PYSCHE 165 JOURNAL
LPPM Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK Padang
Lubuk Begalung Highway, Padang, Zip Code: 25221, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia
Volume: 15, Issue: 2, Page: 104 -113, June 30th, 2025, e-ISSN: 2502-8766
Available online at website: https://jpsy165.org/ojs/index.php/jpsy165/index

Emotion Regulation as a Moderator of the Relationship between Family Functioning and Anxiety Generation Z

Stephanie Angelina [1]✉, Riana Sahrani [2], Pamela Hendra Heng [3]
[1,2,3] Department of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanegara, West Jakarta, Zip Code: 11440, Indonesia
✉correspondent_author_email: stephanie.707232017@stu.untar.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the role of family functioning on anxiety moderated by emotion regulation. Anxiety is a negative emotion characterized by worry and uncertainty about the future. One cause of anxiety is family functioning that isn't going well. Family functioning is the ability of the family to meet the needs of its members by overcoming problems, pressures, and supporting each other. To minimize the occurrence of high anxiety caused by family functioning that is not optimal, individuals need emotion regulation as a protective factor. Emotion regulation is the way individuals manage feelings when faced with tension in their lives. Quantitative research methods are used with non-probability sampling techniques with purposive sampling. The research participants totaled 390 individuals aged 17-27 years. The questionnaire was completed by research participants online and contained three measurement tools, namely the Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD-7) measurement tool to measure anxiety, the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale II (FACES II) and the Family Communication Scale (FCS) to measure family function, and the Emotion regulation Questionnaire (ERQ) to measure emotion regulation. Data processing was done with SPSS ver. 27, and Process Marco Model 1. The results show that emotion regulation in the high reappraisal dimension (*effect* = -0.139, p = 0.002) and low suppression dimension (*effect* = -0.191, p = 0.000) can be a moderator in the relationship between family functioning and cohesion dimension. Thus, emotion regulation can be a protective factor to minimize individuals experiencing anxiety in the midst of low functioning families.

Keywords: Teacher, Emotional Intelligence, Character Education, SLB Students.

1. Introduction

Generation Z or commonly known as Gen-Z is a generation with individuals born between 1997 and 2012 [1]. Many new things in the world were first experienced by Gen-Z compared to previous generations such as the use of the internet in daily needs, technology, social media, and so on [2]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the stress experienced by final year students who are classified as Gen-Z can cause anxiety about future careers [3]. The changes in this world have quite an impact on Gen-Z, especially after COVID-19, Gen-Z has become more psychologically vulnerable and experiences maladaptive problem-solving behavior [4]. Gen-Z also experiences anxiety by 30.5% and is the highest percentage compared to other generations [4].

If *anxiety* continues in the long term, it can have an impact on cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal [5]. Individuals with *anxiety* can experience mild impairment in *working memory,* decreased focus, and impairment in executive function in the brain. Quality of life related to mental health is also an impact of *anxiety.* [6]. Good quality of life is characterized by having good emotional, psychological, social, and physical functions. A person's quality of life is closely related to the individual's emotional and mental state. When an individual experiences *anxiety* , it increases negative emotions and resilience in the individual, so that the quality of life decreases. *Anxiety* also has an impact on a person's satisfaction with their sleep experience, which is characterized by how well the individual is able to align the various parts of the stages in their sleep, such as preparation, quality, quantity, and fitness when waking up [7]. If a person experiences *anxiety* , the quality of sleep may decrease due to long-lasting worries.

Anxiety is a negative, unpleasant emotion or feeling that lasts a long time, characterized by worries and expectations about an unpredictable future and potential dangers that can occur [8]. Feelings of tension, worry, and body changes such as muscle tension, increased blood pressure are indications that someone is experiencing *anxiety.* **Error! Reference source not found.**. *Anxiety* can have an impact on daily life if it occurs continuously, such as difficulty concentrating while doing work, no desire to socialize, and wanting to stay in a place or activity that makes you comfortable [10]. *Anxiety* also has an impact on relationships with family members because when someone feels *anxious* , the individual becomes less ready to help their family members [11].

Submitted: January 16th, 2025 | Revised: April 4th, 2025 | Accepted: June 25th, 2025 | Published: June 30th, 2025

Anxiety can be predicted by a person's *family functioning* based on Bowen *Family System Theory.* [12]. This theory is a theory of human behavior that views the family as an emotional unit and uses a system to describe the complex interactions of the unit. According to this theory, family members are emotionally connected and have expectations of their family so that they can influence feelings. Especially parents as figures for their children who will exemplify how parents distinguish emotions, ways of thinking, how to adapt to problems independently. When someone has good family functioning, that person tends to have good mental health [13]. Individuals will also be more accepting of their feelings when under emotional stress and negative events that occur in their lives [14]. The results of the study [15]family function or *family functioning* has a significant negative role with *anxiety* . When *family functioning* increases the tendency for *anxiety* to decrease and vice versa when *family functioning* is low the tendency for *anxiety* to increase.

Family functioning is the ability of a family unit to meet the needs of each member as indicated by the ability to overcome problems, pressures or events in life as a whole and care for and support each other **Error! Reference source not found.**. *The circumplex model* describes *family functioning* into three dimensions: (a) Cohesion: the emotional bond that members of the family system have with each other; (b) Adaptability: the ability of a system to change the power structure, roles and relationship rules in dealing with certain *stressors* or changes that occur due to system development; and (c) Communication: the facilitating dimension, which encourages the system to move between the other two dimensions **Error! Reference source not found.**. Poor *family functioning* is characterized by a lack of cohesion, adaptability, and good communication between family members; this can be a problem especially for children because it can cause behavioral problems, lack of attention, and problems with verbal and non-verbal abilities such as writing and communication in children [18].

