

Psychological Well Being of Migrant Students

Rahmawati Rahmawati¹, Dyah Amelia Susanti², Putri Inayah³, Nor Khofifatus Sholehah⁴, Ari Khusumadewi⁵,

^{1,2,3,4,5} Guidance and Counseling, State University of Surabaya

Email: *¹24011355010@mhs.unesa.ac.id, ²25011355004@mhs.unesa.ac.id,

³24011355009@mhs.unesa.ac.id, ⁴25011355009@mhs.unesa.ac.id,

⁵arikhusumadewi@unesa.ac.id

Article

Submission

Accepted

Published

History:

Des 17th, 2025

Sept 8th, 2026

Oct 20th, 2026

Abstract. Migrant students those who relocate from their home regions to pursue higher education experience geographical displacement and social transitions that may influence their psychological well-being (PWB). This study aimed to examine the levels of PWB among migrant students on the island of Java (N = 126) using Ryff's multidimensional model. A cross-sectional design with purposive sampling was employed. Data were collected using Ryff's 18-item Psychological Well-Being Short Scale, which has been adapted and validated in the Indonesian context. Descriptive statistics, Mann-Whitney, Kruskal-Wallis, and Spearman's correlation tests were used for analysis. Results indicated that the overall PWB level was moderate (M = 48.07). Personal growth (M = 8.93) and environmental mastery (M = 8.78) emerged as the highest-scoring dimensions, while positive relationships with others was the lowest (M = 7.18). No significant gender differences were found in overall PWB; however, self-acceptance increased significantly with age ($r = 0.266$; $p < 0.05$). Residential status significantly influenced total PWB and personal growth, with students in boarding houses reporting the highest scores. These findings suggest that the PWB of migrant students is shaped more by psychological adaptation processes and contextual living arrangements than by demographic characteristics alone. The study contributes empirical evidence for developing university based mental health interventions targeting environmental mastery, personal growth, and social connectedness. Future research should employ longitudinal designs and more balanced samples to capture the developmental dynamics of PWB among migrant students.

Keywords: psychological well-being, migrant students, emerging adulthood, Ryff model, university students

A. INTRODUCTION

The transition from adolescence to emerging adulthood, typically occurring between ages 18 and 25, represents a critical developmental phase characterized by

exploration, instability, and identity formation (Arnett, 2000; Santrock, 2019). For many Indonesian students, this period coincides with geographical relocation to pursue higher education on islands different from their home regions, particularly when desired study programs are unavailable locally (Apriani et al., 2025; Indra et al., 2024). These migrant students defined as students who relocate from their hometowns to pursue higher education away from their families face compounded challenges: navigating developmental tasks of emerging adulthood while simultaneously adapting to unfamiliar physical, social, and cultural environments (Irham et al., 2022; Karimah et al., 2025). The cumulative stress of managing academic demands, financial independence, homesickness, and cultural adjustment can significantly undermine their psychological functioning (Yang, 2010; Sharma et al., 2022).

Prior research has established that psychological well-being (PWB) serves as a crucial protective factor against mental health difficulties among student populations. Kurniasari et al. (2019) found that 38% of Indonesian students exhibited low PWB, 46% demonstrated moderate levels, and only 16% reported high PWB. Furthermore, studies consistently demonstrate negative associations between PWB and loneliness among migrant students (Laksmidara & Nashori, 2022; Allo & Soetjningsih, 2025), suggesting that enhanced PWB may buffer against social isolation. Peer support also emerges as a significant contributor, accounting for 23.6% of variance in PWB (Indra et al., 2024), underscoring the importance of social networks in fostering psychological resilience. Importantly, higher PWB correlates with reduced anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideation (Yeh et al., 2023), making it a critical target for preventive interventions in higher education settings.

However, existing literature reveals several gaps. First, although studies have examined PWB among university students, few have specifically mapped the dimensional profiles of migrant students' PWB using validated multidimensional frameworks such as Ryff's model. Second, the influence of demographic characteristics particularly gender, age, and residential status on distinct PWB dimensions remains underexplored in the Indonesian context. Third, the majority of

available studies focus on clinical outcomes or general student populations without considering the unique geographical and cultural transitions experienced by migrant students. These gaps underscore the need for research that systematically examines how different aspects of PWB manifest among students living away from home and whether demographic factors differentially shape these dimensions.

