



Exploring Subjective Well-Being between Local and International University Students

Yang Yunhan, Azrina Abdullah Al-Hadi, Norain Mod Asri*

School of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Management, National University of Malaysia

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800673>

Received: 30 August 2026; Accepted: 04 September 2026; Published: 15 September 2026

ABSTRACT

The internationalization policy of the higher education system has led to an increasing number of international students enrolling in public universities in Malaysia over the past few years. At the same time, the lifelong learning policy is seen as an attraction for both local and international students to opt for continuing their studies at the tertiary education level. However, the well-being of students at the university cannot be overlooked to enable them to continue studying well until the completion of their studies. Therefore, the objective of this study is to examine the factors that influence the well-being of local and international students who are continuing their studies at public universities. The study uses a quantitative approach through the distribution of questionnaires to students at public universities. Based on the findings from the logistic regression analysis, in general, the findings show that social support and quality of life can significantly enhance students' well-being. This implies that emotional support from family members and friends allows respondents to study in a happy environment. Moreover, factors such as good quality of life, including sleep and good living conditions, as well as satisfaction with access to healthcare and transportation facilities, can further enhance students' well-being. But, weak mental health factors such as being easily nervous and panicking can lead to poor mental health, which may undermine students' well-being. In conjunction with this situation, university management and other related organizations must provide better facilities for social and psychological support services, financial assistance, accommodation, and health services that meet the needs of local and international students so that they continue to excel in the higher education system.

Keywords : Well-being; social support, quality of life, mental health, higher education

INTRODUCTION

The policy of internationalization in higher education shows the influx of many international students into public universities in Malaysia. For example, there has been a significant increase in the enrollment of international students in recent years at the National University of Malaysia, which is one of the prestigious universities in Malaysia. In the year 2024, these students constitute 19% of the total university student body. Actually, the attraction toward the increase in foreign student enrollment is also contributed by the provision of various facilities that will lead to an improvement in the level of well-being and happiness of students, including those related to health and accommodation. In this matter, the well-being of students is very important. Thus, subjective well-being (SWB) has received many attentions from global researchers.

Much prominence is being paid to it from fields such as psychology, economics, and education. Subjective well-being can be normally described as the assessment conducted by self-based on a person's perceptions of happiness or life satisfaction, being an important psychological indication about one's quality of life. Thus, subjective well-being is an understanding that allows the investigation of an individual's experience that may improve his or her quality of life. For the last couple of decades, there has been growing interest in the study of SWB in specific populations, including college or university students, whose well-being is affected by unique environmental, social, and psychological challenges.

Therefore, this study aims to identify the significant factors affecting the well-being of university students. Exploration of well-being among university students is very important considering that this group is in a new phase of life exposed to freedom and various pressures. Therefore, understanding the factors that influence well-being can help maintain health and a good quality of life, especially for international students who are willing to cross borders to pursue education at public universities in Malaysia. At the same time, the main contribution of this study is through the comparison of factors affecting the well-being of local students and international students. In short, the findings of this study can provide guidance on current policies that need to be updated by the university, the Ministry, and other related organizations toward creating an inclusive and student-friendly environment.

