

Family Strength in Remote Marriage: Social Support, Coping Strategies, and Their Effects

Hanifah¹, Tin Herawati², Defina^{3*)}

^{1,2,3}Department of Family and Consumer Sciences, Faculty of Human Ecology, IPB University, Bogor 16680, West Java, Indonesia

*) Corresponding author: defina@apps.ipb.ac.id

Abstract

Many married couples in Indonesia have carried out long-distance marriages. It happens because the couple is working or going to school. This study aimed to analyze social support and coping strategies and their effect on the strength of families undergoing long-distance marriages. The research was carried out for nine months, namely February-October 2020. The number of respondents in this study was 60 wives who lived in the ex-Pekalongan Residency, namely Batang Regency, Pekalongan City and Regency, Pemalang Regency, Tegal City, and Regency, and Brebes Regency. This research uses a non-probability sampling method with a voluntary sampling technique. They are collecting data using an online questionnaire, namely through a google form. To analyze the influence of variables used, a multiple linear regression test: results, family support and family strength in the medium category. Wives are more likely to use coping strategies that focus on emotions than those that focus on problems. Based on the regression test results, the husband's length of education has a significant positive effect on family strength in long-distance marriages. The research implies that efforts to improve education, especially for husbands, are needed because it affects family strength.

Keywords: coping strategies, family strength, long distance marriage, social support

Abstrak

Pernikahan jarak jauh sudah banyak dijalani oleh pasangan suami istri di Indonesia. Hal ini terjadi karena pasangan ada yang bekerja atau sekolah. Tujuan dari penelitian ini menganalisis dukungan sosial dan strategi daya tindak serta pengaruhnya terhadap ketahanan keluarga yang menjalani pernikahan jarak jauh. Penelitian dilaksanakan selama sembilan bulan, yakni Februari-Oktober 2020. Jumlah responden dalam penelitian ini 60 orang istri yang tinggal di eks-Karesidenan Pekalongan, yakni Kabupaten Batang, Kota dan Kabupaten Pekalongan, Kabupaten Pemalang, Kota dan Kabupaten Tegal, serta Kabupaten Brebes. Kajian ini menggunakan metode *non-probability sampling* dengan teknik *voluntary sampling*. Pengambilan data menggunakan kuesioner *online*, yakni melalui *google form*. Untuk menganalisis uji pengaruh digunakan uji regresi linear berganda. Hasil, dukungan keluarga dan ketahanan keluarga dalam kategori sedang. Istri lebih sering melakukan strategi daya tindak yang berfokus pada emosi dibandingkan yang berfokus pada masalah. Berdasarkan hasil uji regresi, tempoh pendidikan suami berpengaruh positif signifikan dengan ketahanan keluarga pernikahan jarak jauh. Implikasi kajian adalah perlu upaya peningkatan pendidikan, terutama suami, karena berpengaruh pada ketahanan keluarga.

Kata kunci: dukungan sosial, ketahanan keluarga, pernikahan jarak jauh, strategi koping

Introduction

Long-distance marriage or often referred to as long-distance marriage (LDR), is understood as a strong marriage relationship, and their communication is limited due to geographical aspects (Stafford, 2005). Indonesians have been forced to leave their families to migrate because of the demands of work and school. However, information on the number of people undergoing long-distance marriages in Indonesia is not yet available.

According to Putra and Afdal (2020), long-distance marriage does not affect marital satisfaction. The wife has more communication in the family. The wife communicates with her husband and the extended family and feels comfortable being open about various things, whether feelings, concerns, or problems that occur. The existence of good communication in long distance marriage (LDM) is also by Amelia's (2020) findings. It is said that husbands and wives who undergo LDM use many ways of communicating to stay in good contact. Likewise, with Suminar and Kaddi's (2018) finding and Wijayanti (2021) that couples who undergo LDM maintain the quality of communication, commitment, openness, mutual understanding, and trust from each partner. Couples can maintain emotional intimacy, and the geographic distance does not hinder emotional connection (Jurkane-Hobein, 2015)

Long-distance marriage is a complex condition because couples face new problems such as close relationships, parenting problems, household chores, emotional states, or possibly infidelity (Dewi, 2013). According to Mijilputri (2015) and Winta and Nugraheni (2019), long-distance marriages cause many wives to experience loneliness because their husbands have left them for months. Furthermore, Rachman (2017) revealed that long-distance marriage (LDM) impacts are primarily negative. Such as weakening relationships between partners, feeling lonely, rising suspicion from friends and relatives, strained family ties, loss of opportunity to have children, frequent conflicts, and divorce. Furthermore, 9 out of 16 participants said that LDM is an unpleasant, heavy, and risky experience for spouse conflict due to jealousy, and the possibility of leaving parents' obligations to (Wakhidah, Yusuf, & Kurnia, 2020).

