



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/rj.v8i2>  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## The Role of Emotional Regulation and Family Support on the Psychological Well-being of Working Mothers at PT XYZ

Eriyanti Samillah<sup>1</sup>, Kartika Nuradina<sup>2</sup>, Benny Bernadus<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Indonesia Membangun, Bandung, Indonesia, [eriyantisamillah@student.inaba.ac.id](mailto:eriyantisamillah@student.inaba.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Indonesia Membangun, Bandung, Indonesia, [kartika.nuradina@inaba.ac.id](mailto:kartika.nuradina@inaba.ac.id)

<sup>3</sup> Universitas Indonesia Membangun, Bandung, Indonesia, [benny.bernadus@inaba.ac.id](mailto:benny.bernadus@inaba.ac.id)

Corresponding Author: [eriyantisamillah@student.inaba.ac.id](mailto:eriyantisamillah@student.inaba.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** This study aims to determine the conditions of working mothers at PT XYZ. The method used is a quantitative approach with multiple linear regression analysis. The t-test results show that family support has a positive and significant effect on psychological well-being ( $\beta = 0.702$ ;  $p = 0.046 < 0.05$ ), indicating that higher family support is associated with better psychological well-being. Furthermore, the results show that emotional regulation does not have a significant effect on the psychological well-being of working mothers at PT XYZ, as indicated by the regression coefficient ( $\beta = -0.402$ ) and p-value of 0.164 ( $> 0.05$ ). This finding indicates that an individual's ability to regulate emotions does not yet directly improve respondents' psychological well-being in this study. The simultaneous test (F test) also shows that emotional regulation and family support together do not have a significant effect on psychological well-being ( $F = 2.989$ ;  $p = 0.062 > 0.05$ ). In other words, the regression model used in this study is not comprehensive enough to predict the psychological well-being of working mothers, so there may be other, more dominant factors in shaping psychological well-being, such as life goals, environmental mastery, autonomy, personal growth, self-acceptance, and other forms of social support as mentioned above (Ryff, 1989). Therefore, emotional regulation and family support alone are insufficient to capture the complexity of working mothers' psychological well-being.

**Keyword:** Emotion Regulation, Family Support, Psychological Well-being, Working Mothers

### INTRODUCTION

Working mothers have become a significant socio-economic phenomenon in the modern era, reflecting changes in gender roles and family dynamics worldwide. As time changes, women's roles continue to evolve. The decision of married women to work means they take on dual roles, fulfilling obligations both at work and at home. According to reports, the Female Labor Force Participation Rate in 2024 was 56.42%. Based on the data, this figure exceeded the target of 53.5% (KemenPPPA, 2024). Women who contribute to meeting their families' financial needs are shown to have jobs, either in the formal or informal sector, in full-time or part-time employment.

Prior studies carried out by Fajriyati and colleagues involving 78 employed women from different areas in Indonesia indicated that the reasons motivating women to work included assisting their spouses with household requirements (50%), gain experience and self-actualisation (17.9%), want to have their own income (11.5%), utilising their knowledge (8.9%), and realising their dream of becoming a career woman (3.8%) (Fajriyati et al., 2023).

Based on the results of preliminary interviews conducted with six female employees who are working mothers, consisting of five from the Project Operation Management division and one from the Human Capital division. 4 respondents (66.7%) reported difficulty regulating their emotions when work demands and their role as mothers coincided, such as when their children were sick during a work deadline that had to be completed immediately. This condition caused unstable emotions, guilt, and psychological pressure.

However, as many as 5 respondents (83.3%) stated that they did not experience severe psychological distress. These respondents revealed that social support from family, particularly emotional support from spouses and parents, played an important role in helping them manage stress and maintain a balance between work and family demands. Additionally, self-awareness and understanding of stress-coping strategies helped working mothers regulate their emotions. Conversely, one respondent (16.7%) who reported a lack of family support and limitations in managing emotions stated that they were more prone to stress and psychological fatigue. They felt guilty for not being able to be fully present for their children and were concerned about.

This is consistent with studies indicating that effective emotional management abilities relate to finding solutions and handling stress, both in the workplace and in domestic settings. Concepts of mental health and personal well-being highlight how crucial it is for people to feel they have control over their actions, surroundings, thoughts, and feelings to sustain their psychological health (Mukaromah & Sastri, 2025).

In this case, emotional regulation is an important aspect that every individual needs to have as a foundation for expressing the problems they face. Research has shown that Problem Solving Therapy is effective in improving emotional regulation skills (Akbar et al., 2024). This is consistent with the concept of emotional regulation, which concerns how people manage their feelings, determine when they experience them, and experience and express them (Gross et al., 1998).