Preliminary interviews with three migrant students (M1, M2, M3) conducted prior to this study provided initial insight into the phenomenon. All three participants reported significant difficulties in environmental mastery and positive relationships during their first semester, with M1 describing challenges in managing independent academic routines and social isolation, M2 highlighting cultural and communication barriers affecting self-acceptance, and M3 emphasizing peer support as crucial for belonging. Despite these struggles, all three identified personal growth over time, particularly in adaptability and decision-making. These preliminary findings suggested meaningful individual variation in PWB that warranted systematic investigation using standardized measures and broader sampling.

The theoretical framework guiding this study is Ryff's (1989) multidimensional model of psychological well-being, which conceptualizes PWB as comprising six interrelated dimensions: self-acceptance, positive relationships with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth. Unlike unidimensional approaches that equate well-being with happiness or life satisfaction, Ryff's eudaimonic perspective emphasizes optimal psychological functioning and the realization of human potential (Ryff & Singer, 2008). This framework is particularly relevant for migrant students because it captures both intrapersonal capacities (e.g., self-acceptance, personal growth) and interpersonal competencies (e.g., positive relationships), as well as the ability to manage environmental demands all of which are challenged during geographical relocation and educational transition.

Given these considerations, this study aimed to: (1) describe the levels of PWB and its six dimensions among migrant students in Java, (2) examine differences in PWB based on gender, age, and residential status, and (3) explore correlations between

demographic characteristics and PWB dimensions. The findings are expected to contribute empirical knowledge that informs counseling services, university orientation programs, and mental health policies targeting the unique needs of migrant students in Indonesia and similar contexts.

B. RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a cross-sectional quantitative design to examine the psychological well-being of migrant students. The cross-sectional approach was selected because it allows for efficient data collection across multiple participant groups at a single time point, providing a snapshot of PWB levels and their associations with demographic characteristics.

Participants and Sampling

Participants were recruited using purposive sampling based on the following inclusion criteria: (1) currently enrolled as undergraduate students on the island of Java, (2) aged 18–25 years, (3) originally from outside Java (migrant students), and (4) living away from parents (i.e., in boarding houses, rented rooms, dormitories, or with relatives). The final sample consisted of 126 migrant students. No formal power analysis was conducted; however, the sample size exceeds the minimum recommended for nonparametric analyses ($n > 30$ per group for Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests). Data were collected between March and April 2023 across multiple university campuses in East Java.

Instrument

Psychological well-being was measured using the Indonesian adaptation of Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Short Scale (18-item version; Humaidah & Mulyono, 2025). This instrument comprises six dimensions, each assessed with three items: self-acceptance, positive relationships with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth. The 18-item version was selected because it balances brevity with adequate psychometric properties, making it suitable for

student populations while retaining the multidimensional structure of the full-scale version (Garcia et al., 2023). In the Indonesian adaptation, the instrument demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.68 to 0.82 across dimensions (Humaidah & Mulyono, 2025), indicating adequate reliability for research purposes. Items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree). Positive items are scored directly (1–4), while negative items are reverse-coded so that higher total scores indicate higher levels of psychological well-being. Total PWB scores range from 18 to 72, with each dimension score ranging from 3 to 12.

Data Collection Procedure

Questionnaires were distributed both online via Google Forms and in printed format to accommodate participant preferences and accessibility. Prior to participation, all respondents were provided with an information sheet explaining the study's purpose, voluntary nature, and confidentiality protections. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Respondents were assured that their data would be anonymized and used solely for research purposes. No identifying information was collected to protect participant privacy. This study was conducted in accordance with ethical principles for research involving human participants as outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki.

Data Analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 27.0 for Windows. Preliminary data screening included tests for missing values, outliers, and normality. The normality of data distribution was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Since the data violated the assumption of normal distribution ($p < 0.001$), nonparametric statistical tests were employed for all inferential analyses.

Differences between two independent groups (gender: male vs. female) were analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U test. Differences among three or more independent groups (age categories: 18–20, 21–23, 24–25 years; residential status: boarding house, rented room, dormitory, living with family, other) were analyzed

using the Kruskal-Wallis H test. Relationships between variables were examined using Spearman's rank-order correlation. All hypothesis tests were two-tailed with a significance level set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

C. RESEARCH RESULTS

Participant Characteristics

The final sample comprised 126 migrant students, including 92 females (73%) and 34 males (27%). The majority of participants were aged 18–20 years ($n = 64$, 51%), followed by 21–23 years ($n = 53$, 42.1%) and 24–25 years ($n = 9$, 7%). Regarding residential status, most participants lived in boarding houses (kos; $n = 71$, 56%), followed by living with family ($n = 27$, 21%), dormitories ($n = 17$, 13%), rented rooms ($n = 7$, 6%), and other arrangements ($n = 4$, 3%). Preliminary normality testing using the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated non-normal data distribution ($p < 0.001$), justifying the use of nonparametric statistical approaches.

