

Impact of Commitment to Psychological Well-being among Students Who are Undergoing Long-Distance Relationship

Sabathania Georgia Manna Welvart

Satya Wacana Christian University, Salatiga, Indonesia

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8087-576X>, e-mail: thaniawelvart01@gmail.com

Arthur Huwae

Satya Wacana Christian University, Salatiga, Indonesia

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2918-3309>, e-mail: arthur.huwae@uksw.edu

The phenomenon of long-distance relationships among students that have developed in this era is an opportunity that allowed them to thrive optimally in maintaining their relationships. However, in fact, LDR for students is still a challenge in itself because it requires a greater effort that can affect the achievement of individual psychological well-being. Psychological well-being is a necessary condition for individuals, including students who are in long-distance relationships so that they are able to maintain relationships optimally. Psychological well-being can be achieved by the presence of various factors, one of which is commitment. This study aims to determine the relationship between commitment and psychological well-being in students who are in long-distance relationships. The method used in this research is correlational quantitative. 587 students are undergoing long-distance relationships to become participants in this study with the accidental sample as the sampling technique. This study used two scales The Revised Commitment Inventory and the Ryff Scale of Psychological Well-being. The hypothesis test results with the Pearson correlation were 0.987 with sig = 0.000 ($p < 0.01$), which means that the research hypothesis was accepted. Commitment contributed 97.4% to psychological well-being. This research shows that commitment is a very strong factor related to achieving psychological well-being in students who are in long-distance relationships. Commitment is essential in helping students to maintain relationships with existing different conditions while maintaining their psychological well-being and still carrying out their academic role optimally.

Keywords: commitment; psychological well-being; students who are undergoing long-distance relationships.

Funding. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to all the participants.

For citation: Welvart S.G.M., Huwae A. Impact of Commitment to Psychological Well-being among Students Who are Undergoing Long-Distance Relationship. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2024. Vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 140—152. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290411> (In Russ.).

Влияние преданности на психологическое благополучие студентов, состоящих в отношениях на расстоянии

Сабатания Джорджия Манна Велварт

бакалавр психологии, Христианский университет Сатья Вакана, Салатига, Индонезия
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8087-576X>, e-mail: thaniawelvart01@gmail.com

Артур Хуваэ

магистр психологии, преподаватель факультета психологии, Христианский университет Сатья Вакана, Салатига, Индонезия
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2918-3309>, e-mail: arthur.huwae@uksw.edu

Феномен отношений на расстоянии среди студентов, характерный для нашего времени, позволяет научиться оптимально управлять отношениями. Однако на самом деле отношения на расстоянии для студентов все еще проблематичны, поскольку требуют больших усилий, которые могут повлиять на достижение индивидуального психологического благополучия. Психологическое благополучие является необходимым условием для людей вообще, и для студентов в частности, чтобы оптимально поддерживать отношения. Психологическое благополучие может быть достигнуто при наличии различных факторов, одним из которых является преданность. Цель данного исследования -- установить взаимосвязь между верностью и психологическим благополучием у студентов, находящихся в отношениях на расстоянии. Метод, использованный в данном исследовании, — корреляционно-количественный, в исследовании приняли участие 587 студентов, состоящих в отношениях на расстоянии, случайная выборка. В данном исследовании использовались две шкалы: Доработанный опросник преданности и Шкала психологического благополучия Райфа. Результаты проверки гипотезы с помощью корреляции Пирсона составили 0,987 при $\text{sig} = 0,000$ ($p < 0,01$), соответственно, гипотеза подтвердилась. Преданность составила 97,4% в психологическом благополучии. Данное исследование показывает, что преданность является очень сильным фактором, связанным с достижением психологического благополучия у студентов, состоящих в отношениях на расстоянии. Преданность помогает студентам поддерживать отношения при различных условиях, сохранять психологическое благополучие и продолжать оптимально заниматься учебой.

Ключевые слова: верность, психологическое благополучие, студенты, состоящие в отношениях на расстоянии.

Финансирование. Это исследование было сделано без каких-либо грантов от государственных, коммерческих или некоммерческих фондов.

Благодарности. Авторы благодарят всех участников исследования.

Для цитаты: Велварт С.Д.М., Хуваэ А. Влияние преданности на психологическое благополучие студентов, состоящих в отношениях на расстоянии // Психологическая наука и образование. 2024. Том 29. № 4. С. 140—152. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.20242904011>

Introduction

Human beings, as social creatures, inevitably need to establish connections with other living beings. Therefore, entering into romantic relationships becomes a desire for every human. Generally, the inclination to engage in romantic relationships emerges during adolescence, but it further develops during emerging adulthood, which is a period of identity exploration, especially in the context of love, work, and education [13]. Emerging adulthood refers to the developmental stage focused on ages 18 to 29, but developmentally, the years between ages 18 and 24 seem to be very different than between 25 and 29 [33]. College students fall within the age range of 18 to 24, according to data from the Statistics of Higher Education of the Ministry of Education and Culture [37].