In terms of the variables used in this research, for example, previous studies have demonstrated that good mental health is a key determinant of SWB. However, if mental health is poor, which is usually characterized by symptoms of depression, anxiety, and stress, it will likely lead to a lower level of well-being (Lovibond, 1995). In addition, social support represented by a strong social network can enhance resilience and promote higher well-being (Zimet, 1988). In fact, a high level of satisfaction with the environment, including residential, physical, and social aspects, is often associated with positive well-being, especially in the field of education (Skromanis, 2018). Although many studies have explored issues related to well-being, there are still gaps in research concerning well-being issues. This is because there has been relatively little comparative research on well-being between local and foreign students. Thus, this study will detail the interactions between variables that influence the well-being of local and foreign students toward creating a more harmonious and sustainable higher education system.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of subjective well-being has been studied extensively across disciplines. Subjective well-being, as represented by Diener et al. (1984), is considered a broad psychological indicator of an individual's quality of life. An individual's ability to adapt the environment in their lives and fulfil their social function is an important indicator of an individual's subjective well-being. Later, this view was widely adopted and defined by scholars as Subjective Well-Being (SWB), which is defined by individuals' own subjective judgement. Subjective Well-Being generally consists of three interrelated components: life satisfaction (cognitive appraisal of an individual's overall life), positive affect (the experience of pleasant emotions) and negative affect (the experience of unpleasant emotions) (Diener, 1984). This tripartite classification model has been widely used in previous studies that focusing on individual and group well-being. Researchers have emphasized that well-being is subjective in nature and therefore self-report measures are the most commonly used assessments. More research has shown that SWB is influenced by a variety of personal and environmental factors, thus, a multidimensional construct relevant to diverse populations, including university students (Keyes, 1998). In higher (university) education system, SWB is an issue of particular concern because university students face pressures that are unique, such as academic pressures and psychological transitions. Chirkov et al. (2003) pointed out that cultural differences make the assessment of SWB particularly problematic, especially when comparisons are made between local and international students. Therefore, in order to overcome this matter, the WHO-5 Happiness Index (WHO-5) scale was used for measuring SWB in this study. This index developed it in 1998, and it is a brief, valid instrument to determine subjective psychological well-being. It contains five items to check for positive feelings, for instance, cheerfulness and calm, vitality, and interest in life. These items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale (Topp et al., 2015).

Besides that, social work competence highly depends on appropriate mental health characterized by emotional, psychological, and social well-being. According to Yulianti and Cahyani (2019), adolescence is characterized by a lack of care for others, an abundance of freedom to make one's own decisions, peak physical strength and stamina, and a lack of social obligations. Maintaining a healthy mental state is critical for leading a full and productive life (Abidin et al., 2020). A person is considered to have good condition of mental health if they are able to engage in constructive psychological functioning, as described by Ryff (2021). Acceptance of oneself, constructive relationships with others, independence, environmental mastery, and personal development are all components of mentally healthy functioning. Also, having a favorable attitude towards one's former life and oneself is a component of self-acceptance (Yuen et al., 2021). Autonomy implies self-determination and control



of one's surroundings implies coping abilities, yet positive interactions with others show up in high-quality relationships with other people. Lovibond et al. (1995) developed the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21), which is now one of the most utilized mental health measures. It is a 21-item assessment of stress, anxiety, and depression, all of which are linked but separate concepts. The seven questions that make up each construct were assessed on a four-point Likert scale. This allowed for a comprehensive assessment of an individual's mental health condition. Many researchers have begun using the DASS-21 due to its reliability, ease of administration, and sensitivity to changes in mental health status (Lovibond et al., 1995). For instance, Eisenberg et al. (2007) found that SWB was consistently lower among those with high levels of anxiety, stress, depression, and depression. Thus, the following hypothesis is generated based on above discussion.

Ha: Negative mental health (psychology) condition/status affects subjective well-being differently for international and local students.

Another dominant predictor of well-being which has always been described in previous studies is social support. Previously, social support was largely associated only with physical health. However, in the past 10 years, developments in the field of psychology have shifted the focus of research toward the relationship between social support and mental health. Yan (2003) stressed that those who have strong social networks report more positive affect and less negative affect, as well as better levels of subjective well-being and life satisfaction. Wills (1991) states that social support impact exist when an individual feels or knows that they are loved, cared for, respected, and appreciated by others and become part of a social network where they are expected to contribute and be held accountable. A validated instrument for measuring emotional, instrumental, and informational support was created by Zimet et al. (1998) in the form of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS). Perceived social support may come from three sources: one's significant other, one's family, and one's friends. Skromanis et al. (2018) agreed that the Perceived Social Support Scale was developed to examine this aspect of social support. Therefore, a supportive university atmosphere is necessary, since Sawir et al. (2008) found that SWB decreases with the impression of social isolation. Thus, the following hypothesis is derived from premises as mentioned above.

Hb: Social support affects subjective well-being differently for international and local students.