Descriptive Statistics of Psychological Well-Being

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for overall PWB and its six dimensions. The mean total PWB score was 48,07 ($SD = 3,469$), indicating a moderate level of psychological well-being. Among the six dimensions, personal growth recorded the highest mean score ($M = 8,93$, $SD = 1,586$), followed by environmental mastery ($M = 8,78$, $SD = 1,414$). In contrast, positive relationships with others was the lowest-scoring dimension ($M = 7,18$, $SD = 1,176$). Autonomy ($M = 7,92$, $SD = 1,143$), purpose in life ($M = 7,64$, $SD = 1,445$), and self-acceptance ($M = 7,62$, $SD = 1,212$) fell between these extremes.

Table. 1 Descriptive PWB and PWB dimensions in regional students

	Mean	SD	Median	N
PWB	48,07	3,469	48,00	126
Self-Acceptance	7,62	1,212	8,00	126
Positive Relationships with Other Individuals	7,18	1,176	7,00	126
Autonomy	7,92	1,143	8,00	126
Environmental Mastery	8,78	1,414	9,00	126

Life Purpose	7,64	1,445	8,00	126
Personal Growth	8,93	1,586	9,00	126
Gender	1,27	0,446	1,00	126
Age	3,67	1,775	3,00	126
Residence Status	2,48	1,827	1,00	126

PWB: *psychological well-being*, SD; *Standar deviasi*

Difference in PWB Based on Demographic Characteristics

Gender Differences. As shown in Table 2, the Mann-Whitney U test revealed no statistically significant differences between male and female migrant students in overall PWB or any of its six dimensions (all $p > 0.05$). The median PWB scores were nearly identical for females (48.00) and males (47.00), suggesting minimal gender-based variation in psychological well-being among this sample.

Table. 2 Differences in PWB by Gender					
Variabel	JK	Mean	SD	Median	P-Value
PWB	P	48,05	3,509	48,00	0,608
	L	48,12	3,409	47,00	
Self-Acceptance	P	7,53	1,271	8,00	0,196
	L	7,85	1,019	8,00	
Positive Relationships with other individuals	P	7,15	1,148	7,00	0,308
	L	7,26	1,263	8,00	
Autonomy	P	7,98	1,038	8,00	0,113
	L	7,76	1,394	7,50	
Environmental Mastery	P	8,74	1,474	9,00	0,676
	L	8,88	1,250	9,00	
Life Purpose	P	7,74	1,511	8,00	0,178
	L	7,38	1,231	7,00	
Personal Growth	P	8,91	1,615	9,00	0,960
	L	8,97	1,527	9,00	

PWB: *psychological well-being*, SD; *Standard deviation*, JK: *Gender*

Age Differences. The Kruskal-Wallis H test (Table 3) indicated no significant differences in total PWB across age groups ($p = 0,891$). However, the self-acceptance dimension demonstrated significant age-related differences ($p = 0,012$), with scores increasing progressively from the youngest group ($M = 7,30$, $SD = 1,268$) through the

middle group ($M = 7,92$, $SD = 1,107$) to the oldest group ($M = 8,11$, $SD = 0,782$). This pattern suggests a developmental trend in self-acceptance that warrants further investigation.

Table. 3 Differences in PWB in Age group					
Variabel	Age	Mean	SD	Median	P-Value
PWB	18-20	47,83	3,861	48,00	0,891
	21-23	48,38	3,001	48,00	
	24-25	48,00	3,317	48,00	
Self-Acceptance	18-20	7,30	1,268	7,00	0,012
	21-23	7,92	1,107	8,00	
	24-25	8,11	0,782	8,00	
Positive Relationships with Other Individuals	18-20	7,02	1,161	7,00	0,412
	21-23	7,34	1,091	7,00	
	24-25	7,44	1,667	7,00	
Autonomy	18-20	7,95	1,161	8,00	0,529
	21-23	7,94	1,183	8,00	
	24-25	7,56	0,726	7,00	
Environmental Mastery	18-20	8,69	1,511	9,00	0,755
	21-23	8,91	1,319	9,00	
	24-25	8,67	1,323	9,00	
Life Purpose	18-20	7,77	1,423	8,00	0,227
	21-23	7,40	1,335	7,00	
	24-25	8,22	2,048	8,00	
Personal Growth	18-20	9,11	1,644	9,00	0,095
	21-23	8,87	1,401	9,00	
	24-25	8,00	2,000	7,00	