Referring to Bowen's theory, family is closely related to a person's emotional condition. Poor [19]. *Family functioning* can have an impact on a person's ability to control emotions in ongoing experiences or in other words how a person regulates their emotions or *emotion regulation* [20]. If a person's **Error! Reference source not found.**. *Emotion regulation* also has an impact on a person's ability to take actions or behave at risk that could harm their future, the higher *the emotion regulation* they have, the lower the tendency to have risk-taking behavior because a person can better manage their momentary emotions [21]. In addition, by having *emotion regulation* , individuals are more likely not to experience psychological fatigue while working [23].

Emotion regulation is a way of regulating emotions by changing the process of emotions arising consciously or unconsciously **Error! Reference source not found.**. The process can vary such as: (a) Choosing a situation, (b) Modifying the situation, (c) Focusing on the situation, (d) Changing views or thoughts about the situation, and (e) Adjusting the situation **Error! Reference source not found.**. Strategies in this emotion regulation include *cognitive reappraisal* (cognitive change strategy) and *expressive suppression* (response modulation strategy). *Cognitive reappraisal* is interpreting situations that can cause emotions by changing their emotional impact. For example, online learning may be an obstacle because of lack of fluency in using technology, but if seen on the bright side, it can be a learning or experience to use the latest technology. While *expressive suppression* is a form of reaction control that aims to limit emotional behavior that is occurring. An example is online learning causes negative feelings, but individuals tend to hold back these feelings and not show them.

Seeing the phenomenon of anxiety continues to this day and even increases especially among Gen-Z, this study aims to re-examine the factors and processes *of anxiety* seen from the external, namely family and internal, namely emotional. Based on previous research [15], it has been explained that *family functioning* can predict *anxiety* significantly negatively. In this study, *family functioning* was measured only in the dimensions of cohesion and adaptation, while the communication dimension was not included in it. Referring to the *curcumplex model theory* , *family functioning* has three dimensions, namely cohesion, adaptation, and communication. Therefore, this study will add the communication dimension in measuring *family functioning* . Previous research has also not explained whether there is a mechanism to weaken and strengthen both relationships . Previous research [20]found that *family functioning* can be predicted by *emotion regulation.* Other [24]found that *emotion regulation* can predict *anxiety* .

Research [20]and [24]found that there is a relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety* with *emotion regulation* . Seeing *emotion regulation* as the management of emotions to deal with tension in life, it can be assumed that *emotion regulation* can be a moderator in the relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety.* The purpose of this study is: (a) To review the role of *family functioning* and *anxiety,* especially in Generation Z and (b) To see whether *emotion regulation* can be a moderator in the relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety,* especially in Generation Z.

H_1 : *Family functioning* has a significant negative relationship with *anxiety* ; if *family functioning* increases, *anxiety* decreases.

H 2 : *Emotion regulation* can moderate the relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety* .

2. Research methodology

The research design used quantitative with *non-probability sampling technique* . The type of *non-probability sampling* used was *purposive sampling* . This study has mandatory participant characteristics, namely individuals aged 17 to 27 years. The number of participants in this study was 390 participants. The average age of those participating in this study was 21.98 (*SD* = 2.98). The dominant gender was male (*n* = 253). The average participant had a complete family status (*n* = 274).

Anxiety was measured using Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD-7) with 7 items. This measuring instrument was translated into Indonesian through a translation test process and *expert judgment* . This measuring instrument has a *Cronbach's alpha* (α) reliability of 0.89. *Family functioning* has three dimensions, namely cohesion, adaptation, and communication. Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale II (FACES II) to measure the dimensions of cohesion (16 *items*) and adaptation (14 *items*). The communication dimension was measured using the Family Communication Scale with 10 *items* . This measuring instrument was translated into Indonesian [25]*The Cronbach's alpha (α)* reliability on the cohesion dimension was 0.92, the adaptation dimension was 0.91, and the communication dimension was 0.90. *Emotion regulation* was measured using the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ). This measuring instrument has two dimensions, namely *Reappraisal* with 6 *items* and *Suppression* with 4 *items* . This measuring instrument was translated into Indonesian [26]. The reliability of *Cronbach's alpha* (α) on the *reappraisal dimension* was found to be 0.93 and the *suppression dimension* was 0.90.

Data collection was carried out using a *Google form questionnaire* that was distributed online *on* various social media *platforms* . The questionnaire contains several parts, namely: (a) Introduction, (b) Statement of consent (*informed consent*), (c) Respondent demographic data (d) Instructions for filling in, and (e) Contents of the questionnaire measuring instruments *family functioning* , *emotion regulation* , and *anxiety* . If all participant data is in accordance with the criteria, the researcher will begin processing the data using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27 and testing the moderation effect using PROCESS Macro model 1. After obtaining the results of the data testing, the researcher will begin to compile a discussion and conclusions from the research results found.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Participant Categorization Overview

The variables of *anxiety, family functioning,* and dimensions *of emotion regulation reappraisal and suppression* are divided into three categories, namely, low, medium, and high. The division of categorization of each variable and dimension can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1Variable Categorization

