EMPATHY: Jurnal Fakultas Psikologi
Vol. 8, No. 2, December 2025, pp. 211-225
ISSN-P 2303-114X | ISSN-O 2714-786X, 10.26555/empathy.v4i1

The relationship between family support and religiosity with gamophobia in career women: A correlational study

Repika Bonivia*, Bukhari Ahmad

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kerinci, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: boniviar@gmail.com

Article History:	Submission	Revised	Accepted	Published
	2025-11-19	2025-12-08	2025-12-17	2025-12-25

ABSTRACT

Excessive fear of marital commitment, known as gamophobia, among adult career women has received limited scholarly attention, particularly within psychosocial and religiosity frameworks. This study investigated the effects of family support and religiosity on gamophobia among career women aged 33 years and older. A quantitative correlational approach was applied using multiple regression analysis. The study involved 47 career women recruited through purposive sampling. Data were gathered using standardized Likert type instruments and analyzed with SPSS version 26. The findings revealed that family support ($\beta = -0.420$, $p < .001$) and religiosity ($\beta = -0.495$, $p < .001$) were significant negative predictors of gamophobia, with the model explaining 52% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.52$). These results highlight the complementary roles of social support in fostering emotional regulation and religiosity in providing existential meaning, both of which contribute to reducing fear related to marital commitment. From a practical perspective, the findings suggest that intervention programs integrating family support enhancement and religiosity reinforcement may be effective in alleviating gamophobia among adult career women.

Keywords: career women, family support, gamophobia, multiple regression analysis, religiosity

This is an open access article under the CC BY SA license.

Article citation:

Bonivia, R., & Ahmad, B. (2025). The relationship between family support and religiosity with gamophobia in career women: A correlational study. ***EMPATHY: Jurnal Fakultas Psikologi, 8***(2), 211–225. https://doi.org/10.12928/empathy.v8i2.31567

Introduction

Marriage represents a fundamental social institution characterized by emotional, legal, and moral commitment, and in many societies, including Indonesia, it is embedded within strong normative and cultural expectations [1, 2]. However, global demographic trends indicate a steady decline in marriage rates, particularly among young adults and professional women [3]. In China, for instance, official marriage registrations reached a 37 year low in 2022, with the most pronounced decrease observed in urban populations [4]. A

similar pattern has emerged in Indonesia, where the number of registered marriages declined from 2.01 million in 2018 to 1.58 million in 2023. This trend is especially evident among millennials, who increasingly postpone marriage due to career demands, personal aspirations, and evolving socio cultural pressures [5–7].

One psychological factor contributing to delayed or avoided marital commitment is gamophobia, defined as an excessive and persistent fear or anxiety related to marriage that interferes with readiness and decision making regarding long term relationships [8, 9]. Gamophobia is often shaped by a range of psychosocial influences, including prior relational trauma, ambiguity surrounding marital roles, and perceived social or familial expectations [10, 11]. Empirical evidence suggests that professional women may be particularly vulnerable to gamophobia due to occupational stress, concerns regarding partner compatibility, and negative past relationship experiences [12, 13]. Such fear may manifest as emotional distress, avoidance of commitment, and difficulties in establishing intimate relationships, reflecting the complex interplay between individual psychological processes and broader socio cultural norms.

The theory of relational regulation provides a relevant conceptual framework, positing that social support mitigates psychological distress by regulating emotional responses within close relationships [14]. Within this framework, family support may alleviate commitment related anxiety by offering emotional reassurance, instrumental assistance, and guidance, thereby reducing vulnerability to gamophobia [15]. In addition to social support, religiosity defined as adherence to religious beliefs, values, and practices has been shown to influence emotional regulation, moral reasoning, and life decision making. As such, religiosity may serve as a protective factor against excessive fear of marriage by fostering meaning making and psychological resilience [13, 16]. Previous studies have consistently demonstrated that higher levels of family support and religiosity are associated with greater marital readiness, improved psychological well being, and more adaptive coping strategies [17, 18].

Despite growing scholarly interest in marriage readiness and social support, empirical investigations specifically addressing predictors of gamophobia among career women aged 33 years and older remain scarce. Existing research has predominantly focused

on university students or the general population, leaving a critical gap in understanding how psychosocial and spiritual factors interact to influence commitment related fears among adult professional women. Addressing this gap is essential for identifying protective resources that may reduce anxiety surrounding marriage in this demographic group.

