

An Investigation into Emotional Regulation, Affect, and Psychological Wellbeing: A Cross-Cultural Synthesis

Vijyendra Pandey¹, Tabassum Qazi², Kudratov Mirjalol Khurshid Ugli³, Wael M. F. Abuhasan⁴, Prabhu⁵, Azizuddin Khan^{6*}

¹ Professor, Department of Psychology, School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Central University of Karnataka, India. Email - virjup@gmail.com

² Professor, Kattakurgan State Pedagogical Institute, Kattakurgan City Ipak Yuli 8, Samarkand, Uzbekistan. Email: tabassumqazi@katdpi.uz

³ Researcher, Kattakurgan State Pedagogical Institute, Kattakurgan City Ipak Yuli 8, Samarkand, Uzbekistan. Email: xalqaro@katdpi.uz

⁴ Assistant Professor, Department of Health Sciences, Faculty of Allied Medical Sciences, Arab American University of Palestine (Palestine). Email: wael.abuhasan@aaup.edu

⁵ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Christ (Deemed to be University), Yeshwanthpur Campus, Bengaluru Karnataka, India. E-mail: prabhu@christuniversity.in

⁶ Professor, India Value Chair Professor, Psychophysiology Laboratory, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay Powai - 400 076, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India, Email: khanaziz@iitb.ac.in

*Corresponding Author: khanaziz@iitb.ac.in

Citation: Pandey, V., Qazi, T., Ugli, K. M.K., Abuhasan. E. M. F., Prabhu. and Khan, A. (2025). An Investigation into Emotional Regulation, Affect, and Psychological Wellbeing: A Cross-Cultural Synthesis, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(1), 108-123. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.4416>

Published: November 02, 2025

ABSTRACT

The current study aims to investigate the correlation among these study variables and dimensions in the multicultural Indian context as well investigate the correlation cross culturally in the American context. A total of five-hundred and fifty-five sample (N = 555) from both the cultural settings i.e., a total of two-hundred and twenty (39.63%) Indian sample (Indian = 220) and a total of three-hundred and thirty-five (60.36%) American sample (American = 335) were employed. Three questionnaires were employed namely: Emotion Regulation Questionnaire, Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), and Psychological Wellbeing Scale. Results revealed that Negative Affect did not significantly correlate with Emotion Regulation and its dimension, it did significantly correlate negatively with all the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing at < 0.01 level. Positive Affect was significantly correlated with Emotion Regulation and its dimensions as well as all the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing; wherein, notably all these dimensions including the Emotion Regulation were positively correlated at < 0.01 level. The results were discussed in the light of the existing literature.

Keywords: Cross cultural, Emotional regulation, Interpersonal interactions, and Multicultural.

INTRODUCTION

Emotions are an integral part of human life as they help in establishing and maintaining better interpersonal interactions among fellow-individuals by enhancing the behaviours that guide us better in obtaining the much needed physical and psychological wellbeing. However, past researchers noted that the felt emotions do not always help us in monitoring our behaviours in attaining intended goal, instead would disrupt the course of action at times

(Verzeletti, Zammuner, Galli & Agnoli, 2016). Consequently, given the situational factors, instead of helping us in maintaining better interpersonal interactions, felt emotions might disturb the very interpersonal relationship that is established in the past. Therefore, literature emphasizes on effectively regulating our emotions that is relevant to situational demands (McLaughlin, Hatzenbuehler, Mennin, & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2011). Emotion Regulation (ER) refers to a process wherein individuals tend to monitor, evaluate and modify their emotional reactions to situational aspects that help in achieving their goals. Given that the effective regulation of emotion can influence the happenings around an individual's life in obtaining overall wellbeing, the study of emotion regulation and how it influences the overall wellbeing positively and negatively is pivotal.

Gross & John (2003) emphasize two strategies: *Cognitive Reappraisal (CR)* and *Expressive Suppression (ES)* in the 'Process Model of Emotion Regulation.' These two strategies have been linked to various psychological outcomes; CR has been reported to be related with psychological health, positive affect and better social relationships (Hago, Kraft & Corby, 2009; Balzarotti, John & Gross, 2010; Cabello, Salguero, Fernandez-Berrocal & Gross, 2013; John & Gross, 2004). Whereas ES has been related with negative affect (Gross & John, 2003), poor social relationships (John & Gross, 2004) and negative social exchange as well as negative communication with others (Lebowitz & Dovidio, 2015). In addition, it is evident in past research that an inappropriate ER may lead a person to experience negative affect, interpersonal difficulties and behavioural as well as health issues on the longer run (Aldao et al., 2015; Webb, Miles & Sheeran, 2012). Recently, Ayesha, Akbar & Shaikh (2020) attempted to study the mediating role of emotional stability in explaining the relationship between mindfulness and psychological wellbeing; however, they reported that the effect of emotional stability in mediation as non-significant. On the other hand, Brindle, Moulding, Bakker & Nedeljkovic (2015) noted that lack of access to emotion regulation partially mediated the relationship between sensory-processing sensitivity and negative affect.

Despite the findings in past literature as indicated above, studies assessing the significant effects of emotion regulation dimensions onto positive and negative affect and consequently the significant effect of positive and negative affect onto psychological wellbeing dimensions are few. Furthermore, the studies focusing on investigating the mediating role of positive and negative effecting in explaining the relationship between emotion regulation and psychological wellbeing dimensions are limited.

Emotion Regulation (ER) and Positive Affect and Negative Affect

The conceptualization of ER along with the processes of modifying emotional experience in certain context, also surrounds the notion that it is a continuous operational system that regulates both positive and negative emotions (Smith & Bryant, 2017). Among the two dimensions of ER, the CR comparatively produced greater down-regulation of negative emotional experience which indicates that individuals who habitually reappraise are likely to display a pattern of subsequent changes in their experiences of emotions (Cai, Richdale, Dissanayake & Uljarevic, 2019). Bottesi, Tesini, Cerea & Ghisi (2018) examined whether difficulties in ER related to negative affect among individuals with borderline personality disorder wherein they found that individuals with the disorder exhibited higher levels of difficulties in ER and negative affect, difficulties in ER correlated with negative affect and also that difficulties in ER among individual with the disorder were the most significant predictors of negative affect.