Furthermore, quality of life (QoL), which is how people see their own place in the world in relation to their surroundings and the values and norms of the society in which they reside, is another important factor to determine SWB. The term quality of life (QoL) is derived from the following statement: "individuals' perceptions of their position in life within the context of their culture and value system and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards, and concerns" (Skevington et al. 2004). Actually, quantitative well-being is associated with subjective quality of life. The World Health Organization's (WHO) has modified WHOQOL-BREF so that it become a reliable tool for assessing quality of life (QoL) with four key areas: physical health, social interactions and surroundings, mental health, and spiritual health. Therefore, hypothesis related to quality of life can be derived as follows.

Hc: Quality of life affects subjective well-being differently for international and local students.

METHODOLOGY

The population of this study was all current students of Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). Students from UKM were chosen as the sample for this study considering that UKM is active in implementing the internationalization policy of higher education. Therefore, it is appropriate for student well-being to be studied in more detail. Since this study applied quantitative method, therefore the distribution of the questionnaire has been done through a combination of online and offline methods in order to expand the coverage and increase the response rate of the questionnaire. An online survey was done through social media platforms (e.g. WhatsApp, Wechat and Telegram) as well as emails where the link to the designed questionnaire was shared to the student associations. The questionnaire was designed using Google Forms and in order to ensure authenticity and validity of the questionnaire, it was set to be completed only after logging in using a UKM email address. This restrictive requirement ensured the reliability of the data by effectively screening the target audience and avoiding the mixing of data from non-study participants. Offline distribution methods were used to distribute questionnaires

to students at the library, faculties, academic events and campus. This has been done to ensure that students who were unable to participate in the online platform can still participate in this study. The questionnaire was divided into two sections covering various aspects. The first part is demographic variables, which focuses on collecting basic information about respondents' gender, age, major, nationality, etc., which aims to provide demographic background support for subsequent data analysis. The second part of the questionnaire focuses on the core of this study and includes 8 dimensions: others social support (OSS), friend support (FR), family support (FA), physical health (PH), environment condition (EC), stress (SR), anxiety (AX), and depression (DP). Each dimension contains 4-6 questions (items). However, to measure subjective well-being, the WHO-5 Happiness Index (WHO-5) scale was used. Details related to items according to themes/factors are shown in the table in the appendix. Meanwhile, in order to ensure the clarity and applicability of the questions, the questionnaire was pre-tested on a small scale before official distribution to further optimize the design of the questionnaire.

Table 1 below displays the results of Cronbach's Alpha reliability test. Each dimension has a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient greater than 0.8, which indicates that the reliability of the questionnaire is good and can be analyzed subsequently. Next, this study has an excellent sampling effect, as shown in Table 2, with a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value of 0.931 greater than 0.5, estimated chi-square value equal 7708.743, and a p-value less than 0.001 from Bartlett's test of spherical.

Table 1. Reliability Test

Variable	Dimensions	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Social Support	Others social support	3	0.837
	Family	4	0.839
	Friends	4	0.837
Quality of life	Physical health	3	0.841
	Environmental conditions	4	0.841
Mental Health	Depression	7	0.836
	Anxiety	7	0.833
	Stress	7	0.832
Subject well Being	Subject well Being	5	0.834
Total		44	0.836

Table 2. KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.			0.931
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square		7708.743
	P		<0.001

Furthermore, this study also applies binary logistic regression model to determine the effect of predictor variables on the well-being of university students. Thus, 289 survey responses were collected to assess the factors affecting local and international students specifically in Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. Subjective well-being was used as the dependent variable and defined as a dichotomous variable (0 = university students perceive their subjective well-being to be low and 1 = university students perceive their subjective well-being to be high). Social support,

quality of life, and mental health were the independent variables. The logistic regression model can be written as follows:

$$\log\left[\frac{P_i}{1-P_i}\right] = \beta_0 + \beta_i X_i + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where:

$P_i=1$ If university students perceive themselves to be happy (good well-being)

$P_i=0$ for otherwise

X_i =independent variables

β_0 =constant term

β_i =coefficient of independent variables

ε =the error term

$i=1,2,3,\dots,n$

Table 3 below provides a description of the variables used in the logistic regression model.