In connection with one of the impacts of LDM, namely divorce, this is undoubtedly related to a family's strength. Based on BPS (2021) data, there are three provinces with the highest number of divorces and divorces in Indonesia in 2016. East Java province occupies the top position with 86.491 cases, West Java with 75.001 cases, and Central Java with 71.373 divorce cases.

In 2020, the number of divorce cases in Central Java was 65.755, with details of 48.947 divorce lawsuits and 16,808 divorced divorces. The highest cause of divorce in Central Java is leaving one of the parties, namely 12. 679. The number two and third causes of high are drunkenness (169 cases) and adultery (125 cases) (BPS-Jateng, 2021). Leaving a partner is the most common cause of divorce. Married couples who undergo LDM will leave their partners within a certain period. However, there is no data that reveals that this is a factor in divorce. However, as with previous research, this can lead to divorce.

Couples who undergo long-distance marriages experience a reasonably severe challenge, especially for their wives (Lestari, 2013). Based on this phenomenon, it is necessary to support many parties such as family, neighbors, and friends for couples undergoing long-distance marriages. Herawati, Pranadji, and Rukmayanti (2012) state that someone who gets various supports from family or people around him will feel

physical comfort, feel cared for, appreciated, and loved. Budiman (2006) points out that an essential factor that can reduce stress is the support from the husband. However, in a long-distance marriage, the husband and wife are in different places. Therefore, support from the family environment is needed, and contributions from the family can also affect family strength.

The challenges faced by long-distance marriage, according to Dewi (2013), can come from internal (spouse or children) or external (surrounding environment), which can cause stress. Some of the things that cause stress for long-distance marriages are couples who are not happy to be left behind, children are still small, finances are not stable, and transportation is quite challenging to reach. Long-distance marriage makes family conditions unstable, so families must adapt to overcome these problems. Effective coping strategies can affect a person's adjustment in undergoing a long-distance marriage.

According to Folkman and Lazarus (1980), coping strategies can be carried out in two ways, namely problem-centered coping strategies and emotion-centered coping strategies. Coping strategies carried out by individuals dealing with their problems will determine family strength. Rosidah, Hartoyo, and Muflikhati (2012) state that if the welfare status of the family influences coping strategies, the more successful the coping strategies carried out by the family, the less will be. Prosperous families can meet family needs, both food, and non-food needs so that when there is a decrease in income, families can use their resources to overcome them.

From this description, it can be seen that married couples who undergo LDM do not have problems with communication, but there are other problems. The communication between husband and wife undergoing LDA has been widely studied, their problems, and their coping strategies. However, no one has investigated family characteristics, social support, coping strategies, and their effect on family strength. Therefore, this study aims to (1) identify family characteristics, social support, coping strategies, and family strength in long-distance marriages; (2) analyze the effect of family characteristics, social support, coping strategies, and family strength on long-distance marriage.

Methods

Participants

This study uses a cross-sectional design, namely research in a period that is not sustainable. The research was carried out in the former Pekalongan Residency: Batang Regency, Pekalongan City, Pekalongan Regency, Pemasang Regency, Tegal City, Tegal Regency, and Brebes Regency. Research locations were selected purposively, considering that the UMK (district/city minimum wage) of the ex-Pekalongan Residency was still low or less than 2,000,000 per month. It encourages people in these areas to migrate out of town because the UMK in other cities is much higher it can add to the family's economy. Furthermore, the length of data collection is three months, from February to October 2020. The population in this study were wives who underwent long-distance marriages because their husbands worked. They meet at least once a month and are domiciled in the former Pekalongan Residency. This study included 63 wives who were taken through non-probability and voluntary sampling methods. They filled out a questionnaire in the form of a google form. After cleaning the data, the number of respondents became 60 wives.

Measurement

Primary data was obtained through interviews using a tool in an online questionnaire via a google form. The questionnaire contains family characteristics (length of separation, age of husband and wife, length of education of husband and wife, wife's occupation, income per capita, and family size), social support, coping strategies, and family strength.

Social support is support obtained from someone (Ozbay *et al.*, 2007). This support is obtained because of social ties with other individuals, groups, or larger communities. Such social support can come from family, friends, and close people (Canty-Mitchell & Zimet, 2000). Social support was measured using the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support Scoring (MSPSS) instrument developed by Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, and Farley (1988) and referring to Safarino (1996) and Mccubbin (1988) adapted Sunarti, Tati, Atat, Noorhaisma, and Lembayung (2005) with a total of 26 questions (Cronbach's alpha = 0.844). Social support is divided into two dimensions the support of family and friends, and each with four questions.