Among the adolescents' studies on ER and Positive Affect and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), Tortella-Feliu, Balle & Sese (2010) found that both negative affect and negative ER contribute to anxiety symptoms and that most of the adolescents scoring high on negative affect also tended to score higher on negative ER which indicates that adolescents with greater negative affect scores are prone to a dysfunctional style of ER. Whereas among the late adolescents, Hamilton, Burke, Stange, Kleiman, Rubenstein, Scopelliti, Abramson & Alloy (2017) observed that adolescents' trait negative and positive affect are likely to be associated with increased utilization of ER strategies for managing these effects that could lead to occurrence of positive and negative events in the interpersonal relationships. To comprehensively explore the pathways between difficulty in identifying as well as describing emotions and obesity in the presence of negative affect and emotional eating, Pink, Lee, Price & Williams (2018) found that inability to identify and describe emotions predicted obesity indirectly via emotional eating and negative affect among student population that highlights the ways to address an individuals' ability to identify and describe emotions for designing inventions in assisting weight loss and management which are considered to be few of other important aspects of overall wellbeing of a person.

Emotion Regulation and Psychological Wellbeing

The individual differences in cognitive ER and its relation with subjective and psychological wellbeing was examined in the past; consequently, it was found that positive reappraisal and refocus on planning were positively related to both subjective and psychological wellbeing while rumination and self-blame were linked with poor

wellbeing. These findings indicated that cognitive ER strategy could be differently effective mechanism in promoting individual's wellbeing (Balzarotti, Biassoni, Villani, Prunas & Velotti, 2016). Past research noted that ER with its cognitive i.e., CR and affective components i.e., ES could act as a relevant coping mechanism for stressful situations and aid in better wellbeing (Marroquin et al., 2017). Among other coping mechanisms, Croom (2014) explored and reviewed the recent literature on music and psychological wellbeing to provide certain support to the claim that music practice and participation could positively contribute in individuals' living with a positive influence on their emotions, engagement, relationship, meaning and accomplishment.

The link of ER strategies with subjective wellbeing was also examined at within person and between person levels; at within person level, CR was noted to increase positive emotions and linked positively with subjective wellbeing while ES of positive emotions was negatively related with subjective wellbeing. Besides, CR was noted to down-regulate negative emotions and suppression as a strategy to withhold expressions of negative emotions. On the other hand, at between-person level, experiences of negative emotions among individuals found to increase suppression of positive emotions that eventually finds it similarity with the findings of within person level (Katana, Roche, Spain & Allemand, 2019). Although several previous studies have been noted in the area, studies focusing on two-dimensional ER and six-dimensional psychological wellbeing among students' population have been few among young and middle aged adults.

Psychological Wellbeing and PANAS

Although over the years several studies provided evidence of relationship between emotion dynamics and psychological wellbeing, Dejonckheere, Mestdagh, Houben, Rutten, Sels, Kuppens & Tuerlinckx (2019) argued that conventional research has been presently unable to demonstrate independent relationship between emotion dynamics and psychological wellbeing. They further argued that dynamic measures have little values over levels of positive and negative affect in predicting the differences among individuals in three indicators of psychological wellbeing namely: life satisfaction, depressive symptoms and borderline symptoms. While examining the fluctuations in affect among early-stage entrepreneurs, Uy, Sun & Foo (2016) investigated and found the correlations between affect spin with wellbeing. In particular they reported negative relation between affect spin and wellbeing which was moderated by goal-orientation. While the high performance-approach orientation notably weakened negative relation between affect fluctuations and wellbeing. On the other hand, the high learning goal orientation strongly influenced the affect fluctuations on psychological wellbeing.

Whereas the examination of affective intensity and its link with psychological wellbeing emphasized the correlation between affective intensity and few dimensions of psychological wellbeing. Montes-Berges & Augusto-Landa (2014) noted that higher intrapersonal emotional understanding creates a better feeling among individuals i.e., self-acceptance dimension of psychological wellbeing was correlated with higher affective intensity. Interestingly, individuals with negative intensity were noted to score higher on positive relations with others' dimension of wellbeing, indicating to the fact that lower anxiety or tension tends to lead to positive relation with others. On contrast, positive affect predicted the personal growth dimension of wellbeing. Furthermore, the autonomy dimension of wellbeing was determined by emotional attention; serenity predicted the environmental mastery dimension of wellbeing; while age, interestingly predicted purpose in life dimension of wellbeing which highlights that youngest individuals tend to show greater need to set goals and objectives. While studying the positive and negative effects of social networks in later life of an individual that deals with overall health and wellbeing, Rook (2015) provided an overview of health related effects of positive and negative aspects of social relationships and connections in later life with greater focus on health and wellbeing. In spite of greater attention from researchers in the area of positive and negative affect as well as psychological wellbeing, the major focus in the past studies have been on other forms of psychological wellbeing such as life satisfaction and so on. In addition, although a few studies focused on vast nature of assessment such as of Ryff's (1989) six-dimensional approach, such studies mostly have been among varied population, gender-specific and linked with concepts such as ability and trait based emotional intelligence rather than with positive and negative affect. Therefore, the present study attempts to fill this gap.

Present Study

Amidst the ambiguity in the empirical evidence of correlates of PANAS, ER and Psychological Wellbeing dimensions, the current study aims to investigate the correlation among these variables and dimensions in the multicultural Indian context as well investigate the correlation cross culturally in the United States of American context. Owing to the scarce studies of PANAS in the Indian context as well amidst various models and structures of ER and Psychological Wellbeing, the current study firstly intends to examine a) the impact of PANAS dimensions on Psychological Wellbeing dimensions and b) the influence of ER on PANAS and Psychological

Wellbeing cross-culturally for both the Indian as well as the United States of American samples. Furthermore, the present study, in the wake of unanswered questions intends to explore the mediating role of PANAS dimensions in explaining the relations among ER and Psychological Wellbeing dimensions. Finally, the present study investigates the significant differences between the two nations, as well as male and female groups with respect to the study variables.

METHODS

Participants

Respondents included a total of five-hundred and fifty-five sample ($N = 555$) from both the cultural settings i.e., a total of two-hundred and twenty (39.63%) Indian sample (Indian = 220) and a total of three-hundred and thirty-five (60.36%) United States of American sample (American = 335). The respondents belonged to young and middle adulthood wherein their age ranged between 16 to 55 years (Mean = 20.27 years SD = 4.54 years). The sample comprised of two-hundred and thirteen male (38.37%) and three-hundred and forty-two (61.62%) of female (Male = 213 Female = 342). Age range of the United States of American sample was 17-55 years (Mean = 20.60 SD = 5.53) while for the Indian sample it was 16-29 years (Mean = 19.76 SD = 2.25).