Variables	Categorization	Frequency	(%)
Anxiety	Low	81	20.8
	Currently	124	31.8
	Tall	185	47.4
Family Functioning	Low	190	48.7
	Currently	152	39
	Tall	48	12.3
ER-Reappraisal	Low	163	41.8
	Currently	124	31.8
	Tall	103	26.4
ER-Suppression	Low	71	18.2
	Currently	92	23.6
	Tall	227	58.2

Categorization of all variables and dimensions can be seen in Table 2. This shows that all research participants have a high tendency towards *anxiety ,* low *family functioning , and* low *emotion regulation reappraisal dimension and high suppression dimension.*

Table 2. Variable Categorization

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max	Category
Anxiety	1.79	0.67	0.00	3.00	Tall
FF	2.62	0.69	1.33	4.63	Low
FF-Cohesion	2.62	0.70	1.44	4.56	Low
FF-Adaptation	2.61	0.73	1.21	4.64	Low
FF-Communication	2.66	0.75	1.10	5.00	Currently
ER-Reappraisal	3.77	1.29	1.83	6.83	Low
ER-Suppression	4.89	1.38	1.00	7.00	Tall

3.2. Preliminary Analysis

Normality test is conducted to determine whether the data distribution is normal or not. The results of the normality test are seen at the *p value* > 0.05 with *the One-Sample Komologrov-Smirnov Test method* on the *unstandardized residual variable.* The results of the normality test in this study are normal with a *p value* = 0.158 (*p* > 0.05) so that data processing will use parametric correlation, namely *Pearson correlation* .

Classical regression analysis test is also conducted to determine whether the research data is valid for using linear regression data processing. In the classical regression analysis test there are three types of tests, namely linearity test, multicollinearity test, and heteroscedasticity test. The provisions in this test are: (a) Data must have a linear relationship between *dependent* and *independent* variables with a *p value* >

0.05; (b) There are no symptoms of multicollinearity with a *tolerance value* > 0.10 and VIF < 10.00; and (c) There are no symptoms of heteroscedasticity seen at $p > 0.05$.

The results of the linearity test on the *anxiety variable* with *family functioning* are $p = 0.860$ and the *anxiety variable* with *emotion regulation* is $p = 0.385$ seen in *the deviation of linearity* . The multicollinearity test shows a *tolerance value* of 0.890 and a VIF value of 1.123. The heteroscedasticity test uses the Glejser test method with the *family functioning variable value* and the absolute residual value of $p = 0.063$ *and the emotion regulation* variable value and the absolute residual value of $p = 0.758$. From these results it can be concluded that the results of the classical regression analysis test are in accordance with the provisions and can be continued with linear regression data processing.

3.3. Hypothesis Testing

The results of the correlation test between variables and dimensions show that *anxiety* is significantly negatively related to *family functioning* ($r = -0.425$, $p < 0.001$) in accordance with the prediction of H1 . A negative relationship indicates that when an individual experiences high *anxiety, the individual tends to have* low *family functioning. Anxiety* is also significantly negatively related to the dimensions of *family functioning* . *Anxiety* is also significantly negatively related to the *emotion regulation dimension* , namely *reappraisal,* but is significantly positively related to the *suppression dimension* . To see the correlation of each variable and dimension, see Table 3.

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Test

No.	Variables	*Mean*	*Std*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	***Anxiety***	1.79	0.67	-							
2	**ER**	4.21	0.52	-0.24**	-						
3	ER- *Reappraisal*	3.77	1.29	-0.70**	0.71**	-					
4	ER- *Suppression*	4.89	1.37	0.77**	-0.06	-0.74**	-				
5	**FF**	2.63	0.69	-0.43**	0.33**	0.50**	-0.39**	-			
6	FF-Cohesion	2.62	0.70	-0.43**	0.32**	0.49**	-0.39**	0.97**	-		
7	FF-Adaptation	2.61	0.73	-0.41**	0.32**	0.49**	-0.40**	0.97**	0.92**		
8	FF-Communication	2.66	0.75	-0.38**	0.31**	0.44**	-0.34**	0.94**	0.87**	0.89**	-

To determine the extent of the role of *family functioning* and *emotion regulation* on *anxiety* , a regression test was conducted. The regression test was conducted one by one on each variable and dimension to determine the extent of the contribution of each dimension. The results of the regression test found that all variables and have a role in predicting *anxiety* because all variables and dimensions are significant. The magnitude of the role can be seen in $R2^{by}$ changing it to a percentage. *Family functioning* is predicted to contribute 17.8% ($R2 = 0.178$), likewise the *family functioning dimension* also contributes to *anxiety* . The *reappraisal* dimension contributes to predicting *anxiety* by 49.4% ($R2 = 0.494$) and *suppression predicts anxiety* the most with a value of 58.9% ($R2 = 0.589$). The regression results for each variable and dimension can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Regression Test on *Anxiety*

Variables/Dimensions	R^2	*ß*	*Std. Error*	*Sig.*	Information
Family Functioning	0.18	- 0.43	0.04	<0.001	Have a role
FF-Cohesion	0.18	- 0.43	0.04	<0.001	Have a role
FF-Adaptation	0.17	- 0.41	0.04	<0.001	Have a role
FF-Communication	0.14	- 0.38	0.04	<0.001	Have a role
ER- *Reappraisal*	0.49	- 0.70	0.02	<0.001	Have a role
ER- *Suppression*	0.59	0.77	0.02	<0.001	Have a role

Moderation test was conducted on each dimension of *emotion regulation* against *the family functioning dimension* on *anxiety* . Data processing was conducted using Process Macro [27]with an indicator that the variable can be moderately seen from the significance value of the interaction. If the interaction is significant ($p < 0.05$) then the variable successfully moderates the relationship between *independent* and *dependent* . Table 5 shows the conclusion of the results of the moderation test. It can be seen that the *reappraisal dimension* moderates *family functioning* , cohesion and communication dimensions on *anxiety* . However, in the adaptation dimension, *reappraisal* did not succeed in moderating it. For *the suppression dimension* , it only succeeded in moderating the cohesion dimension on *anxiety* .

