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Abstract

Culture shock is one of the main problems for newcomer students. Some factors influencing culture shock include social support, emotional intelligence, and resilience. This study aimed to investigate the direct effect of social support and emotional intelligence on culture shock and indirectly through resilience. 85 newcomer students participated in the study filling the Culture Shock Questionnaire developed by Mumford in 1998, the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support developed by Zimmet et al in 1988, The Brief Resilience Scale by Smith in 2008, and Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire developed by Victor Dulewicz & Malcolm Higgs in 1999. The data were analyzed by using SmartPLS 3.0. The result of the study showed that social support and emotional intelligence influenced culture shock significantly. Also, the result showed that resilience had a mediation effect on those relationships. The institution or university needs to create a learning environment which facilitate diversity. Thus, guidance and counseling services should be utilized to avoid and overcome the culture shock problem.
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INTRODUCTION

Culture shock is one main problem experienced by students, especially for the regional students in the first semester. Culture shock is the first term used by Oberg to describe the suffering experienced by some American expatriates migrating abroad (Oberg, 1960). Mumford explains that when an individual is in an unfamiliar cultural environment for the first time, they often experience some emotional disturbance (Mumford, 1998). The excellent conclusion for the concept of culture shock offered by Taft conceptualizes culture shock as consisting of six different aspects, including the tension of adapting to a new culture, a sense of loss, confusion in role expectations and self-identity, feelings of rejection by members of the new culture, anxiety, and feelings of helplessness due to not being able to cope with the new environment (Bochner, 1986).

Although culture shock has been considered a negative point, Adler argues that culture shock presents excellent opportunities for cultural studies and personal growth (Adler, 1975). Dabrowski calls this opportunity positive disintegration, in which self-disintegrates to find another meaningful self. This disintegration can produce a new and positive identity in dealing with oneself and others (Montuori & Fahim, 2004).

Besides, culture shock must be overcome because it can cause distress and discomfort and contribute to human suffering. Ultimately, it affects intercultural relations, international relations, global trade, and politics (Befus, 1988). A study revealed the effect of culture shock on the anxiety of 167 international students in the first year of study (Buzoianu, Popescu, Bob, & Suciu, 2015). Furthermore, Hamboyan and Bryan revealed that international students often experience culture shock, which can cause severe psychosocial difficulties and mental health problems (Hamboyan & Bryan, 1995).

The culture shock was also experienced by the newcomer students of the Islamic State Institute of Kerinci (Asnel, 2021; Sujadi, 2021). The leading cause is the difference in language used. Sometimes local students always use the Kerinci Dialect. Another problem is local students creates exclusive group of their own. So, it makes the newcomer students uncomfortable. The newcomer students experience the problem of culture shock, which impacts the other aspects, such as some of them being unsympathetic to Kerinci culture, homesickness, and self-withdrawal from the new social environment.

Students also experience culture shock in other universities and national or abroad students. A study explains that students face culture shock when studying abroad, and those who study in their country and collaborate with abroad institutions also have the possible culture shock experience (Pyvis & Chapman, 2005). Then, the studies conducted on Chinese students who are studying in the US also showed that they have culture shock experience; the existence of student organization plays an essential role in social support, as well as the communication process carried out with the same culture member (C. Lin, 2006). Next, the study by Mukminin showed that Indonesian students studying at higher education institutions in the US faced academic and social challenges, which caused culture shock, especially in the first semester. The stressors includes using academic English communicating with academic advisors, and understanding Americans culture (Mukminin, 2012).
Culture shock is also experienced by international students studying in Australia (Presbitero, 2016).

Furthermore, a study revealed that Thai students studying at a university in Palembang experienced culture shock (Sulaiman & Saputri, 2019). Furthermore, a study stated that the newcomer Student of Padang State University from Outside West Sumatera was experience culture shock than the newcomer students from West Sumatra (Handayani & Yuca, 2018).

