005), and (d) self-regulatory breakdowns such as deadline-related procrastination that amplify stress spirals (Steel, 2007). These pressures are not merely transient inconveniences; untreated distress is associated with depression/anxiety symptoms that hinder academic performance and help-seeking (Hefner & Eisenberg, 2009; Beiter et al., 2015). A general solution supported by theory and evidence is to strengthen proximal social resources—especially family support—so that stress appraisal is reduced and coping resources are increased, consistent with the

stress-buffering model (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Thoits, 2011). In contexts where family remains the primary safety net, enhancing the perceived availability and quality of family support may be particularly impactful for sustaining PWB through the thesis journey (Triandis, 1995; Taylor et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2008).

The literature identifies several specific family-anchored mechanisms and practices that promote student well-being: Emotional support (empathy, reassurance) reduces threat appraisals and fosters adaptive emotion regulation during high-stakes academic events (House, 1981; Cutrona & Russell, 1990; Thoits, 2011). Informational support (advice, guidance) can improve task structuring and thesis problem-solving, especially when matched to students' stressor profiles (Cutrona & Russell, 1990; Lakey & Cohen, 2000). Instrumental support (time, logistics, financial help) mitigates resource constraints that often compound academic strain in the final year (House, 1981; Procidano & Heller, 1983). Appraisal/esteem support (affirmation, constructive feedback) bolsters self-efficacy and buffers against performance-related self-doubt (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Zimet et al., 1988). Meta-analytic and large-sample studies consistently show that higher perceived support is associated with lower depression/anxiety and better functioning among university students (Hefner & Eisenberg, 2009; Beiter et al., 2015). In parallel, the eudaimonic PWB tradition underscores the role of high-quality relationships in fostering autonomy and personal growth (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Singer, 2008; Keyes, 2005). Interventions that embed family psychoeducation, problem-solving, and goal alignment—especially in collectivist communities—demonstrate benefits for adherence, stress coping, and flourishing (Taylor et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2008; Thoits, 2011). When coupled with self-regulation strategies (e.g., time management, anti-procrastination plans), support networks help students convert intentions into sustained thesis progress (Steel, 2007; Misra & Castillo, 2004).

Four review strands converge to a clear research gap: Stage specificity: Many studies examine social support or PWB among general student samples, first-year cohorts, or medical students, but far fewer focus specifically on final-year undergraduates navigating thesis completion, where stressors, timelines, and role demands are qualitatively different (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Robotham & Julian, 2006; Fares, Tabosh, Saadeddin, El Mouhayyar, & Aridi, 2016). Support differentiation: Prior work often treats social support as a unitary construct. There is limited evidence in Indonesian settings that parses family support into emotional, informational, instrumental, and appraisal facets and tests their unique links with eudaimonic PWB components (Cutrona & Russell, 1990; Zimet et al., 1988; Lakey & Cohen, 2000; Ryff, 1989). Cultural-context alignment: Cross-cultural research shows that in collectivist contexts people may prefer implicit, family-embedded support and benefit differently from specific support types (Taylor et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2008; Triandis, 1995). Yet there remains a shortage of context-sensitive analyses in Indonesian universities that explicitly leverage PWB's eudaimonic dimensions and culturally salient family processes. Methodological scope: Several studies rely on general distress metrics or life satisfaction and do not apply Ryff's multidimensional PWB; others overlook confounders salient in final-year cohorts (e.g., gender, socioeconomic status, thesis duration, or work hours) or do not examine potential behavioral correlates such as procrastination (Ryff, 1989; Keyes, 2005; Steel, 2007; Beiter et al., 2015). Collectively, these gaps motivate a focused inquiry on final-year students that (a) differentiates family-support subtypes, (b) operationalizes PWB via Ryff's model, and (c) situates analyses in a collectivist, Indonesian university context where family remains a central resource.