Table 5. Results of *the Emotion Regulation* Moderator Test on *Family Functioning* and Anxiety

Moderation (*Anxiety*)	*B*	*t*	*p*	95% CI		Information
				Low	*Up*	
FF*ER	0.016	0.192	0.848	-0.145	0.177	Not moderating
FF*ERR	-0.055	-2.007	**0.045**	-0.109	-0.001	Moderation
FFK*ERR	-0.063	-2.334	**0.020**	-0.117	-0.010	Moderation
FFA*ERR	-0.038	-1.434	0.153	-0.091	-0.014	Not moderating
FFKom*ERR	-0.052	-2.124	**0.034**	-0.100	-0.004	Moderation
FF*ERS	0.040	1,868	0.062	-0.002	0.082	Not moderating
FFK*ERS	0.046	2.122	**0.034**	0.003	0.088	Moderation
FFA*ERS	0.030	1,441	0.150	-0.011	0.070	Not moderating
FFKom*ERS	0.036	1,907	0.057	-0.001	0.074	Not moderating

Conditional effect reappraisal results can be seen in Table 6, showing that when individuals have high *reappraisal ability (M* = 5.06) it will weaken the relationship between *anxiety* and *family functioning* . If individuals have high *reappraisal ability, when family functioning* is low, the tendency to experience *anxiety* also decreases due to the individual being able to regulate emotions using *reappraisal* . While when individuals have low *reappraisal (M* = 2.48), the tendency to experience *anxiety in low family functioning* conditions is more likely to occur because they lack *reappraisal ability. Even in moderate or high family functioning* conditions, individuals still have a high tendency to experience *anxiety* when individuals lack *reappraisal ability* . *Reappraisal* will work significantly when *reappraisal* is high ($p < 0.05$). While when the *reappraisal level* is at average or below average, the role *of reappraisal* is not significant ($p > 0.05$).

Table 6. *Conditional Effects of Reappraisal* on *Family Functioning* and *Anxiety*

Reappraisal	*Effect*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI *Low*	*Up*
-1 SD	0.003	0.062	0.049	0.960	-0.012	0.124
Mean	-0.068	0.041	-1.638	0.102	-0.149	0.014
+1 SD	-0.139	0.046	-2.995	0.003	-0.229	-0.048

Conditional effect reappraisal results in Table 7 and Table 8 show that *reappraisal* will work significantly when *reappraisal* is high (p <0.05). While when the *reappraisal level* is at the average or below average, the role *of reappraisal* is not significant (p >0.05). If an individual has high *reappraisal ability* , when having low closeness with family and also poor communication with family, the tendency to experience *anxiety* also decreases due to the individual being able to regulate emotions using *reappraisal* . While when an individual has low *reappraisal* , the tendency to experience *anxiety* in conditions of being less close to family and poor communication seems more likely to experience *anxiety because of lack of reappraisal* ability.

Table 7. *Conditional Effects of Reappraisal* on *Family Functioning* (Cohesion) and *Anxiety*

Reappraisal	*Effect*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI *Low*	*Up*
-1 SD	0.006	0.061	0.104	0.917	-0.113	0.126
Mean	-0.075	0.041	-1,843	0.066	-0.155	0.005
+1 SD	-0.157	0.046	-3.436	0.000	-0.246	-0.060

Table 8. *Conditional Effects of Reappraisal* on *Family Functioning* (Communication) and *Anxiety*

Reappraisal	*Effect*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI *Low*	*Up*
-1 SD	0.015	0.058	0.282	0.778	-0.092	0.123
Mean	-0.052	0.037	-1.391	0.165	-0.127	0.021
+1 SD	-0.119	0.042	-2.822	0.005	-0.201	-0.036

Conditional effect results *of suppression* can be seen in Table 9. The results show that *suppression* will work significantly when *suppression* is at the average and below the high average (p <0.05). While when the level *of suppression* is above the average, the role *of reappraisal* is not significant (p>0.05). This result is inversely proportional to *reappraisal* . If an individual who has high *suppression* (M = 6.26), then the individual who has less close relationships with his family will have a tendency to experience *anxiety* that does not change because it does not provide a significant effect. While in individuals who have low *suppression* (M = 3.52) or on average (M = 4.89), the tendency to experience *anxiety* when family cohesion is low will also be lower because they use less *suppression* as a method of emotional regulation. This means that when an individual has low *suppression, it will weaken the relationship between cohesion and anxiety* .

Table 9. *Conditional Effects Suppression* on *Family Functioning* (Cohesion) and *Anxiety*

Suppression	*Effect*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI *Low*	*Up*
-1 SD	-0.191	0.040	-4,751	0.000	-0.270	-0.112
Mean	-0.128	0.034	-3.817	0.000	-0.194	-0.062
+1 SD	-0.064	0.049	-1.324	0.186	-0.159	0.031

3.4. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether *family functioning* with dimensions of cohesion, adaptation, and communication has a relationship with *anxiety,* especially in Generation Z. This study also tried to add a moderator variable, namely *emotion regulation* with dimensions of *reappraisal* and *suppression* . The results showed that all dimensions *of family functioning* have a significant negative relationship with *anxiety* . *Emotion regulation,* especially the *reappraisal dimension,* can moderate *family functioning* on *anxiety* . *The reappraisal dimension* can also moderate the cohesion and communication dimensions on *anxiety. However, the suppression* dimension can only moderate the cohesion dimension on *anxiety* .

