JURNAL ECONOMINA
e-ISSN: 2963-1181
Volume 5, Number 10, October 2026
Homepage: ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/economina

The Effect of Household Financial Management, Financial Inclusion, and Consumption Control on Family Financial Well-Being: a Study of Housewives in East Lombok Regency in 2026

Baiq Intan Andini[1*], Sulkiah[2]
[1*2]Accounting Study Program, Faculty of Economics, Mount Rinjani Universities, Indonesia

** Corresponding Author: intanandini1015@gmail.com*

Article History
Received: 17-10-2026
Revised: 25-10-2026
Published: 30-10-2026

Kywords: Household Financial Management, Financial Inclusion, Consumption Control, Family Financial Well-Being, Housewives, East Lombok Regency.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the relationship between household financial management, financial inclusion, and consumption control with family financial well-being among housewives in East Lombok Regency. The study used a quantitative approach with an associative design and online questionnaire data. The data analyzed in the statistical output amounted to 204 observations and were tested using multiple linear regression. The estimation results showed positive coefficients for household financial management ($B = 0.585$; $t = 13.638$; $p < 0.001$), financial inclusion ($B = 0.179$; $t = 4.843$; $p < 0.001$), and consumption control ($B = 0.263$; $t = 6.215$; $p < 0.001$). The simultaneous test produced $F = 350.783$; $p < 0.001$, with an R^2 of 0.840. Although the estimation results show a positive and significant relationship, inferential interpretation requires caution because the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test showed $p = 0.003$, and the heteroscedasticity test indicated problems with the household financial management variable. Item validity and the consistency of the number of respondents also need to be verified before the results are treated as final conclusions.

INTRODUCTION

Household finances relate to a family's ability to allocate income to meet daily needs while maintaining preparedness for future needs. Decisions regarding budgeting, routine expenses, savings, obligations, and unforeseen needs determine how limited resources are used. Therefore, a family's financial well-being is not solely determined by income, but also by the family's ability to meet obligations, maintain financial reserves, and feel capable of meeting changing needs.

The development of formal and digital financial services has expanded household options for saving, making payments, transferring money, and accessing financing. National financial inclusion data provides context that access to financial services has become a critical issue in Indonesia. However, available access does not automatically guarantee better financial outcomes; benefits also relate to how services are used and the household's ability to control spending decisions. Research by Sakyi-Nyarko et al. (2022), for example, found a relationship between financial inclusion and several household well-being outcomes in Ghana.

As transactions become increasingly convenient, households also face the need to weigh consumption priorities. Spending that is not aligned with their means can reduce funds for basic needs, education, health, savings, and obligations. Therefore, consumption control needs to be considered alongside financial management and the use of financial services. Studies in Indonesians also show a link between financial management behavior and financial well-being, although respondent characteristics and tested variables vary (Wijaya et al., 2024; Suriati et al., 2025; Mardliyah & Supriyanto, 2025).

The context of East Lombok Regency is relevant for this study because household consumption and welfare are among the socioeconomic indicators monitored through regional statistical publications. Housewives were chosen because they are often involved in managing spending, meeting family needs, and making decisions about how to use income. However, findings from a specific region and respondent group cannot be directly generalized to all households, so local empirical evidence is needed.

Previous studies generally examined financial management behavior, financial literacy, financial inclusion, or self-control in various combinations. Suriati et al. (2025) examined the financial well-being of housewives in Kendari City, while Wijaya et al. (2024) examined Islamic financial literacy and religiosity among Indonesian Muslim respondents. This study focused on three variables simultaneously—household financial management, financial inclusion, and consumption control—with family financial well-being as the dependent variable for housewives in East Lombok Regency.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between each independent variable and family financial well-being, as well as the relationship between the three variables simultaneously. The expected contribution is to provide initial evidence in a local context and provide practical input for family financial education. Because the study design used questionnaires and observational analysis, the results are interpreted as statistical associations, not absolute causal evidence.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a quantitative approach with an associative design to test the relationship between Household Financial Management (X1), Financial Inclusion (X2), and Consumption Control (X3) and Family Financial Well-being (Y). The research objects are housewives who live in East Lombok Regency and are involved in or aware of their family's financial management.