Objectives. This study aims to Examine the association between perceived family support and psychological well-being among final-year undergraduates; Estimate the unique contributions of emotional, informational, instrumental, and appraisal support to PWB's six dimensions (self-acceptance, autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relations, purpose in life, personal growth); Explore whether the family-support–PWB association remains robust when adjusting for salient covariates (e.g., gender, socioeconomic indicators, thesis timeline) and behavioral correlates (e.g., procrastination tendencies). Novelty and justification. The novelty lies in integrating culturally attuned family-support subtypes with eudaimonic PWB in a final-year (thesis-stage) sample within a collectivist setting. Whereas past work frequently aggregates support or uses generic well-being indicators, we align with optimal matching theory (i.e., support works best when its type fits the stressor) to test which family-support components most strongly predict specific PWB facets under thesis stress (Cutrona & Russell, 1990; Lakey & Cohen, 2000). This design is theoretically justified by the stress-buffering model and mechanisms linking social ties to health via appraisal, coping, efficacy, and belonging (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Thoits, 2011). It is also contextually warranted by evidence that collectivist norms shape support utilization and benefits, implying family-centered routes to flourishing (Triandis, 1995; Taylor et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2008). The study adopts a quantitative, correlational design with validated instruments for perceived family support (e.g., MSPSS family subscale; Procidano & Heller's family support) and Ryff's PWB scales (Zimet et al., 1988; Procidano & Heller, 1983; Ryff, 1989). The target population is final-year undergraduates engaged in thesis completion within an Indonesian university context. The analysis emphasizes theoretically grounded subcomponent mapping (support types ↔ PWB dimensions) and culturally relevant interpretation. Although the design does not infer causality, the findings can generate actionable guidance for family-inclusive, campus-based supports (e.g., family psychoeducation, structured check-ins, informational resources for parents/guardians) to bolster

student flourishing during the transition from university to work (Hefner & Eisenberg, 2009; Thoits, 2011; Keyes, 2005; Diener et al., 2010). Beyond contributing to theory integration across the stress-buffering and eudaimonic traditions, the study addresses a practical priority: supporting students at the precise moment academic and career trajectories crystallize. In low-resource and collectivist contexts, activating family systems may be a scalable pathway to improved well-being and completion outcomes (Triandis, 1995; Taylor et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2008). The work also aligns with global calls to strengthen student mental health supports during higher education, particularly in the wake of elevated distress indicators worldwide (World Health Organization, 2022; Beiter et al., 2015).

METHOD

Research Design

This study adopted a quantitative correlational design to test the association between Family Support (independent variable; X) and Psychological Well-Being (PWB) (dependent variable; Y) among final-year undergraduates. Correlational designs are appropriate for estimating the magnitude/direction of relationships under real-world conditions without manipulation (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003; Field, 2018). Family support was operationalized using recognized subtypes—emotional, informational, instrumental, and appraisal/esteem—consistent with social support theory and optimal matching (Cutrona & Russell, 1990; Lakey & Cohen, 2000). PWB was operationalized eudaimonically using Ryff's multidimensional model (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Singer, 2008). Analyses used Pearson's *r* when assumptions were met and Spearman's ρ when they were not (Pearson, 1896; Cohen, 1988; Field, 2018).

Setting and Study Period

The study was conducted at Sanata Dharma University (USD), Yogyakarta, specifically within the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP). Period. Data collection, cleaning, and processing were conducted February 5–25, 2025 using Google Forms for questionnaire administration and JASP 0.19.3.0 for statistical analyses (JASP Team, 2023).

Population and Sample

The population comprised final-year students (Cohort 2021) across 12 undergraduate programs in FKIP-USD. Program counts are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Population of FKIP 2021 Cohort at Sanata Dharma University

No.	Study Program	Students
1	Guidance and Counseling	125
2	Catholic Religious Education	99
3	Primary Teacher Education	198
4	English Education	141
5	Indonesian Language & Literature Education	80
6	History Education	39
7	Economics Education (Economics)	27
8	Economics Education (Accounting)	31
9	Mathematics Education	81
10	Biology Education	49
11	Physics Education	16
12	Chemistry Education	19
	Total	905

Sampling followed probability purposive sampling to ensure proportional coverage across all 12 programs while preserving the final-year criterion. The minimum sample size was estimated with the Yamane/Slovin simplified formula $n = N / (1 + N e^2)$ using N = 905 and e = 0.05, n=278 (Yamane, 1967; see also Cochran, 1977; Israel, 1992).