In this study, Coping strategies are used by respondents to deal with problems while undergoing LDM. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) say that coping is a continuous effort to change cognition and behavior in the face of external and internal burdens or exceeds one's resources. Using the Ways of Coping Scale developed by Folkman and Lazarus (1980). Coping strategy variables were measured with 29 questions. The questionnaire was translated into Indonesian using a machine translation. The translation results were re-checked so that the meaning was the same as the original language and arranged according to the structure of the Indonesian language (Cronbach's alpha = 0.779).

Family strength establishes balance in the system due to disturbances caused by significant adversity (Macphee, Lunkenheimer, & Riggs, 2015). Family strength refers to a family's ability to regain its psychological and functional integrity after experiencing adversity. The attributes of family strength are 1) collective trust; 2) linkage; 3) a positive outlook on life; 4) resources, including the availability of perceived support and the ability to identify and utilize support; 5) open communication patterns; and 6) collaborative problem solving (Oh & Chang, 2014). Furthermore, family strength was measured using a family strength questionnaire developed by Sunarti (2001) and Puspitawati (2018) with a total of 36 questions (Cronbach's alpha = 0.837).

Analysis

The entire questionnaire uses a Likert scale as the answer. The data obtained were then analyzed using descriptive and inferential tests analyzed using. The inference test used is the multiple linear regression test. For that, use Microsoft Excel and SPSS 25 for windows.

Findings

Family Characteristics

This research was conducted in the former Pekalongan Residency, namely in Batang Regency, Pekalongan City and Regency, Pemasang Regency, Tegal City and Regency, and Brebes Regency. This study takes the example of wives who undergo long-distance marriages. The length of time separated by husband and wife is more than three months; almost half and more than half are separated for less than three months. In addition, the study results found that the average age of the husband was in the range of

35 years. It is in contrast to the average age of the mother, which is in the range of 31 years.

Another family characteristic is that the husband's average length of education is 11.8 years, while the wife's average length of education is 12.7 years. It is illustrated that, on average, husbands study up to high school (SMA), and wives take longer in education than husbands. In addition, more than half of the respondents are employed, and less than half are housewives. Meanwhile, the average family income per capita is in the range of IDR 2.064.634.20 per month. The families in this study include upper-middle-class or non-poor families because they have a per capita income above the poverty line of Central Java Province in 2019, which is IDR 381.992.00 per month.

Table 1. Distribution of examples by type of work

Category	n	%
Husband's Job		
Does not work	0	0.0
Laborer	13	21.7
Trader/entrepreneur	9	15.0
Entrepreneur	12	20.0
PNS/ABRI/Police	5	8.3
Private sector employee	20	33.3
Honorary employee	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0
Wife's Job		
Does not work	32	53.3
Laborer	2	3.3
Trader/entrepreneur	1	1.7
Entrepreneur	6	10.0
PNS/ABRI/Police	4	6.7
Private sector employee	8	13.3
Honorary employee	7	11.7
Total	60	100.0

Social Support

Social support is encouragement from the surrounding environment, namely family, friends, and neighbours. This support can be physical, financial, and psychological, for example affecting the life of a wife who is in a long-distance marriage. Table 2 shows that more than half of the respondents received low social support in this study. In fact, out of 60 respondents, only one respondent received high social support. Of the two types of social support, social support from friends was the lowest, i.e. more than two-thirds received low peer support. It is because the respondent's friends are less helpful in solving problems. The highest percentage is family support, but even that is in the moderate category, almost half. Almost a third of the respondents who received family support were in a low category. The form of family support felt by the respondent is that the partner helps solve the problem, and the extended family always supports the respondent's decision positively.

Table 2. Dimensions of social support and its distribution

Two dimensions of social support	n	%
Social support from family		
Low (0-60)	18	30.0
Medium (61-80)	29	48.3
High (81-100)	13	21.7
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	38-100	
Mean±Standard deviation	68.0±14.0	
Social support from friends		
Low (0-60)	47	78.3
Medium (61-80)	10	16.7
High (81-100)	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	5-100	
Mean±Standard deviation	47.1±19.0	
Total social support		
Low (0-60)	34	56.7
Medium (61-80)	25	41.7
High (81-100)	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	26-100	
Mean±Standard deviation	57.6±12.4	

Coping Strategy

A coping strategy is an effort or effort made by someone to overcome and reduce the problem at hand. Table 3 shows that more than four-fifths of respondents (90%) have moderate coping strategies. Respondents used emotion-focused coping more often than problem-focused coping. Most of the respondents, i.e., more than three-quarters, used problem-focused coping in the moderate category. It can be seen from respondents focusing on things that can solve problems and asking for advice from others in solving problems. Furthermore, most of the respondents, i.e., more than two-thirds, used emotion-focused coping in the moderate category. It can be seen from the respondents always being patient in dealing with problems and always being calm in solving problems.