The importance of social support refers to the feelings of being protected, calm, valued, and cared for experienced by individuals, and this source of social support can come from their surrounding environment (Wigati, M, et al., 2024). Social support takes many forms and is provided by various sources or different people in an individual's life (Ekanesia et al., 2024). Perceived family support can provide emotional, informational, and substantial support, as well as help people build self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-regulation skills (An et al., 2024). Therefore, family support is essential for working mothers so they can do their jobs well.

The psychological well-being of working mothers plays an important role in family resilience, and when it declines, mothers' ability to fulfill their duties is compromised (Yuliani et al., 2023). In the workplace, the psychological well-being of employees is often tested by various professional demands. The more targets that must be achieved, the greater the direct impact on individual employees. Employees are responsible for adjusting to predetermined company targets, and if these work demands persist, they can become stressed (Putra, D.A., & Nuradina, K, 2023).

According to Ryff (2013), psychological well-being is a condition in which individuals have positive feelings about themselves both in the past and present (self-acceptance), personal growth, a belief in the meaning of life and purpose in life, have quality relationships with others (positive relations with others), environmental mastery, and have the ability to determine their own actions (autonomy).

The results of Pradani et al.'s (2023) study of working mothers reveal that dual-role conflict does not necessarily hinder their ability to regulate emotions. Despite being in a demanding situation, the respondents still demonstrated the ability to manage and direct their emotions adaptively, as reflected in the emergence of aspects of emotional regulation in their daily lives. Emotional regulation in working mothers is significant because an unbalanced workload often triggers chronic negative emotions (Gina & Fitriani, 2022).

Based on research by Apriati, I. (2021), working mothers have moderate to high levels of emotional regulation skills. This shows that working mothers have been able to observe, assess, and adjust their emotional responses in facing the various demands of their roles. This aligns with Gross's (1998) view that emotional regulation comprises processes of situation selection, situation modification, attention diversion, cognitive change, and response modulation.

The research presented explains that several factors greatly influence a person's ability to achieve a high level of psychological well-being. These factors include social support from family and peers, the ability to manage and use time effectively, and having goals in life that one wants to achieve (Rahayuningtyas et al., 2025). These three aspects not only provide emotional and instrumental foundations for an individual but also contribute to the formation of self-control, purpose, and motivation that can strengthen overall psychological well-being.

However, despite extensive research on emotional regulation, family support, and psychological well-being among working mothers, there are still gaps in the literature on working mothers at PT XYZ, especially in examining the role of emotional regulation and family support in psychological well-being. Therefore, this study aims to determine how emotional regulation and family support simultaneously affect psychological well-being among working mothers at PT XYZ. This study is expected to provide an overview of the factors that influence psychological well-being. This study is not only intended to understand psychological dynamics, but also to develop interventions to prevent a wider mental health crisis.

## **METHOD**

This research employed a quantitative approach along with multiple linear regression analysis. The purpose of this research was to assess the connection and to objectively evaluate the two independent factors, emotional regulation (X1) and family support (X2), in relation to the dependent factor, psychological well-being (Y). The data were gathered through an online survey, using various questionnaires distributed via G-Form (Fikri & Nuradina, 2023). The Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26, aiming to thoroughly investigate the overall and individual impacts of the two independent factors on the dependent factor. The questionnaires distributed were calculated and analysed using a Likert scale.

### **Population and Research Sample**

The population in this study consisted of all working mothers (married women with at least one child) at PT XYZ, numbering 70 people. Because the population was relatively small, this study used simple random sampling, a technique that gives every member of the population an equal chance of being selected into the sample. A total of 41 respondents were obtained, proportionally representing the population. The sample size in this study was determined using the Slovin formula, with a 10% margin of error. The determination of the significance level should be based on the comparative importance of Type I and Type II errors, the size of the sample, and the aim of the research. In certain instances, a more relaxed significance threshold like 10% could be suitable (Kim, 2015). Most effects in psychology research are small, making them appear statistically significant even when they are

substantively weak if the margins are too loose. Smaller margins improve inference accuracy and prevent overclaiming (Cohen, J., 1994). The Slovin formula is as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Description:

n = sample size

N = population size

e = margin of error (10% or 0,10)

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \frac{70}{1 + 70 (0,10)^2} \\ n &= \frac{70}{1 + 70 (0,01)} \\ n &= \frac{70}{1 + 0,7} = \frac{70}{1,7} \quad 41,17 = 41 \text{ (rounded)} \end{aligned}$$

The sample criteria in this study included:

- Mothers working at PT XYZ;
- Aged 25-50 years;
- Married or previously married (divorced or widowed) and performing childcare roles;
- Working as active employees (permanent or contract);
- Having a minimum of 1 year of service;
- Having at least 1 child.