One phenomenon related to romantic relationships among college students is the long-distance relationship (LDR). LDR entails a romantic relationship between partners who are physically separated by distance, such as residing in different cities, provinces, islands, or even countries [25]. Research has shown that many individuals face the challenge of maintaining relationships with partners from different universities [10]. This situation often leads college students to engage in LDRs. The prevalence of LDRs continues to rise, indicating a significant shift. A survey conducted by Rahmawati and Chozanah [41] of 1.000 participants in Indonesia found long-distance relationships only had a 58% success rate. Djupe in 2023 [19] also found that 75% of students have been in a long-distance relationship. This study also found that one strong reason for college students to engage in LDRs is the demand to pursue experiences in life trajectories diverge. Based on the research from the Center Long Distance Relationship Research (CSLDR) in 2021, there is 2.9% of couples in the United States or 3.75 million couples in a long-distance relationship. In addition, it was found that 32.5% of relationships are at the university level [48]. According to “Long Distance Relationship Statistics” by Guldner, shows that approximately 70% of college students were in a long-distance relationship at some point during their college years. The survey also found that

58% of long-distance relationships are successful with the average duration of the relationship in 2023 being 14 months [44].

Love relationships in Indonesian culture are often arranged and based on patriarchal rules that stress the importance of partners belonging to the same cultural background and place of residence. Furthermore, these relationships create strong bonds not only between the couples but also between their respective families [7]. Dating different religions, races, and ethnicities is still dominantly opposed in Indonesian cultural traditions, as it will undermine the regeneration of the local culture of the individual’s family. This is why most dating couples tend to have the same local cultural background and are bound by cultural and religious rituals [23, 40]. This basis is what makes individuals in a dating relationship tend to maintain their relationship even though they are in LDRs.

Romantic relationships experienced by college students in LDRs may contribute to their personal growth, the discovery of meaning and purpose in life, and the enhancement of prosocial skills [24]. However, in reality, LDRs can lead to complex challenges that may encompass ambiguity and uncertainty in communication, resulting in relationship strain and emotional issues between partners [10]. Couples in LDRs face challenges to remain connected at a distance that impacts relationship maintenance behaviors and also often leads to psychological and emotional distress [9, 35]. Additionally, college students in LDRs may experience distrust and fear of being left behind, leading to increased emotional pressure in their efforts to maintain closeness with their partners [8], particularly when engaged in long-distance relationships.

The phenomenon of college students in LDRs not only involves physical distance but also extends to deep-seated issues related to partner control, especially when the partners are separated by islands. The lives of college students in LDRs are also intertwined with encounters with new individuals that impact their relationships, potentially evoking specific forms of relationship insecurity [22]. The LDRs experienced by college students often demand more substantial effort, particularly in terms of finances, especially when

the distance is considerable. Additionally, LDRs can create personal conflicts that disrupt daily life as a student, making it difficult for individuals to engage in relationships because they often feel isolated and lonely due to partner-imposed limitations [29]. These factors can lead to a lack of openness and honesty, an underdeveloped self-concept, and a fear of personal growth. It can be seen as a representation of poor psychological well-being. Research has found that psychological distress in long-distance relationships can cause relationship stress and lead to increased anxiety, depression, sleep problems, pain, decreased physical functioning, and lower satisfaction with social role participation [12].

Psychological well-being can be understood as a state where individuals accept everything within themselves and exhibit self-control in their surroundings. They are capable of building relationships with others and their social environment even in challenging circumstances [43]. In this context, college students in LDRs face and navigate through complex conditions [10]. This requires them to maintain and motivate their partners effectively, allowing the relationship to endure [46].

Psychological well-being in individuals is formed from six dimensions [43]. The first dimension is autonomy, referring to the ability to be independent in performing tasks and responsibilities, which is particularly relevant for college students in LDRs. The second is environmental mastery, which pertains to the ability to cope with various environmental demands, including those different from their partner's environment. The third is personal growth, involving the ability to continue growing as an individual despite facing challenges while being in a distant relationship. The fourth is positive relations with others, which refers to the ability to maintain positive relationships with others even in the context of an LDR. The fifth is purpose in life, encompassing the ability to maintain and pursue life goals while navigating the challenges of a distant relationship. The sixth is self-acceptance, involving positive recognition and acceptance of oneself, including both positive and negative aspects, as well as the conditions experienced as a college student in an LDR [43].

College students in LDRs need to have a strong sense of psychological well-being, cause low psychological well-being tends to exhibit low self-esteem and emotional instability [34]. In turn, it might contribute to less positive relationship experiences [16] and indicate their higher psychological vulnerability [30]. Furthermore, it can lead to mental health problems such as elevated levels of depression and anxiety that hinder their lives as students [42]. Conversely, high psychological well-being tends to promote positive self-attitudes, independence in learning, positive social relationships with others, a sense of purpose in life, and optimal personal development [18].

The attainment of psychological well-being doesn't occur automatically but is influenced by various factors according to Ryff including age, gender, socioeconomic status, culture, social support, evaluation of life experience, and locus of control (LOC) [2] well as commitment [47]. This study aims to focus on the context of commitment in LDRs experienced by college students. This is manifested through a high dedication to the relationship, belief in the partner, and a commitment to achieving common goals [4; 5]. Commitment is a cornerstone for successful relationships amidst the complexity of potential conflicts.

Commitment refers to the fundamental reasons individuals participate in a romantic relationship, motivating them to engage and find ways to sustain the relationship [36]. Commitment is crucial for romantic relationships as it closely relates to individual sacrifices [28] in building communication and trust in their partners [50]. This enables individuals to navigate the dynamics of a long-distance relationship. Commitment has two aspects: dedication, which represents the desire to remain united and committed to the partner, and constraint commitment, which is associated with factors that contribute to the longevity of a relationship [36]. Individuals with low commitment in a relationship are likely to have reduced interactions with their partners, which can predict potential separation [21]. Conversely, individuals with high commitment in a relationship tend to develop a strong psychological connection with their partners, enabling them to actively engage and maintain the relationship over a long period [45].