Accordingly, the present study aims to examine the effects of family support and religiosity on gamophobia among career women aged 33 years and above. By integrating psychosocial and spiritual perspectives, this study seeks to contribute empirical evidence to the literature on marital commitment anxiety and to offer theoretical and practical insights for enhancing emotional readiness and psychological well being among adult professional women facing decisions about marriage.

Research Method

Research Design

This study employed a cross sectional quantitative research design to examine the associations between family support, religiosity, and gamophobia among career women aged 33 years and older. A correlational approach was adopted as it allows for the assessment of relationships among variables without experimental manipulation. Data were collected at a single time point, enabling an efficient and direct analysis of the interrelationships between the studied constructs.

Participants and Sampling Procedure

The study sample comprised 47 career women recruited using purposive sampling, as this technique ensured the selection of participants who met the specific criteria relevant to the research objectives [19]. The inclusion criteria were: (1) women aged 33 years or older, (2) permanent employment status as career women, and (3) willingness to complete the research questionnaire. Participants were excluded if they were pregnant or reported severe mental health conditions that could potentially influence their responses.

The research was conducted in Sungai Penuh City and Kerinci Regency, areas characterized by sociocultural heterogeneity and considered representative of the broader context of career women in Indonesia. Sample size adequacy was determined using G*Power software (effect size = 0.50, $\alpha = 0.05$, power = 0.80), which indicated a minimum required sample of 34 participants [20]. Participant recruitment was facilitated through

professional networks and career women communities using electronic announcements, followed by the provision of written informed consent prior to data collection.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents (N = 47)

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	47	100.0
Age	33–35 years	40	85.1
	>35 years	7	14.9

As shown in Table 1, all respondents were female (100%, n = 47). In terms of age distribution, the majority of participants were between 33 and 35 years old (85.1%), while a smaller proportion were older than 35 years (14.9%). These findings indicate that the sample was predominantly composed of career women in early middle adulthood, consistent with the study's inclusion criteria.

Research Instruments

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire employing a 4 point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 4 = *Strongly Agree*), measuring three primary constructs.

Family Support was assessed using 16 items derived from the social support framework proposed by House and James [21]. The scale captures emotional, informational, and instrumental support provided by family members. A sample item is, *"My family provides emotional support when I feel stressed."* The internal consistency of the scale was excellent (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.91$).

Religiosity was measured using a 27 item instrument adapted from the Tadayyun Scale, encompassing the dimensions of faith, worship, and moral conduct [22]. The adaptation process followed standard cross cultural procedures, including back translation and expert validation by scholars in Islamic psychology. A representative item is, *"I feel a sense of peace when I read the Qur'an."* The religiosity scale demonstrated strong reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.89$).

Gamophobia was evaluated using a 21 item scale developed based on Terror Management Theory [23], designed to capture anxiety and avoidance related to marital commitment. An example item is, *"I am afraid that marriage would bring major changes to my life."* This scale showed high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.93$).

All scale scores were treated as interval data for the purposes of regression analysis. Construct validity was examined through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), which indicated satisfactory psychometric properties, with factor loadings exceeding 0.50, Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values above 0.50, and Composite Reliability (CR) values greater than 0.70 for all constructs.

Research Procedure

Prior to participation, all respondents provided informed consent. Data collection was conducted both online and offline, with an average completion time of approximately 20–30 minutes. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from [name of institution and certificate number], and all procedures complied with established ethical standards for psychological research involving human participants.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 28. The analytical process comprised several stages. First, descriptive statistics were calculated to examine the distribution and central tendencies of each study variable. Second, statistical assumption testing was conducted. Normality was assessed using skewness (±2), kurtosis (±7), and the Shapiro–Wilk test ($p > 0.05$). Multicollinearity was evaluated using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF < 5) and tolerance values (> 0.20). Homoscedasticity was examined through visual inspection of residual scatterplots.

Subsequently, regression analyses were performed. Simple linear regression was used to assess the partial effects of each independent variable on gamophobia, while multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the simultaneous influence of family support and religiosity on gamophobia. In cases where normality assumptions were not met, Spearman's rank order correlation was employed as a non parametric alternative.