Culture shock is influenced by several factors: social support (C. Lin, 2006; Pantelidou & Craig, 2006). Social support is described as support that an individual can access through social relationships with other individuals, groups, and the larger community (N. Lin, Simeone, Ensel, & Kuo, 1979). The sources of social support depend on the developmental stage of the person receiving the support. For example, parental support appears to be more valuable in early adolescence than in late adolescence (Stice, Ragan & Randall, 2004). Social support is essential in providing resilience to stress feeling. For example, in childhood sexual abuse victims, a combination of self-esteem (the individual feels valued by others) and appraisal support (the individual feels that he or she is capable of getting advice when faced with adversity) is most helpful in preventing the onset of PTSD (Hyman, Gold, & Cott, 2003).

The other influencing factor of culture shock is resilience (Hormozi, Miller, & Banford, 2018). Resilience refers to positive adaptation, or the ability to maintain or restore mental health, despite adversity (Sujadi, Yandri, & Juliawati, 2021; Wald, Taylor, & Asmundson, 2006). The theory or definitions have evolved along with increasing scientific knowledge. Researchers from various science disciplines have studied resilience, including psychology, psychiatry, sociology, biology, genetics, epigenetics, endocrinology, and neuroscience. Resilience impacts several factors like burnout (Cho & Kang, 2018) and achievements study (Etherton, Steele-Johnson, Salvano, & Kovacs, 2020).

Moreover, emotional Intelligence also affects culture shock (Y. Lin, Chen, & Song, 2012). The concept of Emotional Intelligence was formulated first by Daniel L Goleman in 1998. Emotional Intelligence is the ability to identify, understand, and use emotions positively to manage anxiety, communicate well, empathize, solve problems, and manage conflict (Drigas & Papoutsi, 2018). Another opinion explains that Emotional intelligence (EI) is the ability to perceive, use, understand, and regulate emotions (Gutiérrez-Cobo, Cabello, & Fernández-Berrocal, 2016). Individuals with better emotional Intelligence will quickly adapt to others and uneasy face culture shock. Besides being influenced directly by social support and Intelligence, Emotional influences also affect culture shock through resilience (Qi, Roslan, & Zaremohzzabieh, 2021; Thomas & Zolkoski, 2020).

Based on the explanation above, it is essential to study the effect of social support, resilience, and emotional Intelligence on culture shock. Moreover, counselor needs to develop an intervention plan to improve the aspects that can solving the culture shock problems. Studies showed that students’ ability to adapt to the environment will increase their academic performance (Zhao, 2006). On the other hand, students who cannot adapt will face culture shock, which will impact their mental health (Hamboyan & Bryan, 1995).
METHODS

Research Design and Respondents

This study used a correlational survey approach. Besides, the conceptual correlation between variables in this study formed asymmetrically. Thus, the researcher found the influence of social support, emotional intelligence, and resilience toward the culture shock of newcomer students. Then, the population of this study consisted of 85 newcomer students at the State Islamic Institute of Kerinci Academic Year 2021/2022 instigating from outside area. Since, the Population was under 100, thus all of the population was sampled. The data of students was obtained from the ICT center & database (UPT TIPD) State Islamic Institute of Kerinci. Meanwhile, this data is the same to to the existing data in PDDikti.

Data Collection Techniques

The scale used in this study includes the Culture Shock Questionnaire (Mumford, 1998), Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ) (Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason, 1983), Resilience Quotient Test (RQ Test) (Reivich & Shatte, 2002) and Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Dulewicz & Higgs, 1999).

Culture Shock Questionnaire

The culture shock was measured using 12 items adopted from Mumford (Mumford, 1998). This scale consists of two subscales between core culture shock and interpersonal trauma. This scale have been used in previous studies and show high reliability and validity (Chen, Lin, & Sawangpattanakul, 2011). Item examples are: “I feel strain from the effort to adapt to a new culture” and “I feel generally accepted by the local people in the new culture.” The reliability of this scale test was a Cronbach Alpha score of 0.85.

Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support

The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support consists of three subscales, each scale addressing additional support; it was identified and found which have strong factorial validity, that includes: (a) family, (b) friends, and (c) other people (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988). This scale consists of 12 items with a 7-point rating scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) (Zimet et al., 1988). An example of the item: “There is a special person who is around when I am in need” (item 1). Several studies have shown that this instrument has good psychometric properties in adults (Dambi et al., 2018; Laksmita, Chung, Liao, & Chang, 2020). MSPSS has good internal and retest-test reliability and moderate construct validity. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated for the overall scale and each subscale. The Significant value of Other, Family, and Friends got scores of .91, .87, and .85, respectively. The total scale reliability was .88. Furthermore, the retest-test reliability for the Significant: Other, Family, and Friends were .72, .85, and .75, respectively The overall scale's Cronbach alpha value was .85 (Zimet et al., 1988).

The Brief Resilience Scale

The Brief Resilience Scale is an instrument to bounce back or recover from trauma. This scale consists of 6, where 1, 3, and 5 are positive items, and items 2, 4, and 6 are negative items. BRS was assessed by inverse coding of items 2, 4, and 6 to find the mean of the six items (Smith et al., 2008). The instructions for filling this scale begin with "Please indicate how extent you agree with each of the following statements using the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree,
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5 = strongly agree." Example item number 1 "I tend to bounce back quickly after hard times." Factor loading ranged from .68 to .91. Good internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from .80–.91. BRS was administered twice in two samples with a test reliability of 0.69 for one month and 0.62 for one month three months (Smith et al., 2008).

**Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire**

The Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire used in this study adapts the Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire developed by Victor Dulewicz and Malcolm Higgs (Dulewicz & Higgs, 1999). This scale measures seven dimensions: self-awareness, emotional toughness, motivation, interpersonal sensitivity, affect, intuitiveness, and awareness. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for each scale element ranged from 0.6 to 0.8. The Cronbach alpha for the overall EIQ scale is 0.77.

**Data Analysis Techniques**

The data was analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). Partial Least Square is a reliable and excellent data analysis method; this method does not use more assumptions. First, all variables and all possible relationships (direct and indirect effects) are included in the model. In the evaluation of the measurement model (outer), only the indicators which value above 0.60 are maintained. In addition, the quality of the model is also assessed by considering Convergent validity, where the Cronbach Alpha, rho_A, CR, and AVE values must be equal to 0.5 or higher. Furthermore, discriminant validity also measured by looking at the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) value; if the score is below 0.90, it is maintained (Henseler, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2015). Second, suppose the requirements have been found. In that case, the next step is to test the coefficient and total effect to see the direct effect between variables and the indirect effect of testing the effect of social support and emotional intelligence on culture shock mediated by resilience.

**RESULT**

**Measurement Model**

Before the hypothesis testing, firstly, this study conducted validity and reliability testing, which includes internal consistency (composite reliability and alpha Cronbach), convergent validity (loading factor and AVE), and discriminant validity Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT). Refer to table 1., there were two constructs with values of < 0.7. It means that SS11 and SS12. Next, the Cronbach's Alpha, rho_A and composite reliability values > 0.7 and AVE values > 0.5. Thus, it can be concluded that all variables were valid and reliable (See Table 1).
### Table 1. Factor Loading, Cronbach Alpha, Dijkstra & Henseler's, composite reliability and AVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>rho_A</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture Shock</td>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS4</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS5</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS6</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS7</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS1</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS2</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS3</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS4</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS5</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>SS1</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS2</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS4</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS5</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS6</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS7</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS8</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS9</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS10</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS11</td>
<td>-0.675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS12</td>
<td>-0.689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>AOE1</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AOE2</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AOSE1</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AOSE2</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROE1</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROE2</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROSE1</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROSE2</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UE1</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UE2</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRS1</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRS2</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRS3</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRS4</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRS5</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRS6</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Discriminant Validity Test: HTMT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Shock</th>
<th>Social Support</th>
<th>Emotional Intelligence</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture Shock</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Emotional Intelligence | 0.834 | 0.768 | 0.794 | 3.71
The discriminant validity measurement results in this study were carried out using the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio procedure (see Table 2). The HTMT value should be less than 0.9 to ensure the discriminant validity between the two reflective constructs (J. Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2017). Based on the results of the data in the table above, all values were less than 0.9. Thus, it can be concluded that the research instruments were valid.