College students in LDRs are susceptible to conditions that can lead to conflicts affecting the success of their relationship [32]. Therefore, college students in LDRs need to understand themselves and possess strong commitment. Commitment forms the foundation of a relationship and is crucial in maintaining the psychological well-being of college students in LDRs. When individuals have strong commitment, they can proactively prevent and reduce depression symptoms related to anxiety levels [1]. Low commitment, on the other hand, can disrupt an individual's psychological well-being, as it is associated with inconsistent behavior maintenance for relationship satisfaction [27].

A study conducted by Tan, Ho, and Agnew [47] found a significant positive relationship ($p = 0.003$) between commitment and psychological well-being, particularly related to conflict management for relationship maintenance. Another study by Agnew, Hadden, and Tan [3] demonstrated a positive relationship between commitment and psychological well-being, particularly in terms of predicting maintenance processes (self-disclosure, accommodation, sacrifice), leave behavior, and readiness for commitment within ongoing involvements ($p = 0.001$). However, the study by Cassepp-Borges et al [17] did not find a direct relationship between commitment and psychological well-being, but commitment remains a factor that mediates relationship satisfaction. College students in LDRs may experience relationship-related stress, although this may not directly affect health and psychological well-being. Therefore, the phenomenon of LDRs with their positive and negative impacts presents an area of focus that warrants investigation. This could lead to the development of resources that can support college students in LDRs amidst the increasing cases and holistic phenomena that affect individuals, their partners, and their surroundings.

Thus, this study aims to explore the relationship between commitment and psychological well-being among college students in long-distance relationships. This research hypothesizes that there is a positive relationship between commitment and psychological well-being among college students in LDRs. Higher commitment levels among college students in LDRs are as-

sociated with higher levels of psychological well-being. Conversely, lower commitment levels are linked to lower levels of psychological well-being among college students in LDRs.

Method

Participants

The population in this study are students in Indonesia who undergo LDR because of higher education pursued outside the city or the island. The sampling technique uses accidental samples with the criteria, of active students aged 18—24 years who are undergoing LDR, and the length of undergoing LDR is at least 6 months. The data that has been collected resulted in 587 participants who fit the criteria. All research participants were first asked to fill out an informed consent sheet related to research procedures based on the Indonesian Psychological Association code of ethics. Informed consent contains statements about the description of the research and the involvement of participants. In addition, participants chose the option to agree (if willing) and ignore or leave blank (if refusing participation). If willing, then participants were directed to fill in their identity and continued with filling in the research scale. The overall demographic data of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Procedure

Measurements in the study used two psychological scales, namely the commitment scale and the psychological well-being scale. Before the scales were distributed, the construct validity test was first carried out, and the content validity test, namely through expert judgment conducted by two experts (1 expert in the field of psychology and 1 expert in the field of language). After that, the research design was presented to be assessed for feasibility by three reviewers. The next stage, licensing and making informed consent sheets was carried out. The research was done in the form of a questionnaire distributed in the form of a Google form.

Instruments

Commitment Scale

The commitment scale was measured using The Revised Commitment Inventory based

Table 1

Demographic Data of Participants

Participant Classification	Information	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	97	16.5
	Female	490	83.5
Age	18 years old	37	6.3
	19 years old	108	18.4
	20 years old	151	25.7
	21 years old	123	21
	22 years old	84	14.3
	23 years old	55	9.4
	24 years old	29	4.9
Length of LDRs	<1 year	80	13.6
	1 year	85	14.5
	2 year	92	15.7
	3 year	111	18.9
	4 year	115	19.6
	5 year	48	8.2
	6 year	30	5.1
	7 year	26	4.4

on the commitment aspects by Owen et al [36], which include dedication and constraint commitment. This scale was then translated by the researcher into Indonesian and adjusted based on the participants' context. The commitment scale consists of 25 items with both favorable and unfavorable statements. An example item from this scale is: *"I want this relationship to endure, regardless of the difficult times we face"*. The response options for this scale use a Likert scale model with four response categories: Very Appropriate (VA), Appropriate (A), Not Appropriate (NA), and Very Inappropriate (VI). The Cronbach's Alphas for dedication and constraint commitment are 0.855 and 0.863, respectively.

Psychological Well-being Scale

The psychological well-being scale was measured using the Ryff Scale of Psychological Well-being (SPWB), based on the psychological well-being dimensions by Ryff [43]. These dimensions include autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. The psychological well-being scale consists of 38 items with both favorable and unfavorable

statements. An example item from this scale is *"I am confident in my opinions even when they differ from my partner's opinions"*. The response options for this scale use a Likert scale model with six response choices: Very Appropriate (VA), Appropriate (A), Quite Appropriate (QA), Less Appropriate (LA), Not Appropriate (NA), and Very Inappropriate (VI). Cronbach's Alpha values for all dimensions of psychological well-being ranged from 0.889—0.892.

Results

The raw data collected via Google Form (online) were validated and analyzed using SPSS 21. The means, standard deviations (SD), and Pearson's product-moment correlation of coefficients were calculated between commitment and dimension of psychological well-being among students who are undergoing LDRs and are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

From the Pearson product-moment correlation test (Table 2), it is found that the correlation coefficient between commitment and psychological well-being is 0.987 ($p = 0.000$), signifying a significant positive relationship between commitment and psychological well-being among

students in LDRs. This demonstrates that commitment is a strong influencing factor in psychological well-being among students in LDRs.