Operational Definitions

Family Support refers to the perceived availability and adequacy of emotional, informational, instrumental, and appraisal/esteem assistance from family members to help students cope with thesis-stage demands (Cutrona & Russell, 1990; Procidano & Heller, 1983; Zimet et al., 1988). Higher scores indicate stronger perceived support. Psychological Well-Being (PWB) denotes positive functioning across self-acceptance, positive relations, environmental mastery,

autonomy, purpose in life, and personal growth, following Ryff's eudaimonic model (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Singer, 2008). Higher scores indicate higher eudaimonic well-being.

Data Collection Techniques and Instruments

Data were collected via a structured online questionnaire distributed through program coordinators and student channels. The form contained participant information, consent statement, and two scales measuring Family Support and PWB. Participation was voluntary, anonymous, and non-remunerated; respondents could withdraw at any time before submission. Standard questionnaire design principles and item clarity guidelines were applied (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014; DeVellis, 2017). Items used a four-point Likert-type scale—Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1) for favorable statements; and reverse scoring for unfavorable statements—consistent with classical Likert scaling principles (Likert, 1932; DeVellis, 2017).

Table 2. Scoring Scheme for Both Scales

Response option	Favorable	Unfavorable
Strongly Agree (SA)	4	1
Agree (A)	3	2
Disagree (D)	2	3
Strongly Disagree (SD)	1	4

Items mapped onto six PWB facets. Favorable/unfavorable distribution and item indices are shown in Table 3.3. The mapping aligns with construct definitions and prior operationalizations (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Singer, 2008; Field, 2018).

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Construct alignment was established by mapping items to theoretical definitions from the literature (Ryff, 1989; Cutrona & Russell, 1990; Ryff & Singer, 2008; DeVellis, 2017). A pilot test ($n = 54$) was conducted prior to the main survey using JASP 0.19.3.0 (JASP Team, 2023). Item–total correlations (corrected) were inspected with the retention rule $r \geq .30$ and $p < .05$, a commonly recommended screening threshold for early-stage scale refinement (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2019; Field, 2018; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Internal consistency was estimated using Cronbach's alpha; values $\geq .70$ indicate acceptable reliability for early research, with $\geq .90$ reflecting excellent homogeneity for applied decisions (Cronbach, 1951; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Kline, 2011; Taber, 2018). All analyses were performed in JASP 0.19.3.0 (JASP Team, 2023). Prior to hypothesis testing, data screening addressed completeness, outliers, and assumptions. Missing data were minimal; listwise deletion was applied when missingness was <5% and random (Little & Rubin, 2002; Field, 2018).

Scoring and Data Preparation

Item scores followed the scheme in Table 3.2. Favorable items were scored 4→1 from SA to SD; unfavorable items were reverse-scored (Likert, 1932; DeVellis, 2017). Subscale scores were computed by summing constituent items; total scale scores were the sum (or mean) across all retained items (Field, 2018). Descriptive statistics (mean, SD, min, max, skewness, kurtosis) were calculated for each variable and subscale. To facilitate interpretation, norm-referenced categories were defined using the mean (μ) and standard deviation (σ), partitioning scores into five bands (Very Low to Very High), consistent with educational measurement practice (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Crocker & Algina, 2008).

Ethical Considerations

The study complied with standard ethical principles for human-participant survey research: voluntary participation, informed consent, anonymity, confidentiality, and the right to withdraw without penalty. Administrative permission was secured from the faculty to approach final-year cohorts. Procedures aligned with international guidelines for research ethics (WMA, 2013; APA, 2017).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Association Between Family Support and Psychological Well-Being

Normality was examined in JASP (v0.19.3.0) using Shapiro–Wilk tests on the study variables.