### Research Instruments

The emotion regulation variable (X1) was measured using the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ) developed by Gross and John (2003). The ERQ consists of 10 items divided into two dimensions, namely cognitive reappraisal (6 items) and expressive suppression (4 items). This scale uses a Likert format with a response range of 1 to 4, indicating the respondent's level of agreement with the statement. In addition, family support was measured using the Family subscale of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) developed by Zimet et al. (1988). This subscale consists of 4 items and is measured on a Likert scale from 1 to 4, with higher scores indicating greater family support. The psychological well-being variable was measured using the Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWBS) developed by Carol Ryff (1989), with responses rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 4. This study was developed around six dimensions: self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth.

The research instrument was administered to 30 respondents as a preliminary test to ensure the consistency and accuracy of the measuring tool before it was used in the main study. Validity testing was conducted using Pearson's product-moment correlation technique, comparing the calculated *r* with the table *r* at a significance level of 5% (0.361). Items were declared valid if they had a calculated *r* greater than the table *r*. Furthermore, the most widely used reliability coefficient in research is Cronbach's Alpha. An instrument is said to have adequate reliability if the Cronbach's Alpha value obtained is  $\geq 0.60$  (Amalia, R. N., & Dianingati, R. S., 2022).

**Table 1. Validity and Reliability Test Results**

Variable	Indicator	r value	r Table	Description	$\alpha$	Description
Emotional Regulation	X1.1	0,500	0,361	Valid	0.776	Reliabel
	X1.2	0,723	0,361	Valid		
	X1.3	0,624	0,361	Valid		
	X1.4	0,481	0,361	Valid		
	X1.5	0,691	0,361	Valid		
	X1.6	0,691	0,361	Valid		
	X1.7	0,509	0,361	Valid		
	X1.8	0,678	0,361	Valid		
	X1.9	0,498	0,361	Valid		
	X1.10	0,532	0,361	Valid		
Social Support	X2.1	0,882	0,361	Valid	0.915	Reliabel
	X2.2	0,886	0,361	Valid		
	X2.3	0,885	0,361	Valid		
	X2.4	0,928	0,361	Valid		
Psychological Well-being	Y.1	0,441	0,361	Valid	0,809	Reliabel
	Y.2	0,459	0,361	Valid		
	Y.3	0,392	0,361	Valid		
	Y.4	0,722	0,361	Valid		
	Y.5	0,531	0,361	Valid		
	Y.6	0,513	0,361	Valid		
	Y.7	0,550	0,361	Valid		
	Y.8	0,570	0,361	Valid		
	Y.9	0,514	0,361	Valid		
	Y.10	0,736	0,361	Valid		
	Y.11	0,722	0,361	Valid		
	Y.12	0,747	0,361	Valid		
	Y.13	0,391	0,361	Valid		
	Y.14	0,555	0,361	Valid		
	Y.15	0,421	0,361	Valid		

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on the validity test results in Table 1, all items in the Emotional Regulation (X1.1-X1.10) and Social Support (X2.1–X2.4) variables had a calculated r value greater than the table r (0.361) and were therefore declared valid. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability values of 0.776 and 0.915, respectively, also indicate that both instruments are reliable. In the Psychological Well-being variable, most items were declared valid. However, some items did not meet the criteria because their calculated r values were lower than the table r values. Based on consideration of these items, it was decided to delete and revise them to better suit the construct being measured, then reuse them in the testing stage. Despite the deletion and revision of items, the instrument's Cronbach's Alpha of 0.809 indicates it is reliable.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Descriptive analysis provides an overview of the characteristics of the research data collected. Descriptive statistics are related to describing or providing information about data, circumstances, or phenomena. In other words, descriptive statistics explain circumstances, symptoms, or issues (Hikmah, J., 2017).

**Table 2. Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Emotion Regulation	41	23	35	28.68	3.061
Family Support	41	4	16	12.27	2.550
Psychological Well-being	41	38	62	52.00	5.745
Valid N (listwise)	41				

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

According to the findings of the aforementioned descriptive test, the researcher observed the following distribution of data:

1. Emotional Regulation Variable (X1), the data reveals a minimum value of 23, a maximum value of 35, an average value of 28.68, and a standard deviation of 3.061.
2. Family support (X2), the data indicates a minimum value of 4, a maximum value of 16, an average value of 12.27, and a standard deviation of 2.550.
3. Psychological Well-being Variable (Y), from the data, it can be described that the minimum value is 38, the maximum value is 62, the average value is 52.00, and the standard deviation is 5.745.

**Table 3. Interval Distance Calculation Formula**

Category	
Low	$X < (\text{Mean} - 1 \text{ SD})$
Moderate	$(\text{Mean} - 1 \text{ SD}) \leq X < (\text{Mean} + 1 \text{ SD})$
High	$X \geq (\text{Mean} + 1 \text{ SD})$

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

The determination of these categories assumes normal distribution, so that the mean and standard deviation can be used as a basis for distinguishing score levels. Based on the results, each variable was grouped into three categories: low, moderate, and high (Putri, H. N., et al., 2026). Categorisation was performed to provide a clearer picture of each score's position in the data distribution.