Results and Discussion

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive analyses were conducted to summarize the distributional characteristics of the study variables, namely family support, religiosity, and gamophobia. Mean scores were calculated on a per item basis rather than as total raw scores to facilitate comparability

across constructs with differing numbers of items. Score categorization into low, moderate, and high levels was determined using the *Mean ± 1 SD* criterion [24]. The descriptive statistics for all research variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables (N = 47)

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	Kurtosis	Category
Family Support	47	49.48	8.39	34	68	0.21	–0.56	High
Religiosity	47	40.65	9.59	27	58	0.12	–0.48	High
Gamophobia	47	52.21	18.80	20	85	0.31	–0.22	Moderate–High

Note. N = number of participants; SD = standard deviation. Skewness and kurtosis values are reported as indicators of distribution normality. Variable categories were determined based on the *Mean ± 1 SD* method.

As shown in Table 2, family support exhibited a relatively high mean score (M = 49.48, SD = 8.39), with observed scores ranging from 34 to 68, indicating a high level of perceived family support among participants. Religiosity similarly demonstrated a high average score (M = 40.65, SD = 9.59), with values spanning from 27 to 58. In contrast, gamophobia showed a mean score of 52.21 (SD = 18.80), with scores ranging from 20 to 85, placing it within the moderate to high category.

The skewness and kurtosis values for all variables fell within acceptable thresholds (±2), suggesting approximately normal data distributions and supporting the suitability of the dataset for subsequent parametric analyses.

Classical Assumption Testing

Prior to conducting regression analyses, a series of classical assumption tests were performed to ensure the suitability of the data. These tests included assessments of normality using the Shapiro–Wilk test, multicollinearity using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and tolerance values, and heteroscedasticity using the Breusch–Pagan test. The results of these assumption tests are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 Results of Classical Assumption Tests

Assumption	Statistic	df	p value	Interpretation
Normality (Family Support)	W = 0.973	47	.274	Normal distribution
Normality (Religiosity)	W = 0.961	47	.119	Normal distribution
Normality (Gamophobia)	W = 0.972	47	.123	Normal distribution
Multicollinearity (VIF)	$X_1 = 1.114$; $X_2 = 1.114$	–	–	No multicollinearity
Heteroscedasticity (Breusch–Pagan)	$\chi^2 = 0.000$	1	1.000	Homoscedastic residuals

Note. X_1 = Family Support; X_2 = Religiosity. All variables met the assumptions of normality, absence of multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity.

As shown in Table 3, the Shapiro–Wilk test results for family support (W = 0.973, p = .274), religiosity (W = 0.961, p = .119), and gamophobia (W = 0.972, p = .123) were non significant (p > .05), indicating that all variables were normally distributed. Multicollinearity diagnostics revealed VIF values of 1.114 for both independent variables, well below the commonly accepted threshold, suggesting that multicollinearity was not a concern. Furthermore, the Breusch–Pagan test yielded a χ^2 value of 0.000 (p = 1.000), indicating homogeneity of residual variance. Collectively, these results confirm that the data satisfied the key assumptions required for regression analysis.

Correlations Among Study Variables

Pearson's productmoment correlation analysis was conducted to examine the bivariate relationships among family support, religiosity, and gamophobia. The correlation matrix is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Pearson Correlations Among Study Variables

Variable	1	2	3
1. Family Support	1	.538***	–.595***
2. Religiosity	.538***	1	–.644***
3. Gamophobia	–.595***	–.644***	1

Note. ***p < .001.

As indicated in Table 4, family support was positively and significantly correlated with religiosity (r = .538, p < .001), suggesting that participants who perceived greater family support also tended to report higher levels of religiosity. Importantly, family support exhibited a strong negative association with gamophobia (r = –.595, p < .001), indicating that higher levels of perceived family support were associated with lower levels of fear related to marital commitment. Similarly, religiosity demonstrated a significant negative correlation with gamophobia (r = –.644, p < .001), suggesting that individuals with stronger religious engagement experienced lower levels of gamophobia. Overall, these findings support the role of both family support and religiosity as protective factors against gamophobia among career women.

Regression Analysis

Simple Regression Analyses

Simple linear regression analyses were conducted to examine the independent effects of family support and religiosity on gamophobia among the respondents.