The first finding of this study found that Gen-Z has low *family functioning* (M = 2,626). This result is in line with the short questions asked before participants filled out the questionnaire, that 54.9% of participants thought that the participant's family could not communicate well and 79.5% felt that problems in the family could not always be resolved well. The participants' views on how families communicate and resolve problems have implied that the average *family functioning* of participants tends to be less than good. One possible reason why participants feel that their families do not have a well- *functioning family* is because family members have unbalanced roles/tasks [28].

family functioning can have an impact on the individual's mental state because indirectly the individual will feel lonely [29]due to a lack of good communication with the family, poor problem solving in family matters, and a lack of close interpersonal relationships with the family. *Multigenerational transmission process theory* [12]states that the relationship patterns that a family has will be repeated by the next generation. Therefore, families need to re-establish whether each family member feels that their family has good *family functioning* so that negative things do not happen again in the next generation.

When testing the correlation, it was found that *family functioning* had a significant negative relationship to *anxiety* with a value of r = -0.425 (p <0.01). This result is in line with previous research [15] that *family functioning* in the dimensions of cohesion (r = -0.41, p <0.01) and adaptation (r = -0.42, p <0.01) has a negative relationship to *anxiety* . *Family functioning* can also predict *anxiety* by 18.9%. The higher *the family functions,* the more likely it is to reduce individual *anxiety* . Conversely, low *family functioning* can increase the tendency of individuals to experience *anxiety* . Therefore, it is important to re-evaluate how *family functioning* is in individual families and what interventions can be developed to improve *family functioning* because the results of the study found that Gen-Z *family functioning* is quite low and results in *anxiety* .

The second result found that *emotion regulation* in the *reappraisal dimension* had a significant negative relationship to *anxiety* (r = -0.704, p <0.01). This result shows that when individuals have a good ability to change the meaning of unpleasant situations, it is related to a tendency to experience less *anxiety* . Conversely, when individuals are less able to change their perspective in emotional conditions, the possibility of experiencing *anxiety* is higher.

Reappraisal can also predict *anxiety experience* by 49.4% negatively. This negative relationship is also reflected in the description of participants where participants tend to have low *reappraisal* (M = 3.769) and high *anxiety* . *Meanwhile, the suppression dimension* has a positive relationship with *anxiety* (r = 0.768, p < 0.01). This negative relationship indicates that when individuals hold back or suppress the emotions they feel, they tend to experience higher *anxiety* . *Individuals who do not keep their feelings to themselves are less likely to experience anxiety* . *Suppression* can also be predicted by 58.9%. This negative relationship is also reflected in the description of participants where participants tend to have high *suppression* (M = 4.8883) and high *anxiety. These results are in line with* previous research [24] which found that *the reappraisal dimension* has a negative relationship with *anxiety* (r = −0.27, p <0.01) and *suppression* with *anxiety* has a positive relationship (r = 0.37, p <0.01). Individuals have a tendency to use *reappraisal* or *suppression* as a way to regulate emotions in certain conditions. Gross's theory **Error! Reference source not found.**states that individuals are in the anxiety stage because there is a process and emotional involvement that makes individuals need to react to things that are considered threatening. The strategy of using *reappraisal* is more adaptive to *anxiety* because it reduces subjective thinking of the situation so that unpleasant feelings and emotions are reduced. While *suppression* is often maladaptive to *anxiety* and is only good to use in certain conditions such as experiencing exposure to traumatic events, in the short term *suppression* becomes adaptive. It can be implied that *reappraisal* and *suppression* have different and opposing emotional regulation mechanisms.

If we look at the previous regression results, *emotion regulation* can predict *anxiety* more than *family functioning* . This shows that internal factors, namely oneself, have a greater role in determining whether an individual experiences *anxiety* or not compared to external factors. This result is in line with previous research [15]which found that external factors, namely *family functioning,* can predict *anxiety* by 18.8% while internal factors such as *differentiation of self* can predict *anxiety by 50.3%* . It can be implied that how individuals decide to think about events that occur in their lives is a major determinant of experiencing *anxiety* compared to the influence of the surrounding environment. *Dual Process Theory* [30]states that individuals have a way of processing information received, namely *the reflective system* and *impulsive system* . *The reflective system* is the way individuals make decisions by linking the information and knowledge they have to the situation that occurs. *The impulsive system* is the way individuals make decisions directly without or with little thought. This theory reflects that events experienced by individuals both in the family and in the environment do not directly impact the individual but there is a thought process and other internal factors such as knowledge, information, even automatic thoughts from individuals to digest what is happening.