Instruments

The current study used following instruments to assess the study variables among intended population from two comparative study areas.

Emotion Regulation

The Emotion Regulation among study participants was assessed using the 10-item *Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ)* by Gross & John (2003). The ERQ assesses individual differences in two habitual strategies namely a) Cognitive Reappraisal (CR) and b) Expressive Suppression (ES). The CR dimension assessed by 6-items of which the scores range from 6 – 42 and the internal consistency of the sub-scale stands at (.79) while the ES assessed by 4-items of which the scores range from 4 – 28 and the internal consistency of the sub-scale stands at (.73). ERQ is assessed on 7-point Likert scale wherein 1 denotes strongly disagree and 7 denotes strongly agree.

Positive and Negative Affect

Positive and Negative Affect was assessed using the 20-item *Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)* by Watson, Clark & Tellegan (1988). The schedule consists of two independent dimensions namely a) Positive Affect (PA) and b) Negative Affect of which the coefficient alpha was found to be (.88) and (.87) respectively for PA and NA dimensions of PANAS. The PA and NA assessed by 10-items each of which the score ranges from 10 – 50 for both. While higher scores represent higher levels of PA, whereas the lower scores represent lower levels of NA on the schedule. These respective 10-items for each dimension are responded on 5-point Likert scale wherein 1 represents very slightly or not at all while 5 represents extremely.

Psychological Well-Being Scale

The study participants were assessed with 84-items (14-items each six-sub scales) of *Psychological Wellbeing Scale (PWBS)* by Ryff (1989). The PWBS has six dimensions: a) Autonomy (AT) b) Environmental Mastery (EM) c) Personal Growth (PG) d) Positive Relation with Others (PRWO) e) Purpose in Life (PIL) and f) Self-Acceptance (SA). All these six dimensions are assessed using respective 14-items each and as Ryff (2014) notes “items from separate scales are mixed (by taking one item from each scale successively into one continuous self-report instrument). Participants respond using a six-point format: strongly disagree (1), moderately disagree (2), slightly disagree (3), slightly agree (4), moderately agree (5), strongly agree (6). Responses to negatively scored items (-) are reversed in the final scoring procedures so that high scores indicate high self-ratings on the dimension assessed.” The coefficient alpha for all the six dimension have been noted as: a) AT - .83 b) EM - .86 c) PG - .85 d) PRWO - .88 e) PIL - .88 f) SA - .91.

Procedures

The respondents were approached through online platforms to invite for participation in the research survey. Among the approached individuals, and upon explaining the purpose of the research, an informed consent

was taken from the ones willing to participate. The respondents were assured of confidentiality of their identity and personally identifiable information. In addition, they were familiarized with the survey platform and relevant instructions were given on how to respond to the same and important things to keep in mind while responding. Furthermore, they were informed how the data collected will be stored and protected as well as how any identifiable information from the survey data would be de-linked. Once the data were received from respective samples they were thanked for responding to the survey and their cooperation in carrying out the study.

Data Analyses

The data were analysed using SPSS (version 24). In addition, we performed the mediation analysis using PROCESS Macro (version 3.5) to investigate the mediation role of PANAS on the relationship between Emotion Regulation & Psychological Wellbeing separately for both Indian and the United States of American dataset.

RESULTS

We present the current study’s results and findings in three-folds. Firstly, we present results and findings derived from Indian sample, secondly, we present the result of obtained from the various analyses performed for the United States of American sample. Finally, we present the results and findings of compiled data of both the cultures. In the first fold of results, we performed two major analyses viz. correlation and multiple regression. The correlation analysis was done to test the relationship among various study variables. While various multiple regression analyses were performed to rest the influence of two or more relevant variables on a given dependent variable that are in line with the framed objectives of the study. The results and findings of these deployed statistical analyses are presented as follows:

First Fold – Results of the Indian Dataset

In the first fold of results, we performed two major analyses viz. correlation and multiple regression. The correlation analysis was done to test the relationship among various study variables. While various multiple regression analyses were performed to rest the influence of two or more relevant variables on a given dependent variable that are in line with the framed objectives of the study. The Results and findings derived from the respective analyses for the Indian dataset are presented as follows:

Table 1: Correlation Analysis: among study variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	8	9	10	11	12		
1) NA							
2) PA	-.04						
3) PS	.70**	.68**					
4) ES	.05	.22**	.19**				
5) CR	-.01	.51**	.35**	.41**			
6) ER	.01	.49**	.36**	.73**	.87**		
7) AT	-.34**	.24**	-.07	.04	.17**	.15*	
8) EM	-.33**	.18**	-.11	-.14*	.17*	.04	.25**
9) PG	-.39**	.27**	-.09	-.02	.26**	.20**	.42**
	.45**						
10) PRWO	-.33**	.18**	-.11	-.14*	.17*	.04	.25**
	1.00**	.45**					
11) PIL	-.39**	.27**	-.09	.01	.26**	.20**	.42**
	.45**	1.00**		.45**			
12) SA	-.41**	.29**	-.09	.05	.21**	.18**	.54**
	.47**	.62**		.47**	.62**		

*p < 0.05
 **p < 0.01

The table 1 shows that although Negative Affect did not significantly correlate with Emotion Regulation and its dimension, it did significantly correlate negatively with all the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing at < 0.01 level; wherein, all the dimensions were negatively correlated with the Negative Affect. While the Positive Affect

was significantly correlated with Emotion Regulation and its dimensions as well as all the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing; wherein, notably all these dimensions including the Emotion Regulation were positively correlated at < 0.01 level. Interestingly, the PANAS did not significantly correlate with any of the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing, but was positively correlated with Cognitive Reappraisal and Expressive Suppression dimensions of Emotion Regulation positively at < 0.01 level. Among the two dimensions of Emotion Regulation, Expressive Suppression only correlated negatively with two dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing namely Environmental Mastery and Positive Relation with Others negatively at < 0.05 level while the Cognitive Reappraisal dimensions correlated significantly with all the six dimension of Psychological Wellbeing at < 0.01 level. Whereas the Emotion Regulation was positively correlated with four dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing namely Autonomy, Personal Growth, Purpose in Life and Self-Acceptance. In addition, all six dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing dimensions were correlated positively with each other.