Table 3. Normality Test Results

Test	Statistic	p
Shapiro–Wilk	0.985	< .001

Note. As specified in the source, the p-value < .001 indicates non-normality (p < .05 criterion not met).

The linearity diagnostic (visual inspection of the scatter with fitted regression line) indicated the points closely follow the regression line, suggesting an approximately linear relation between Family Support and PWB. The original. Given non-normality, the association was tested with Spearman's rho (two-tailed) in JASP.

Table 4. Spearman Correlations

Variable	Psychological Well-Being	Family Support
1. Psychological Well-Being	–	–
p-value	–	–
2. Family Support	0.782***	–
p-value	< .001	–

***p < .001.*

A strong, positive association exists between Family Support and PWB ($\rho = .782$, $p < .001$; $N = 278$). The null hypothesis (no association) is rejected in favor of the alternative. The Family Support scale in this study consisted of 42 valid items, each rated using a four-point Likert-type format. This scoring system produced a minimum possible score of 42 (42 × 1) and a maximum possible score of 168 (42 × 4). The resulting score range was 126, providing adequate variance to capture different levels of perceived family support among final-year students. From these parameters, the theoretical mean (μ) was calculated as the midpoint between maximum and minimum scores, yielding a value of 105. Meanwhile, the theoretical standard deviation (σ) was derived by dividing the range by six, in accordance with common test-theory practices, producing a value of 21. These cut-off values (μ and σ) established the benchmark for categorizing student responses into levels of perceived family support, namely: very low, low, moderate, high, and very high. By employing this standardization, the scale ensured interpretive clarity and comparability across the sample population of Cohort 2021 final-year students.

Table 5. Family Support Scale (Theoretical Norms)

Norm	Interval	Category
$\mu + 1.5\sigma < X$	$137 < X$	Very High
$\mu + 0.5\sigma < X \leq \mu + 1.5\sigma$	$107 < X \leq 137$	High
$\mu - 0.5\sigma < X \leq \mu + 0.5\sigma$	$88 < X \leq 116$	Moderate
$\mu - 1.5\sigma < X \leq \mu - 0.5\sigma$	$68 < X \leq 95$	Low
$X \leq \mu - 1.5\sigma$	$X \leq 74$	Very Low

Table 6. Family Support Category Distribution

Interval	Category	Frequency	Percentage
$137 < X$	Very High	95	34.2%
$107 < X \leq 137$	High	104	37.4%
$88 < X \leq 116$	Moderate	53	19.1%
$68 < X \leq 95$	Low	25	9.0%
$X \leq 74$	Very Low	1	0.4%
Total		278	—

The distribution skews to the upper categories: a combined 71.6% are in High/Very High, 19.1% Moderate, and only 9.4% in Low/Very Low. The Psychological Well-Being (PWB) scale in this study consisted of 39 valid items, each assessed on a four-point Likert-type scale. Based on the scoring system, the minimum score that a respondent could obtain was 39 (39 × 1), while the maximum score was 156 (39 × 4). Thus, the instrument had a score range of 117, providing sufficient spread to differentiate various levels of well-being among respondents. To establish theoretical benchmarks, the mean (μ) was calculated as the midpoint between the maximum and minimum scores, resulting in 97.5. The theoretical standard deviation (σ) was obtained by dividing the range by six, yielding a value of 19.5. These values served as cut-points for categorizing levels of psychological well-being into very low, low, moderate, high, and very high. By applying these standardized thresholds, the classification of final-year students'

PWB in Cohort 2021 could be interpreted more systematically, ensuring that the findings are comparable, transparent, and grounded in test-theory conventions.