Table 3. Descriptions of Variables

Variables	Descriptions
Subject well being	1=Yes (High or good well-being)
	0=No (Low or poor well-being)
Gender	1=Male
	0=Female
Age	1=18-23 years old
	0=others
Marital status	1=Single
	0=Non-single
Accommodation	1=renting a room in housing/apartment/condominium
	0=stay in campus dorm/college
Degree level	1=Undergraduate
	0=Postgraduate (Master and PhD)
Nationality	1=Malaysia
	0=International
Social support	1 = Strongly Disagree



	2 = Mildly Disagree
	3 = Neutral
	4 = Mildly Agree
	5= Strongly agree
Quality of life	1=Very poor
	2=poor
	3=Neither poor nor good
	4=Good
	5=Very good
Mental health	0 = Did not apply to me at all
	1 = Applied to me to some degree, or some of the time
	2 = Applied to me to a considerable degree, or a good part of the time
	3 = Applied to me very much, or most of the time

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Respondent background

Based on Table 4, the majority of respondents are aged 18 to 22 years (56.1%). But for international students, 61.2% of the respondents were students aged 23 and above. Most respondents were also female students (73.4%), currently enrolled in undergraduate programs (60.9%), and still single (76.5%). Although many are not yet married, the findings show that local students tend to live on campus/college, whereas international students prefer to rent houses/apartments/condominiums. This may be because international students want to live with their friends and they are able to afford the rent. Meanwhile, in terms of the breakdown of respondents by faculty, it was found that the majority of respondents came from FEP, making up 56.4%.

Table 4. Demographic characteristics of survey sample (N=289)

Variables	Options	International	Local	Total
		N (%)	N (%)	
Age	18-22	69(38.8%)	93(83.8%)	162(56.1%)
	23 years and above	109 (61.2%)	18 (16.2%)	127(43.9%)
Gender	Female	128 (71.9%)	84 (75.7%)	212(73.4%)
	Male	50 (28.1%)	27 (24.3%)	77(26.6%)
Degree level	Undergraduate	77 (43.3%)	99 (89.2%)	176(60.9%)
	Postgraduate (Master and PhD)	101 (56.7%)	12 (10.8%)	113(39.1%)



Faculty	Faculty of Economic and Management (FEP)	111 (62.4%)	52 (46.8%)	163(56.4%)
	Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (FSSK)	30 (16.9%)	19 (17.1%)	49(17%)
	Others	37 (20.8%)	40 (36%)	77(26.6%)
Accommodation	renting a room in housing/apartment/condominium	162 (91.0%)	32 (28.8%)	194(67.1%)
	on campus dorm/college	16 (9%)	79(71.2%)	95(32.9%)
Marital status	Single	124 (69.7%)	93(83.7%)	221(76.5%)
	Non-single	54 (30.3%)	18(16.2%)	68(23.5%)
Total		178(61.6%)	111 (38.4%)	289

Logistic regression analysis

Omnibus tests were used to examine the overall picture of the model. Table 5 proved that $p < 0.001$, which means that at least one of the variables included in this fitted model has a meaningful value of odds ratio. Therefore, it leads to the meaningful model in general.

Table 5. Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

	Chi-square	P
Step	300.646	<.001
Block	300.646	<.001
Model	300.646	<.001

The data's fit to the regression model was also checked using the Hosmer-Lemeshow test as shown by Table 6. When compared to the significance threshold of 0.05, the probability P-value of 0.848 is much higher. This data sets are well-suited to the binary Logistic regression model that was previously developed; moreover, the model's output results accurately portray the true nature of the relationships between the original variables.