PWB: psychological well-being, SD; Standar deviasi,

Residential Status Differences. As presented in Table 4, significant differences were observed in total PWB across residential status groups ($p = 0,027$). Migrant students living in boarding houses reported the highest PWB scores ($M = 48,76$, $SD = 3,155$), while those in rented rooms reported the lowest ($M = 44,71$, $SD = 3,147$). The most pronounced dimension-specific difference emerged in personal growth ($p = 0,007$), with boarding house residents scoring highest ($M = 9,25$, $SD = 1,471$) and rented room occupants scoring lowest ($M = 6,71$, $SD = 1,604$). Dormitory residents and those living with family demonstrated intermediate scores.

Table. 4 Differences in PWB in Residence Status

Variabel	Residence Status	Mean	SD	Median	P-Value
PWB	Kos	48,76	3,155	49,00	0,027
	Rent	44,71	3,147	44,00	
	Dormitory	48,24	3,527	50,00	
	Living With Family	47,30	3,667	48,00	
	Others	46,25	4,349	47,50	
Self-Acceptance	Kos	7,54	1,181	8,00	0,461
	Rent	8,43	1,134	9,00	
	Dormitory	7,53	1,007	8,00	
	Living With Family	7,67	1,387	8,00	
	Others	7,75	1,500	8,00	
Positive Relationships with Other Individuals	Kos	7,31	1,166	7,00	0,330
	Rent	7,14	1,464	7,00	
	Dormitory	6,94	1,144	7,00	
	Living With Family	7,15	1,167	7,00	
	Others	6,25	0,957	6,50	
Autonomy	Kos	7,97	1,069	8,00	0,868
	Rent	7,43	1,718	7,00	
	Dormitory	8,18	1,510	8,00	
	Living With Family	7,74	0,859	8,00	
	Others	8,00	1,414	7,50	
Environmental Mastery	Kos	8,96	1,292	9,00	0,052
	Rent	7,57	0,787	8,00	
	Dormitory	8,76	1,437	9,00	
	Living With Family	8,59	1,716	9,00	
	Others	9,00	1,414	8,50	
Life Purpose	Kos	7,73	1,567	8,00	0,628
	Rent	7,43	1,718	7,00	
	Dormitory	7,82	1,074	8,00	
	Living With Family	7,48	1,221	7,00	
	Others	6,75	1,708	6,50	
Personal Growth	Kos	9,25	1,471	9,00	0,007
	Rent	6,71	1,604	7,00	
	Dormitory	9,00	1,369	9,00	
	Living With Family	8,67	1,569	9,00	
	Others	8,50	1,732	9,00	

PWB: psychological well-being, SD; Standar deviasi,

Correlations Between PWB Dimensions and Demographic Characteristics

Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis (Table 5) revealed several noteworthy relationships. First, gender showed no significant correlation with total PWB ($r = -0.046$) or any of the six dimensions, confirming the absence of gender effects. Second, age demonstrated a significant positive correlation with self-acceptance ($r = 0.266$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that older migrant students reported higher self-acceptance, but age was unrelated to other dimensions or total PWB. Third, residential status showed a significant negative correlation with personal growth ($r = -0.180$, $p < 0.05$), suggesting that certain living arrangements (particularly rented rooms) were associated with lower personal growth, although the overall relationship with PWB was weak and non-significant ($r = -0.169$).

Most importantly, all six PWB dimensions were significantly and positively correlated with total PWB, with environmental mastery ($r = 0.617$, $p < 0.01$) and personal growth ($r = 0.600$, $p < 0.01$) demonstrating the strongest associations. Significant inter-dimension correlations were also observed, including positive relationships with self-acceptance ($r = 0.032$, $p < 0.05$), environmental mastery ($r = 0.307$, $p < 0.01$), purpose in life ($r = 0.016$, $p < 0.05$), and personal growth ($r = 0.032$, $p < 0.05$). Environmental mastery was also significantly correlated with personal growth ($r = 0.317$, $p < 0.01$). These interconnected relationships support the multidimensional

Table. 5 Correlation Statistics Between PWB and Demographics (Gender, Age Group, Residence Status Group)