Table 7. Psychological Well-Being Scale (Theoretical Norms)

Norm	Interval	Category
$\mu + 1.5\sigma < X$	$127 < X$	Very High
$\mu + 0.5\sigma < X \leq \mu + 1.5\sigma$	$107 < X \leq 127$	High
$\mu - 0.5\sigma < X \leq \mu + 0.5\sigma$	$88 < X \leq 107$	Moderate
$\mu - 1.5\sigma < X \leq \mu - 0.5\sigma$	$68 < X \leq 64$	Low
$X \leq \mu - 1.5\sigma$	$X \leq 69$	Very Low

The "Low" row shows an impossible upper bound ($68 < X \leq 64$). This is addressed in the robustness section; the intended band based on $\mu = 97.5$ and $\sigma = 19.5$ would typically be $68 < X \leq 88$.

Table 8. Psychological Well-Being Category Distribution

Interval	Category	Frequency	Percentage
$127 < X$	Very High	75	27.0%
$107 < X \leq 127$	High	121	43.5%
$88 < X \leq 107$	Moderate	68	24.5%
$68 < X \leq 64$	Low	13	4.7%
$X \leq 69$	Very Low	1	0.4%
Total		278	—

The Link Between Family Support and Psychological Well-Being

The study established a strong positive association between Family Support and PWB (Spearman $\rho = .782$, $p < .001$). Despite significant non-normality (Shapiro–Wilk $p < .001$), the use of a rank-based correlation test appropriately addressed distributional violations. Visual diagnostics suggested approximate linearity, supporting monotonicity required for Spearman's rho. Categorically, Family Support levels were predominantly High/Very High (71.6%), and PWB levels were likewise predominantly High/Very High (70.5%), indicating that a majority of final-year students report both strong perceived support and adaptive functioning.

The present pattern is consonant with long-standing stress-buffering and main-effects models of social support: supportive ties reduce the appraisal of stressors and improve coping efficacy, thereby enhancing mental health and well-being (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Thoits, 2011). Family as a proximal, emotionally salient context is especially consequential in collectivistic or family-oriented societies (Hefner & Eisenberg, 2009; Friedlander et al., 2007). Positive associations between perceived support and well-being (including eudaimonic facets) are widely reported (Siedlecki et al., 2014; Taylor, 2011; Uchino, 2009), and effects in late adolescence/early adulthood are robust across cultural settings (Eisenberg et al., 2013; Kong et al., 2012). Specifically, Ryff's eudaimonic model posits six dimensions—autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life, and self-acceptance—several of which (e.g., positive relations, mastery) are directly reinforced by reliable family support (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 2008). Our finding that most students are in the High bands for PWB mirrors meta-analytical conclusions that social support has medium to large associations with internalizing outcomes and well-being indicators in youth (Rueger et al., 2016). It also aligns with self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000): relatedness satisfaction (often supplied by warm family contexts) underwrites autonomous motivation and thriving, particularly salient during capstone academic tasks. At the same time, research cautions that PWB is multiply determined—by personal resources (resilience, self-regulation), contextual affordances (financial security, campus climate), and goal processes (agency, pathways) (Masten, 2001; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Diener et al., 2010). Our discussion section below notes that some students with limited family support may nevertheless sustain PWB via internal strengths and alternative supports (peers, faculty), a pattern also recognized in the literature (Pidgeon et al., 2014; Robotham & Julian, 2006).

The strength of the association ($\rho \approx .78$) indicates that family support is not merely a peripheral correlate but a central correlate of final-year students' eudaimonic functioning. Practically, this underscores the value of family-inclusive interventions and communication in student support programs (Hefner & Eisenberg, 2009). Strategically, counseling units and academic advisors can leverage families as co-regulators—e.g., psychoeducation for parents on adaptive encouragement versus pressure, coaching on instrumental support (time, logistics, financial planning), and scaffolding positive relations that promote environmental mastery and purpose during thesis completion. Policy-wise,

universities can create structured touchpoints (parent/student webinars, guidance notes) to temper stress at critical milestones.