Table 3. Dimensions of coping strategies and their distribution

Coping strategy dimensions	n	%
Problem-focused coping		
Low (0-60)	12	20.0
Medium (61-80)	46	76.7
High (81-100)	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	50-87	
Mean±Standard deviation	66.7±7.4	

Table 3. Dimensions of coping strategies and their distribution (*continue*)

Coping strategy dimensions	n	%
Emotion-focused coping		
Low (0-60)	2	3.3
Medium (61-80)	47	78.3
High (81-100)	11	18.3
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	60-93	
Mean±Standard deviation	72.3±7.6	
Total coping strategy		
Low (0-60)	2	3.3
Medium (61-80)	54	90.0
High (81-100)	4	6.7
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	59-86	
Mean±Standard deviation	70.4±6.8	

Family Strength

Family strength is the ability to manage resources and problems faced by the family so that all the needs of family members are met. Family strength consists of three dimensions: physical strength, psychological strength, and social strength. The study results in Table 4 show that almost two-thirds of the respondents have moderate Family strength. However, there are still respondents whose Family strength is low, namely 1 in 10 respondents. Of the three forms of strength, the respondents' physical endurance is more than half in the moderate category. However, there are still a quarter of respondents have low physical endurance. It can be seen from respondents' answers who have savings for the future. This condition is also almost the same as psychological strength. Namely, a quarter of respondents have low psychological strength. None of the respondents had high psychological susceptibility. It is different from social strength, where almost half of the respondents have high social strength. Respondents with low social strength are no more than one-tenth.

Table 4. Distribution of examples based on family strength

Dimensions of Family strength	n	%
Physical endurance		
Low (0-60)	15	25.0
Medium (61-80)	41	68.3
High (81-100)	4	6.7
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	38-87	
Mean±Standard deviation	64.6±10.1	
Social strength		
Low (0-60)	4	6.7
Medium (61-80)	27	45.0
High (81-100)	29	48.3
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	50-100	
Mean±Standard deviation	77.9±12.5	
Psychological strength		
Low (0-60)	15	25.0
Medium (61-80)	45	75.0
High (81-100)	0	0.0

Table 4. Distribution of examples based on family strength (*continue*)

Dimensions of Family strength	n	%
Psychological strength		
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	48-78	
Mean±Standard deviation	66.8±8.1	
Total Family strength		
Low (0-60)	8	13.3
Medium (61-80)	43	71.7
High (81-100)	9	15.0
Total	60	100.0
Min-max	56-88	
Mean±Standard deviation	70.3±8.2	

Effects of the studied variables

Out of the ten variables, only two variables affect Family strength: the husband's length of education and coping strategies. The results in Table 5 show that the husband's length of education has a positive effect of 0.240 on family strength. The longer the husband's education, the better the strength of the respondent's family. In addition, the coping strategy was found to have a positive effect of 0.142 on family strength. The higher the coping strategy used by the respondent, the higher the family's strength. Social support was found to have no significant effect on coping strategies and family strength. Likewise, the length of time a partner undergoes long-distance marriage, the age of husband and wife, the wife's occupation, family income and family size do not affect family strength.

Table 5. Family characteristics, social support, coping strategies and their effect on family strength

Variable	Family strength		Sig.
	B is not standardized	B is standardized	
Constant	40.179		0.004
Length of LDR (months)	-0.048	-0.038	0.765
Husband's age (years)	0.000	-0.001	0.999
Wife's age (years)	-0.035	-0.035	0.911
Husband's education (years)	2.151	0.240	0.099*
Wife's education (years)	-1.482	-0.173	0.249
Wife's occupation (0=not working; 1=working)	2.022	0.124	0.402
Income per capita (rupiah)	5.262E-7	0.155	0.329
Family size (person)	-0.942	-0.177	0.387
Social support (index)	-0.066	-0.099	0.447
Coping strategy (index)	0.498	0.142	0.004**
R Square		0.292	
Adj R ²		0.148	
F		2.022	
Sig.		0.051	

Note: * Significant at p < 0.1, ** Significant at p < 0.05

Discussion

Overall, the average married couple undergoes a long-distance marriage (LDR) is three months. However, the average time the couples in this study underwent LDR was not as long as the other couples in the other studies. For example, Kismini, Wicaksono, and Putri's (2018) research revealed that a married couple in Tulungagung takes five years of LDM to work. Meanwhile, Fatimah (2018) revealed that respondents underwent LDM for 5-10 years. Wijayanti's research (2021) shows that married couples experience LDM throughout their marriage, namely the age of marriage for ten years and LDM for ten years.

