

Looking Back Self-Disclosure and Relationship Satisfaction in Partners After the Pandemic

Christofel Martua Aritonang^{1*}, Widya N. S. Samosir², Hotpascaman Simbolon³

^{1,2,3}Faculty of Psychology, University of HKBP Nommensen, Medan, Indonesia

*christofel.aritonang@uhn.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Adjustments to both distance and crowding rules after the pandemic provide opportunities for how couples perceive their relationship. The purpose of this study was to review self-disclosure and perceptions of relationship satisfaction in couples after the pandemic period. The measuring instrument used was the relationship satisfaction measurement scale from Hendric (1988) and the adjustment of the measuring instrument by Matthew Martin (2004) for self-disclosure. The total sample of the study was 82 partners, although the results showed that there was no relationship between the two variables with $> 0,05$ significance. Another results shows The condition of the distance, and dating time between partners has a fairly varied frequency in expressing relationship satisfaction and disclosing the value or relationship in public (social media).

Keywords: partners, relationship satisfaction, self-disclosure,

Introduction

The Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia is part of the 2019 Coronavirus disease pandemic which is taking place throughout the world. The disease is caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) (Wikipedia, 2020). The Covid-19 pandemic that is happening around the world does not only have an impact on public health but also has an impact on economic conditions, education, and social life. According to World Meters (2021), Covid-19 cases in Indonesia have reached 4,223,094 cases and 142,413 deaths.

According to Pietromonaco and Collins (2017) "people have a fundamental need for belonging, and they are most likely to thrive in the face of stress when they feel closely connected to significant others". This means that people strive for the belonging by including the proximity. on the contrary people were forced to stay at home because to COVID-19 epidemic restrictions on travel and interaction, which disrupted family patterns and harmed relationships. This was thought to be the root of a great deal of strife between the pair. Some of their disagreements sprang from their anger with the circumstances at hand, while others were the result of previously unresolved emotional issues that their hectic schedules had forced them to brush aside. Additionally, around this time there was a noticeable rise in domestic violence. The needs of self-disclosure in expressing all the emotions through verbal, non-verbal becomes so important, not to mention the significance of media becomes the tool in exploring the loves one. Self-disclosure becomes so important as partners gain confidence between themselves as a pair.

This was thought to be the root of a great deal of strife between the pair. Some of their disagreements sprang from their anger with the circumstances at hand, while others were the result of previously unresolved emotional issues that their hectic schedules had forced them to brush aside (Simran & Nambiar, 2022). According to Karney and Bradbury (1995), the most

important factor influencing couples (in this study partner) outcomes is the feeling and expression of unpleasant emotions. In his research, Kurdek (1999) discovered that a lack of emotional expression is one of the factors that predicts low relationship satisfaction. Being aware of, accepting, caring about, understanding, and supporting one's partner's needs is essential to maintaining a good relationship.

Responding to a partner's needs fosters a closer relationship (Reis et al., 2004). When people encounter external pressures and problems in their day-to-day lives, such as work stress, managing domestic tasks, caring for children and extended family, and financial challenges, it affects how receptive they are to their partners. For Covid 19 we found more and more data from the Google Trends that enforcing people for staying home, on which this could potentially lead to several things such as intensity for boredom (Brodeur, Clark, Fleche, & Powdthavee, 2020).

For 2022, the limit of travel banned, mobility rules were lifted up though the ongoing data of numbers on Covid worldwide. Charlotte and Elton (2022) says that 109 countries still have some travel restrictions in place, 118 are completely open. This could be the sign of how partners can perceive the opportunity of mobility can be done between partners. This study aiming the impact of Post status of pandemic towards impact of physical proximity from the perspective relationship satisfaction at it seems Taneja & Goyal (2020) found there was a significant difference in the levels of trust and commitment, although an insignificant difference was observed in the levels of relationship satisfaction among couples in long distance and proximally close relationship. And it was observed that, young adults involved in long distance relationship elicited higher levels of commitment.

This study aimed how the relationship satisfaction and self-disclosure can be describe by the couples after pandemic.

Method

In this research using quantitative research methods with descriptive research design. Collecting data with purposive sampling online and using the exposed facto method. This research was conducted to look again at self-disclosure and relationship satisfaction in LDR (Long Distance Relationship) partners and non-LDR partners with a minimum age limit of 13 years, with minimum 1 year relationship status and the respondents had partners with a population of 82 respondents. The instrument in this research used a relationship satisfaction measurement tool from Hendric (1998) as many as 7 items with a reliability value of 0.731, for the second measurement tool with a reliability value of 0.909 using self-disclosure from adjustments to Matthew Martin's (2004) measuring instrument as many as 18 items.