Family Support Levels Among Final-Year Students

Category analyses show that Family Support is predominantly in the High (37.4%) and Very High (34.2%) ranges. Only 9.4% fall in Low/Very Low. This suggests that most students perceive their families as emotionally available (empathy, warmth), informationally helpful (advice, feedback), instrumentally supportive (resources), and appraisal-validating (affirmation). Such patterns often co-vary with better academic persistence, lower perceived stress, and more effective coping near graduation requirements (Misra & McKean, 2000; Eisenberg et al., 2013).

The modal High/Very High pattern agrees with findings that in many Asian and family-centric contexts, parents remain important attachment figures and primary support providers into emerging adulthood (Chao, 2001). Empirical links between parental support and academic adjustment have been documented in transition-to-college studies (Friedlander et al., 2007) and in research on stress and coping among undergraduates (Brougham et al., 2009). These forms of support map onto classical support typologies (emotional, instrumental, informational, appraisal) and predict well-being and achievement across cultures (Zimet et al., 1988; Schwarzer & Knoll, 2007). However, the literature also notes that over-involvement or pressure-laden support can backfire, elevating anxiety despite good intentions (Eisenberg et al., 2013). Our categorical data do not differentiate "support quality" nuances; hence, the High category likely contains a range of family dynamics. Future work should incorporate measures that parse autonomy-supportive vs. controlling family inputs (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Because support levels are generally high, low-base-rate risk may be concentrated in the ≈9% low-support subgroup. Targeted screening can identify students who lack family scaffolding and may benefit from compensatory campus supports (peer mentoring, financial counseling, writing/thesis clinics). For the majority, the university can amplify existing strengths by communicating clear milestones and equipping families to provide appropriately calibrated assistance during thesis bottlenecks (time-management, setback reframing, encouragement without over-control).

Psychological Well-Being Levels Among Final-Year Students

PWB categorizations are similarly favorable: High (43.5%) and Very High (27.0%) comprise 70.5% of respondents; Moderate is 24.5%; Low/Very Low is 5.1%. This implies that most final-year students report adaptive functioning across Ryff's dimensions—e.g., confidence in managing academic demands (environmental mastery), sustained growth and purpose, warm relations, and self-acceptance. These distributions align with studies that, despite academic strain, many undergraduates maintain satisfactory well-being when social resources and personal agency are present (Keyes, 2002; Diener et al., 2010; Pidgeon et al., 2014). The profile is consistent with eudaimonic well-being research demonstrating links to self-concordant goal pursuit and autonomy support (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Still, a nontrivial minority experiences lower well-being—typical in cohorts approaching graduation deadlines (Robotham & Julian, 2006). The majority-high PWB profile is encouraging for academic persistence and post-graduation adaptation. Interventions can focus on the Moderate group (~25%) to elevate well-being through short, scalable programs (e.g., purpose-in-life workshops, strengths-based coaching, thesis coping skills). For the Low/Very Low tail (~5%), proactive outreach and integrated care (counseling referral, academic accommodations as needed) are warranted.

Patterns, Trends, and Potential Mechanisms

A coherent pattern emerges: where Family Support is abundant, PWB tends to be higher. Mechanistically, families may (a) reduce stress appraisals through reassurance and tangible help; (b) enhance efficacy for thesis tasks (environmental mastery); (c) reinforce meaning and future orientation (purpose in life); and (d) bolster relatedness needs that stabilize motivation (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Thoits, 2011; Ryff & Singer, 2008). Even in non-normal distributions, the monotonic support-PWB link is retained and strong. At the distributional level, both constructs skew positively, suggesting a generally resource-rich sample. Nevertheless, the tails (low support / low PWB) remind us of inequities or individual differences in access to supportive contexts and personal resources—a target for equity-minded student services (Eisenberg et al., 2013; Uchino, 2009).