Table 6. Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Chi-square	P
4.103	0.848

Next, the impact of social support, quality of life, and mental health on the well-being of college students was investigated using the findings of binary logistic regression analysis. Based on Table 7, the mental health variable has a substantial negative influence on well-being, as shown by the regression coefficient of -0.814. With an $\text{Exp}(B)$ equal to 0.443, it's easy to prove that the chances of being well decrease dramatically with every mental health decline at a significant level of 5%. Therefore, enhancing students' mental health is an important factor in raising their level of happiness or well-being during studying at university. Besides that, with a regression coefficient of 0.578, social support seems to have a positive and substantial impact on university students' well-being. This finding is statistically significant since the threshold of significance, P is less than 0.05. The value of $\text{Exp}(B)$ is determined to be 1.782. This indicates that students with a high social support are 1.782 times more

likely to have higher level of well-being than those with a low social support. Support from friends and family is crucial for college students' health and happiness. Furthermore, the variable for quality of life has a substantial positive influence on subjective well-being, as shown by the regression coefficient of 0.688 that significance at 5%. Since $\text{Exp}(B)$ has a value of 1.989, this indicates that students with high quality of life are 1.989 times more likely to have higher level of well-being than students with low quality of life.

Table 7. Logistic regression analysis results for the whole student sample

	B	S.E.	Wald	P	Exp(B)
Gender	0.413	0.428	0.931	0.335	1.512
Age	0.067	0.480	0.020	0.888	1.070
Accommodation	-2.55	0.444	0.330	0.566	0.775
Marital status	-0.795	0.548	2.103	0.147	0.452
Social support	0.578	0.257	5.074	0.024	1.782
Quality of life	0.688	0.319	4.650	0.031	1.989
Mental health	-0.814	0.338	5.778	0.016	0.443
Constant	-9.655	1.884	20.959	<0.001	0

To further analysis, this study also run logit regression separately for the case of local and international students. As depicted by Table 8, for the group sample of international students, with p-value is 0.009, this indicating a significant and positive effect of social support on the well-being of international students. In fact, with $\text{Exp}(B) = 2.685$, this suggests that international students who scored high on social support were 2.685 times more likely to have higher well-being than those who scored low. At the same time, regression coefficient for quality of life was 1.433 with a p-value of $0.008 < 0.001$, indicating a significant and positive effect of quality of life on international students' well-beings. Since the value of $\text{Exp}(B)$ equal to 4.189, it reflects that international students with a high quality of life are 4.189 times more likely to have higher well-being compare to those with a low quality of life. However, it was also found that the p-value of mental health is 0.227, which proved no significant effect of mental health items on international students' well-being.

Nevertheless, for local students, at the 5% significance level, it is evident that only mental health has a substantial detrimental impact on students' wellbeing. Meanwhile, other variables were found to have no significant impact on students' well-being. Similarly, the findings on the background variables of the respondents proved to be insignificant in affecting the well-being of both international and local student samples. Overall, it can be concluded that the factors of social support and quality of life greatly influence the well-being of international students studying at public universities in Malaysia. However, local students will experience a decline in well-being if their mental health is poor or not good

Table 8. Logistic regression analysis results (International and Local students)

	International			Local		
Dimensions	B	P	Exp(B)	B	P	Exp(B)
Gender	0.41	0.484	1.507	0.753	0.405	2.124
Age	0.284	0.628	1.328	-3.165	0.705	0.042



Accommodation	-0.384	0.636	0.681	-0.724	0.423	0.485
Marital status	-0.279	0.67	0.757	-0.831	0.446	0.435
Social support	0.988	0.009	2.685	0.944	0.127	2.570
Quality of life	1.433	0.008	4.189	0.430	0.471	1.538
Mental health	-0.62	0.227	0.538	-1.618	0.016	0.198
Constant	-10.899	<.001	0	-7.205	0.414	0

DISCUSSION

This study examines the state of well-being of international and local students. Based on the findings from the logistic regression analysis, in general, the findings show that social support and quality of life can significantly enhance students' well-being. This implies that emotional support from family members and friends allows respondents to study in a happy environment. It aligns with the view of Yan (2003). Moreover, factors such as good quality of life, including sleep and good living conditions, as well as satisfaction with access to healthcare and transportation facilities, can further enhance students' well-being. Of course, the decision aligns with the idea of Skevington et al. (2004). But, weak mental health factors such as being easily nervous and panicking can lead to poor mental health, which may undermine students' well-being as mentioned by Eisenberg et al. (2007). However, when explored in the case of international students only, it is proven that only social support and quality of life can enhance student well-being. Meanwhile, the well-being of local students is significantly declining due to poor mental health.