Furthermore, based on the results of the correlation test between each aspect of commitment with each of the dimensions of psychological well-being in Table 3, it shows that the dedication aspect is significantly positively related to all dimensions of psychological well-being because it has a significance value of less than 0.01. Likewise, the constraint commitment aspect has a significant positive relationship with all dimensions of psychological well-being ($p < 0.01$). The results of dedication and constraint commitment are so similar because

both of them may have an impact on psychological well-being. The difference is that dedication focuses on individual intrinsic desires while commitment constraints focus on external factors that can influence the individual. However, constraint commitment alone is not sufficient to maintain a healthy relationship, and it has historically been far less associated with relationship quality than dedication is.

The data in Table 4 shows that commitment as a significant predictor of psychological well-being in students undergoing LDRs. Adjusted R^2 is found to be 0,974, indicating that commitment explains 97,4% of the variance in psychological well-being.

Table 2

Correlation between Commitment and Psychological Well-being

Commitment	Psychological Well-being	
	Pearson Correlation	0.987**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.000
	N	587

Note: ** $p < 0.01$ level of significance, * $p < 0.05$ level of significance.

Table 3

Correlation between Aspects of Commitment and Dimensions of Psychological Well-being

	Mean (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Dedication	29.45 (4.747)	1							
Constraint Commitment	43.16 (5.388)	0.753**	1						
Autonomy	13.89 (3.578)	0.634**	0.637**	1					
Environmental mastery	14.42 (3.924)	0.755**	0.756**	0.554**	1				
Personal growth	11.41 (3.733)	0.739**	0.755**	0.440**	0.620**	1			
Positive relation with others	11.79 (3.868)	0.677**	0.665**	0.414**	0.546**	0.483**	1		
Purpose in life	13.55 (5.254)	0.719**	0.730**	0.335**	0.523**	0.696**	0.451**	1	
Self-acceptance	15.94 (4.366)	0.712**	0.735**	0.499**	0.550**	0.548**	0.492**	0.524**	1

Note: ** $p < 0.01$ level of significance, * $p < 0.05$ level of significance.

Table 4

Regression Analysis of Commitment and Psychological Well-being among Students in LDRs

Criterion	Predictors	β (Unstandardized coefficients)	β (Standardized coefficients)	t value
Psychological Well-being	Commitment	2.055	0.987	147.460**

Note: $R^2 = 0.974$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.974$, ** $p < 0.01$ level.

Furthermore, specifically the data in Table 5 shows that:

1. Dedication and constraint commitment are the significant predictors of autonomy. Adjusted R^2 is found to be 0.460, indicating that dedication and constraint commitment explain 46% of the variance in autonomy.

2. Dedication and constraint commitment are the significant predictors of environmental mastery. Adjusted R^2 is found to be 0.651, indicating that dedication and constraint commitment explain 65,1% of the variance in environmental mastery.

3. Dedication and constraint commitment are the significant predictors of personal growth. Adjusted R^2 is found to be 0.636, indicating that dedication and constraint commitment explain 63.6% of the variance in personal growth.

4. Dedication and constraint commitment are the significant predictors of positive relation with others. Adjusted R^2 is found to be 0.512, indicating that dedication and constraint commitment explain 51.2% of the variance in positive relation with others.

5. Dedication and constraint commitment are the significant predictors of purpose in life. Adjusted R^2 is found to be 0.598, indicating that

dedication and constraint commitment explain 59.8% of the variance in purpose in life.

6. Dedication and constraint commitment are the significant predictors of self-acceptance. Adjusted R^2 is found to be 0.597, indicating that dedication and constraint commitment explain 59.7% of the variance in self-acceptance.

An interesting finding from the regression analysis is that individuals who have good dedication will be encouraged to continue to unite and maintain trust with their partners during LDRs which lead to positive achievement of each dimension of psychological well-being formed in love life as a form of responsibility from a dating relationship. In addition, the results show that individuals can make positive things that can be the reason for the relationship to last during LDRs.

The clustering results in Table 6, show that most men's commitment is in the moderate category ($N = 44 / 45.5\%$), and women in the high category ($N = 251 / 51.2\%$). For psychological well-being, most males were in the low category ($N = 49 / 50.5\%$), and females in the high category ($N = 262 / 53.5\%$).

Based on age, the commitment of most 18-year-old participants is in the low category

Table 5

Regression Analysis Aspects of Commitment and Dimension of Psychological Well-being among Students in LDRs

Criterion	Predictors	β (Unstandardized coefficients)	β (Standardized coefficients)	t value
Model 1: Autonomy	Dedication	0.268	0.356	7.720**
	Constraint Commitment	0.245	0.370	8.011**
Model 2: Environmental mastery	Dedication	0.355	0.429	11.572**
	Constraint Commitment	0.316	0.433	11.692**
Model 3: Personal growth	Dedication	0.311	0.395	10.437**
	Constraint Commitment	0.317	0.457	12.085**
Model 4: Positive relation with others	Dedication	0.331	0.406	9.271**
	Constraint Commitment	0.258	0.359	8.194**
Model 5: Purpose in life	Dedication	0.435	0.393	9.868**
	Constraint Commitment	0.423	0.434	10.907**
Model 6: Self-acceptance	Dedication	0.336	0.366	9.181**
	Constraint Commitment	0.372	0.460	11.535**

Note: Model 1. $R^2=0.461$, Adjusted $R^2=0.460$, ** $p<0.01$ level, Model 2. $R^2=0.652$, Adjusted $R^2=0.651$, ** $p<0.01$ level, Model 3. $R^2=0.637$, Adjusted $R^2=0.636$, ** $p<0.01$ level, Model 4. $R^2=0.514$, Adjusted $R^2=0.512$, ** $p<0.01$ level, Model 5. $R^2=0.599$, Adjusted $R^2=0.598$, ** $p<0.01$ level, Model 6. $R^2=0.598$, Adjusted $R^2=0.597$, ** $p<0.01$ level.

