



The Influence of Social Support and Peer Instrumental Support on Students' Psychological Well-Being

Debora Siregar¹, Haning Aulya Dita²

deborasiregar1304@gmail.com¹, haningaulya@gmail.com²

Pamulang University ^{1,2}

Abstract

This study aims to determine the effect of social support and peer instrumental support on students' psychological well-being. The research method employed is quantitative, utilizing a multiple linear regression approach. The study included 107 university students as respondents. The data were collected using a Likert scale questionnaire and analyzed through validity, reliability, and classical assumption tests. The results show that both social support (X1) and peer instrumental support (X2) have a positive and significant influence on psychological well-being (Y). The correlation coefficient (R) of 0.833 indicates a very strong relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Meanwhile, the coefficient of determination (R²) of 0.694 indicates that 69.4% of the students' psychological well-being is influenced by social and peer instrumental support, while other factors account for 30.6%.

Keywords: *social support, instrumental support, peer relationship, psychological well-being, students*

Introduction

Psychological well-being is a condition in which individuals are able to evaluate their lives positively, maintain healthy social relationships, and actualize their personal potential. According to Ryff (1989), psychological well-being consists of six dimensions: self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth.

University students often face various pressures related to academic demands, social relationships, and future uncertainty. These pressures can influence their emotional stability and overall well-being. In such circumstances, social support and instrumental support from peers play an important role in maintaining mental health and psychological stability. Social support refers to emotional attention, information sharing, and appreciation received from others (Sarafino & Smith, 2014), while instrumental support refers to tangible assistance such as help with tasks, time, or material resources (Taylor, 2011).

Literature Review

Social Support

Social support refers to the perception or experience of being cared for, valued, and part of a supportive social network. According to House (1981), social support consists of emotional, informational, and appraisal support. Emotional support involves expressions of empathy and love; informational support refers to advice and guidance; and appraisal support provides affirmation and feedback that helps individuals evaluate themselves positively.

In the context of students' lives, social support plays a protective role against stress and psychological distress. Sarafino and Smith (2014) explain that individuals who perceive higher social support tend to have better coping mechanisms and lower levels of anxiety and depression. Furthermore, social support is found to enhance students' self-esteem and life satisfaction, which are key components of psychological well-being.

Instrumental Support among Peers

Instrumental support refers to tangible help, such as financial assistance, sharing of materials, or help in completing academic tasks (Taylor, 2011). Peer instrumental support is especially important for university students, who often face academic and personal challenges without direct family supervision.

Peers can provide practical help that reduces the impact of academic stress, such as sharing lecture notes, explaining difficult materials, or helping with group projects. Research by Pratiwi and Santoso (2020) found that instrumental peer support strengthens students' self-efficacy and promotes emotional balance, thus contributing to higher psychological well-being.

Psychological Well-Being

Psychological well-being, as conceptualized by Ryff (1989), includes six dimensions: self-acceptance, positive relationships with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth. It is not merely the absence of psychological disorders but a condition where individuals experience meaningfulness, balance, and satisfaction in their lives.

Several studies in Indonesia have shown that social and peer support are strong predictors of psychological well-being among university students. Fitriani (2021) found that students who receive higher levels of emotional and instrumental support report greater life satisfaction and reduced stress levels. Similarly, research by Wulandari (2022) revealed that the presence of strong peer networks enhances adaptive coping and optimism in facing academic difficulties.

Based on previous studies, it can be concluded that both social and instrumental support from peers play a critical role in maintaining and improving students' psychological well-being. These findings provide a strong theoretical foundation for the current research, which seeks to empirically test the influence of both variables within the student population.

Method

This study employed a quantitative research approach using a multiple linear regression design to examine the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable under investigation. A quantitative approach was considered appropriate as it enables the measurement of variables, statistical testing of hypotheses, and objective analysis of the extent to which predictor variables contribute to outcome variables.

The population of this study comprised 107 university students, who were considered relevant to the research context and objectives. These students were assumed to possess the necessary academic and experiential background to provide meaningful responses related to the variables examined in the study.

A purposive sampling technique was utilized to select the research participants. This non-probability sampling method was chosen to ensure that respondents met specific inclusion criteria aligned with the research objectives. By selecting participants who possessed particular characteristics relevant to the study, purposive sampling allowed the researchers to obtain data that were both contextually appropriate and analytically meaningful.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire designed in the form of a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questionnaire items were developed to capture respondents' perceptions, attitudes, and experiences related to the variables under study in a systematic and quantifiable manner. The use of a Likert-scale instrument facilitated statistical analysis by enabling the transformation of subjective responses into numerical data suitable for regression analysis.