The first model assessed the effect of family support on gamophobia. The results indicated a strong and statistically significant negative association between family support and gamophobia ($B = –1.33$, $SE = 0.27$, $\beta = –0.60$, $t(45) = –4.97$, $p < .001$). The overall regression model was significant, $F(1, 45) = 24.69$, $p < .001$, accounting for 35.4% of the variance in gamophobia ($R^2 = .354$). The effect size was large, as indicated by Cohen's f^2 of 0.55, demonstrating that family support constitutes a substantial predictor of fear related to marital commitment.

A second simple regression model examined the effect of religiosity on gamophobia. The findings revealed a strong and significant negative relationship between religiosity and gamophobia ($B = –1.26$, $SE = 0.22$, $\beta = –0.64$, $t(45) = –5.64$, $p < .001$). This model was also statistically significant, $F(1, 45) = 31.86$, $p < .001$, explaining 41.4% of the variance in gamophobia ($R^2 = .414$). The associated effect size was large (Cohen's $f^2 = 0.71$), indicating that religiosity is a particularly robust predictor of reduced gamophobia among career women.

Multiple Regression Analysis

To examine the combined contribution of family support and religiosity in predicting gamophobia, a multiple regression analysis was performed. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Gamophobia (N = 47)

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI
Family Support (X_1)	–0.94	0.24	–0.42	–3.97	< .001	[–1.42, –0.46]
Religiosity (X_2)	–0.97	0.21	–0.50	–4.68	< .001	[–1.40, –0.54]
Constant	176.99	16.80	–	10.54	< .001	–

Note.

- *Model statistics:* $R^2 = .598$; Adjusted $R^2 = .582$; $F(2, 44) = 31.62$, $p < .001$; Cohen's $f^2 = 1.48$ (large effect).
- *Assumption diagnostics:* No evidence of multicollinearity (VIF < 2); residuals were normally distributed; no influential outliers were detected (Cook's D < 1).

As shown in Table 5, both family support and religiosity emerged as significant negative predictors of gamophobia. Family support was associated with a significant reduction in gamophobia (B = –0.94, SE = 0.24, β = –0.42, $p < .001$), indicating that higher perceived family support corresponded to lower levels of fear regarding marital commitment. Religiosity demonstrated a stronger negative effect (B = –0.97, SE = 0.21, β = –0.50, $p < .001$), suggesting that increased religious engagement contributed more substantially to the reduction of gamophobia than family support alone. The 95% confidence intervals for both predictors did not include zero, confirming the robustness and stability of the estimated coefficients.

Overall, the model explained approximately 59.8% of the variance in gamophobia, indicating that family support and religiosity jointly play a critical role in understanding commitment related fear among career women.

Discussion

The results of the multiple regression analysis demonstrate that both family support (β = –0.420, $p < .001$) and religiosity (β = –0.495, $p < .001$) significantly contribute to the reduction of gamophobia among career women aged 33 years and above. These findings suggest that psychosocial and spiritual resources play a critical protective role in alleviating fear related to marital commitment in this population.

From a psychosocial perspective, family support appears to operate primarily through emotional regulation and enhanced interpersonal security, consistent with the relational regulation theory [14, 25, 26]. Emotional, informational, and instrumental support provided by family members offers stable social validation and reassurance, which can mitigate anxiety associated with long term relational commitments, including marriage. This finding aligns with prior studies demonstrating that family support reduces pre marital anxiety and enhances marital readiness and psychological well being [27, 28].

Notably, religiosity emerged as a slightly stronger predictor of reduced gamophobia than family support. This finding may be explained by the internalization of values and life meaning inherent in religious engagement, which serves as a buffer against existential anxiety, as proposed by Terror Management Theory [29, 30]. Intrinsic religiosity provides individuals with a coherent moral framework, self regulatory capacities, and a sense of purpose, enabling career women to manage commitment related fears more consistently than

reliance on external sources of support alone [31, 32]. These results corroborate previous empirical evidence highlighting the role of religiosity in marital decision making, psychological resilience, and subjective well being [33, 34].