Primary data was collected using an online questionnaire distributed via WhatsApp. Respondents were selected using non-probability sampling using a purposive sampling approach based on the suitability of respondent characteristics to the research objectives. The methodology document stated a target of 200 respondents, while the statistical output recorded 204 observations. Due to these inconsistencies, the number 204 is used to describe the available analytical output, and the final sample size must be confirmed before publication.

The instrument uses a five-level Likert scale, from strongly disagree (score 1) to strongly agree (score 5). The reported analysis includes reliability tests, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, t-tests, F-tests, and coefficients of determination. The regression equation used is $Y = \alpha + \beta1X1 + \beta2X2 + \beta3X3 + e$. The validity test in the available documents is in the form of an inter-item correlation matrix, so it is not sufficient to ensure the validity of each item through item-total correlations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

model reliability and diagnostic tests

The Cronbach's Alpha values for Household Financial Management, Financial Inclusion, Consumption Control, and Family Financial Well-being were 0.820, 0.835, 0.835, and 0.832, respectively. These values indicate adequate internal consistency based on the general threshold of 0.70. However, reliability results do not replace the need to properly examine item validity.

Table 1. Reliability test results

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of grains
Household Financial Management (X1)	0.820	6
Financial Inclusion (X2)	0.835	6
Consumption Control (X3)	0.835	6
Family Financial Well-being (Y)	0.832	6

The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test on the residuals yielded a statistic of 0.080 with $p = 0.003$ for 204 observations. At a level of 0.05, this result indicates that the residuals do not meet the normality criteria for the test. In the heteroscedasticity test based on the absolute value of the residuals, the significance of X1 was 0.024, while X2 was 0.322 and X3 was 0.528. These results indicate potential heteroscedasticity that needs to be addressed. In contrast, the Tolerance values of 0.455; 0.506; and 0.459, as well as the VIF of 2.196; 1.976; and 2.177, do not indicate multicollinearity problems based on general criteria.

Multiple linear regression results

The regression equation based on the available coefficients is $Y = 0.372 + 0.585X1 + 0.179X2 + 0.263X3$. All three independent coefficients are positive. The t-test and F-test results in the output show significance below 0.001, but inferential results need to be confirmed after residual diagnostics and data consistency are checked.

Table 2. Summary of regression results

Variables	B	Beta	T	Sig.
Constant	0.372	—	0.508	0.612
Household Financial	0.585	0.571	13,638	<0.001

Management (X1)				
Financial Inclusion (X2)	0.179	0.192	4,843	<0.001
Consumption Control (X3)	0.263	0.259	6,215	<0.001

Simultaneously, the model yielded F = 350.783 with $p < 0.001$. The R value was 0.917, R^2 was 0.840, and Adjusted R^2 was 0.838. Thus, the combination of the three variables statistically explained 84.0% of the variation in family financial well-being scores in the analyzed data. This figure represents the proportion of variation explained by the model, not the percentage of causal influence.

Table 3. Summary of model fit

Statistics	**Mark**
R	0.917
R Square	0.840
Adjusted R Square	0.838
F	350,783
Significance of F	<0.001
Number of observations in the output	204

Discussion

Household Financial Management showed a positive coefficient of 0.585 and a t-value of 13.638 ($p < 0.001$). In the estimated model, higher financial management scores were associated with higher family financial well-being scores after other variables were controlled. Practically, budget planning, prioritization, recording income and expenses, and evaluating the use of funds can help households understand their financial condition. This finding is in line with the study by Wijaya et al. (2024) regarding the relationship between financial management behavior and well-being, and Suriati et al. (2025) who found a positive and significant relationship between financial management behavior and financial well-being in housewives.

Financial inclusion has a positive coefficient of 0.179 with a t-value of 4.843 ($p < 0.001$). These results indicate a positive relationship in the model, which may be substantively related to the ease of saving funds, making payments, and accessing financial services. This finding aligns with Sakyi-Nyarko et al. (2022), who reported a link between financial inclusion and several indicators of household welfare. However, the benefits of financial access remain contingent on product suitability, understanding of costs and risks, and the household's ability to meet obligations.

Consumption Control has a positive coefficient of 0.263 with a t-value of 6.215 ($p < 0.001$). This result indicates a positive relationship between consumption control scores and financial

well-being in the model. Its substantive interpretation depends on the direction of coding of all statements: high scores should actually reflect better consumption control. Households that can distinguish needs from wants, delay non-urgent purchases, and keep spending within their means have the potential to preserve funds for priority needs.