Result

The data of this study were analyzed using the statistical approach with correlation analysis. Here are the descriptive results of the research that can be described.

Table 1.
Type of Relationship

Type of Relationship	Frequency
Long Distance Relationship	44
Not Long-Distance Relationship	38
Total	82

Based on table 1. above, it illustrates that there were as many as 44 respondents who had long-distance relationships, on the other hand as many as 38 people who had long-distance relationships for couples.

Table.2
Age Distribution

Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 19	13	15.9	15.9	15.9
20	26	31.7	31.7	47.0
21	20	24.4	24.4	72.0
22	13	15.9	15.9	87.8
23	7	8.5	8.5	96.3
25	2	2.4	2.4	98.8
28	1	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	81	100.0	100.0	

Based on table 2, namely the age distribution, we can see that there were variations in the age of the respondents, namely ages 19-28, where the most respondents were 20 years old, namely 31.7%, and the least, namely 28 years, 1.2%.

Table.3
Duration Dating

Long Time Dating	Frequency
0 years	5
1 years	23
2 years	17
3 years	11
4 years	11
5 years	8
6 years	5
7 years	0
8 years	1
9 years	1
10 years	0
Total	82

Table 3. As many as 82 respondents in this research, if examined from the length of being in a relationship from the range of 0-10 years, the highest frequency was obtained, namely 23 respondents who were in a relationship for 1 year.

Table.4
Respondent's Sex

Sex	Frequency
Male	55
Female	27
Total	82

Table 4 above explains that this research was answered by as many as 82 respondents and the majority of respondents were male with as many as 55 respondents, while respondents with female gender answered as many as 27 respondents.

Table.5
Respondent's & Partner Education

Respondent Education	Frequency	Partner Education	Frequency
Senior High School	55	Senior High School	41
Bachelor Degree	27	Bachelor Degree	41
Total	82	Total	82

Table 5 above explains that the spread of data is that as many as 55 respondents with last education were in the high school category and as many as 27 respondents were in the bachelor degree education category. Meanwhile for the education of the respondent's partner is at a balanced frequency of 41.

Table.6
Category Self-disclosure

Category Self-disclosure	Data	
	Frequency	Percent
Low	12	14.6
Medium	61	74.4
High	9	11.0
Total	82	100.0

Based on table 6, respondents in the low category of self-disclosure were 14.6%, medium 74.4%, and high 11% so that it can be concluded that the majority of self-disclosure variables were in the medium category and at least in the high category.

Table.7
Category Relationship

Category Relationship	Data	
	Frequency	Percent
Low	18	22.0
Medium	48	59.8
High	15	18.3
Total	82	100.0

In table 7 the respondents were in the low category in the relationship, namely 22%, medium 59.8%, and high 18.3% so it can be concluded that the majority of relationship variables were in the medium category and at least in the high category

Table.8
Normality

Normalitas (K-SZ)	Relationship	Self-disclosure
Asympt.Sig. (2-Tiled)	0.133	0.909

The normality test uses the Kolmogorov Smirnov sample test with the condition that the data can be said to be normally distributed if it meets the requirements $p > 0.05$ so that based on table 8 it can be concluded that the self-disclosure variable and the relationship normally distributed

Tabel 9.
Linearity for the variables

Relationship Satisfaction Self-disclosure	Mean square	F	Sig.
Linearity	13.291	0.592	0.446
Deviation from linearity	18.610	0.829	0.715

In Table 9, this study tries to see how the frequency of movement of the joint data between the self-disclosure and relationship satisfaction variable data, so it is found that these two data have not moved linearly towards the $x = y$ line equation, there is a spread of data that cannot be used as a reasonable limit for explain the linearity of the two. This can be seen from the linearity value which is at a value above the significance of $p > 0.05$, which is 0.446. So that the two cannot be said to have the potential to provide an overview of the relationship. Even so, it can be seen in table 10, that the two variables have a very small correlation value of 0.089 with a significance that cannot be thought of to accommodate generalizations to a population that is similar to a p value > 0.05 .

Table.11
Additional descriptive

LDR				NON LDR			
Highest Satisfaction Relationship		Highest Self Disclosure		Highest Satisfaction Relationship		Highest Self Disclosure	
Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Vomen
8	2	5	0	8	0	2	1

In this study, it was found that both categorical relationship satisfaction were highest and categorical self-disclosure were highest in male gender (table 11)

Discussion

The study represents the descriptive of partners who already firm the status of the relationship. surprisingly we found that male participant were more frequently responsive than the female participants. as far of the type relationship, this study show more type long distance relationship (LDR), in which proximity by demografi gave as a brief review of the situation tough in after pandemic. As we found that there is no significance correlation between variable self-disclosure and relationship satisfaction with the current $r = 0.089$ ($p > 0.05$). This findings were currently direct different similarities toward the Simran, S., & Nambiar, (2022) findings.