(N = 18 / 48.7%), 19-year-olds in the low category (N = 53 / 49.1%), 20-year-old participants in the medium category (N = 58 / 38.4%), 21-year-olds in the high category (N = 59 / 48%), 22-year-olds in the high category (N = 30 / 35.7%), 23-year-olds in the high category (N = 23 / 41.8%), and 24-year-olds in the high category (N = 18 / 62.1%). For the achievement of psychological well-being, most of the 18-year-old participants were in the low category (N = 22 / 59.5%), 19-year-olds in the low category (N = 57 / 42.8%), 20-year-old participants in the medium category (N = 62 / 41.1%), 21-year-olds in the high category (N = 66 / 53.7%), 22-year-olds in the high category (N = 32 / 38.1%), 23-year-olds in the high category (N = 24 / 43.6%), and 24-year-olds in the high category (N = 17 / 58.6%).

Furthermore, from the length of undergoing LDR commitment, most participants who underwent LDRs for less than one year were in the

low category (N = 29 / 36.2%), age 1 year in the medium category (N = 35 / 41.2%), participants age 2 years in the high category (N = 46 / 50%), age 3 years in the high category (N = 68 / 61.3%), age 4 years in the high category (N = 66 / 57.4%), age 5 years in the high category (N = 41 / 85.4%), age 6 years in the high category (N = 27 / 90%), and age 7 years in the high category (N = 26 / 100%). For the achievement of psychological well-being, most participants who underwent LDRs for less than one year were in the low category (N = 33 / 41.2%), aged 1 year in the medium category (N = 36 / 42.4%), participants aged 2 years in the high category (N = 41 / 44.6%), age 3 years in the high category (N = 65 / 58.6%), age 4 years in the high category (N = 67 / 58.2%), age 5 years in the high category (N = 37 / 77.1%), age 6 years in the high category (N = 24 / 80%), and age 7 years in the high category (N = 25 / 96.2%).

Table 6

Clustering Commitment and Psychological Well-being Based on Demographic Data

Description	Commitment						Psychological Well-being					
	Low		Medium		High		Low		Medium		High	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender												
Male	17	17.5	44	45.4	36	37.1	49	50.5	38	39.2	10	10.3
Female	50	10.2	189	38.6	251	51.2	84	17.1	144	29.4	262	53.5
Age												
18 years old	18	48.7	11	29.7	8	21.6	22	59.5	12	32.4	3	8.1
19 years old	53	49.1	37	34.2	18	16.7	57	52.8	41	38	10	9.2
20 years old	46	30.5	58	38.4	47	31.1	41	27.1	62	41.1	48	31.8
21 years old	23	18.7	41	33.3	59	48	18	14.6	39	31.7	66	53.7
22 years old	25	29.8	29	34.5	30	35.7	24	28.6	28	33.3	32	38.1
23 years old	15	27.3	17	30.9	23	41.8	12	21.8	19	34.6	24	43.6
24 years old	5	17.2	6	20.7	18	62.1	4	13.8	8	27.6	17	58.6
Length of LDRs												
<1 year	29	36.2	27	33.8	24	30	33	41.2	29	36.3	18	22.5
1 year	32	37.6	35	41.2	18	21.2	29	34.1	36	42.4	20	23.5
2 year	2	2.2	44	47.8	46	50	21	22.8	30	32.6	41	44.6
3 year	6	5.4	37	33.3	68	61.3	7	6.3	39	35.1	65	58.6
4 year	15	13	34	29.6	66	57.4	21	18.3	27	23.5	67	58.2
5 year	2	4.2	5	10.4	41	85.4	2	4.2	9	18.7	37	77.1
6 year	1	3.3	2	6.7	27	90	1	3.3	5	16.7	24	80
7 year	0	0	0	0	26	100	0	0	1	3.8	25	96.2

Note: N = Frequency, % = Percentage.

Discussion

Based on the conducted research regarding the relationship between commitment and psychological well-being among students in LDRs, the following results indicate a strong and significant positive relationship between the independent variable (commitment) and the dependent variable (psychological well-being). This suggests that an increase in commitment corresponds to an increase in psychological well-being among students in LDRs. This finding is consistent with the study by Du Bois et al. [12], which asserts that commitment to maintaining a relationship in LDRs predicts an individual's psychological well-being.

The research findings imply that the psychological well-being of students in LDRs is influenced by their level of commitment. The descriptive analysis indicates that commitment contributes significantly, accounting for 97,4% of the effective contribution. This indicates that commitment is a strong factor influencing the increase in psychological well-being among students in LDRs. A research [15] found that commitment in LDRs has an impact on psychological well-being, by investigating the mechanisms that explain relationship quality and attachment between partners. Additionally, the study by Tran, Judge, and Kashima [49] supports the notion that commitment is essential for psychological well-being, as it correlates with an individual's satisfaction.