The table 2 showed positive correlation between Negative and Positive Affect on Psychological Wellbeing. The R^2 value of model 2 explains 34% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Negative Affect ($\beta = -.46$, $p = < 0.001$) had negative influence and Positive Affect ($\beta = .34$, $p = < 0.001$) had positive influence on the Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major negative role Negative Affect in predicting the Psychological Wellbeing.

Table 02: Multiple Regression Analysis: Dimensions of PANAS as predictors of Psychological Wellbeing.

Variable	Model 1 Std β	t	Model 2 Std β	t
Negative Affect	-.47	8.01***	-.46	8.41***
Positive Affect			.34	6.16***
R	.47		.58	
R^2	.23		.34	
F	64.28***		56.63***	
ΔR^2	.22		.33	
ΔF	64.28		38.05	

*** $p < 0.001$

Table 03: Multiple Regression Analysis: Dimensions of PANAS as predictors of Autonomy dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

Variable	Model 1 Std β	t	Model 2 Std β	t
Negative Affect	-.34	5.40***	-.33	5.40***
Positive Affect			.23	3.78***
R	.34		.41	
R^2	.11		.16	
F	29.16***		22.61***	
ΔR^2	.11		.16	
ΔF	29.16		14.28	

*** $p < 0.001$

The table 3 shows that influence of Negative and Positive Affect on Autonomy dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R^2 value of model 2 explains 16% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Negative Affect ($\beta = -.33$, $p = < 0.001$) had negative influence and Positive Affect ($\beta = .23$, $p = < 0.001$) had positive influence on the Autonomy dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major negative role of Negative Affect in predicting the Autonomy dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

The table 4 shows that influence of Negative and Positive Affect on Environmental Mastery dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R^2 value of model 2 explains 14% of variance created by the two dimensions of

PANAS. Wherein Negative Affect ($\beta = -.32, p < 0.001$) had negative influence and Positive Affect ($\beta = .16, p < 0.001$) had positive influence on the Environmental Mastery dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major negative role of Negative Affect in predicting the Environmental Mastery dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

The table 5 shows that influence of Negative and Positive Affect on Personal Growth dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R^2 value of model 2 explains 47% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Negative Affect ($\beta = -.38, p < 0.001$) had negative influence and Positive Affect ($\beta = .26, p < 0.001$) had positive influence on the Personal Growth dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major negative role of Negative Affect in predicting the Personal Growth dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

The table 6 shows that influence of Negative and Positive Affect on Positive Relation with Others' dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R^2 value of model 2 explains 14% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Negative Affect ($\beta = -.32, p < 0.001$) had negative influence and Positive Affect ($\beta = .17, p < 0.01$) had positive influence on the Positive Relation with Others' dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major negative role of Negative Affect in predicting the Positive Relation with Others' dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

Table 04: Multiple Regression Analysis: Dimensions of PANAS as predictors of Environmental Mastery dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

Variable	Model 1 Std β	t	Model 2 Std β	t
Negative Affect	-.33	4.87***	-.32	4.91***
Positive Affect			.16	4.70***
R	.33		.37	
R^2	.10		.14	
F	27.22***		17.53***	
ΔR^2	.09		.17	
ΔF	27.22		7.07	

*** $p < 0.001$

Table 05: Multiple Regression Analysis: Dimensions of PANAS as predictors of Personal Growth dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

Variable	Model 1 Std β	t	Model 2 Std β	t
Negative Affect	-.39	6.07***	-.38	6.21***
Positive Affect			.26	5.25***
R	.39		.47	
R^2	.15		.22	
F	40.42***		31.17***	
ΔR^2	.15		.21	
ΔF	40.42		18.63	

*** $p < 0.001$

The table 7 shows that influence of Negative and Positive Affect on Purpose in Life dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R^2 value of model 2 explains 22% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Negative Affect ($\beta = -.38, p < 0.001$) had negative influence and Positive Affect ($\beta = .26, p < 0.001$) had positive influence on the Purpose in Life dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major negative role of Negative Affect in predicting the Purpose in Life dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

Table 06: Multiple Regression Analysis: Dimensions of PANAS as predictors of Positive Relation with Others dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

Variable	Model 1 Std β	t	Model 2 Std β	t
Negative Affect	-.33	5.20***	-.32	5.16***
Positive Affect			.17	2.71**
R	.33		.37	
R ²	.11		.14	
F	27.15***		17.59***	
ΔR^2	.10		.13	
ΔF	27.15		7.26	

p < 0.01 *p < 0.001

Table 07: Multiple Regression Analysis: Dimensions of PANAS as predictors of Purpose in Life dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

Variable	Model 1 Std β	t	Model 2 Std β	t
Negative Affect	-.39	6.31***	-.38	6.38***
Positive Affect			.26	4.26***
R	.39		.47	
R ²	.15		.22	
F	40.42***		31.17***	
ΔR^2	.15		.21	
ΔF	40.42		18.63	

***p < 0.001

The table 8 shows the influence of Negative and Positive Affect on Self-Acceptance dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R² value of model 2 explains 49% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Negative Affect ($\beta = -.40$, $p < 0.001$) had negative influence and Positive Affect ($\beta = .27$, $p < 0.001$) had positive influence on the Self-Acceptance dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major negative role of Negative Affect in predicting the Self-Acceptance dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

The table 9 shows that influence of dimensions of Emotion Regulation on PANAS. The R² value explains 13% of variance created by the Cognitive Reappraisal dimension of Emotion Regulation. Wherein Cognitive Reappraisal ($\beta = .36$, $p < 0.001$) had positive influence on the PANAS among study respondents. This indicates to the fact that only Cognitive Reappraisal loaded into the model to explain predictive role while Expressive Suppression didn't load in the model to determine PANAS scores among study participants.

Table 08: Multiple Regression Analysis: Dimensions of PANAS as predictors of Self-Acceptance dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

Variable	Model 1 Std β	t	Model 2 Std β	t
Negative Affect	-.41	6.70***	-.40	6.82***
Positive Affect			.27	4.68***
R	.41		.49	
R ²	.17		.24	

F	44.91***	35.61***
ΔR^2	.16	.24
ΔF	44.91	22.00

***p <0.001

Table 09: Multiple Regression Analysis: Dimensions of Emotion Regulation as predictors of PANAS.