**Hypothesis Testing**

The hypothesis testing was conducted by using the bootstrap resampling method. The purpose of using this method is to increase all collected data applicability, and this method does not need the normal distribution and large sample (minimum of 30 samples). According to Hair et al., the normal distribution quintiles can be used as critical scores compared with empirical t values (J. Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2017). When the t score is empirically more significant compared with the critical score, thus, we can say that the significance coefficient is at a certain error probability (level significance). The hypothesis was tested with a t-test on the outer and inner models. The hypothesis was tested using R square (R 2) and T/P Value.

The Table 3 describes the score original sample (O), the sample means, standard deviation, t value, and p values to test the effect directly and not direct endogenous variable toward exogenous. From the Table 3, there is significant social support influence for culture shock was ($\beta = 0.367$, $p = 0.000$), the influence of social support for resilience was ($\beta = 0.316$, $p = 0.000$), the influence of intelligence emotional on culture shock was ($\beta = -0.513$, $p = 0.000$), the influence of intelligence emotional to resilience was ($\beta = 0.313$, $p = 0.000$), the influence of resilience to culture shock was ($\beta = 0.412$, $p = 0.000$). Then, the study’s results also showed a social support influence for culture shock mediated by resilience ($\beta = 0.309$, $p = 0.000$), and the influence of emotional intelligence for culture shock mediated by resilience ($\beta = 0.209$, $p = 0.000$).

**Table 3. Direct and Indirect Effect of the Variable**

|                                | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| Social Support -> Culture Shock| 0.367               | 0.375           | 0.076                      | 5,221                       | 0.000    |
| Social Support -> Resilience   | 0.316               | 0.328           | 0.052                      | 4.163                       | 0.000    |
| Emotional Intelligence -> Culture Shock | -0.513        | -0.523          | 0.070                      | 7,200                       | 0.000    |
| Emotional Intelligence -> Resilience | 0.313            | 0.322           | 0.050                      | 4,617                       | 0.000    |
| Resilience -> Culture Shock    | 0.412               | 0.422           | 0.049                      | 8,922                       | 0.000    |
| Social Support -> Resilience -> Culture Shock | 0.309        | 0.309           | 0.040                      | 5,224                       | 0.000    |
| Emotional Intelligence -> Resilience -> Culture Shock | 0.209         | 0.209           | 0.030                      | 3,580                       | 0.000    |
DISCUSSIONS

Culture shock is one problem that often happens to newcomer students. The problem of culture shock refers to the feelings of uncertainty, confusion, or possible anxiety experienced by the student when they are moved to a new environment. Even though they are in the same country, the possibility of culture shock could happen (Handayani & Yuca, 2018). Habits, language, and behavior become the main source of the problem.

The results of current study show that culture shock is influenced significantly by social support. The higher the social support received, it will cause the lower the perceived culture shock. Research conducted by Buzoianu on Health students in Romania showed that the gender and quality of social support received by the student related to the culture shock they experiencing (Buzoianu et al., 2015). The related finding was revealed through the studies of Pantelidou & Craig (Pantelidou & Craig, 2006). Social support is also a determinant of cultural adjustment and significantly mediates anxiety feelings and regulation (Baba & Hosoda, 2014). The regional Students organization is beneficial for the student in overcoming culture shock; communicating with students from the same culture can help them regulate a new environment (Lin, 2006).