The research results demonstrate that students who maintain commitment in LDRs possess a high level of autonomy. This enables them to focus on their academics while separated from their partners and then shift their focus back to their relationship upon reuniting. This finding aligns with the study by Kluwer et al [31], suggesting that high autonomy leads to good adaptive behavior and motivates relationship behavior. Furthermore, the research reveals that high commitment in LDRs is associated with a high level of environmental mastery. In this case related to human adaptation and human responses to environmental [11, 38], which could reduce the likelihood of relationship dissolution, which could have negative effects on individuals.

The study also highlights that committed students in LDRs have a relatively strong ca-

capacity for personal growth. This is in line with the findings of Borowa et al [14], which suggest that individuals are ready to commit because they have a good understanding of personal reflection experiences that provide insight into individual and relational needs. Consequently, individuals can maintain existing relationships while remaining open to new experiences.

Hatamleh et al [26] assert that individuals committed to relationships are vital for nurturing strong and enduring relationships among individuals which aid in adaptation and allow them to build social relationships with others. This is consistent with the findings of this study, as students committed to LDRs exhibit a high ability to develop positive relationships with others. The idea that commitment in LDRs contributes to the development of strong relationships within groups [39].

The research further indicates that committed students in LDRs tend to have high levels of self-acceptance. This internal commitment helps build self-concept clarity to face conflicts and difficulties in the relationship, providing emotional stability to sustain a better-quality relationship [20]. On the other hand, the study identifies that committed students in LDRs have low levels of shared purpose in life. This may be attributed to factors preventing these students from having a clear sense of life purpose. Research suggests that lack of trust has also been associated with low emotionality, physical, and other forms of sacrifice that may cause conflict as a form of disagreement or contradiction due to differences in goals, aspirations, values, and daily life problems [6]. Research from Bald and Sirsch [8] similarly found that diverse experiences in LDRs can shift an individual's focus to personal goals, altering their future relationship orientation.

In conclusion, it can be inferred that higher commitment among students in LDRs correlates with higher psychological well-being. Therefore, committed students in LDRs are capable of maintaining their relationships while actively fulfilling their academic roles. This conclusion is supported by the significant positive relationship between commitment and psychological well-being found in the research. An interesting insight from this study is that the presence of commitment in students engaged in LDRs does

not always translate to a strong sense of shared life purpose. This is evident from the finding that 39.5% of participants exhibited low levels of shared life purpose.

While the research was conducted following proper procedures, it is acknowledged that limitations were encountered during its execution. Many participants inquired about the alignment of their status with the set criteria, which overwhelmed the researchers and led to difficulties in providing individual responses.

Conclusion

Based on the conducted research, it can be concluded that there is a significant positive relationship between commitment and psychological well-being among students in LDRs. Specifically, the level of commitment was categorized

as high, while the level of psychological well-being was categorized as moderate. More specifically, it can be concluded that commitment has a significant positive relationship with each dimension of psychological well-being among students in LDRs. This study also demonstrates that the commitment variable contributes 97.4% to psychological well-being. Thus, commitment emerges as a very strong factor influencing the psychological well-being of students in LDRs.

For future researchers, it is suggested to further explore and investigate the life purpose of students in LDRs, as well as to identify other factors that influence psychological well-being among individuals in such relationships. This could provide deeper insights into the interplay of various factors and their impact on the well-being of individuals in LDR.

References

- Adamczyk K. et al. Relationship (in)congruency may differently impact mental health. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*. 2023. Vol. 23, no. 3, pp 1—9. (Accessed 10.05.2024) DOI: 10.1016/j.ijchp.2023.100376
- Afnibar A. et al. Children's Worth School: Psychological well-being of high school students in Padang. *Al-Ta'lim Journal*. 2020. Vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 215—226. (Accessed 16.02.2024) DOI: 10.15548/jt.v27i2.632
- Agnew C.R., Hadden B.W., Tan K. It's about time: Readiness, commitment, and stability in close relationships. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 2019. Vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 1046—1055. (Accessed 17.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/1948550619829060
- Amelia F R. Long-Distance romantic relationships among international students: "My first qualitative research". *Studies in Philosophy of Science and Education*. 2020. Vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 74—86. (Accessed 15.02.2023) DOI: 10.46627/sipose.v1i2.28
- Arfensia D.S. et al. Relationship quality in early adult individuals that are in Long-Distance relationship. *Psychosofia: Journal of Psychology, Religion, and Humanity*. 2021. Vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 141—155. (Accessed 13.02.2023) DOI: 10.32923/psc.v3i2.1858
- Arikewuyo A.O., Eluwole K.K., Özad B. Influence of lack of trust on romantic relationship problems: The mediating role of partner cell phone snooping. *Psychological Reports*. 2021. Vol. 124, no. 1, pp. 348—365. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/0033294119899902
- Azca M.N., Putri R.D., Nilan P. Gendered youth transitions in local jihad in Indonesia: Negotiating agency in arranged marriage. *Journal of Youth Studies*. 2023. pp. 1—16. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI:10.1080/13676261.2023.2248894
- Baldt B., Sirsch U. What happens abroad stays abroad? Going on a student exchange while being in a committed relationship. *Journal of International Students*. 2020. Vol. 10, no 1, pp. 1—16. (Accessed 15.02.2024) DOI: 10.32674/jis.v0i0.1047
- Bazani M., Bakhtiari M., Masjedi Arani A. An investigation of Long-Distance relationship maintenance in married individuals in Tehran, 2020. *American Journal of Family Therapy*. 2022. Vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1—19. (Accessed 15.02.2024) DOI: 10.1080/01926187.2021.1941419
- Beckmeyer J.J., Herbenick D., Eastman-Mueller H. Long-distance romantic relationships among college students: Prevalence, correlates, and dynamics in a campus probability survey. *Journal of American College Health*, 2021. Vol. 0, no 0, pp. 1—5. (Accessed 15.02.2023) DOI:10.1080/07448481.2021.1978464
- Blake S., Janssens A. Through 'thick and thin' as long as it is healthy: shared meanings of commitment in long-term couple relationships, whether married or not. *Journal of Family Studies*. 2023. Vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 595—611. (Accessed 09.05.2024) DOI: 10.1080/13229400.2021.1952889
- Bois S.N. Du et al. Examining Relationship-Level Predictors of Individual-Level Health in Long Distance Relationships. *Family Journal*. 2022. Vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 289—300. (Accessed 15.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/10664807211054151
- Boisvert S., Poulin F., Dion J. Romantic relationships from adolescence to established adulthood. *Emerging Adulthood*, 2023. Vol. 11,