	Gender	Age	Residence Status	PWB	Self-acceptance	Positive Relationships	Autonomy	Environmental Mastery	Life Purpose	Personal Growth
Gender	1									
Age	0.083	1								
Residence Status	0.128	0.168	1							
PWB	-0,046	0,011	-0,169	1						
Self-Acceptance	0,116	0.266**	0,070	0.354**	1					
Positive Relationships	0,091	0,107	-0,140	0.473**	0,032*	1				
Autonomy	0,142	-0,044	-0,037	0.232**	-0.105	-0.150	1			
Environmental Mastery	0,037	0,047	-0,138	0.617**	0.175	0.307**	-0.083	1		
Life Purpose	0,120	-0,026	-0,082	0.236**	-0.195	0,016*	0,090	-0,076	1	
Personal Growth	-0,005	-0,169	-0.180*	0.600**	0,039	0,032*	0,038	0.317**	-0,093	1

PWB= psychological well-being, JK= Gender, **significance correlation at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Significant correlation at 0.05 (2-tailed).

and integrative nature of Ryff's PWB model.

D. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the levels and correlates of psychological well-being among Indonesian migrant students using Ryff's six-dimensional framework. The findings contribute to the growing literature on student mental health by providing a nuanced understanding of how different aspects of PWB manifest among this population and how demographic factors relate to these dimensions. This discussion interprets the results in light of existing theory and research, addresses the study's implications, and acknowledges its limitations.

Overall Psychological Well-Being and Dimensional Patterns

The finding that migrant students demonstrated moderate overall PWB ($M = 48.07$ out of 72) aligns with previous research showing that university students, particularly those undergoing major life transitions, tend to report moderate rather than high psychological well-being (Allo & Soetjningsih, 2025; Kurniasari et al., 2019). This moderate level likely reflects the dual challenges inherent to migration and emerging adulthood: students are navigating developmental tasks of identity formation and independence while simultaneously adapting to unfamiliar academic, social, and cultural environments (Arnett, 2000; Santrock, 2019). The transitional nature of this phase, characterized by instability and exploration, may constrain the attainment of optimal psychological functioning while still allowing for functional adaptation.

The prominence of personal growth and environmental mastery as the highest-scoring dimensions warrants careful interpretation. Personal growth the sense of continuing development, openness to new experiences, and realization of potential may be particularly salient among migrant students precisely because geographical relocation forces them into novel situations that demand growth and adaptation (Ryff, 1989). Students living away from home must navigate unfamiliar academic systems, develop new social networks, manage independent living arrangements, and contend with cultural differences all of which challenge their existing competencies and create

opportunities for personal development. This interpretation is consistent with research on positive psychology in transitional contexts, where adversity often stimulates growth (Dong et al., 2024). Similarly, the high environmental mastery scores suggest that despite initial difficulties (as indicated by preliminary interviews), migrant students develop effective strategies for managing daily demands, academic pressures, and life responsibilities over time. The relocation itself requires rapid development of self-regulation and problem-solving skills, which may explain why environmental mastery emerged as a strength rather than a vulnerability.

Conversely, the finding that positive relationships with others was the lowest-scoring dimension is both noteworthy and theoretically consistent. Building warm, trusting, and supportive relationships requires time, effort, and opportunities for meaningful social interaction (Ryff & Singer, 2008). Migrant students must build social networks from scratch, often while simultaneously managing academic pressures and adjusting to new cultural norms of interpersonal communication. The preliminary interviews corroborated this difficulty, with participants describing social isolation and challenges in forming close connections during their first semester. This finding resonates with international research on first-year university adjustment, which consistently identifies social integration as one of the most challenging aspects of the transition to higher education (Tinto, 1993). The comparatively low scores on positive relationships underscore the need for universities to intentionally facilitate social connectedness among incoming migrant students through orientation programs, peer mentoring, and structured social activities.

Gender Differences: Absence of Significant Effects

The absence of significant gender differences in total PWB and all six dimensions represents an important finding that challenges assumptions that female students are inherently more vulnerable to psychological difficulties during transition. In this sample, male and female migrant students reported nearly identical PWB scores across all dimensions. This pattern suggests that the psychosocial challenges of living away from home—managing independent living, adapting to new environments,

building social networks, and academic pressure are experienced similarly by both genders. These findings support the emerging adulthood framework (Arnett, 2000), which posits that the developmental tasks of this period are relatively universal, transcending gender boundaries. While some research has reported gender differences in student well-being, often favoring males (Matud et al., 2019), the current findings suggest that in the Indonesian migrant student context, the common experience of relocation may override gender-based variation.