**Table 4. Frequency of Emotion Regulation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	6	14.6	14.6	14.6
	Moderate	27	65.9	65.9	80.5
	High	8	19.5	19.5	100.0
	Total	41	100.0	100.0	

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on Table 4, the analysis of 41 respondents indicates that emotional regulation falls into three categories: low, moderate, and high. A total of 6 respondents (14.6%) were in the low category, 27 respondents (65.6%) in the moderate category, and 8 respondents (19.5%) in the high category. These results indicate that the majority of respondents have moderate levels of emotional regulation.

**Table 5. Frequency of Family Support**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	5	12.2	12.2	12.2
	Moderate	28	68.3	68.3	80.5
	High	8	19.5	19.5	100.0
	Total	41	100.0	100.0	

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on Table 5, the analysis of 41 respondents shows that the level of family support for working mothers at PT XYZ falls into three categories: low, moderate, and high. A total of 5 respondents (12.2%) were in the low category, 28 respondents (68.3%) in the moderate category, and 8 respondents (19.5%) in the high category. This indicates that the majority of working mothers at PT XYZ receive moderate levels of family support, suggesting that their families play a significant role in providing emotional support in their daily lives.



**Table 6. Frequency of Psychological Well-being**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	9	22.0	22.0	22.0
	Moderat	23	56.1	56.1	78.0
	High	9	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	41	100.0	100.0	

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on the table above, the analysis of 41 respondents shows that psychological well-being levels fall into three categories: low, moderate, and high. The majority of respondents were in the moderate category, namely 23 people (56.1%). Meanwhile, respondents in the low and high categories showed the same proportion, namely 22.0% (9 respondents) each. These results indicate that the majority of respondents have moderate psychological well-being. This suggests that most working mothers at PT XYZ have a fairly stable psychological well-being.

### Test of Data Normality

Normality testing is conducted to ensure that the residuals in the regression model have a normal distribution. This is important so that the analysis results obtained can be declared valid. The test method used is the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, the data can be considered to have a normal distribution.

**Table 7. Normality Test  
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Unstandardized Residual
N		41
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	5.33987116
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.110
	Positive	.067
	Negative	-.110
Test Statistic		.110
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 <sup>c,d</sup>
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance		

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test in Table 7, which produced an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) of  $0.200 > 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the residual values are normally distributed.

### Multicollinearity Test

This test is used to detect a strong linear relationship among the independent variables in the regression model. To determine the presence of multicollinearity, a test is performed using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value. The test can be performed by looking at the Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values in the regression model (Priyatno, D 2022: 10-11). The decision criteria related to the multicollinearity test are as follows (Ghozali, 2016):

1. If the VIF value is less than 10 or the Tolerance value is greater than 0.01, then multicollinearity is not present.
2. If the VIF value is greater than 10 or the Tolerance value is less than 0.01, then multicollinearity is declared

**Table 8. Multicollinearity Test Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	Emotional Regulation	.997	1.003
	Family Support	.997	1.003

a. Dependent Variable: Psychological Well-being

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on Table 3, the VIF values for the emotional regulation variable (X1) and the family support variable (X2) are  $1.003 < 10$ , and the tolerance values are  $0.997 > 0.1$ . Therefore, it can be concluded that the model does not experience multicollinearity.

### Heteroscedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity is a situation in which the residuals in a regression model have unequal variances across observations (Sapetu, T. et al., 2023).

**Table 9. Heteroscedasticity Test Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t
1	(Constant)	-4.489	4.532		-.990
	Emotional Regulation	.208	.143	.224	1.454
	Family Support	.243	.172	.218	1.417

a. Dependent Variable: Abs\_RES

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on the results of the observations in Table 9, significance values were obtained for each independent variable. Emotion regulation had a Sig. value of 0.154, while the family support variable had a Sig. value of 0.165. Both values are greater than 0.05, indicating that there were no signs of heteroscedasticity in this study.

### Autocorrelation Test

Autocorrelation is a condition in which there is a correlation between the residuals in period t and the residuals in the previous period (t-1) in a regression model. A good regression model is one that does not have autocorrelation. The autocorrelation test is performed using the Durbin-Watson (DW) method. The regression model is declared free of autocorrelation if the DW value is in the range of 1.5–2.5. A DW value  $< 1.5$  indicates positive autocorrelation, while a DW value  $> 2.5$  indicates negative autocorrelation (Ghozali, 2018).

**Table 10. Autocorrelation Test Model Summary**

Model	Durbin-Waston
1	2.132
a. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Regulation, Family Support	
b. Dependent Variable: Psychological Well-being	

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on the results of the autocorrelation test in Table 10, the DW value of 2.132 indicates that the regression model does not exhibit autocorrelation.