The third finding found that *family functioning* has a positive relationship with *reappraisal* (r = 0.501, p <0.01) and a negative relationship with *suppression* (r = -0.398, p <0.01). This result shows that when individuals have a well functioning family, individuals tend to have *reappraisal* as a method of emotional regulation compared to *suppression* . This result is in line with previous research [32]which found that low *family functioning is related to increased suppression* due to loneliness felt by individuals. Individuals who use *suppression* tend to keep their feelings to themselves and do not depend on others. This result can also be explained by previous research [33], who found that children *model* how parents *regulate emotions* and parents also play a major role in providing socialization to children about how to regulate emotions. Individuals who have the *reappraisal method* as emotional regulation can occur because they have parents who also use the *reappraisal model* and parents provide *emotional supportive reactions* when children have problems, such as parents will focus on reactions to the problems and emotions faced by children. Parents will try to divert children's problems with what children like so that in the long term children will *reappraise* when

faced with unpleasant conditions. Meanwhile, the reason individuals tend to use the *suppression method* as a way of regulating emotions is because parents often *suppress* and parents provide *non-supportive reactions* to their children when children have problems, such as parents will minimize or suppress the feelings that children are feeling or even give negative things to children such as punishment when children overreact. Therefore, the family plays a role in determining how individuals *regulate emotions* .

The results of the relationship between *family functioning* , *emotion regulation* , and *anxiety* can be explained by *Family Systems Theory* [12]*emotional fusion* often occurs in families. which is interpreted as an individual caught up in the desires and feelings of family members so that they lose their own uniqueness, the boundaries between themselves and their families become unclear. For example, a child sees their parents feeling upset so that the child becomes anxious because of their parents' condition. This kind of affected condition can make all family members feel depressed so that rationality is lost. *Emotional fusion* can occur because of having a low [15]. Therefore, *a protective factor is needed* to maintain one's own identity but still maintain good relationships with family members. When individuals are firm in themselves without being emotionally affected by others, they tend to have better abilities in *emotion regulation* . If individuals have good *emotion regulation, especially reappraisal* , the tendency to experience *anxiety* will decrease.

The fourth finding found that *reappraisal* can be a moderator in the relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety* , especially when individuals have high *reappraisal (Effect* = -0.139, p = 0.002). *Reappraisal* can function to weaken the relationship between low *family functioning and* high *anxiety. So if the individual's condition is in a* poor *family functioning condition but has* high *reappraisal , the tendency to experience anxiety* is reduced. *Reappraisal* can also be a moderator in the relationship between the dimensions of cohesion (*Effect* = -0.1565, p = 0.000) and communication (*Effect* = -0.1187, p = 0.005) to *anxiety* . So, if individuals have poor closeness and communication with their families but have high *reappraisal , the tendency to experience anxiety* is reduced. These results can be from the theory of *Gross's Process Model of Emotion Regulation* **Error! Reference source not found.** *Reappraisal* serves to change the individual's thinking and perspective on stressful events. *Reappraisal* is an effective technique in the initial process of regulating emotions. When faced with circumstances such as a low *functioning family* , individuals who have high *reappraisal are more likely to experience less anxiety* . It can be implied that *reappraisal* is *a protective factor* that can help to deal with the impact of low *family functioning.*

Suppression dimension can only moderate the relationship between cohesion dimension and *anxiety,* especially when individual *suppression* is low, it will give the greatest effect (*Effect* = -0.1912, p = 0.000). If *suppression* is low, *suppression* can work to weaken the relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety* . However, when individuals have high suppression, *suppression* cannot work as a moderator. This shows that suppression has limited benefits in the relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety* compared to *reappraisal* . This result can be explained by previous research [33]which found that *suppression* is related to parenting methods and mental health problems. The closeness of children and parents (cohesion) determines how much *suppression will be done* as a method of emotional regulation. When children have a family that is open to emotions, the tendency for children to *suppress* is also lower. Therefore, *suppression* can only work as a moderator when individual *suppression is low because when suppression* is high, individuals tend to experience negative feelings and other psychological problems that cause individual *anxiety* to continue.

Based on the research results that have been explained, this study has advantages and limitations. The first advantage in this study is explaining the picture of *anxiety* in generation Z, especially in Indonesia. Second, this study uses simple regression on each variable and dimension to see one by one how big a role is given to *anxiety* . Third, all research data and measuring instruments used have been declared valid and reliable so as to minimize bias that can occur from the research results. Fourth, this study tries to explore the use of *emotion regulation* as *a personal resource* owned by each individual to moderate the relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety* where no similar research has been conducted. Fifth, *family functioning* is seen in three dimensions, namely cohesion, adaptation, and communication, while in previous studies *family functioning* was only seen in two dimensions, namely cohesion and adaptation [15][29].

In addition to the advantages of the study, of course this study also has several limitations. First, this study only represents Generation Z so it cannot be generalized to other generations. Second, the study did not consider cultural backgrounds or other variants that might influence the results. Third, participants filled out the questionnaire based on *self-report* so it is very possible that there is a certain bias or motivation. Fourth, when data collection was carried out *online* at a certain time so that researchers were not there to see participants filling it out directly, if participants had obstacles or confusion with the questions, participants might be able to interpret it themselves so that they had different intentions with the questions asked.

The researcher has some suggestions from the results of this study to conduct counseling to the community so that they can better understand the importance of *family functioning* and *emotion regulation* . Further research can develop this research by reviewing *reappraisal* as an intervention and conducting experiments such as creating training to improve *reappraisal* . Further research can also use a *mix-method method* to find out *family functioning* in depth and minimize participant answers from being biased. Furthermore, research can use other variables such as *core beliefs* , *metacognitive strategies* and *self-image* which may be able to explain the occurrence of *anxiety* more deeply.

Researchers also have suggestions for teenagers or Generation Z to change their perspective that the problems they have now are not threats but challenges to create growth. Individuals can *journal* to record moments and reflect on the reactions that individuals do when faced with problems so that in the future they can try to change the way they react or think to be more positive or good. Individuals can also practice *reframing* and *mindfulness* so that individuals are aware of what they are doing and are aware of seeing other perspectives of a situation. Researchers also have suggestions for parents to create an open communication space with children and provide positive affirmations so that children feel *emotional support* .