A married couple undergoing LDR means they do not see each other for three months. In the opinion of Gerstel and Gross (1982), long-distance marriages are separated at least three nights a week for at least three months. Furthermore, this married couple did not have face-to-face contact for three months because they were separated by geographical distance. It is following the opinion of Jurkane-Hobein (2015). that LDR is a couple who cannot meet face-to-face every day or at least often does not meet face-to-face due to geographical distance making it difficult to control. However, their partners maintain intimate relationships that include body contact.

The age of the husband and the wife's age are in the category of early adulthood. According to Hurlock (1980) early adulthood is a period marked by the process of adjusting to a new way of life and taking advantage of the freedom it has. On average, husbands and wives graduated from high school (SMA). However, Fatimah (2018), who researched married couples in Cluring Banyuwangi Village, revealed that wives left by their husbands because migrant workers abroad were due to economic factors, and 34 of the 53 respondents (wives) only had an elementary education and did not work. According to Herawati (2012), a person's level of education will affect the level of income received; the higher a person's education, the higher the level of income. Therefore, education is one of the critical indicators that will determine a person's economic and employment status.

More than half of the respondents do not work, and almost a quarter of the respondents' husbands work as laborers. Economic factors that make married couples undergo LDM are also the same as the findings of Prameswara and Sakti (2016) and Wijayanti (2021) that married couples undergo LDM due to economic factors. Furthermore, almost half of the married couples studied entered into LDM because of job demands, namely private employees, civil servants, and TNI/Polri. This finding is similar to Winta and Nugraheni's (2019) findings that husband and wife undergo LDM due to work factors, namely the TNI, contractors, and sailors.

Work placements and study assignments put couples in long-distance relationships. However, the demand for a better career path and economy has slightly changed their household relations (Rubyasih, 2016).

The presence of respondents who work, which is almost half, increases family income. The research results by Rosidah *et al.* (2012) also confirmed that working wives contribute to family income. It is also done by Filipino female workers who leave the country and their husbands to work in Singapore (Acedera & Yeoh, 2019). That is, married couples undergoing LDM are not only caused by job demands but also by work.

The average income per capita of respondents is IDR 2.064.634.20 per month. This figure is far above the poverty line of Central Java Province in 2020, which is IDR 395.407.00 per capita per month (BPS-Jateng, 2021). Herawati *et al.* (2012) stated that

family strength is influenced by per capita income and asset ownership. The higher the income per capita and ownership of assets, the greater the family's strength. The size of the respondent's family is categorized as a small family with three family members. It is in line with Firdaus and Sunarti (2009) research that families with fewer members have fewer burdens and expenses to meet family needs than families with significant family members.

Based on the research, the social support received by the respondents is low. Social support from the respondent's family is in the medium category, and social support from friends is low. Sagita, Amsal, and Fairuz (2020) found a low level of social support in family strength. Of the five indicators to measure family strength (positive prospects, spirituality, communication within the family, family attachment, financial management, and social support), this social support is the lowest on average. Lack of social support, especially partners, will damage trust in marital relationships (Johnson & Moosath, 2019). Herawati *et al.* (2012) stated that family strength was significantly negatively related to social support obtained from neighbors and extended family. According to Walen and Lachman (2000), low social support can increase stress levels in women, which can reduce family strength. Social support, healthy relationships, communication, belief-based practices, and positive thinking patterns are adaptive coping responses to crises and shared difficulties in a family (Gayatri & Irawaty, 2021). On the other hand, wives who undergo LDM share their problems with their husbands and friends. Even though sometimes they do not get the best solution, respondents are satisfied because they feel that their burden is reduced when respondents tell stories to people they trust (Winta & Nugraheni, 2019; Wardhani & Widiyasavitri, 2020).