However, it is important to interpret this finding cautiously. The sample included a substantially larger proportion of females (73%) than males (27%), which may have affected the statistical power to detect small-to-moderate gender differences. Additionally, the absence of gender differences in total PWB does not preclude gender-based differences in coping styles, help-seeking behaviors, or the types of support students require. Future research with more balanced gender representation is needed to confirm these findings and explore potential interaction effects between gender and other contextual variables.

Age Differences: Developmental Trends in Self-Acceptance

While total PWB did not differ across age groups, the significant age-related increase in self-acceptance represents a theoretically meaningful finding that aligns with developmental perspectives on psychological maturation. Self-acceptance the ability to maintain positive attitudes toward oneself while acknowledging limitations increased consistently from ages 18–20 ($M = 7.30$) through 21–23 ($M = 7.92$) to 24–25 ($M = 8.11$). This pattern suggests that self-acceptance develops gradually over the emerging adulthood period, likely as a function of accumulated life experiences, increased self-understanding, and the resolution of identity exploration (Arnett, 2000; Ryff & Singer, 2008).

The correlation between age and self-acceptance ($r = 0.266$) provides further support for a developmental interpretation. Older migrant students, having spent more time navigating independent living, academic demands, and social relationships, may have accumulated experiences that fostered realistic self-appraisal

and self-compassion. This interpretation is consistent with Eriksonian developmental theory, which posits that identity resolution in young adulthood contributes to the capacity for intimacy and self-acceptance (Kamilla et al., 2022). For universities, this finding highlights the importance of developmental timing in mental health interventions: younger students (18–20 years) may benefit from targeted programs that foster self-awareness, self-compassion, and adaptive self-appraisal, while older students may require less intensive support in this domain.

Residential Status: Contextual Influences on Personal Growth

The finding that residential status significantly influenced total PWB and, more specifically, personal growth, provides compelling evidence that living arrangements matter for the psychological well-being of migrant students. Students living in boarding houses (kos) reported the highest levels of personal growth ($M = 9.25$), while those in rented rooms reported the lowest ($M = 6.71$). This substantial difference nearly 2.5 points on a 12-point scale requires careful interpretation.

Boarding houses, a common accommodation type in Indonesia, typically involve private rooms but shared common areas, kitchens, and often a community of other students. This arrangement may provide an optimal balance of independence and social connection: students must manage daily responsibilities independently, fostering environmental mastery and personal growth, while the presence of other residents offers opportunities for social interaction, peer support, and mutual learning. The shared living environment may naturally facilitate the development of adaptive coping strategies, problem-solving skills, and interpersonal competencies.

In contrast, migrant students living in rented rooms often isolated individual accommodations may experience greater loneliness and fewer opportunities for social learning and peer modeling. The significantly lower personal growth scores among this group ($M = 6.71$) suggest that isolation may impede the developmental benefits typically associated with independent living. This interpretation aligns with research on social connectedness and well-being, which consistently demonstrates that social integration supports psychological flourishing (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015). Similarly,

students living with family, while benefiting from emotional security and support, may have fewer opportunities to develop independence and adaptive coping, potentially limiting personal growth ($M = 8.67$).

The near-significant association between residential status and environmental mastery ($p = 0.052$) further supports the contextual interpretation. Students in rented rooms reported lower environmental mastery ($M = 7.57$) compared to boarding house residents ($M = 8.96$), suggesting that accommodation type influences not only growth opportunities but also the capacity to manage daily demands effectively. It should be noted, however, that the small sample size in the rented room group ($n = 7$) warrants caution in generalizing these findings. Nevertheless, the pattern highlights the need for universities to consider accommodation context when designing support services, particularly for migrant students in more isolated living arrangements.

Interconnections Between PWB Dimensions: Integrative Model Support

The strong inter-correlations among PWB dimensions provide empirical support for Ryff's (1989) integrative model, which conceptualizes psychological well-being as a multidimensional but coherent construct. The finding that environmental mastery ($r = 0.617$) and personal growth ($r = 0.600$) showed the strongest associations with total PWB is particularly noteworthy. However, it is important to interpret these correlations carefully: since these dimensions are components of the PWB construct, high correlations with total PWB are to be expected and do not indicate that environmental mastery or personal growth are independent "causes" of PWB. Rather, they suggest that these dimensions contribute substantially to observed variation in PWB within this sample.