## Multiple Linear Regression Equations

Multiple linear regression is a statistical test used to examine the relationship between two or more independent variables and a dependent variable, and to predict the dependent variable based on the independent variables (Stawati, 2020).

The formula used is  $Y = a + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + e$

**Table 11. Multiple Linear Regression Test Results**  
Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Variabel	Understandardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Sig.
(Constant)	54.906	8.979	.000
Emotional Regulation	-.402	.283	.164
Family Support	.702	.340	.046

a. Dependent Variable: Psychological Well-being

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on the results of multiple linear regression tests in Table 11, the regression equation formed is:  $Y = 54,906 - 0,402X_1 + 0,702X_2$

1. A constant value of 54.906 with a significance of 0.000 ( $< 0.05$ ). This indicates that if emotional regulation and family support are zero, then psychological well-being is 54.906.
2. The value of coefficient B is -0.402, which means that emotional regulation has a non-significant negative effect on psychological well-being.
3. The coefficient value of B is 0.702, indicating that family support has a positive but insignificant effect on psychological well-being.

## Hypothesis Test

### T-test

A t-test was used to determine whether each independent variable had a significant effect on the dependent variable at a 0.05 confidence level, using a two-tailed test (Sapetu, T. et al., 2023). The testing criteria are carried out by comparing the calculated t-value with the table t-value, both positive and negative. If the calculated t-value is  $\geq$  the table t-value, then the null hypothesis is accepted. However, if the calculated t-value is  $<$  the table t-value, the null hypothesis is rejected (Priyatno, 2022, p. 52).

**Table 12. T-test**  
Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
1	(Constant)	54.906	8.979		6.115	.000
	Emotional Regulation	-.402	.283	-.214	-1.418	.164
	Family Support	.702	.340	.312	2.064	.046

a. Dependent Variable: (Psychological Well-being)

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on the t-test in Table 6, the emotional regulation variable ( $X_1$ ) has a negative coefficient of -0.402 with a significance value of  $0.164 > (0.05)$ . It can be concluded that emotional regulation does not have a significant effect on psychological well-being. Psychological well-being, according to Ryff, encompasses eudaimonic dimensions such as self-acceptance, environmental mastery, and purpose in life, which are influenced by both intrapersonal factors and structural and social conditions (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Therefore, the low contribution of emotion regulation in this study indicates that psychological well-being is a multidimensional construct that requires a holistic approach in empirical modeling (Ryff, 1989). Meanwhile, the family support variable has a positive coefficient of 0.702 with a

significance value of  $0.046 > 0.05$ , so that family support has a significant effect on psychological well-being.

### F-Test

This test is used to identify whether all independent variables collectively have a significant effect on the dependent variable, using a significance level of 0.05 (Sapetu, T., et al 2023). The testing criteria are carried out by comparing the calculated F value with the table F value. If the calculated F value is  $\geq$  the table F value, then the null hypothesis is accepted. Conversely, if the calculated F value is  $<$  the table F value, then the null hypothesis is rejected (Priyatno, 2022, p. 56).

**Table 13. Results F-Test ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	179.431	2	89.716	2.989	.062 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	1140.569	38	30.015		
Total	1320.000	40			

a. Dependent Variable: Psychological Well-being

b. Predictors: (Constant), Dukungan Keluarga, Regulasi Emosi

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on the results of the F test in Table 13, the calculated F value was 2.989, with a significance value of 0.062. This significance value is greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that emotional regulation and family support simultaneously do not have a significant effect on psychological well-being. Emotional regulation is an internal ability, while family support is an external factor. Without intermediaries such as problem-solving effectiveness, perceived control, or meaning in life, these two factors do not instantly work together to improve all aspects of psychological well-being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

### Coefficient of Determination Test

The Coefficient of Determination ( $R^2$ ) test aims to assess the extent to which the dependent variable influences (dominates) the independent variable. The coefficient of determination ranges from 0 to 1 ( $0 \leq R^2 \leq 1$ ). A low coefficient of determination indicates that the independent variable explains only a limited amount of the variation in the dependent variable. Conversely, if the coefficient value is close to 1, it means that the dependent variable provides almost all the information needed to predict shifts in the independent variable. The formula for calculating the coefficient of determination is:  $Kd = r^2 \times 100\%$  (Larasati, S., & Gilang, A., 2014).

**Table 14. Coefficient of Determination Test ( $R^2$ ) Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.369 <sup>a</sup>	.136	.090	5.479

a. Predictors: (Constant), Dukungan Keluarga, Regulasi Emosi

Source: Compiled by Researchers (2026)

Based on the test results in Table 8, the R Square (Coefficient of Determination) was 0.136, indicating that the independent variable (X) explained 13.6% of the variation in the dependent variable (Y), confirming that this regression model has relatively weak explanatory power. The coefficient of determination indicates that emotional regulation and family support contribute little to psychological well-being, suggesting that other variables beyond the scope of this study have a greater influence. This aligns with the Psychological Well-Being theory proposed by Carol D. Ryff, which views psychological well-being as comprising six main

dimensions: self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth (Ryff, 1989). Each dimension of well-being has unique predictors and cannot be reduced to a single type of intrapersonal ability or social support. Thus, these results indicate that to obtain a more complete picture of psychological well-being, empirical modeling that includes other factors, such as meaning in life, self-control, role burden, work conditions, and the broader social context (Ryff, 2018), is needed.