4. Conclusion

This study aims to determine the role of *emotion regulation* as a moderator in the relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety* , especially in Generation Z. Based on the results of data processing, the first hypothesis has been proven that *family functioning* and its dimensions, namely cohesion, adaptation, and communication, have a significant negative relationship and have a role in predicting *anxiety* by 14.1% - 18.4% with a negative effect. These results indicate that when individuals have low closeness to their families, poor problem solving within the family, and ineffective communication with the family can increase individual anxiety.

Hypothesis two has also been proven that the dimension of *emotion regulation* can moderate the relationship between *family functioning* and *anxiety* under certain conditions. *Reappraisal* can be a moderator in the relationship between *family functioning* as a whole, the cohesion dimension, and the communication dimension on *anxiety* . These results indicate that individuals who have an *emotion regulation method* by changing their perspective of thinking when receiving information can better handle low *family functioning conditions so as to minimize experiencing anxiety* . *The suppression dimension* only moderates the cohesion dimension on *anxiety* and if the individual has low *suppression, suppression* can moderate *family functioning* as a whole and the communication dimension. *Suppression* can work effectively as a moderator when the individual has low *suppression to weaken the relationship between family functioning* and *anxiety* . If the individual has high *suppression , suppression* cannot work as a moderator.

The results of this study are expected to provide contributions, uses, and information to the science of psychology in the field of family so that it can be evidence and evaluation that the role of *family functioning* is important for mental health, especially *anxiety* and for individuals who read to consider the importance of the role of *emotion regulation* in relating to family. This study is expected to be the basis for further research to create interventions that can improve *emotion regulation,* especially *reappraisal* .

Reference List

[1] Arum, LS, Zahrani, A., & Duha, NA (2023). Characteristics of Generation Z and their readiness to face the 2030 demographic bonus. *Accounting Student Research Journal, 2* (1), 59-72. https://doi.org/10.62108/asrj.v2i1.5812

[2] Uhlhaas, PJ, Davey, CG, Mehta, UM, Shah, J., Torous, J., Allen, NB, Avenevoli, S., Bella-Awusah, T., Chanen, A., Chen, EYH, Correll, CU, Do, KQ, Fisher, HL, Frangou, S., Hickie, IB, Keshavan, MS, Konrad, K., Lee, FS, Liu, CH, Luna, B., … Wood, S. J. (2023). Towards a youth mental health paradigm: a perspective and roadmap. *Molecular psychiatry* , *28* (8), 3171–3181. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-023-02202-z

[3] Rahmadani, R., & Sahrani, R. (2021). The role of stress during the COVID-19 Pandemic in the future career anxiety of final-year students. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Economics, Business, Social, and Humanities (ICEBSH 2021), 570* , 979–984. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210805.154

[4] Grelle, K., Shrestha, N., Ximenes, M., Perrotte, J., Cordaro, M., Deason, R.G., & Howard, K. (2023). The generation gap revisited: Generational differences in mental health, maladaptive coping behaviors, and pandemic-related concerns during the initial COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Adult Development* , *30* , 381–392. h ttps://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-023-09442-x

[5] Zhou, Y., Luo, Y., Zhang, N., & Liu, S. (2024). Ten years of research on generalized anxiety disorder (GAD): A scientometric review. *Current Psychology, 43* (24), 21393–21408. https://doi.org/10.1007/S12144-024-05872-2/METRICS

[6] Zhang, Y., Chai, C., Xiong, J., Zhang, L., Zheng, J., Ning, Z., & Wang, Y. (2023). The impact of anxiety, depression, and social support on the relationship between HIV-related stigma and mental health-related quality of life among Chinese patients: a cross-sectional, moderate-mediation study. *BMC Psychiatry, 23* (1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-05103-1

[7] Wu, R., Niu, Q., Wang, Y., Dawa, Y., Guang, Z., Song, D., Xue, B., Lu, C., & Wang, S. (2024). The impact of problematic smartphone use on sleep quality among Chinese young adults: Investigating anxiety and depression as mediators in a three-wave longitudinal study. *Psychology Research and Behavior*

Management , *17* , 1775–1786. https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S455955

[8] Xi, Y. (2020). Anxiety: A concept analysis. *Frontiers of Nursing* , *7* (1), 9-12. https://doi.org/10.2478/fon-2020-0008

[9] Park, S. C., & Kim, Y. K. (2020). Anxiety disorders in the DSM-5: Changes, controversies, and future directions. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology* , *1191* , 187–196. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9705-0_12

[10] Mendlowicz, M.V., & Stein, M.B. (2020). Quality of Life in Individuals With Anxiety Disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 157* (5), 669–682. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.157.5.669

[11] Orbon, MC, Basaria, D., Dewi, FIR, Gumarao, MS, Mergal, VC, & Heng, PH (2021). Codependency among family members as predicted by family functioning and personality type. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Economics, Business, Social, and Humanities (ICEBSH 2021)* , *570* , 1388–1393. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210805.218

[12] Calatrava, M., Martins, M. V., Schweer-Collins, M., Duch-Ceballos, C., & Rodríguez-González, M. (2022). Differentiation of self: A scoping review of Bowen family systems theory's core construct. *Clinical Psychology Review* , *91* , 102101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102101