Importantly, the present findings underscore the complementary functioning of social support and religiosity. Family support facilitates emotional regulation through social co regulation and relational reassurance, whereas religiosity fosters existential meaning, cognitive reframing, and internal psychological stability [34–37]. In this sense, family support primarily addresses commitment related fear through affective and relational pathways, while religiosity reduces such fear through cognitive mechanisms and deeply internalized value systems [30, 38, 39]. The integration of these mechanisms provides a more comprehensive understanding of how gamophobia is mitigated among adult career women.

Comparisons with previous research further contextualize these findings. For instance, studies focusing on younger adult populations have reported different patterns of predictors related to marital anxiety [40]. By contrast, the present study specifically examines career women aged 33 years and older, a group that encounters distinct psychosocial pressures related to career advancement, family expectations, and societal norms surrounding marriage. These developmental and contextual differences highlight that the interaction between psychosocial and religious factors varies across life stages, thereby shaping unique manifestations of gamophobia.

Theoretically, this study extends the conceptualization of gamophobia beyond a purely clinical or individual level phenomenon, positioning it as a socio cultural construct shaped by the interplay of social support systems and religiosity. The findings suggest that gamophobia among adult career women reflects not only personal anxiety but also broader social influences, cultural values, and the internalization of belief systems. As such, this study contributes to the growing literature linking psychosocial resources, religiosity, and fear of marital commitment.

From a practical standpoint, the results have important implications for intervention strategies. Programs aimed at reducing gamophobia may benefit from strengthening family based support, particularly through enhancing emotional communication, validation of life choices, and instrumental assistance. Concurrently, religious or spiritual interventions may

focus on fostering value internalization, meaning making, and existential coping strategies. An integrated intervention approach that combines psychosocial and spiritual components is likely to be more effective than single domain interventions.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that both family support and religiosity function as protective factors against gamophobia among adult career women. While family support primarily reduces anxiety through affective and relational co regulation, religiosity exerts its influence through internalized values and existential meaning. These results underscore the importance of adopting a multidimensional framework when addressing fear of marital commitment in adult professional women.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that both family support and religiosity exert significant negative effects on gamophobia among career women aged 33 years and older, with religiosity exhibiting a slightly stronger influence than family support. These findings lend empirical support to relational regulation theory and terror management theory, suggesting that emotional regulation facilitated by social support and existential meaning derived from religiosity jointly contribute to the reduction of fear related to marital commitment.

From an applied perspective, the results highlight the importance of intervention strategies that integrate the enhancement of family support with the strengthening of religious or spiritual values to more effectively alleviate gamophobia among adult career women. Furthermore, this study extends the existing literature by shifting the focus of gamophobia research beyond college students and young adults to include adult professional women, thereby underscoring the role of interacting psychosocial and religious factors in shaping commitment related anxiety.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The cross sectional design restricts causal inferences, and the relatively small, region specific sample limits the generalizability of the findings. Future research is encouraged to employ longitudinal designs and larger, more diverse samples to further elucidate the developmental dynamics of gamophobia and to examine the long term roles of psychosocial resources and religiosity in mitigating commitment related fear.

Author Contributions

Author 1 was responsible for the overall research process, including study design, data collection, data analysis, and preparation of the final manuscript. Author 1 also led the writing process and collaborated closely with Author 2 to ensure content consistency, analytical accuracy, and adherence to established scientific and ethical standards.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] Susanto, A., & Bisyaroh, N. (2022). Pernikahan beda agama menurut perspektif hukum Islam dan Undang-Undang No. 1 Tahun 1974. ***SAMAWA: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam***, *2*(2), 65–73. https://doi.org/10.53948/samawa.v2i2.61

[2] Repi, A. A., & Maliombo, N. E. (2022). Career or relationship: Which should I choose? Marriage decision-making among career women. ***Psychopreneur Journal***, *6*(2), 60–75. https://doi.org/10.37715/psy.v6i2.2687

[3] Putri, H. (2025). Marriage is scary trend: Narratives of fear of marriage for women. ***Glocal Society Journal***, *2*(1), 11–24. https://doi.org/10.31947/gs.v2i1.45155

[4] Chang, J. N. (2024). Why do Chinese women experience gamophobia? Psychoanalytic theory–assisted discourse analysis. ***Frontiers in Psychology***, *15*, Article 1357795. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1357795

[5] Adhani, A. F., & Aripudin, A. (2024). Perspektif Generasi Z di platform X terhadap penurunan angka pernikahan di Indonesia. ***Jurnal Komunikasi Islam (JKIs)***, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.53429/jkis.v5i1.1001