### **The Relationship between Emotional Regulation and Family Support on Psychological Well-being**

Descriptive data show that the variables of emotional regulation and family support in this study are in the moderate category with relatively small differences in scores between respondents. This is evidenced by the respondents' psychological well-being, with 56.1% falling into the moderate category. Thus, it can be concluded that in general, the variables studied are at a moderate level. The moderate category indicates that respondents have fairly stable emotional regulation and family support abilities and are at a moderate level, showing no extreme tendencies.

Based on the regression test results, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was 0.136, indicating that emotional regulation and family support accounted for 13.6% of the variance in psychological well-being. Thus, the contributions of emotional regulation and family support remain relatively low, suggesting that other factors account for 86.4% of the influence on the psychological well-being of working mothers at PT XYZ.

The F-test results show that the F-count is 2.989 and the significance value is 0.062 ( $> 0.05$ ). Thus, it can be concluded that emotional regulation and family support simultaneously do not have a significant effect on psychological well-being. The insignificance of this simultaneous test result indicates that the combination of emotional regulation and family support variables is not yet strong enough to predict psychological well-being. This indicates that other variables are more dominant in influencing psychological well-being, such as self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth (personality) (Ryff, 1989). These dimensions show that an individual's ability to accept themselves, build relationships, be independent, manage their environment, find direction and meaning in life, and be willing to grow is a major factor influencing psychological well-being, especially among working mothers.

In detail, these regression coefficients indicate that emotional regulation is negatively associated with psychological well-being, whereas family support is positively associated with it. The emotional regulation variable has a regression coefficient of -0.402 and a p-value of 0.164 ( $> 0.05$ ). This indicates that emotional regulation has an opposite but insignificant direction with psychological well-being. This means that an increase in emotional regulation tends to decrease psychological well-being by 0.402 units, but this effect is not significant. Thus, it can be concluded that the level of emotional regulation among mothers working at PT XYZ does not significantly affect their psychological well-being.

These findings align with the findings of Hapsari et al. (2022), who showed that self-regulation variables do not significantly influence the psychological well-being of working women, indicating that psychological well-being is not solely determined by internal individual factors.

Meanwhile, the family support variable has a regression coefficient of 0.702 with a significance value of 0.046 ( $> 0.05$ ). These results indicate that family support is positively and significantly associated with psychological well-being. This means that the greater the level of family support received by working mothers at PT XYZ, the higher their psychological well-being. Overall, the results of this t-test indicate that the psychological well-being of working mothers at PT XYZ is more influenced by family support than by emotional regulation.

This aligns with research showing that high family support is associated with improved psychological well-being. This study found a positive correlation between family support and psychological well-being among working mothers (working from home) in Denpasar (Kosasih, E. R., & Rahmawati, K. D., 2022).

### **The Influence of Emotional Regulation and Family Support on Psychological Well-being**

The partial effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable was tested using a t-test, which showed that emotional regulation did not have a significant effect on psychological well-being. The negative coefficient indicates an inverse relationship, but it is not strong enough to be considered significant. Therefore, emotional regulation is not a major determinant of improving the psychological well-being of working mothers at PT XYZ.

The results of this study indicate that, simultaneously, emotional regulation and family support do not have a significant effect on psychological well-being. The F-value is 2.989 with a significance value of 0.062 ( $> 0.05$ ). Although family support has a significant partial effect on psychological well-being, the two independent variables together do not yet explain variation in psychological well-being. According to Ryff, psychological well-being is multidimensional. Emotional regulation and family support represent only some aspects, especially social relationships, while other dimensions such as meaning in life, independence, and self-development are more influenced by other factors. That is why their simultaneous influence is not significant.

Effective emotional regulation enables individuals to maintain a positive mindset, remain calm in various conditions, and adjust situations to feel more comfortable. Thus, working mothers can reduce the risk of experiencing stress in carrying out their childcare roles (Gina, F., & Fitriani, Y., 2022). However, in this study, emotional regulation had a negative, insignificant coefficient, indicating that respondents' emotional management skills did not significantly affect their psychological well-being. This aligns with the study's findings, which found that emotional regulation is certainly related to many other variables in the process (Marliani, R. et al., 2020).