- no 4, pp. 947—958. (Accessed 05.08.2023) DOI:10.1177/21676968231174083
14. Borowa D. et al. Personal growth initiative's relation to life meaning and satisfaction in a polish sample. *Current Psychology*, 2020. Vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1648—1660. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI: 10.1007/s12144-018-9862-2
15. Bouchard G. et al. Attachment, relational maintenance behaviors and relationship quality in romantic Long-Distance relationships: A dyadic perspective. *Interpersona*. 2023. Vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 213—231. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI: 10.5964/ijpr.9771
16. Bühler J.L., Krauss S., Orth U. Development of Relationship Satisfaction Across the Life Span: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2021. Vol. 147, no 10, pp. 1012—1053. (Accessed 15.02.2024) DOI: 10.1037/bul0000342
17. Cassepp-Borges V. et al. Love and relationship satisfaction as a function of romantic relationship stages. *Trends in Psychology*. 2023. pp. 1—16. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI:10.1007/s43076-023-00333-4
18. Chaudhry S. et al. Student psychological well-being in higher education: The role of internal team environment, institutional, friends and family support and academic engagement. *PLoS One*. 2024. Vol. 19, no 1, pp. 1—23. (Accessed 16.02.2024). DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0297508
19. Djupe P.A. How Many Students are in Long-Distance Relationships? [Electronic resource]. *onetwentyseven*. 2023. Available at: <https://onetwentyseven.blog/2023/04/10/how-many-students-are-in-long-distance-relationships/>. (Accessed 14.02.2024)
20. Emery L.F. et al. Who are “We”? Couple Identity clarity and romantic relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2021. Vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 146—160. (Accessed 17.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/0146167220921717
21. Finn C., Johnson M. D., Neyer F. J. Happily (n) ever after? Codevelopment of romantic partners in continuing and dissolving unions. *Developmental Psychology*. 2020. Vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 1022—1028. (Accessed 16.02.2024) DOI: 10.1037/dev0000897
22. Freeman H., Simons J., Benson N. F. Romantic duration, relationship quality, and attachment insecurity among dating couples. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2023. Vol. 20, no 1, pp 1—18. (Accessed 10.05.2024) DOI: 10.3390/ijerph20010856
23. Gede Budasi I., Wayan Suryasa I. The cultural view of North Bali community towards *Ngidih* marriage reflected from its lexicons. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 2021. Vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 1484—1497. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI: 10.52462/jlls.107
24. Gómez-López M., Viejo C., Ortega-Ruiz R. Well-being and romantic relationships: A systematic review in adolescence and emerging adulthood. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2019. Vol. 16, no. 13, pp. 1—31. (Accessed 15.02.2024) DOI: 10.3390/ijerph16132415
25. Hammonds J.R., Ribarsky E., Soares G. Attached and apart: Attachment styles and self-disclosure in long-distance romantic relationships. *Journal of Relationships Research*. 2020. Vol. 10, pp. 1—10. (Accessed 14.02.2024) DOI: 10.1017/jrr.2020.10
26. Holtzman S. et al. Long-distance texting: Text messaging is linked with higher relationship satisfaction in long-distance relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2021. Vol. 38, no. 12, pp. 3543—3565. (Accessed 15.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/02654075211043296
27. Jesslyn E., Dewi F.I.R. Trust in dating couples: Attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, and perceived partner responsiveness. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*. 2020. Vol. 439, pp. 684—691. (Accessed 17.02.2024) DOI: 10.2991/assehr.k.200515.112
28. Johnson R.M., Hall J.A. The discourses surrounding long-distance romantic relationships and perceived network support: A mixed methods investigation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2021. Vol. 38, no. 9, pp. 2525—2544. (Accessed 15.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/02654075211013890
29. Khlomov K.D., Bochaver A.A., Korneev A.A. Well-being and coping with stress among russian adolescents in different educational environments. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*. 2021. Vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 68—80. (Accessed 15.02.2024) DOI: 10.11621/pir.2021.0305
30. Kluwer E.S. et al. Autonomy in Relatedness: How Need Fulfillment Interacts in Close Relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2020. Vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 603—616. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/0146167219867964
31. Naz G.A.A. A grounded theory on conflict management in long-distance relationships: A sociotechnical perspective. *International Journal of Sociotechnology and Knowledge Development*. 2020. Vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 41—59. (Accessed 25.02.2023) DOI: 10.4018/IJSKD.2020070103
32. Nelson L.J. The theory of emerging adulthood 20 years later: A look at where it has taken us, what we know now, and where we need to go. *Emerging Adulthood*. 2021. Vol. 9, no 3, pp. 1—10. (Accessed 14.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/2167696820950884
33. Nikitina E.A. Is selfie behavior related to psychological Well-being?. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*. 2021. Vol. 14, no 3, pp. 22—33. (Accessed 16.02.2024) DOI:10.11621/pir.2021.0302
34. Ogolsky B.G., Stafford L. A systematic review of relationship maintenance: Reflecting back and looking to the future. *Personal Relationships*. 2023. Vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 19—43. (Accessed 09.05.2024) DOI: 10.1111/per.12429