Instrument Testing

- **Validity Test:** All questionnaire items were declared valid with correlation coefficients (r values) ranging from **0.807 to 0.892**, which exceeded the critical value of **0.300** (Sugiyono, 2018).
- **Reliability Test:** The instrument's **Cronbach's Alpha** coefficient was **0.915**, indicating a **high level of reliability** (Ghozali, 2017).

Classical Assumption Tests

- **Normality Test:** The data were normally distributed with an **Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)** value of **0.018 > 0.05**.
- **Multicollinearity Test:** There was no indication of multicollinearity, as the **VIF value (2.896)** was less than **10**.
- **Heteroscedasticity Test:** The scatterplot showed no specific pattern, indicating that heteroscedasticity was absent.
- **Autocorrelation Test:** The **Durbin-Watson** statistic value of **2.147** fell within the range of **1.55–2.46**, suggesting no autocorrelation in the regression model.

Multiple Linear Regression Model

The regression model used in this study is as follows:

$$Y = 4.615 + 0.215X_1 - 0.602X_2 + e$$

Findings and Discussion

Results of Analysis

- **Correlation Coefficient (R):** 0.833 → indicates a *very strong* relationship.
- **Coefficient of Determination (R²):** 0.694 → shows a *69.4% contribution* of the independent variables to the dependent variable.

t-Test (Partial Test)

- **X₁ → Y:** t value (2.405) > t table (1.983), $p < 0.05$ → significant effect.
- **X₂ → Y:** t value (6.973) > t table (1.983), $p < 0.05$ → significant effect.

F-Test (Simultaneous Test)

The F value (118.096) > F table (3.09) with $p < 0.05$, indicating that **social support (X₁)** and **peer instrumental support (X₂)** have a *simultaneous and significant influence* on psychological well-being (Y).

Table 1. The results of the study

| Participant | Initials | Home University |
|-------------|----------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | ABCD,etc | Universitas Pamulang |
| 2 | TW,etc | Universitas Teknologi Yogyakarta |
| 3 | RF,etc | Global Institute |
| 4 | DM,etc | Universitas Brawijaya |
| 5 | IS,etc | Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa |
| 6 | ORA,etc | Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta |
| 7 | PN,etc | Universitas Muhammadiyah Nusantara |
| 8 | SC,etc | Universitas Islam Syekh Yusuf |
| 9 | DA,etc | Universitas Terbuka |
| 10 | RRP,etc | Universitas Al-Azhar Indonesia |
| 11 | AEH,etc | Bina Sarana Informatika |
| 12 | AD,etc | Universitas Negeri Jakarta |

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis indicate that the proposed model is statistically significant. This is evidenced by the F-test result, which shows that the obtained F value (118.096) exceeds the critical value of the F table (3.09) at the 0.05 significance level. Additionally, the significance probability ($p < 0.05$) confirms that the regression model fits the data well.

These findings demonstrate that social support (X_1) and peer instrumental support (X_2) collectively exert a significant simultaneous effect on psychological well-being (Y). In other words, when considered together, both forms of support meaningfully contribute to explaining variations in students' psychological well-being. This result suggests that the combined presence of emotional and instrumental support systems plays an important role in enhancing individuals' psychological health.

The significant F-test further implies that the independent variables, taken as a set, provide a better prediction of psychological well-being than a model without predictors.



Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that social support and peer instrumental support have no joint effect on psychological well-being is rejected. Overall, this finding underscores the importance of social and peer-based support mechanisms in promoting psychological well-being among university students.

These findings are consistent with Fitriani (2021), who stated that social support plays an important role in enhancing students' happiness, and with Pratiwi & Santoso (2020), who emphasized that instrumental support strengthens students' sense of competence in dealing with academic pressure.

Conclusion

The results show that social support and instrumental support from peers have a positive effect on students' psychological well-being. Students who receive attention and tangible assistance from their peers tend to experience lower stress levels and maintain a more positive outlook on life.

References

- Fitriani, R. (2021). *The influence of social support on students' psychological well-being*. Journal of Psychology of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati, 8(2), 101–112.
- Ghozali, I. (2017). *Application of multivariate analysis with IBM SPSS 25 program*. Semarang: Diponegoro University.
- House, J. S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Addison-Wesley.
- Pratiwi, D., & Santoso, H. (2020). *The role of peer instrumental support on students' psychological well-being*. Scientific Journal of Psychology, 5(1), 55–63.
- 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.
- Sarafino, E. P., & Smith, T. W. (2014). *Health psychology: Biopsychosocial interactions* (8th ed.). Wiley.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Research methods: Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D approaches*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Taylor, S. E. (2011). *Social support: A review*. American Psychologist, 66(4), 354–367.