The coping strategies accepted by the respondents are in the moderate category. Meanwhile, respondents' dimensions of problem-focused coping and emotions-focused coping were in the moderate category. Coping strategies can be done by allocating resources and empowering the abilities of family members (Herawati *et al.*, 2012). Emotions-focused coping is used more often than problem-focused coping. According to Lazarus (1993), problem-focused coping is carried out when individuals feel that their resources can change the situation and solve the problems they face. Next, coping focused on emotions tends to be done if the individual cannot change the situation and can only accept the situation. It is also by the findings of Winta and Nugraheni (2019) that wives who undergo LDM accept this situation. In overcoming LDM due to pandemic quarantine, positive coping strategies of married individuals are an essential factor in increasing family strength (Aydogan, Kara, & Kalkan, 2021).

The results showed that the strength of the respondent's family was classified as moderate. The respondents' physical endurance is in the moderate category. According to Sunarti (2001), a family will be free from economic problems if the family has a per capita income that exceeds the minimum physical needs, more than one family member works, and has economic resources that exceed the minimum physical needs. The psychological strength of the respondents is in the medium category. Families have good psychological strength when facing non-physical problems; families can manage emotions and good self-concept (Sunarti, 2001).

The social strength of the respondents is categorized as high. It is indicated by more than half of the wives 1) having goals or goals to be achieved with their partners, 2) good communication with their husbands and children, and 3) worshipping regularly. Sumari, Baharudin, Mashkor, Yahya, and Aman (2021) also found religion and commitment to marriage, religious belief as a coping strategy, and religious practice as a coping strategy

in undergoing LDM. High communication with a partner despite undergoing LDM is also by the findings of Hampton, Rawlings, Treger, and Sprecher (2017), namely that respondents use various communication channels such as text messages. Love and communication by exploring joint decisions every day in LDM couples will maintain relationship stability (Jimenez & Asendorpf, 2010). namely that respondents use various communication channels such as text messages. Love and communication by exploring joint decisions every day in LDM couples will maintain relationship stability (Suryani & Nurwidawati, 2016). Sunarti (2001) states that the family will have high social strength if it has non-physical resources, including the quality of the wife and the quality of good marital relationships to meet their social needs.

The regression test results showed that the husband's length of education had a significant positive effect on family strength. It is in line with Nurillah's (2013) research that the higher the husband's education will provide the opportunity to get a better job and the higher the family's per capita income, thereby increasing family strength. The regression test results also show that coping strategies have a positive effect on family strength; the more maximal the strategies used will increase family strength. Again, it is in line with Nurillah's (2013) research that the more maximal the family's coping strategies in overcoming problems, the more resilient the family will be. On the other hand, Saefullah, Giyasih, and Setiyawati (2019) revealed that social support variables positively affect family strength in families undergoing LDM.

According to McCubbin (1988), strength is one of the factors that interacts with strategy and becomes part of family stress management. McCubbin (1979) states that the factors that influence coping strategies include socioeconomic characteristics, demographic characteristics, area of residence, and workplace pressures. Pilny and Siems (2019) revealed that LDM couples need maintenance strategies to maintain interpersonal relationships, such as positivity, openness, assurance, networking, conflict management, division of tasks, giving advice, and further division into intrapersonal activities. The limitation in this study is that the data source is only from the wife's perspective, while the husband is not involved. Furthermore, this data collection was not carried out by direct interviews with respondents but through an online questionnaire. In addition to respondents and data collection techniques, another limitation is that the data collection area is only in the ex-Pekalongan Residency, so it does not describe long-distance marriages in Central Java Province.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Conclusion

Respondents can be said to have undergone a long-distance marriage even though, in general, they only underwent LDM for three months. They do it because of work and economic factors. With their education average high school, this makes couples look for a decent job outside the home by leaving the family. The couple's business has brought their per capita income above the poverty line. During this LDM, respondents received social support, although this social support was still in the low category. Most of the social support obtained is from family compared to friends. Family support in the form of partner assistance in making decisions. Meanwhile, social support from friends is in the form of suggestions that help respondents solve problems.

To undergo this LDM, respondents also develop coping strategies to have family strength. Although more than two-thirds of the respondents have had a moderate category

of coping strategies, more than two-thirds of the respondents also have moderate family strength; almost twenty per cent of respondents have low family strength. If this is not allowed to drag on without social support, families undergoing LDM may end up in divorce. The respondent's coping strategy that is widely used is problem-focused coping by solving problems with a partner. However, it does not mean that there are still respondents who do not focus on emotional strategies, so there are still respondents who have low family strength in terms of emotions. If this is allowed, it will undoubtedly make the respondent stressed. Furthermore, when viewed from the aspect of the strength of the respondent's family, this aspect is classified as moderate. Furthermore, the factors that significantly affect family strength are the length of the husband's education and coping strategies.