[6] Nurviana, A., & Hendriani, W. (2021). Makna pernikahan pada generasi milenial yang menunda pernikahan dan memutuskan untuk tidak menikah. ***Buletin Riset Psikologi dan Kesehatan Mental***, *1*(2), 1037–1045. https://doi.org/10.20473/brpkm.v1i2.27995

[7] Safiudin, K. (2024). Gender problems in Indonesia: The phenomenon of gamophobia in a permissive society. ***Nisa: Jurnal Kajian Perempuan dan Keislaman***, *17*(1), 56–65. https://doi.org/10.35719/annisa.v17i1.245

[8] Bahjatunnisa, B. (2024). Kecemasan wanita karir terhadap ikatan pernikahan (Adaptasi kasus gamophobia). ***Jurnal Mandalika Literature***, *5*(4), 1039–1044. https://doi.org/10.36312/jml.v5i4.3627

[9] Ossai, M. O., & Chujor, C. J. (2023). Some social predictors of gamophobia among unmarried postgraduate students in tertiary institutions in Rivers State. ***British Journal of Education***, *11*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.37745/bje.2023/vol11n11324

[10] Alifa, I. N., & Mirna, N. A. A. (2024). Fenomena gamophobia pada Gen Z dampak dari kasus perceraian orang tua. ***Sabana: Jurnal Sosiologi, Antropologi, dan Budaya Nusantara***, *3*(3), 243–248. https://doi.org/10.55123/sabana.v3i3.3361

[11] Jarwan, A. S., & Al Rub, Y. K. A. (2024). Gamophobia and its relationship with family communication patterns among unmarried postgraduate students at Yarmouk University. ***Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture***, *8*, 206–227. https://doi.org/10.70082/esiculture.vi.682

[12] Afzal, M., & Akhtar, S. (2025). Marriage proposal, body image concern, gamophobia, and life satisfaction in university students. ***Journal of Asian Development Studies***, *14*(3), 802–808. https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2025.14.3.66

[13] Tyara, R., Mirza, M., Rachmatan, R., & Aprilia, E. D. (2023). Religiusitas dan pengambilan keputusan menikah pada mahasiswi. ***Seurune: Jurnal Psikologi Unsyiah***, *6*(2), 237–249. https://doi.org/10.24815/sjpu.v6i2.28709

[14] Lakey, B., & Orehek, E. (2011). Relational regulation theory: A new approach to explain the link between perceived social support and mental health. ***Psychological Review***, *118*(3), 482–495. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023477

[15] Priharsiwi, D., & Kurniawati, T. (2021). Family support and dietary adherence among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: A literature review. ***Proceedings of the National Health Seminar***, *1*, 324–335. https://doi.org/10.48144/prosiding.v1i.679

[16] Sayyidah, A. F., Mardhotillah, R. N., Sabila, N. A., & Rejeki, S. (2022). The role of Islamic religiosity in enhancing psychological well-being. ***Al Qalb: Jurnal Psikologi Islam***, *13*(2), 103–115. https://doi.org/10.15548/alqalb.v13i2.4274

[17] Annisa, N. M., & Fadhilla, P. Y. A. (2020). "I'm here for you": The relationship between social support and marriage readiness in early adulthood. ***Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi***, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.37278/jipsi.v2i1.302

[18] Matar Touma, V., Saad Harfouche, J., & Touma, N. (2025). *Validation of Matar Touma Perceptual-Emotional Maturity Scale (MTPEMS) through the drawing of a person: Age 3 to 12 years*. **European Review of Applied Psychology, 75**(2), Article 101027. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2024.101027

[19] Etikan, I. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. ***American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics***, *5*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

[20] Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1. ***Behavior Research Methods***, *4*1(4), 1149–1160. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

[21] Altun, A., & Duran, S**.** (2025). *Determining the job stress, quality of work life, and social support systems of care staff working in nursing homes and elderly care and rehabilitation centers*. ***Geriatric Nursing, 65***, Article 103470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gerinurse.2025.103470

[22] Rahmawati, R., Junaidi, J., Sabri, S., Mustika, I., & Sumardin, S. (2025). *Religiosity role on Islamic bank consumers' self-esteem, mortal salience and social responsibility (CnSR): A terror management theory (TMT) perspective*. ***International Journal of Social Economics, 52***(11), 1570–1583. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-02-2024-0105