This study shows that mental health problems arising from depression, stress, and anxiety have a significant negative impact on subjective well-being for local students and a lesser impact on international students. This may be caused by deeper emotional impacts on some long-standing issues faced by local students such as academic pressure, competition for employment, and family expectations over a long period of time. This issues, when combined, has a detrimental effect on wellbeing and emotions. The negative effects of such emotions may be more pronounced among local students because they are less tolerant of problems and do not have the stimulus of a new environment to distract them. In contrast, international students are more likely to view these problems as short-term challenges. They may have developed greater mental toughness as they adapt to their new environment. Although they face cultural differences and feelings of isolation, these problems are usually seen as temporary. They may relieve stress by exploring the new culture or interacting with other international students, thus reducing the long-term impact of negative emotions on them.

Our findings also confirm that social support had a greater impact on the well-being of international students than local students. Of course, international students have limited sources of social support since they are usually far away from their families and have greater difficulty in establishing deep relationships with local residents. As a result, they are more likely to rely on other international students or short-term social networks in order to maintain their well-being and happiness.

Another factor that cannot be ignored is the quality of life. International students usually face culture clashes, language barriers and unfamiliarity with the rules of the local society. These factors can exacerbate their sensitivity to living conditions. Let say the accommodation is not ideal or the neighborhood is not friendly enough, international students may be more likely to feel uncomfortable or stressed. Thus, anything that can improve the quality of life will certainly lead to better well-being for international students.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, several important initiatives need to be implemented immediately to curb the decline in university students' well-being. It should be highlighted here that instability in well-being is likely to affect students' academic performance. First and foremost, student themselves should be under the initiative in seeking

and maintaining the social support network. Keeping close ties with the family, friends, and classmates contributes not only to emotional but also to practical help when something is going wrong. In fact, students need to keep healthy living habits, actively engage in leisure activities and care about their mental health. They can seek help from the psychological counseling center or other professional bodies if they cannot cope with their problems. By changing their cognitive styles and behavior patterns, university students will be able to improve their level of well-being effectively. In conjunction with this situation, university management and other related organizations must provide better facilities for social and psychological support services, financial assistance, accommodation, and health services that meet the needs of local and international students so that they continue to excel in the university education system in Malaysia. All these elements need to be further refined in the policies related to the internationalization of universities and lifelong learning policies. This, in turn, can attract more students to continue their studies at universities in Malaysia, especially in the current era of artificial intelligence boom.

REFERENCES

1. Chirkov, V., Ryan, R. M., Kim, Y., & Kaplan, U. (2003). Differentiating autonomy from individualism and independence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(1), 97–110.
2. Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542–575.
3. Eisenberg, D., Gollust, S. E., Golberstein, E., & Hefner, J. L. (2007). Prevalence and correlates of depression, anxiety, and suicidality among university students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 77(4), 534–542.
4. Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61(2), 121–140.
5. Lovibond, S.H. & Lovibond, P.F. (1995). *Manual for the Depression Anxiety & Stress Scales*. (2nd Ed.) Sydney: Psychology Foundation.
6. Lovibond, P. F., & Lovibond, S. H. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33(3), 335–343.
7. Ryff, C. D. (2021). Spirituality and well-being: Theory, science, and the nature connection. *Religions*, 2(11), 914. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12110914>
8. Sarah, S., Nick, C., Bryan, R., Terry, P., Frances, F., Heather, B., Keith, H., Jennifer, P., & Jonathan, P. (2018). Health and Well-Being of International University Students, and Comparison with Domestic Students, in Tasmania, Australia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(6), 1147. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15061147>
9. Sawir, E., Marginson, S., Deumert, A., Nyland, C., & Ramia, G. (2008). Loneliness and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12(2), 148–180.
10. Skevington, S. M., Lotfy, M., & O'Connell, K. A. (2004). The World Health Organization's WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment: Psychometric properties and results of the international field trial. *Quality of Life Research*, 13(2), 299–310.
11. Topp, C.W., Østergaard, S.D., Søndergaard S., & Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: a systematic review of the literature. *Psychother Psychosom*, 84(3), 167–76. doi: 10.1159/000376585. Epub 2015 Mar 28. PMID: 25831962.
12. Wills, T. A. (1991). Social support and interpersonal relationships. In M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Prosocial behavior*, 265–289. Sage Publications, Inc.
13. WHOQOL Group. (1998). Development of the World Health Organization WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. *Psychological Medicine*, 28(3), 551–558.
14. Yan, B. (2003). A study of the effect of social support on the subjective well-being of college students
15. Yuen, M., Lee, Q. A., & Chung, Y. B. (2021). Meaning in life, connectedness, and life skills
16. development in junior secondary school students: Teachers' perspectives in HongKong. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 39(1), 67–83.
17. Yulianti, I., & Cahyani, R. (2019). Relationship of meaningfulness of life and regularity performing prayers with psychological well-being in students. *Journal of Psychology*, 2(2), 169–180.
18. Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N.W., Zimet, S.G., & Farley, G.K. et al. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 30–41.