35. Owen J. et al. Commitment uncertainty: A theoretical overview. *Couple and Family Psychology; Research and Practice*. 2014. Vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 207—219. (Accessed 10.01.2023) DOI: 10.1037/cfp0000028
36. PDDikti. Higher education statistic 2020. *PDDikti*. 2020. Vol. 5, pp. 123—125. Available at: <https://pddikti.kemdikbud.go.id/asset/data/publikasi/Statistik Pendidikan Tinggi 2020.pdf> (Accessed 13.02.2023)
37. Pisor A.C., Jones J.H. Do people manage climate risk through long-distance relationships?. *American Journal of Human Biology*. 2021. Vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 1—19. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI: 10.1002/ajhb.23525
38. Pisor A.C., Ross C.T. Distinguishing intergroup and Long-Distance relationships. *Human Nature*. 2022. Vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 280—303. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI: 10.1007/s12110-022-09431-1
39. Ragavan M. et al. The Influence of Culture on Healthy Relationship Formation and Teen Dating Violence: A Qualitative Analysis of South Asian Female Youth Residing in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2021. Vol. 36, no. 7—8, pp. 1—27. (Accessed 18.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/0886260518787815
40. Rahmawati Y., Chozanah R. Punya hubungan jarak jauh? Begini Caranya agar langgeng menurut terapis [Electronic resource]. *Suara.com*. 2021. Available at: <https://www.suara.com/health/2021/03/14/140000/punya-hubungan-jarak-jauh-begini-caranya-agar-langgeng-menurut-terapis>. (Accessed 13.02.2024)
41. Ritter L J., Hilliard T., Knox D. “Lovesick”: Mental health and romantic relationships among college students. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2022. Vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1—14. (Accessed 16.02.2024) DOI: 10.3390/ijerph20010641
42. Ryff C.D. Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*. 2013. Vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 10—28. (Accessed 17.01.2023) DOI: 10.1159/000353263
43. SurviveLDR. Long distance relationship statistics 2023 — what you need to know [Electronic resource]. *SurviveLDR*. 2023. Available at: <https://survivedr.com/long-distance-relationship-statistics/>. (Accessed 14.02.2024)
44. Tan J.J.X. et al. Partner commitment in close relationships mitigates social class differences in subjective Well-Being. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 2020. Vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 16—25. (Accessed 17.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/1948550619837006
45. Tan K., Agnew C.R., Hadden B.W. Seeking and ensuring interdependence: Desiring commitment and the strategic initiation and maintenance of close relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2019. Vol. 46, no 1, pp. 36—50. (Accessed 14.02.2023) DOI: 10.1177/0146167219841633
46. Tan K., Ho D., Agnew C. R. Relationship status and psychological Well-being: Initial evidence for the moderating effects of commitment readiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. 2023. Vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 2563—2581. (Accessed 17.02.2024) DOI: 10.1007/s10902-023-00692-w
47. The Center for the Study of Long Distance Relationships. Long distance relationship [Electronic resource]. *JF Milne Publications*. 2021. Available at: <https://www.longdistancerelationships.net/>. (Accessed 13.02.2024)
48. Tran P., Judge M., Kashima Y. Commitment in relationships: An updated meta_analysis of the Investment Model. *Personal relationships*. 2019. Vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 158—190. (Accessed 17.02.2024) DOI: 10.1111/pere.12268
49. Zoppolat G., Visserman M.L., Righetti F. A nice surprise: Sacrifice expectations and partner appreciation in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2020. Vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 450—466. (Accessed 17.02.2024) DOI: 10.1177/0265407519867145

Information about the authors

Sabathania Georgia Manna Welvart, Bachelor of Psychology, Satya Wacana Christian University, Salatiga, Indonesia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8087-576X>, e-mail: thaniawelwart01@gmail.com

Arthur Huwae, Master of Psychology, Lecturer at Faculty of Psychology, Satya Wacana Christian University, Salatiga, Indonesia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2918-3309>, e-mail: arthur.huwae@uksw.edu

Информация об авторах

Сабатания Джорджия Манна Велварт, бакалавр психологии, Христианский университет Сатъя Вакана, Салатига, Индонезия, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8087-576X>, e-mail: thaniawelwart01@gmail.com

Артур Хуваэ, магистр психологии, преподаватель факультета психологии, Христианский университет Сатъя Вакана, Салатига, Индонезия, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2918-3309>, e-mail: arthur.huwae@uksw.edu

Получена 30.08.2023

Принята в печать 30.08.2024

Received 30.08.2023

Accepted 30.08.2024