Variables	Model 1 Std β	t
Cognitive Reappraisal	.36	5.673***
R	.36	
R ²	.13	
F	32.20***	
ΔR^2	.12	

***p <0.001

Table 10: Mediation Analysis: Total Effect, Direct Effect and Standardized Effect of Emotion Regulation on Psychological Wellbeing dimensions

Sl. No	Effect	Total Effect	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect	Confidence Interval	Mediation Strengths
1	Emotion Regulation → Positive Affect → Psychological Wellbeing	.92**	.34 ^{ns}	.14**	[.08:.21]	Full Mediation
2	Emotion Regulation → Negative Affect → Psychological Wellbeing	.92**	.34 ^{ns}	-.00 ^{ns}	[-.08:.06]	No Mediation
3	Emotion Regulation → Positive Affect → Autonomy	.12*	.04 ^{ns}	.10**	[.03:.17]	Full Mediation
4	Emotion Regulation → Negative Affect → Autonomy	.12*	.04 ^{ns}	-.00 ^{ns}	[-.05:.04]	No Mediation
5	Emotion Regulation → Positive Affect → Environmental Mastery	.03 ^{ns}	-.04 ^{ns}	.09**	[.02:.17]	No Mediation
6	Emotion Regulation → Negative Affect → Environmental Mastery	.03 ^{ns}	-.04 ^{ns}	-.00 ^{ns}	[-.05:.04]	No Mediation
7	Emotion Regulation → Positive Affect → Personal Growth	.19**	.10 ^{ns}	.10**	[.03:.17]	Full Mediation
8	Emotion Regulation → Negative Affect → Personal Growth	.19**	.10 ^{ns}	-.00 ^{ns}	[-.06:.05]	No Mediation
9	Emotion Regulation → Positive Affect → Positive Relation with Others	.03 ^{ns}	-.04 ^{ns}	.09**	[.02:.17]	No Mediation

10	Emotion Regulation → Negative Affect → Positive Relation with Others	.03 ^{ns}	-.04 ^{ns}	-.00 ^{ns}	[-.05:.04]	No Mediation
11	Emotion Regulation → Positive Affect → Purpose in Life	.19**	.10 ^{ns}	.10**	[.03:.17]	Full Mediation
12	Emotion Regulation → Negative Affect → Purpose in Life	.19**	.10 ^{ns}	-.00 ^{ns}	[-.06:.05]	No Mediation
13	Emotion Regulation → Positive Affect → Self- Acceptance	.15**	.05 ^{ns}	.12**	[.05:.19]	Full Mediation
5	Emotion Regulation → Negative Affect → Self- Acceptance	.15**	.05 ^{ns}	-.00 ^{ns}	[-.06:.06]	No Mediation

ns: Not Significant *p < 0.05 **p < 0.01

Second Fold - Results of the American Dataset

In the second fold of results, we performed two major analyses viz. correlation and multiple regression for the United States of American dataset. The correlation analysis was done to test the relationship among various study variables. While various multiple regression analyses were performed to test the influence of two or more relevant variables on a given dependent variable that are in line with the framed objectives of the study for the United States of America dataset. The results and findings derived from mentioned analyses for the United States of American dataset are presented as follows:

The table 11 shows that Negative Affect significantly correlated with all other study variables and sub-dimensions. Wherein it was noted to have negatively correlated all the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing and Expression Suppression dimension of Emotion Regulation as well as Positive Affect at < 0.01 level. While the Positive Affect was significantly correlated with all the study variables and sub-dimensions positively except for Cognitive Reappraisal and Emotion Regulation. Interestingly, the PANAS did not significantly correlate with any of the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing and other study variables. Among the two dimensions of Emotion Regulation, Expressive Suppression correlated with all the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing positively except for Autonomy, while Cognitive Reappraisal did correlate with all the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing negatively at < 0.01 level. Whereas the Emotion Regulation was negatively correlated with four dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing namely Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Purpose in Life and Self-Acceptance. In addition, all six dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing dimensions were positively correlated with each other. The table 2 shows the influence of Positive and Negative Affect on Psychological Wellbeing. The R² value of model 2 explains 54% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Positive Affect ($\beta = .47$, $p = < 0.001$) had positive influence and Negative Affect ($\beta = -.42$, $p = < 0.001$) had negative influence on the Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major positive role of Positive Affect in predicting the Psychological Wellbeing.

The table 12 shows the influence of Positive and Negative Affect on Autonomy dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R² value of model 2 explains 16% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Positive Affect ($\beta = .26$, $p = < 0.001$) had positive influence and Negative Affect ($\beta = -.23$, $p = < 0.001$) had negative influence on the Autonomy dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major positive role of Positive Affect in predicting the Autonomy dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The influence of Positive and Negative Affect on Environmental Mastery dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R² value of model 2 explains 52% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Positive Affect ($\beta = .46$, $p = < 0.001$) had positive influence and Negative Affect ($\beta = -.42$, $p = < 0.001$) had negative influence on the Environmental Mastery dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major positive role of Positive Affect in predicting the Environmental Mastery

dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The influence of Positive and Negative Affect on Personal Growth dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R² value of model 2 explains 20% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Positive Affect ($\beta = .33, p = < 0.001$) had positive influence and Negative Affect ($\beta = -.21, p = < 0.001$) had negative influence on the Personal Growth dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major positive role of Positive Affect in predicting the Personal Growth dimension of Psychological Wellbeing.

Table 11: Correlation Analysis: among study variables

	1 8	2 9	3	4 10	5 11	6 12	7		
1) NA									
2) PA	-.32**								
3) PS	.55**	.61**							
4) ES	-.24**	.12*	-.09						
5) CR	.29**	-.35**	-.07	.27**					
6) ER	.14**	-.22**	-.08	.63**	.89**				
7) AT	-.31**	.34**	.03	.07	-.24**	-.16**			
8) EM	-.57**	.60**	.04	.24**	-.37**	-.19**	.43**		
9) PG	-.31**	.40**	.08	.26**	-.26**	-.09	.50**	.44**	
10) PRWO	-.44**	.47**	.04	.40**	-.19**	.00	.30**	.62**	.42**
11) PIL	-.50**	.57**	.07	.23**	-.36**	-.18**	.53**	.73**	.67**
12) SA	-.51**	.55**	-.00	.29**	-.36**	-.17**	.50**	.77**	.53**
	.65**	.77**							

* $p < 0.05$
 ** $p < 0.01$

Table 12: Multiple Regression Analysis: Dimensions of PANAS as predictors of Psychological Wellbeing.