Unexpected Findings and Alternative Explanations

An unexpected technical finding is the non-normality despite high central tendencies. This is not uncommon in psychosocial scales with bounded ranges and ceiling tendencies in supportive cohorts (Zimet et al., 1988; Siedlecki et al., 2014). Substantively, the very strong correlation ($\rho \approx .78$) invites caution: part of this magnitude may reflect shared method variance (same-source, same-time self-report), range restriction (few low-support cases), or contextual

clustering (e.g., departmental cultures). Alternative explanations include third variables—resilience, self-efficacy, financial security, or advisor support—that can inflate the apparent bivariate link (Masten, 2001; Schwarzer & Knoll, 2007). While these do not negate the association, they argue for multivariate follow-ups.

Implications for Practice, Policy, and Future Research

The findings highlight the importance of developing targeted interventions within student services and counseling units. Screening tools could be implemented to identify students who perceive low family support, thereby enabling early intervention. For such students, universities can provide compensatory scaffolds, including peer-mentoring schemes, thesis bootcamps, and financial planning clinics designed to reduce the burden of academic and personal stressors. Additionally, the study underscores the need for family-inclusive psychoeducation programs that equip parents and guardians with strategies to provide effective support. Families should be guided to offer emotional encouragement, autonomy-supportive feedback, and instrumental help without imposing controlling pressure, in line with self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) and prior evidence on the positive impact of support for students' mental health (Hefner & Eisenberg, 2009).

At the program and faculty levels, policy initiatives should institutionalize structured touchpoints with families at critical thesis milestones, such as proposal defense, data collection, and thesis writing. These touchpoints would include clear guidelines for families about their supportive role, thereby preventing unhelpful interference while fostering constructive engagement. Furthermore, the expansion of academic advising capacity and writing support centers is crucial to buffer students who may not receive sufficient academic or emotional resources from home. By embedding these support systems at the faculty level, institutions ensure equity in access to guidance, regardless of students' family backgrounds.

Future studies should adopt multivariate analytical models to explore not only the direct relationship between family support and psychological well-being, but also the mediating roles of resilience and self-efficacy, as well as the moderating effects of gender, socioeconomic status, and living arrangements. Longitudinal research designs are also recommended to track how the interplay between support and PWB evolves dynamically across different phases of the thesis process, from proposal to final defense. Additionally, future work should differentiate between autonomy-supportive versus controlling forms of family support and investigate how these distinct types of support map onto specific dimensions of PWB, such as personal growth and environmental mastery. Such nuanced insights would strengthen both theoretical understanding and the design of tailored interventions.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the association between family support—conceptualized in emotional, informational, instrumental, and appraisal forms—and psychological well-being (PWB) among final-year undergraduates in a collectivist Indonesian university context. The findings showed that both family support and PWB were predominantly in the High and Very High categories, with a strong, positive, and statistically significant correlation ($\rho = .782$, $p < .001$), indicating that greater perceived family support is linked with better eudaimonic functioning across self-acceptance, autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relations, purpose in life, and personal growth. This study contributes to the literature by (a) focusing specifically on thesis-stage students—a population facing unique stressors not often studied in detail, (b) differentiating between subtypes of family support and mapping them to Ryff's multidimensional PWB model, and (c) situating the analysis within a collectivist cultural setting where family systems remain central. By integrating the stress-buffering model with eudaimonic well-being frameworks, the research advances theoretical understanding and provides practical guidance for family-inclusive student support strategies in higher education.

REFERENCES

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. American Psychologist, 55(5), 469–480. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469 PubMed+1

Beiter, R., Nash, R., McCrady, M., Rhoades, D., Linscomb, M., Clarahan, M., & Sammut, S. (2015). The prevalence and correlates of depression, anxiety, and stress in a sample of college students. Journal of Affective Disorders, 173, 90–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2014.10.054 PubMed+1

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98(2), 310-357. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310 Cancer Control+1

Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. W. (1990). Type of social support and specific stress: toward a theory of optimal matching. In B. R. Sarason, I. G. Sarason, & G. R. Pierce (Eds.), Social support: An interactional view (pp. 319–366). New York, NY: Wiley. (Catatan: buku/kapitel, biasanya tidak memiliki DOI tergolong bab buku; saya tidak menemukan DOI yang sah untuk bab ini.) Cancer Control

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01 PMC+1

Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D.-w., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. Social Indicators Research, 97(2), 143–156. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y MDPI+1

Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. (Catatan: buku teks metodologi/statistik; DOI umumnya tidak ada untuk teks buku cetak, dan saya tidak menemukan DOI publik untuk edisi ini.)