But the better results we found there are no different from perspective of satisfaction relationship between the long distance and the non-long-distance relationship type. This led to

concern for Humans by their very nature are social beings, and by discussing their feelings, they are better able to control the relationship satisfactory. Partners perceived can express themselves and their emotions freely and without restraints by engaging in the process of self-disclosure using social media as this study were built.

This study also gave us the description about no differences whether self-disclosure were defined by participant of long distance relationship type or non-long distance relationship type. in which we can conclude differ from earlier studies, which showed that disclosure had an immediate emotional impact on a discloser by decreasing stress from negative experiences (Martins et al., 2013), reducing anxiety (Tam et al., 2006), and increasing negative affect in the short term (Greenberg & Stone, 1992), are evidence of the enormous significance of emotional self-disclosure. This leads to long-term psychological improvement (Kelley, Lumley, & Leisen, 1997). Additionally, disclosure combined with support can enhance the closeness and intimacy of relationships (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Sprecher, Treger, & Wondra, 2013).

We might seeing this study did not fully generate the all romantic partnership by defining status. This study also found that male suppress frequency for relationship satisfaction and self-disclosure with the highest level categorial on long distance relationship, we may assume that male attachment anxiety about rejection repeatedly showed statistically significant associations with physical interpersonal distance in stouples. We might assume that attachment may manifest itself not only in terms of psychological intimacy but also in terms of physical distance as it was found by Conradi, Noordhof, Boyette, & De Jonge (2020)

Conclusion

Several conclusion that might need to be concerned for this study were, correlation between the variabel was value of $r = 0.426$ but not significant. There is no differences on frequencies by the couples whether they undergo or Long distance relationship (LDR) in expressing or communicating themselves and their partners on social media. Highest self-disclosure was dominated by men whether or not they undergo LDR

Acknowledgement

This study was raised for personal acknowledgement of psychology student from university HKBP Nommensen by far the class of SPSS and Construction class.

References

- Brodeur, A., Clark, A. E., Fleche, S., & Powdthavee, N. (2021). COVID-19, lockdowns and well-being: Evidence from Google Trends. *Journal of public economics*, 193, 104346.
- Charlotte & Elton (2022). entry rules and how are they changing. <https://www.euronews.com/travel/2022/05/18/israel-entry-rules-everything-you-need-to-know-about-testing-forms-and-masks>
- Conradi, H. J., Noordhof, A., Boyette, L. L., & de Jonge, P. (2020). Physical distance between romantic partners as a marker for attachment in couples: A proof of concept study. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 41(1), 91-106.
- Frisby, B. N., & Martin, M. M. (2010). Instructor–student and student–student rapport in the classroom. *Communication Education*, 59(2), 146-164.
- Hendrick, S. S., Dicke, A., & Hendrick, C. (1998). The relationship assessment scale. *Journal of social and personal relationships*, 15(1), 137-142.
- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, methods, and research. *Psychological bulletin*, 118(1), 3.

- Lumley, M. A., Kelley, J. E., & Leisen, J. C. (1997). Predicting pain and adjustment in rheumatoid arthritis: The role of life stress and emotional processing. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2(2), 255-264.
- Pietromonaco, P. R., & Collins, N. L. (2017). Interpersonal mechanisms linking close relationships to health. *American Psychologist*, 72(6), 531–542. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000129>
- Reis, H. T., Crasta, D., Rogge, R. D., Maniaci, M. R., & Carmichael, C. L. (2017). Perceived Partner Responsiveness Scale (PPRS) (Reis & Carmichael, 2006). *The sourcebook of listening research: Methodology and measures*, 516-521.
- Simran, S., & Nambiar, D. (2022) Emotional Self Disclosure and Relationship Satisfaction among Married Adults during COVID19.
- Sprecher, S., Treger, S., Wondra, J. D., Hilaire, N., & Wallpe, K. (2013). Taking turns: Reciprocal self-disclosure promotes liking in initial interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(5), 860-866.
- Taneja, S., & Goyal, P. (2020). Impact of Physical Proximity in Romantic Relationships on Trust, Commitment and Relationship Satisfaction among Young Adults. *Indian Journal of Mental Health*, 7(1), 15-20.