Variable	Model 1 Std β	t	Model 2 Std β	t
Positive Affect	.61	14.25***	.47	12.19***
Negative Affect			-.42	10.93***
R	.61		.73	
R ²	.38		.54	
F	203.22***		197.59***	
ΔR^2	.37		.54	
ΔF	203.22		119.59	

*** $p < 0.001$

The R² value of model 2 explains 32% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Positive Affect ($\beta = .37, p = < 0.001$) had positive influence and Negative Affect ($\beta = -.32, p = < 0.01$) had negative influence on the Positive Relation with Others' dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major positive role of Positive Affect in predicting the Positive Relation with Others' dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R² value of model 2 explains 42% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Positive Affect ($\beta = .45, p = < 0.001$) had positive influence and Negative Affect ($\beta = -.36, p = < 0.001$) had negative influence on the Purpose in Life dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major positive role of Positive Affect in predicting the Purpose in Life dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R² value of model 2 explains 49% of variance created by the two dimensions of PANAS. Wherein Negative Affect ($\beta = -.46, p = < 0.001$) had negative influence and Positive Affect ($\beta = .40, p = < 0.001$) had positive influence on the Purpose in Life dimension of Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to major negative role of Positive Affect in predicting the Purpose in Life dimension of Psychological Wellbeing. The R² value of model 2 explains 33% of variance created by the Cognitive Reappraisal

and Expressive Suppression dimensions of Emotion Regulation. Wherein Cognitive Reappraisal ($\beta = -.49, p < 0.001$) had negative influence while Expressive Suppression ($\beta = -.45, p < 0.001$) on the other hand had positive influence on Psychological Wellbeing among study respondents. This indicates to the fact that major negative role of Cognitive Reappraisal could be noted in predicting the Psychological Wellbeing.

Third Fold – Results of Compiled Dataset

In the third fold of results, we performed one major analysis i.e., independent sample t-test. The t-test analysis was done to test the significant difference between study variables with respect to gender. The results derived from the mentioned analysis are mentioned as follows:

The results showed that female participants (356.78 (51.04), $t = 3.78$) significantly displayed better Psychological Wellbeing as compared to male participants (340.57 (45.51), $t = 3.78$). Whereas male participants (41.06 (11.56), $t = 5.25$) significantly exhibited better Emotion Regulation skills than female participants (36.27 (9.69)) in the study. Similarly, male participants (58.51 (10.43), $t = 4.00$) significantly scored better on PANAS as compared to female participants (55.14 (9.32), $t = 4.00$). In specific, the male participants (34.35 (7.45), $t = 3.22$) differed significantly from female participants (32.35 (8.11), $t = 3.22$), while on the Negative Affect dimension, no significant difference was found between male and female participants.

The results of t-test analysis of study variables with respect to nation and the findings indicated that the United States of American participants (362.63 (51.92), $t = 7.41$) significantly displayed better Psychological Wellbeing as compared to the Indian participants (332.18 (39.32), $t = 7.41$). Whereas the Indian participants (46.04 (9.58), $t = 17.69$) significantly exhibited better Emotion Regulation skills than the United States of American participants (32.90 (7.80)) in the study. Similarly, the Indian participants (60.08 (9.68), $t = 7.33$) significantly scored better on PANAS as compared to the United States of American participants (54.06 (9.30), $t = 7.33$). In specific, the Indian participants (35.30 (6.88), $t = 5.75$) differed significantly from the United States of American participants (31.45 (8.21), $t = 5.75$). On the other hand, for Negative Affect dimension the Indian respondents (24.77 (7.09), $t = 3.32$) differed significantly from the United States of America respondents (22.60 (7.79), $t = 3.32$).

DISCUSSION

Firstly, the negative correlation of NA with all the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing highlights that higher the individuals are characterized by sadness and lethargy accompanied by distress and unpleasant engagement lower would be the Psychological Wellbeing. Wherein the Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relation with Others, Purpose in Life and Self-Acceptance are likely to be lower. This findings indicates to the fact that engagement into mood states such as anger, contempt, disgust and nervousness could hinder a person's attempt to attain the desired wellbeing. On contrary, PA was significantly correlated positively with all the other study variables and dimensions. For example, PA was positively correlated with all the six dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing. Previous work of Uy et al., (2016) and our findings on this note are in same line to argue that an individual's affect spin correlates strongly with his or her wellbeing and that the affect fluctuations such as between the PA & NA could have varied relations with the overall wellbeing. In addition, the correlation between PANAS dimension and ER in the present study have been reflecting the findings of Cai et al. (2019). However, our findings differ from the argument of Dejonckheere et al., (2019) that says emotional dynamics such as the affect fluctuation of PA and NA levels of values have little values in explaining the relations between affect dynamics and Psychological Wellbeing.

Secondly, among the dimensions of ER, the ES significantly and negatively correlated with EM & PRWO dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing. This finding indicates that the higher engagement into ES strategy of ER would decrease the mastery an individual has over his environment and also could disturb the positive relations of this individual with others. Our findings on this note, however differ from previous work that argued the positive and favourable link between ES and Wellbeing in stressful situation (Marrouin et al., 2017). Whereas the CR dimension of ER was found to correlate positively with all the dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing as well as with PA dimension of PANAS. This indicates that the positive cognitive component of ER strategy be linked positively with Psychological Wellbeing and this is in line with previous work that linked the positive cognitive ER with subjective as well as Psychological Wellbeing (Marrouin et al., 2017) and argued that CR is effective mechanism to attain better wellbeing under stressful situations (Balzarotti et al., 2016).

Besides, NA had a significant negative influence and PA had a significant positive influence on Psychological wellbeing among the Indian samples. The negative effect of NA highlighted reduced opportunities of study respondents in availing the due fruits an effective experience of Psychological Wellbeing offers. The respondents notably tend to miss out the due benefits for indulging in high intensity of NA in regular transactions of environmental dealings. Although Montes-Berges & Augusto-Landa (2014) emphasized that higher intensity of

affect especially on understandings of intrapersonal emotions would create a better feeling among individuals in attaining the Psychological wellbeing, this particular explanation could possibly be relevant to the positive impact of PA on Psychological Wellbeing. Our study further sets up explorations on this common claim of 'higher intensity lead to higher wellbeing' as our findings specifically differentiates the two intensities and differing role on attainment of overall wellbeing. In fact, it emphasizes that NA has major effect on wellbeing which is negative in nature.