The significant inter-dimension correlations, such as positive relationships with environmental mastery ($r = 0.307$) and environmental mastery with personal growth ($r = 0.317$), suggest reciprocal influences: migrant students who develop effective coping strategies for managing their environment may simultaneously enhance their capacity for growth and their ability to form meaningful social connections. Conversely, the absence of correlation between autonomy and other dimensions (with

the exception of age) suggests that autonomy the capacity for independent thinking and action may be relatively distinct from other PWB components, potentially reflecting its unique developmental trajectory during emerging adulthood. This pattern of interconnections provides empirical support for intervention approaches that target PWB holistically, recognizing that improvements in one dimension may cascade to benefit others.

Implications for Practice

The findings of this study have several practical implications for universities and mental health services serving migrant students. First, the moderate overall PWB levels and the specific challenges in positive relationships suggest the need for comprehensive orientation programs that deliberately foster social integration. Universities should consider implementing structured peer mentoring programs, interest-based social groups, and facilitated activities that help migrant students build connections during their first semester. Such programs could address the documented difficulties in forming supportive relationships, which were the lowest-scoring dimension in this study.

Second, the strong associations between environmental mastery and overall PWB underscore the importance of support services that help students develop practical competencies for independent living. Workshops on time management, financial literacy, stress management, and academic skills could enhance students' capacity to manage environmental demands, potentially improving overall PWB. The finding that boarding house residents showed higher PWB than those in isolated accommodations suggests that universities should consider the accommodation context when designing support services, perhaps targeting additional resources toward students in more isolated living arrangements.

Third, the developmental trend in self-acceptance increasing with age suggests that interventions should be developmentally tailored. Younger students (18–20 years) may benefit more from programs that foster self-awareness, self-compassion, and realistic self-appraisal, while older students may require less support in this

domain. Counseling services should be prepared to address different developmental needs across the emerging adulthood period.

Finally, the multidimensional nature of PWB and its interconnected dimensions suggest that comprehensive interventions targeting multiple aspects simultaneously self-acceptance, relationships, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose, and growth may be more effective than those addressing isolated dimensions. University counseling centers should consider offering holistic wellness programs that integrate psychological, social, and practical skill development.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The cross-sectional design precludes causal inferences, and the predominantly female sample (73%) limits generalizability. The use of purposive sampling from East Java universities further restricts the applicability of findings to broader migrant student populations. Additionally, self-report measures may introduce response bias, and the study did not include formal ethics committee approval.

Future research should employ longitudinal designs to examine causal relationships and developmental trajectories of PWB. More balanced gender samples and probability sampling techniques are needed to enhance generalizability. Studies should also investigate predictive factors such as social support, resilience, coping strategies, homesickness, and cultural adaptation to provide a more comprehensive understanding of PWB development among migrant students.

E. CONCLUSION

This study examined psychological well-being (PWB) among migrant students using Ryff's six-dimensional framework. The findings reveal moderate overall PWB, with personal growth and environmental mastery as the strongest dimensions, while positive relationships with others emerged as the most vulnerable aspect. Overall PWB did not differ by gender or age; however, self-acceptance increased with age, and residential status significantly influenced personal growth, with boarding house residents scoring highest and those in rented rooms lowest. These results indicate that

PWB among migrant students is shaped more by contextual factors and developmental processes than by demographic characteristics alone.

Universities should prioritize interventions that strengthen environmental mastery (e.g., workshops on time management and stress coping), foster personal growth through self-reflection and skill-building opportunities, and enhance social connectedness via peer mentoring and structured orientation programs. Particular attention should be given to students in isolated living arrangements. Future research should employ longitudinal designs and examine predictive factors such as social support, resilience, coping strategies, homesickness, and cultural adaptation to better understand the mechanisms underlying PWB development in this population.

F. REFERENCE LIST

- Allo, T. B., & Soetjningsih, C. H. (2025). Psychological well-being and loneliness in new students. *Journal of Malahayati Psychology*, 7(1), 155–164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33024/jpm.v7i1.19020>
- Apriani, D., Vidyastuti, V., & Ramadhan, R. (2025). Social support with. *Psychodynamics: Journal of Psychological Literacy*, 5(1), 123–132.
- 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>
- Barrera, M. (1986). Distinctions between social support concepts, measures, and models. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(4), 413–445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00922627>
- Dong, S., Ge, H., Su, W., Guan, W., Li, X., Liu, Y., Yu, Q., Qi, Y., & Zhang, H. (2024). Enhancing psychological well-being in college students: The mediating role of perceived social support and resilience in coping styles. *BMC Psychology*, 12(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01902-7>
- Eviliani, A., Nurhayaty, A., & Syah, T. A. (2024). Psychological well-being in regional students: Is there an effect of social support and self-adjustment? *Psyche Scientific Journal*.
- Firdaus, N., Pratikto, H., & Suhadianto. (2025). Safeguarding the soul overseas: The role of father involvement in the psychological well-being of regional students.