[23] Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Pyszczynski, T. (1997). Terror management theory of self-esteem and cultural worldviews. ***Advances in Experimental Social Psychology,*** **29**, 61–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60016-7

[24] Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587

[25] Siregar, R. N., Prabawanto, S., Mujib, A., & Rangkuti, A. N. (2021). Family support factors influencing students' interest in mathematics education. ***JIPMat***, *6*(2), 250–260. https://doi.org/10.26877/jipmat.v6i2.9196

[26] Arsini, Y., Sitompul, F. A. F., & Nasution, K. A. (2023). Social psychology and human behavior. ***Guruku: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sosial Humaniora***, *1*(3), 174–190. https://doi.org/10.59061/guruku.v1i3.274

[27] Wang, X., Wang, S., Yang, D., Chu, Y., Hao, Y., & Dai, H. (2022). *Associations among resilience, hope, social support, stress, and anxiety severity in Chinese women with abnormal cervical cancer screening results*. ***Heliyon, 8***(12), Article e12539. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12539

[28] Batmaz, H., Alkhulayfi, A. M. A., & Yıldırım, M. (2025). *Religiosity and psychological adjustment: A chain mediation model of social media addiction and loneliness*. ***Mental Health and Social Inclusion, 29***(6), 729–742. https://doi.org/10.1108/MHSI-02-2025-0067

[29] Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., & Solomon, S. (1999). A dual-process model of defense against death-related thoughts. ***Psychological Review***, *106*(4), 835–845. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.106.4.835

[30] Jonas, E., & Fischer, P. (2006). Terror management and religion. ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology***, *91*(3), 553–567. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.3.553

[31] Walsh, F. (2016). Applying a family resilience framework. **Family Process**, 55(4), 616–632. https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12260

[32] Phuangkhem, W., Phongphanngam, S., Opasanant, P., Nawai, A., & Ross, R. (2025). *Health literacy, social support, self-management behavior, and quality of life among community-dwelling older adults with hypertension in Northern Thailand*. ***Geriatric Nursing, 64***, Article 103427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gerinurse.2025.103427

[33] Tyara, R., Mirza, M., Rachmatan, R., & Aprilia, E. D. (2023). Religiusitas dan pengambilan keputusan menikah pada mahasiswi. ***Seurune: Jurnal Psikologi Unsyiah***, 6(2), 237–249. https://doi.org/10.24815/sjpu.v6i2.28709

[34] Rufaidah, I., & Setiasih, S. (2024). Single women's happiness in terms of social support and religiosity. ***Nisa: Jurnal Kajian Perempuan dan Keislaman***, 17(1), 41–54. https://doi.org/10.35719/annisa.v17i1.270

[35] Amir, Y., & Lesmawati, D. R. (2016). Religiosity and spirituality: Similar or different concepts? **Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Psikologi**, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.22236/jippuhamka.v2i2

[36] Guo, L., Zhang, Y., Zhou, Y., Yu, J., Yang, X., Bai, L., Lu, Q., & Bi, X. (2025). *Readiness for hospital discharge and associated factors in patients with oral cancer: A cross-sectional study*. ***European Journal of Oncology Nursing, 74***, Article 102777. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejon.2025.102777

[37] Manalu, G. R., & Kusumiati, R. Y. E. (2025). Social support and resilience in emerging adulthood following parental loss. ***Jurnal Psikologi Malahayati***, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.33024/jpm.v7i1.15386

[38] Vail, K. E., Rothschild, Z. K., Weise, D. R., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Greenberg, J. (2010). A terror management analysis of religion. ***Personality and Social Psychology Review***, *14*(1), 84–94. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309351165

[39] Cohen, A. B., Pierce, J. D., Chambers, J., Meade, R., Gorvine, B. J., & Koenig, H. G. (2005). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity and life satisfaction. ***Journal of Research in Personality***, *39*(3), 307–324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2004.02.005

[40] Lantz, E. D., & Nadorff, D. K. (2026). *An attitude of gratitude: How psychological and social resources mediate the protective effect of religiosity on depressive symptoms*. ***Journal of Affective Disorders, 397***, Article 120851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2025.120851