Whereas the investigation of significant predictive role of dimensions of PANAS on dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing, our findings shown that NA had a significant and negative influence while PA had a significant positive effect on all the six dimensions of Psychological Wellbeing among the Indian respondents of the study. Specifically, in predicting the Autonomy dimension of NA had a significant negative role while PA had a significant positive role, wherein NA had major role compared to PA in its effects on Autonomy dimension. Montes-Berges & Augusto-Landa (2014) noted that positive emotional attention of individuals would significantly determine the Autonomy dimension of wellbeing. The possible reason behind this findings can be attributed to the fact that individuals who are enthusiastic and active with higher engagement into pleasurable activities would tend to be self-determined, independent and self-regulated with self-evaluations as per the personal standards. The attainment of autonomy is higher among individuals who tend to be high on energy with greater concentration on doing the pleasurable activities (Watson et al., 1988; Ryff, 2014).

The second dimension EM has been significantly predicted by NA negatively and by PA positively wherein NA had a major prediction role as compared to PA. This findings attributes that the active and alert characteristics of an individual with higher PA is more likely to have a greater ability that helps him or her in either choosing or creating an environment that promotes his current conditions of varied nature and therefore the particular individuals could be at a receiving end of due fruitfulness of the desired wellbeing (Ryff, 2014). Whereas in the case of NA that surrounds with a sad and lethargic in nature that accompany fearful, stressed and nervous state of mind is likely to yield the desired outcomes offered by Psychological Wellbeing at large. Furthermore, our study findings go beyond the previous studies that have predicted a general sense of wellbeing in the workplace (Siu, Cheung & Lui, 2015).

Similarly, for the third dimension PG, the NA had a significant negative influence while PA had a strong positive influence wherein NA was comparatively a strong influencer. The major role of NA in predicting the PG dimension of wellbeing explains possible reasons as, that an individuals is highly stressful, fearful and nervous in his or her general nature of state of mind for regular dealings with the environment, he or she is likely to be lacking the very essence of the necessities that promote his or her growth and development as a person. As to do so, one needs to be calm and serene with a state of mind that encourages one to be self-regulated to indulge in pleasurable activities to derive the joy and satisfaction as expected (Katana et al., 2019). Although Montes-Berges & Augusto-Landa (2014) observed similar findings in their study, our findings adds on an additional evidence of predictive role of PA & NA on wellbeing among young and middle adult samples of India. Dahiya & Rangnekar (2019) have noted that only two major studies on PANAS have been conducted in Indian setting which therefore highlights the relevance of our study and the relevant findings.

Furthermore, PRWO dimension was negatively influenced by NA while positively influenced by PA and between the two NA had a major influencing role. This finding can be understood as that an individual who is likely to be in a state of mind that includes being scare, upset, ashamed, hostile and guilty tend to be a greater risk of not meeting the essential requirements of characteristics such as being warmth, lovable and trustworthy to build and maintain healthy and positive relationships with others (Malinauska & Malinauskiene, 2020). The very negative state of mind is most likely to hinder these positive forms of characteristics for better interpersonal transactions (Ryff, 2014; Katana et al., 2019). On the other hand, contrasting the findings of Montes-Berges & Augusto-Landa (2014) that negatively intensive affect predicted the higher scores of PRWO, our finding emphasizes that NA predicts negatively while PA predicts positively. This empirical evidence adds on to the better understanding as needed, especially from an Indian perspective.

Besides, for the fifth dimension PIL, among the two predictors the NA had a comparatively major role while PA was a positive predictor, NA on the other hand was a strong negative predictors. Individuals who have been observed to possess certain state of mind such as irritable, distressed, jittery, and ashamed among many others do not seem to be having certain beliefs that could provide feeling that there is some and meaning attached to their life, wherein they tend to lack clear goal, intention and sense of direction to follow through (Ryff, 1988). Whereas a person with a state of mind such as interested, determined, excited, inspired and proud is more likely to have a clear purpose and meaning to his or her life to move towards a goal that is intended and well-directed (Watson et al., 1988; Katana et al., 2019; Uy et al., 2016). Although Montes-Berges & Augusto-Landa (2014) on an interesting note, found that age significantly predicted the PIL, our findings that emphasize the role of NA and PA in predicting PIL adds on to empirical evidence of study variables' role rather than of demographic variables.

The six dimension SA, was significantly influenced by NA more strongly as compared to PA wherein the NA had negative influence and PA had a positive influence on the same. Although previous studies have noted the link between affective intensity and SA, our findings emphasizes the influential and relevant role of PANAS dimensions that are concerned with an individual's state of mood at a given period of time. The major role of PA on the prediction of SA provides empirical evidence that higher indulgence into unpleasant activities and dealings could strongly hamper the wellbeing of a person, in particular the SA dimension. This dimension is vital for individuals to realize and refocus their mental health and reflect on their functionality to reach the optimal level with much needed maturity and acceptance Dejonckheere et al., (2019). While this attainment could be of greater concern for individuals with higher scores on NA, for those with higher scores on PA it possibly is not much of a concern given that they are determined and proud of oneself which in turn boosts their chances of SA at large (Rook, 2015).