Simultaneously, all three variables were significantly related to family financial well-being in the available outputs. These results support the importance of viewing financial management, use of financial services, and consumption control as complementary aspects. However, the non-normality of residuals and indications of heteroscedasticity require further review of standard errors and significance. Therefore, these results should be treated as preliminary until data examination, instrument coding, item-total validity testing, and appropriate inference approaches are completed.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the available regression output, Household Financial Management, Financial Inclusion, and Consumption Control each have positive coefficients and a significance value of $p < 0.001$ on Family Financial Well-being. Simultaneously, the model is significant with $F = 350.783$ and $R^2 = 0.840$. These findings indicate a statistical relationship between the three independent variables and family financial well-being in the analyzed housewives' data.

These conclusions should not be treated as final without further verification. The output shows non-normal residuals in the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test ($p = 0.003$), indications of heteroscedasticity in X1 ($p = 0.024$), a validity matrix that is not yet an item-total correlation, and differences in the number of respondents between the methodology description and the output. Researchers need to re-examine the raw data, item coding consistency, the number of valid respondents, and consider robust standard errors or other appropriate inference methods.

Practically, families are advised to create a budget, record transactions, determine priorities, set aside a reserve fund according to their abilities, and use financial services safely and according to their needs. Local governments and relevant institutions can consider financial education that focuses on everyday practices. Future research could expand the sample, clarify the sampling framework, add factors such as income and debt burden, and ensure the validity and reliability of the instruments before testing hypotheses.

THANK-YOU NOTE

The author would like to thank the housewives in East Lombok Regency who participated in filling out the questionnaire, as well as the parties who provided support in the research process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. (2015). Financial well-being: The goal of financial education. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Financial Consumer Agency of Canada. (2019). Financial well-being in Canada: Survey results. Government of Canada.

International Organization for Standardization. (2021). ISO 22222: Personal financial planning—Requirements for personal financial planners. ISO.

Mardliyah, D., & Supriyanto, A. (2025). Efek financial literacy dan financial management behavior terhadap financial well-being melalui financial self-efficacy. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Islam, 3(4). https://jim.uinsuku.ac.id/index.php/JEBISKU/article/view/5431

Netemeyer, R.G., Warmath, D., Fernandes, D., & Lynch, J.G., Jr. (2018). How am I doing? Perceived financial well-being, its potential antecedents, and its relation to overall well-being. Journal of Consumer Research, 45(1), 68–89. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx109

OECD. (2023). OECD/INFE 2023 international survey of adult financial literacy. OECD Publishing.

Financial Services Authority. (2025). National Survey of Financial Literacy and Inclusion (SNLIK) 2025. Financial Services Authority.

Financial Services Authority, Deposit Insurance Corporation, & Central Statistics Agency. (2026). Results of the 2026 National Survey of Financial Literacy and Inclusion (SNLIK). OJK, LPS, and BPS.

Ramadhini. (2025). The influence of financial behavior, financial knowledge, and self-control on the financial well-being of Generation Z in Indonesia. University of Bengkulu Scholar Repository. https://repository.unib.ac.id/id/eprint/24893/

Sakyi-Nyarko, C., Ahmad, A. H., & Green, C. J. (2022). The role of financial inclusion in improving household well-being. Journal of International Development, 34(8), 1606–1632. https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3661

Suriati, W., Ma'mun, S. Z., & Maksar, M. S. (2025). Eksplorasi determinan financial well-being pada ibu rumah tangga. Mega Aktiva: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen, 14(2). https://megaaktiva.umkendari.ac.id/index.php/Jurnal/article/view/816

Wijaya, H. R., Hati, S. R. H., Ekaputra, I. A., & Kassim, S. (2024). The impact of religiosity and financial literacy on financial management behavior and well-being among Indonesian Muslims. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11, Article 830. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03309-6

Xiao, J. J., & O'Neill, B. (2016). Consumer financial education and financial capability. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 40(6), 712–721.

Central Statistics Agency of East Lombok Regency. (2025). Statistics on the welfare of the people of East Lombok Regency 2025. BPS East Lombok Regency.