APPENDICES

Questionnaire

Variable	Item	code	Scale content	Scale source	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Social Support	Significant Others	SO1	someone support to you when needed make you feel positive about your life?	The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS).	0.832
		SO2	Someone cares about your feelings enhance your sense of happiness?		0.834
		SO3	Does having someone who comforts you improve your emotional well-being?		0.833
	Family	FA1	Does your family's help make you feel less stressed while studying?		0.836
		FA2	Does emotional support from your family improve your mental well-being?		0.835
		FA3	Can talking to your family about problems help you maintain emotional balance?		0.836
		FA4	Does your family's willingness to assist you make you feel more secure and confident?		0.835
	Friends	FR1	Do your friends' efforts to help you improve your well-being?		0.834
		FR2	Does being able to rely on friends make you feel emotionally supported?		0.833
		FR3	friendships share your feelings contribute to your happiness and sense of fulfillment?		0.833
		FR4	Can discussing personal concerns with friends improve your overall life satisfaction?		0.833
Quality of life	Physical health	PH1	How satisfied are you with your ability to perform your daily living activities?	Quality of life assessment (WHOQOL-BREF)	0.839
		PH2	How satisfied are you with your sleep?		0.836
		PH3	How satisfied are you with your capacity for work?		0.838
	Environmental	EC1	How safe do you feel in your daily life?		0.838
		EC2	How satisfied are you with the conditions of your living place?		0.837



	condition s	EC3	How satisfied are you with your access to health services?		0.838
		EC4	How satisfied are you with your transport?		0.837
Mental Health	Depression	DP1	I couldn't seem to experience any positive feeling at all	Depression , Anxiety and Stress Scale - 21 Items (DASS-21)	0.833
		DP2	I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things		0.835
		DP3	I felt that I had nothing to look forward to		0.833
		DP4	I felt down-hearted and blue		0.833
		DP5	I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything		0.833
		DP6	I felt I wasn't worth much as a person		0.83
		DP7	I felt that life was meaningless		0.832
	Anxiety	AX1	I was aware of dryness of my mouth		0.831
		AX2	I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g. excessively rapid breathing),		0.83
		AX3	I experienced trembling (e.g. in the hands)		0.831
		AX4	I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself		0.829
		AX5	I felt I was close to panic		0.831
		AX6	I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion		0.83
		AX7	I felt scared without any good reason		0.829
	Stress	SR1	I found it hard to wind down		0.827
		SR2	I tended to over-react to situations		0.828
		SR3	I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy		0.827
		SR4	I found myself getting agitated		0.829
		SR5	I found it difficult to relax		0.831
		SR6	I was intolerant of anything that kept me from getting on with what I was doing		0.83
		SR7	I felt that I was rather touchy		0.831



Subject well Being	Subject well Being	WB 1	I have felt cheerful in good spirits.	World Health Organizati on's five indicators of well- being (WHO-5)	0.832
		WB 2	I have felt calm and relaxed.		0.834
		WB 3	I have felt active and vigorous.		0.832
		WB 4	I woke up feeling fresh and rested.		0.836
		WB 5	My daily life has been filled with things that interest me.		0.836