REFERENCES

- Ayesha, T., Akbar, W., & Shaikh, S. (2020). Mediating role of Emotional Stability and Self-Esteem between Mindfulness and Psychological Wellbeing. *International Journal of Psychological Rehabilitation*, 24 (1), 5161-5174.
- Azczygiel, D., & Mikolajczak, M. (2017). Why are people high in emotional intelligence happier? They make the most of their positive emotions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 117, 117-181.
- Balzarotti, S., Biassoni, F., Villani, D., Prunas, A., & Velotti, P. (2016). Individual Differences in Cognitive Emotion Regulation: Implications for Subjective and Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17, 125-143.
- Balzarotti, S., John, O. P., & Gross, J. J. (2010). An Italian adaptation of the emotion regulation questionnaire. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 26, 61–67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000009>
- Brindle, K., Moulding, R., Bakker, K., & Nedeljkovic, M. (2015). Is the relationship between sensory-processing sensitivity and negative affect mediated by emotional regulation? *Australian Journal of Psychology*. doi: 10.1111/ajpy.12084
- Bottesi, G., Tesini, V., Cerea, S., & Ghisi, M. (2018). Are difficulties in emotion regulation and intolerance of uncertainty related to negative affect in borderline personality disorder? *Clinical Psychologist*, 22, 137-147.
- Cabello, R., Salguero, J. M., Fernández-Berrocal, P., & Gross, J. J. (2013). A Spanish adaptation of the emotion regulation questionnaire. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 29, 234–240. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000150>
- Cai, Y.R., Richdale, A.L., Dissanayake, C., & Uljarevic, M. (2019). Resting heart rate variability, emotion regulation, psychological wellbeing and autism symptomatology in adults and without autism. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 137, 54-62.
- Croom, A.M. (2014). Music practice and participation for psychological well-being: A review of how music influences positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning and accomplishment. *Musicae Scientiae*, 1-21. DOI: 10.1177/1029864914561709
- Dahiya, R., & Rangnekar, S. (2019). Validation of the positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS) among employees in Indian manufacturing and service sector organizations. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 51 (3), 184-194. DOI 10.1108/ICT-08-2018-0070
- Dejonckheere, E., Mestdagh, M., Houben, M., Rutten, I., Sels, L., Kuppens, P., & Tuerlinckx, F. (2019). Complex affect dynamics add limited information to the prediction of psychological well-being. *Nature Human Behaviour*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0555-0>
- Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M.E. (2016). Promoting Well-Being: The contribution of Emotional Intelligence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7:1182. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01182
- Fernandez-Berrocal, P., & Extremera, N. (2016). Ability Emotional Intelligence, Depression and Well-Being. *Emotion Review*, 8 (4), 1-5. DOI: 10.1177/1754073916650494
- Gross, J. J. (1998). Antecedent- and response-focused emotion regulation: Divergent consequences for experience, expression, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 224–237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.224>
- 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, 348–362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348>
- Haga, M. H., Kraft, P., & Corby, E. (2009). Emotion regulation: Antecedents and well-being outcomes of cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression in cross-cultural samples. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10, 271–291. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-007-9080-3>

- Hamilton, J.L., Burke, T.A., Stange, J.P., Kleiman, E.M., Rubenstein, L.M., Scopelliti, K.A., Abramson, L.Y., & Alloy, L.B. (2017). Trait Affect, Emotion Regulation, and the Generation of Negative and Positive Interpersonal Events. *Behaviour Therapy*, 48, 435-447.
- John, O. P., & Gross, J. J. (2004). Healthy and unhealthy emotion regulation: Personality processes, individual differences, and life span development. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 1301–1334. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00298.x>
- Katana, M., Rocke, C., Spain, S.M., & Allemand, M. (2019). Emotion Regulation, Subjective Well-Being, and Perceived Stress in daily Life of Geriatric Nurses. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10:1097. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01097
- Lebowitz, M. S., & Dovidio, J. F. (2015). Implications of emotion regulation strategies for empathic concern, social attitudes, and helping behavior. *Emotion*, 15, 187–194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038820>
- Malesza, M. (2019). Relationship between emotion regulation, negative affect, gender and delay discounting. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00366-y>
- Malinauskas, R., & Malinauskiene, V. (2020). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Psychological Well-Being among Male University Students: The Mediating Role of Perceived Social Support and Perceived Stress. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17, 1605. doi:10.3390/ijerph17051605
- Marroquin, B., Tennen, H., & Stanton, A. L. (2017). Coping, Emotion Regulation and Well-Being: Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Processes. In M.D. Robinson, M. Eid (eds.), *The Happy Mind: Cognitive Contributions to Well-Being*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-58763-9_14.
- Mastandrea, S., Fagioli, S., & Biasi, V. (2019). Art and Psychological Well-Being: Linking the Brain to the Aesthetic Emotion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10:739. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00739
- McCarty, R., & Zayas, M.A. (2014). Cardiac coherence, self-regulation, autonomic stability, and psychosocial wellbeing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5:1090. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01090
- McLaughlin, K. A., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Mennin, D. S., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2011). Emotion dysregulation and adolescent psychopathology: A prospective study. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 49, 544–554. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2011.06.003>
- Montes-Berges, B., & Augusto-Landa, J. (2014). Emotional intelligence and affective intensity as life satisfaction and psychological well-being predictors on nursing professionals. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 30 (1), 80-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2012.12.012>
- Pink, A.E., Lee, M., Price, M., & Williams, C. (2018). A serial mediation model of the relationship between alexithymia and BMI: The role of negative affect, negative urgency and emotional eating. *Appetite*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.11.014>
- Puente-Martinez, A., Paez, D., Ubilos-Lanada, S., & Da Costa-Dutra, S. (2018). Examining the Structure of Negative Affect Regulation and Its Association with Hedonic and Psychological Wellbeing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9:1592. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01592
- Rook, K.S. (2015). Social Networks in Later Life: Weighing Positive and Negative Effects on Health and Well-Being. *Current Directions in Psychological Sciences*, 24 (1), 45-51.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069
- Ryff, C. D. (2014). Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 83(1), 10-28. doi:10.1159/000353263
- Siu, O. L., Cheung, F., & Lui, S. (2015). Linking Positive Emotions to Work Well-Being and Turnover Intention among Hong Kong Police Officers: The Role of Psychological Capital. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16, 367-380.
- Smith, J., & Bryant, F. (2017). Savoring and well-being: Mapping the cognitive-emotional terrain of the happy mind. In M. D. Robinson & M. Eid (Eds.), *The happy mind: Cognitive contributions to well-being* (139–156). Cham: Springer.
- Tortella-Feliu, M., Balle, M., & Sese, A. (2010). Relationship between negative affectivity, emotion regulation, anxiety, and depressive symptoms in adolescents as examined through structural equation modeling. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 24, 686-693.
- Trompetter, H.R., Kleine, E., & Bohlmeijer, E.T. (2017). Why does positive mental health buffer against psychopathology? An exploratory study on self-compassion as a resilience mechanism and adaptive emotion regulation strategy. *Cognitive Therapies Research*, 41, 459-468.
- Uy, M.A., Sun, S., & Foo, M. (2016). Affect spin, entrepreneur's well-being, and venture goal progress: The moderating role of goal orientation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 05801. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2016.12.001>

- Verzeletti, C., Zammuner, V.C., Galli, C., & Agnoli, S. (2016). Emotion regulation strategies and psychosocial well-being in adolescence. *Cogent Psychology*, 3 (1), 1199294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2016.1199294>
- Wante, L., Beveren, M., Theuwis, L., & Braet, C. (2017). The effects of emotion regulation strategies on positive and negative affect in early adolescents. *Cognition and Emotion*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2017.1374242>
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegan, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063.
- Webb, T.L., Miles, E., & Sheeran, P. (2012). Dealing with feeling: A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of strategies derived from the process model of emotion regulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138 (4), 775–808. doi:10.1037/a0027600.