[13] Liu, L., Chen, J., Liang, S., Yang, W., Peng, X., Cai, C., Huang, A., Wang, X., & Zhao, J. (2023). Impact of family functioning on mental health problems of college students in China during COVID-19 pandemic and moderating role of coping style: a longitudinal study. *BMC Psychiatry* , *23* (1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-04717-9

[14] Berryhill, M. B., & Smith, J. (2021). College student chaotically-disengaged family functioning, depression, and anxiety: The indirect effects of positive family communication and self-compassion. *Marriage and Family Review* , *57* (1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2020.1740373

[15] Dolz-Del-Castellar, B., & Oliver, J. (2021). Relationship between family functioning, differentiation of self and anxiety in Spanish young adults. *PLOS ONE* , *16* (3), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246875

[16] Ramaswami, S.B., Jensen, T., Berghaus, M., De-Oliveira, S., Russ, S.A., Weiss-Laxer, N., Verbiest, S., & Barkin, S. (2022). Family health development in life course research: A scoping review of family functioning measures. *Pediatrics* , *149* (5), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.202 1-053509J

[17] Costantine, L.L. (2024). Family types and family dimensions: The paradigmatic framework and the circumplex model. *Journal of Family Theory & Review* , 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12573

[18] Ulitua, AE, & Soetikno, N. (2022). What is happening with his behavior? A case study of problem behavior and family function from little "A.". *Proceedings of the 3rd Tarumanagara International Conference on the Applications of Social Sciences and Humanities (TICASH 2021)* , *655* , 1622–1627. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220404.262

[19] Zhao, M., Kadir, N.B.A., & Razak, M.A.A. (2024). The relationship between family, emotional functioning intelligence, loneliness, social support, and depressive symptoms among undergraduate students. *Behavioral Sciences* , *14* (9), 819. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14090819

[20] Boyes, M.E., Mah, M.A., & Hasking, P. (2023). Associations between family functioning, emotion regulation, social support, and self-injury among emerging adult university students. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* , *32* (3), 846–857. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-022-02516-6

[21] Wright, R.N., Adcock, R.A., & LaBar, K.S. (2025). Learning emotion regulation: An integrative framework. *Psychological Review, 132* (1), 173–203. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000506

[22] Margaretha, J., Soetikno, N., & Sari, MP (2023). The effect of emotional regulation on risk-taking behavior in late adolescence. *International Journal Of Application on Social Science and Humanities* , *1* (1), 613–620. https://doi.org/10.30994/sjik.v9i2.496

[23] Wahyuni, PS, & Dewi, FIR (2020). Burnout riot police officers: Emotional regulation and five personality traits as predictors. *Psychodimensia* , *19* (2), 206. https://doi.org/10.24167/psidim.v19i2.2856

[24] Zhao, T., Fu, Z., Lian, X., Ye, L., & Huang, W. (2021). Exploring emotion regulation and perceived control as antecedents of anxiety and its consequences during COVID-19 full remote learning. *Frontiers in Psychology* , *12* , Article 675910. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.675910

[25] Judodihardjo, E., Satiadarma, MP, & Soetikno, N. (2024). The role of family functioning as a moderator in the relationship between overprotective parenting patterns and anxiety levels in adolescents. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences* , *17* (3), 276–290. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2024.17.3.276

[26] Radde, HA, Nurrahmah, Nurhikmah, & Saudi, ANA (2021). Construct validity test of the Indonesian language version of the emotion regulation questionnaire using confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Character Psychology* , *1* (2), 152–160. https://doi.org/10.56326/jpk.v1i2.1284

[27] Igartua, J.-J., & Hayes, A. F. (2021). Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: Concepts, Computations, and Some Common Confusions. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology* , *24* , e49. https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2021.46

[28] Walsh, F. (2023). Promoting family resilience. In S. Goldstein & R.B. Brooks (Eds.), *Handbook of resilience in children* (3rd ed., pp. 365–375). Springer Nature Switzerland AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14728-9_20

[29] Pan, Y., Yang, Z., Han, X., & Qi, S. (2021). Family functioning and mental health among secondary vocational students during the COVID-19 epidemic: A moderated mediation model. *Personality and Individual Differences* , *171* , 110490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110490

[30] Vlasenko, V.V., Hayutin, I., Pan, C., Vardakis, J.M., Waugh, C.E., Admon, R., & McRae, K. (2024). How do people use reappraisal? An investigation of selection frequency and effective outcomes of reappraisal tactics. *Emotion* , *24* (3), 676–686. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0001259

[31] Gronchi, G., Gavazzi, G., Viggiano, M. P., & Giovannelli, F. (2024). Dual-Process Theory of thought and inhibitory control: An ALE meta-analysis. *Brain Sciences* , *14* (1), 101. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci14010101

[32] Yun, P., Xiaohong, H., Zhongping, Y., & Zhujun, Z. (2021). Family function, loneliness, emotion regulation, and hope in secondary vocational school students: A moderated mediation

model. *Frontiers in Public Health* , *9* , 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.722276

[33] Guo, X., Jiao, R., & Wang, J. (2024). Connections between parental emotion socialization and internalizing problems in adolescents: Examining the mediating role of emotion regulation strategies and moderating effect of gender. *Behavioral Sciences* , *14* (8), 660. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14080660

[34] van Eickels, R.L., Tsarpalis-Fragkoulidis, A., & Zemp, M. (2022). Family cohesion, shame-proneness, expressive suppression, and adolescent mental health—A path model approach. *Frontiers in Psychology* , *13* , 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.921250