The study’s results also showed that emotional intelligence negatively influence on culture shock. This result shows that low emotional intelligence causes the high culture shock experienced by students. Gabel et al. investigated how Emotional Intelligence (EI) plays a vital role refugees during a mission oversea. When expats have higher emotional intelligence, they may succeed in overseas missions (Gabel, Dolan, & Cerdin, 2005). Y. Lin et al. also revealed emotional intelligence (EI) positively moderated the relationship between cultural intelligence (CQ) and regulation across cultures. These studies have shown the importance of CQ and EI in understanding the relationship with regulation cross culture (Y. Lin et al., 2012). In the student group, the related findings also reveal that emotional intelligence influenced the perceived level of cultural anxiety (Vergara, Smith, & Keele, 2010).

High resilience can help the student in solving culture shock problems. Resilience is the endurance psychological of somebody when they are face to face with psychological pressure. Students with good resilience could quickly resolve the problem of culture shock; on the other hand, Students with low resilience will face a high level of culture shock feeling. However, not all individuals will feel long duration of anxiety when they move to a new environment, which could sometimes make them more resilient because they have the experience regulating themselves (Scorza, 2020).

This study also proves that student resilience is significantly influenced by social support and emotional intelligence. Sippel et al. argue that the effective intervention development for increasing endurance depends on various coating Public (Sippel, Pietrzak, Charney, Mayes, & Southwick, 2015). Literature has shown the dangerous consequence of inadequate social support in guarding physical and psychological health (Ozbay et al., 2007). The research conducted during COVID-19 times also revealed similar findings; the interactive analysis showed that resilience positively correlates with mental health. Social support is a buffer of negative impact for low resilience (Liu, Jiang, Li, & Yang, 2021).
Additionally, higher emotional intelligence facilitates the anxiety response to the direction of challenges rather than threats (Schneider, Lyons, & Khazon, 2013). Research shows that emotional intelligence positively predicts resilience. Then, the exam anxiety and academic stress are predictable negative resistance (Trigueros et al., 2020). Besides, other studies have shown a significant relationship between emotional and spiritual intelligence. Moreover, resilience significantly correlates positively with emotional and spiritual intelligence (Keshtegar & Jenaabadi, 2015).

The research finding also proves that resilience is a mediation factor between emotional intelligence and culture shock. Students with high emotional intelligence tend to have excellent or high resilience affecting their capability to overcome culture shock. Studies by Thomas & Zolkoski have shown that emotional intelligence indirectly influences anxiety through cognitive reappraisal and resilience (Thomas & Zolkoski, 2020). Also, the research with nursing student revealed correlation between emotional intelligence, resilience, and anxiety (Shin & Park, 2013). Resilience mediating social support and culture shock. Research on Chinese international students who study in Malaysia revealed the resilience and spirituality mediate the correlation between social support and psychological welfare (Qi et al., 2021).

Current study has some limitations: first, the sample was only 85 newcomer students of the State Islamic Institute of Kerinci. The next studies should include samples from universities or other institutions to obtain more comprehensive results. Second, the efforts to assess culture shock are only carried out through questionnaires, even though this variable is significant and complex, thus, need collaboration with the expertise.

Nevertheless, this research has an important implication for managing the culture shock problem experienced by newcomer students. The policy makers needs to arrange a regulation related to the newcomer student's services, such as giving a unique accompaniment or assistance in finding place to stay. Besides, related to the previous research, high social support will cause low culture shock. Then, the conductive learning environment condition will help the student adjusting with the new environment. Besides, the counselling centre has to be present and involved to overcome and prevent the problem of culture shock through the formulation appropriate intervention which might involving certain related parties.

CONCLUSIONS

Newcomer students often experience culture shock. This research studied the influence of social support and emotional intelligence on culture shock and resilience as the mediating factor. The finding of this study confirmed that resilience becomes a significant mediator toward culture shock. Moreover, the correlation between social support and culture shock through resilience is stronger than the emotional intelligence and culture shock through resilience. This study important implication is that enhancement of resilience is a possible means to prevent or overcome culture shock.
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