- Jiwa: Indonesian Journal of Psychology*, 3(1), 198–207. <https://jurnal.untag-sby.ac.id/index.php/jiwa>
- Garcia, D., Kazemitabar, M., & Asgarabad, M. H. (2023). The 18-item Swedish version of Ryff's psychological wellbeing scale: Psychometric properties based on classical test theory and item response theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1208300. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1208300>
- Heras, M. L., Grau, M. G., & Rofcanin, Y. (Eds.). (2022). *Human flourishing: A multidisciplinary perspective on neuroscience, health, organizations and arts* (1st ed.). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-09786-7>
- Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: A meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(2), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568352>
- Humaidah, A., & Mulyono, R. (2025). Adaptation of psychological well-being short scale in students. *Edukatif: Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(1), 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v7i1.7990>
- Indra, I. G., Satria, J., & Kurniawati, M. (2024). The effect of peer social support on psychological well-being (Study on migrant students). *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, 4(1), 2764–2775.
- Irham, S. S., Fakhri, N., & Ridfah, A. (2022). The relationship between loneliness and nomophobia in migrant students of the State University of Makassar. *J-Check: Journal of Scientific Scholars*, 1(4).
- Kamilla, N. K. N., Saputri, N. A. N. E., Fitriani, N. D. A., Zahrah, N. S. A., Andryana, N. P. F., Ayuningtyas, N. I., & Firdausia, N. I. S. (2022). Erik Erikson's theory of psychosocial development. *Early Childhood Journal*, 3(2), 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.30872/ecj.v3i2.4835>
- Karimah, H., Sukirno, A., & Syaputra, Y. D. (2025). The relationship between loneliness, nomophobia, and psychological well-being of migrant students. *Journal of Advanced Guidance and Counselling*, 6(1). <https://journal.walisongo.ac.id/index.php/agc>
- Kausar, S., & Ahmad, G. (2021). Perceived stress, self-efficacy and psychological wellbeing among performing arts students. *Academic Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(3), 289–302. <https://ojs.lgu.edu.pk/ajss/article/view/1509>
- Kurniasari, E., Rusmana, N., & Budiman, N. (2019). An overview of student psychological well-being. *Journal of Innovative Counseling: Theory, Practice &*

- Research, 3(2), 52–58.
http://journal.umtas.ac.id/index.php/innovative_counseling
- Laksmidara, M., & Nashori, F. (2022). The state of loneliness among migrating students: The effect of psychological well-being and religiosity. *International Journal of Islamic Educational Psychology*, 3(2), 172–187.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.18196/ijiep.v3i2.15613>
- Manuel, F., Espigares-L, I., Brown, T., & Manuel, P. (2022). The relationship between psychological well-being and psychosocial factors in university students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(13), 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134778>
- Matud, M. P., López-Curbelo, M., & Fortes, D. (2019). Gender and psychological well-being. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(19), 3531. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16193531>
- Moghe, S. (2024). A study on psychological well-being among university students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 12(1).
<https://doi.org/10.25215/1201.241>
- 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>
- Ryff, C. D. (2023). In pursuit of eudaimonia: Past advances and future directions. In M. L. Heras, M. G. Grau, & Y. Rofcanin (Eds.), *Human flourishing: A multidisciplinary perspective on neuroscience, health, organizations and arts* (pp. 9–31). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-09786-7_2
- Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(1), 13–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9019-0>
- Santrock, J. W. (2019). *Children* (14th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Sharma, A., Singh, T., Dhakar, J., & Bharti, A. (2022). Psychological well-being among college students: A study from Central India. *Asian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 13(1), 46–51. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ajms.v13i1.39350>
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Yang, Y.-T. (2010). *Stress, coping, and psychological well-being: Comparison among American and Asian international graduate students from Taiwan, China, and South Korea* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Texas at Austin.

Yeh, P., Moxham, L., Patterson, C., & Antoniou, C. (2023). A comparison of psychological well-being, coping strategies, and emotional problems between Taiwanese and Australian nursing students. *The Journal of Nursing Research*, 31(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JNR.0000000000000543>