Recommendation

Respondents need to improve coping strategies by doing other activities when they have problems and managing their negative emotions. Therefore, further research is recommended to take an example from the husband and wife side and expand the research location in Central Java and add other factors such as communication and gender partnerships in a long-distance marriage. In addition, the government and other institutions are expected to create special counseling programs for families undergoing long-distance marriages.

References

- [BPS-Jateng] Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Tengah. (2021). *Provinsi Jawa Tengah dalam Angka*. Retrieved from <https://jateng.bps.go.id/publication/download.html?>
- [BPS] Badan Pusta Statistik. (2021). *Nikah, Talak dan Cerai, serta Rujuk 2007-2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.bps.go.id/indicator/27/176/1/jumlah-nikah-talak-dan-cerai-serta-rujuk.html>
- Acedera, K. A., & Yeoh, B. S. A. (2019). 'Making time': Long-distance marriages and the temporalities of the transnational family. *Current Sociology*, 67(2), 250–272. doi: 10.1177/0011392118792927
- Amelia, F. R. (2020). Long-distance romantic relationships among international students: My first qualitative research. *Studies in Philosophy of Science and Education*, 1(2), 74–86. doi: 10.46627/sipose.v1i2.28
- Aydogan, D., Kara, E., & Kalkan, E. (2021). Understanding relational strength of married adults in quarantine days. *Current Psychology*, 1–11. doi: 10.1007/s12144-021-02224-2
- Budiman. (2006). *Persepsi efektifitas kinerja karyawan ditinjau dari konflik peran ganda istri dan dukungan sosial rekan kerja* (Universitas Gadjah Mada). Retrieved from <https://repository.ugm.ac.id>
- Canty-Mitchell, J., & Zimet, G. D. (2000). Psychometric properties of the multidimensional scale of perceived social support in urban adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28(3), 391–400. doi: 10.1023/A:1005109522457
- Dewi, N. K. (2013). *Commuter Marriage: Ketika Berjauhan Menjadi Sebuah Keputusan*. Bogor (ID): IPB Press.
- Fatimah, S. (2018). Hubungan cinta komitmen dengan kepuasan pernikahan dimoderatori oleh kebersyukuran. *Psikodimensia*, 17(1), 26–35. doi: 10.24167/psidim.v17i1.1428

- Firdaus, F., & Sunarti, E. (2009). Hubungan antara tekanan ekonomi dan mekanisme coping dengan kesejahteraan keluarga wanita pemetik teh. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga Dan Konsumen*, 2(1), 21–31. doi: 10.24156/jikk.2009.2.1.21
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1980). An analysis of coping in a middle-aged community sample. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 21(3), 219–239. doi: 10.2307/2136617
- Gayatri, M., & Irawaty, D. K. (2021). Family strength during Covid-19 pandemic: A literature review. *Family Journal*, 14(1), 1–7. doi: 10.1177/10664807211023875
- Gerstel, N., & Gross, H. E. (1982). Commuter marriages: A review. *Marriage & Family Review*, 5(2), 71–93. doi: 10.1300/J002v05n02_05
- Hampton, A. J., Rawlings, J., Treger, S., & Sprecher, S. (2017). Channels of computer-mediated communication and satisfaction in long-distance relationships. *Interpersona*, 11(2), 171–187. doi: 10.5964/ijpr.v11i2.273
- Herawati, T., Pranadji, D. K., & Rukmayanti, I. Y. (2012). Dukungan sosial dan ketahanan keluarga peserta dan bukan peserta Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (PNPM) Mandiri. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga Dan Konsumen*, 5(1), 1–10. doi: 10.24156/jikk.2012.5.1.1
- Jimenez, F. V., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2010). Shared everyday decisions and constructive communication: Protective factors in long-distance romantic relationships. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*, 4(2), 157–182. doi: 10.5964/ijpr.v4i2.47
- Johnson, E., & Moosath, H. (2019). Exploring the role of distance in trust and marital-quality in married women. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 24(2), 14–24. doi: 10.9790/0837-2402071424
- Jurkane-Hobein, I. (2015). Imagining the absent partner-intimacy and imagination in long-distance relationships. *Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences*, 8(1), 223–241. doi: 10.12959/issn.1855-0541.iiass-2015-no1-art13
- Kismini, E., Wicaksono, H., & Putri, N. A. (2018). The husbands-wives relation model of long distance marriage farmer households. *Komunitas: International Journal of Indonesian Society and Culture*, 10(1), 112–120. doi: 10.15294/komunitas.v9i1.12446
- Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress appraisal and coping*. New York (NY): Springer Publishing Company.
- Lestari, S. (2013). *Psikologi Keluarga: Penanaman Nilai dan Penanganan Konflik dalam Keluarga* (1st ed.). Jakarta (ID): Kencana.
- Macphee, D., Lunkenheimer, E., & Riggs, N. (2015). Strength as regulation of developmental and family processes. *Family Relations*, 64(1), 153–175. doi: 10.1111/fare.12100.Strength
- McCubbin, H. I. (1979). Integrating coping behavior in family stress theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 41(2), 237–244. doi: 10.2307/351693
- McCubbin, M. A. (1988). Family stress, resources, and family types: Chronic illness in children. *Family Relations*, 37(2), 203–210. doi: 10.2307/584557
- Nurillah, H. (2013). *Strategi coping, tekanan ekonomi, dan ketahanan keluarga di kawasan kumuh* (IPB). Retrieved from <http://repository.ipb.ac.id/handle/123456789/66296>
- Oh, S., & Chang, S. J. (2014). Concept analysis: Family strength. *Open Journal of Nursing*, 04(13), 980–990. doi: 10.4236/ojn.2014.413105
- Ozbay, F., Johnson, D. C., Dimoulas, E., Morgan, C. A., Charney, D., & Southwick, S.