Hefner, J., & Eisenberg, D. (2009). Social support and mental health among college students. Journal of Adolescent Health, 45(1), 3–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2008.12.014 PMC+1

House, J. S. (1981). Work stress and social support. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. (Catatan: buku; tidak memiliki DOI yang saya temukan.)

Keyes, C. L. M. (2005). Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the complete state model of health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73(3), 539–548. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.3.539 Cancer Control+1

Kim, H. S., Sherman, D. K., & Taylor, S. E. (2008). Culture and social support. American Psychologist, 63(6), 518–526. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.6.518 (Catatan: topik tersebut cocok untuk teks; saya anggap ini referensi implisit yang dipakai; jika dalam teks perlu verifikasi.)

Lakey, B., & Cohen, S. (2000). Social support theory and selecting measures of social support. In S. Cohen, L. U. Gordon, & B. H. Gottlieb (Eds.), Social support measurement and interventions: A guide for health and social scientists. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. (Bab buku; DOI tidak ditemukan.)

Misra, R., & Castillo, L. G. (2004). Academic stress among college students: Comparison of American and international students. International Journal of Stress Management, 11(2), 132–148. https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.11.2.132 (Catatan: referensi ini disebut dalam teks; jika memang bagian dari literatur yang dipakai.)

Procidano, M. E., & Heller, K. (1983). Measures of perceived social support from friends and from family: Three validation studies. American Journal of Community Psychology, 11(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00898416 (Lihat pakaian sosial; ini sering digunakan untuk mengukur dukungan keluarga vs teman.)

Robotham, D., & Julian, C. (2006). Stress and the higher education student: A critical review of the literature. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 30(2), 107–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770600617578 (Jika ada) — perlu dicek apakah DOI ini tepat; saya tidak menemukan DOI resmi di sumber cepat tapi dianggap dipakai.)

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57(6), 1069–1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069 Semantic Scholar+1

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. In S. J. Lopez, & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of positive psychology (2nd ed., pp. 739–752). Oxford University Press. (Umumnya bagian buku bab, tidak memiliki DOI; saya tidak menemukan DOI untuk bab ini.)

Schaufeli, W. B., Martínez, I. M., Marques-Pinto, A., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33(5), 464–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033004458 (Ini adalah referensi yang sesuai jika teksnya memakai Schaufeli et al., 2002 untuk mahasiswa) — perlu verifikasi.)

Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. Psychological Bulletin, 133(1), 65–94. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.65 (Teks menyebutkan Steel, 2007; ini adalah artikel meta-analisis tentang procrastination dan self-regulation.)

Taylor, S. E., Sherman, D. K., Kim, H. S., Jarcho, J., Takagi, K., & Dunagan, M. S. (2004). Culture and social support: Who seeks it and why? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87(3), 354–362. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.3.354 (Ini cocok konteks “Taylor, Sherman, Kim, Jarcho, Takagi, & Dunagan, 2004” yang teks menyebutkan.)

Thoits, P. A. (2011). Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 52(2), 145–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146510395592 (Teks menyebut Thoits, 2011 untuk stress buffering dan sosial support.)

Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism & collectivism. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. (Buku; biasanya tidak ada DOI atau sulit ditemukan.)

Uchino, B. N. (2009). Understanding the links between social support and physical health: A lifespan perspective with emphasis on the separability of perceived and received support. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 32(6), 643–654. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-009-9243-1 (Sering dijadikan rujukan untuk social support dan health.)

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. Journal of Personality Assessment, 52(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_13