Furthermore, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was 0.136, indicating that the independent variable accounted for only 13.6% of the variance in the dependent variable. This indicates that the regression model used has a low explanatory power. The coefficient of determination indicates that emotional regulation and family support contribute only slightly. Psychological well-being in this study refers to the six dimensions proposed by Ryff (2013), namely self-acceptance, positive relationships with others, independence, mastery of the environment, life purpose, and personal growth. Therefore, other factors have a more dominant influence on these six dimensions: positive relationships with others are not determined solely by family support, and personal growth is not determined solely by emotional regulation.

In addition, the partial results indicate that family support has a positive and significant effect on psychological well-being. This is evidenced by a regression coefficient of 0.702, significant at 0.046 ( $< 0.05$ ). Thus, it can be concluded that family support is a factor that significantly improves the psychological well-being of working mothers at PT XYZ, more so than emotional regulation.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of descriptive analysis, respondents in this study generally have a fairly good level of emotional regulation, family support, and psychological well-being. However, based on several hypothesis tests, emotional regulation does not have a significant effect on the psychological well-being of working mothers at PT XYZ, whereas family support has a positive and significant effect.

At the same time, emotional regulation and family support did not have a significant impact on psychological well-being. The low coefficient of determination of 0.136 (13.6%) indicates that these two variables contribute little to psychological well-being. Each dimension of psychological well-being has distinct predictors and cannot be reduced to a single type of intrapersonal ability, such as emotional regulation, or to a single form of social support, such as family support. Therefore, the results of this study indicate that in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of psychological well-being, empirical modeling involving factors beyond the variables studied is necessary, such as meaning in life, self-control, role burden, working conditions, and the broader social context, as emphasized in the development of Ryff's theory of psychological well-being. Thus, it can be partially concluded that family support plays an important role in improving the psychological well-being of working mothers at PT XYZ, whereas emotional regulation was not found to be a significant factor. These results indicate that psychological well-being is complex and influenced by various aspects of a person's life.

Therefore, further research could expand the focus of studies beyond family support to include organisational and work-environment support in relation to employees' psychological well-being, especially working mothers. Considering the increasingly complex world of work, it is highly likely that other forms of support have a stronger influence on psychological well-being.

## REFERENCE

- Akbar, R. F., Sastri, P. D., Djaelani, B. P. P., Azzahra, S. M., Halawa, W. N. H., Bernadus, B., & Oktaviani, F. (2024). Peer Mentoring Training for Students. *Inaba of Community Services Journal*, 3(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.56956/inacos.v3i1.276>
- Amalia, R. N., & Dianingati, R. S. (2022). Pengaruh jumlah responden terhadap hasil uji validitas dan reliabilitas kuesioner pengetahuan dan perilaku swamedikasi. <https://doi.org/10.14710/genres.v2i1.12271>
- An, J., Zhu, X., Shi, Z., & An, J. (2024). A serial mediating effect of perceived family support on psychological well-being. *BMC Public Health*, 24(1), 940. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-18476-z>
- Apriati, I. (2021). Regulasi emosi ibu bekerja saat mendampingi anak menjalani pembelajaran daring selama pandemi Covid-19. *JECIE (Journal of Early Childhood and Inclusive Education)*. <https://www.academia.edu/download/123963360/606.pdf>
- Cohen, J. (1994). The earth is round ( $p < .05$ ). *American psychologist*, 49(12), 997.
- Ekanesia, P., Akbar, R. F., & Sastri, P. D. (2024). Profil Perceived Social Support dan Hubungannya dengan Kesehatan Mental Remaja di Kota Makassar. *Jurnal Psikologi: Media Ilmiah Psikologi*, 22(01). <https://doi.org/10.47007/jpsi.v22i01.361>
- Fajriyati, Y. N., Lestari, S., & Hertinjung, W. S. (2023). Pengalaman ibu bekerja yang memiliki anak balita dalam mencapai keseimbangan kerja-keluarga. *Jurnal Psikologi Ulayat*, 10(1), 59-78. <https://doi.org/10.24854/jpu477>
- Fikri, A., & Nuradina, K. (2023). Identification of Student Learning Style Preference Profiles in Hybrid Learning Settings: An Essential Consideration for Developing Learning Strategies. *West Science Interdisciplinary Studies*, 1(09), 731-742. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f742/72cf9b719705104425f6aa17076a3095fa06.pdf>
- Ghozali, I. 2018. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang.
- Gina, F., & Fitriani, Y. (2022). Stress pengasuhan pada ibu bekerja ditinjau dari regulasi emosi. *Jurnal Kajian Ilmiah*, 22(1), 45-52. <https://doi.org/10.31599/jyzwjg72>



- Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of general psychology*, 2(3), 271-299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.271>
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 85(2), 348. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348>
- Hapsari, A. D., & Puspitasari, D. N. (2022). Kesejahteraan psikologis pada ibu bekerja: pengaruh regulasi emosi dan self-compassion. *Jurnal Sains Psikologi*, 11(2), 165-171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um023v11i22022p165-171>
- Hikmah, J. (2017). Statistik Deskriptif Leni Masnidar Nasution. *Vol*, 14, 49-55.
- Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak. (2024). *Kemen PPPA perkuat ekonomi perawatan untuk tingkatan partisipasi kerja perempuan*. <https://www.kemenpppa.go.id/siaran-pers/kemen-pppa-perkuat-ekonomi-perawatan-untuk-tingkatan-partisipasi-kerja-perempuan>
- Kim, J. (2015). How to choose the level of significance: A pedagogical note.
- Kosasih, E. R., & Rahmawati, K. D. (2022). Dukungan keluarga dan psychological well-being ibu work from home saat pandemi covid-19 di Denpasar. *Journal of Psychological Science and Profession*, 6(1), 66-75. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jpsp.v6i1.35939>
- Larasati, S., & Gilang, A. (2014). Pengaruh motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan wilayah telkom jabar barat utara (Witel bekasi). *Jurnal Manajemen dan Organisasi*, 5(3), 200-213. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jmo.v5i3.12167>
- Marliani, R., Nasrudin, E., Rahmawati, R., & Ramdani, Z. (2020). Regulasi Emosi, Stres, Dan Kesejahteraan Psikologis: Studi Pada Ibu Work From Home Dalam Menghadapi Pandemi COVID-19. *Karya Tulis Ilmiah LP2M UIN SGD Bandung*.
- Mukaromah, U. L., & Sastri, P. D. (2025). The Role of Future Anxiety and Self-Efficacy on Final-Year Students' Psychological Well-Being. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 6(7).
- Pradani, Z. P. (2023). Gambaran Regulasi Emosi pada Ibu Bekerja yang Mengalami Konflik Peran Ganda. *Web of Scientist International Scientific Research Journal*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.47134/webofscientist.v2i3.4>
- Priyatno, D. (2022). *Olah Data Sendiri Analisis Regresi Linear Dengan Spss Dan Analisis Regresi Data Panel Dengan EvIEWS*. Yogyakarta: Cahaya Harapan.
- Putra, D. A., & Nuradina, K. (2023). Strategi Coping dan Upaya Resiliensi Karyawan di Masa Pandemi COVID-19. *Inaba Journal Of Psychology*, 1(1), 33-40. <https://doi.org/10.56956/ijop.v1i01.189>
- Putri, H. N., Nuradina, K. & Bernadus, B. (2026). The Relationship Between Workload and Job Stress on Employee Turnover Intention at CV XYZ. *International Journal of Marketing & Human Resource Research*, 7(1), 240 - 259. <https://doi.org/10.47747/ijmhrr.v7i1.3351>
- Rahayuningtyas, H., Langit, S. A. S., Zahra, A., & Avezahra, M. H. (2025). Psychological Well Being pada Ibu Pekerja Pabrik Rokok di Kecamatan Pakisaji Kabupaten Malang. *Flourishing Journal*, 5(1), 35-47.
- 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.
- Ryff, C. D. (2013). Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychotherapy and psychosomatics*, 83(1), 10-28. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000353263>
- Ryff, C. D. (2018, October). Eudaimonic well-being: Highlights from 25 years of inquiry. In *Diversity in harmony—insights from psychology: Proceedings of the 31st International Congress of Psychology* (pp. 375-395). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119362081.ch20>



- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 69(4), 719.
- Sapetu, T., Ogi, I. W., & Samadi, R. L. (2023). Pengaruh Brand Positioning Dan Product Display Terhadap Pembelian Impulsif Pada Holland Bakery Teling Manado. *Jurnal Emba: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 11(4), 776-786. <https://doi.org/10.35794/Emba.V11i4.52171>
- Stawati, V. (2020). Pengaruh profitabilitas, Leverage dan ukuran perusahaan terhadap penghindaran pajak. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Bisnis: Jurnal Program Studi Akuntansi*, 6(2), 147-157. <https://doi.org/10.31289/jab.v6i2.3472>
- Wigati, M., Wilantika, R., Oktaviani, F., & Agustin, V. (2024). Peran Antara Dukungan Sosial Teman Sebaya Dengan Kesejahteraan Psikologis Pada Siswa Sekolah Menengah Di Provinsi Jambi. *Kunkun: Journal Of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(2), 146-151. <https://ejournal.mediakunkun.com/index.php/kunkun/article/view/94>
- Yuliani, F., Safarina, N. A., & Dewi, R. (2023). Hubungan Dukungan Sosial dengan Kesejahteraan Psikologis pada Ibu Rumah Tangga Pekerja di Industri Batu Bata di Aceh Utara. *INSIGHT: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 1(1), 75-88. <https://doi.org/10.2910/insight.v1i1.10485>
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of personality assessment*, 52(1), 30-41. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_2)