- (2007). Social support and strength to stress: from neurobiology to clinical practice. *Psychiatry*, 4(5), 35–40. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20806028%0A>
- Pilny, H. L., & Siems, F. U. (2019). Maintenance strategies and long-distance Relationships: An adaption of theories from interpersonal relationship research to marketing. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 18(4), 309–323. doi: 10.1080/15332667.2019.1648938
- Prameswara, A. D., & Sakti, H. (2016). Pernikahan jarak jauh: Studi kualitatif fenomenologis pada istri yang menjalani pernikahan jarak jauh. *Empati*, 5(3), 417–423. doi: 10.14710/empati.2016.15360
- Puspitawati, H. (2018). *Pengantar Studi Keluarga* (Revision). Bogor (ID): IPB Press.
- Putra, B. N., & Afdal, A. (2020). Marital satisfaction: An analysis of long distance marriage couples. *International Journal of Research in Counseling and Education*, 4(1), 64–69. doi: 10.24036/00287za0002
- Rachman, I. P. (2017). Pemaknaan seorang istri terhadap pengalamannya menjalani pernikahan jarak jauh (long distance marriage). *Calyptra: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Universitas Surabaya*, 6(2), 1672–1679. Retrieved from <http://webhosting.ubaya.ac.id/~journalubayaac/index.php/jimus/article/view/1100>
- Rosidah, U., Hartoyo, H., & Muflikhati, I. (2012). Kajian strategi koping dan perilaku investasi anak pada keluarga buruh pemetik melati gambir. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga Dan Konsumen*, 5(1), 77–87. doi: 10.24156/jikk.2012.5.1.77
- Rubyasih, A. (2016). Model komunikasi perkawinan jarak jauh. *Jurnal Kajian Komunikasi*, 4(1), 109–119. doi: 10.24198/jkk.v4i1.7854
- Saefullah, L., Giyasih, S. R., & Setiyawati, D. (2019). Pengaruh dukungan sosial terhadap ketahanan keluarga tenaga kerja Indonesia. *Jurnal Sosiologi Pendidikan Humanis*, 3(2), 119–132. doi: 10.17977/um021v3i2p119-132
- Sagita, D. D., Amsal, M. F., & Fairuz, S. U. N. (2020). Analysis of family strength: The effects of the Covid-19. *Sawwa: Jurnal Studi Gender*, 15(2), 275–294. doi: 10.21580/sa.v15i2.6542
- Sumari, M., Baharudin, D. F., Mashkor, M. I., Yahya, A. N., & Aman, N. S. (2021). The role of religion in long-distance marriage as experienced by Malaysian muslim husbands. *Family Journal*, (August), 106648072110357. doi: 10.1177/10664807211035706
- Suminar, J. R., & Kaddi, S. M. (2018). The phenomenon of marriage couples with long-distance relationship. *MIMBAR : Jurnal Sosial Dan Pembangunan*, 34(1), 121–129. doi: 10.29313/mimbar.v34i1.3183
- Sunarti, E. (2001). *Studi ketahanan keluarga dan ukurannya: Telaah kasus pengaruhnya terhadap kualitas kehamilan* (Institut Pertanian Bogor). Retrieved from <http://repository.ipb.ac.id/handle/123456789/4337>
- Sunarti, E., Tati, Atat, S. N., Noorhaisma, R., & Lembayung, D. P. (2005). Pengaruh tekanan ekonomi keluarga, dukungan sosial, kualitas perkawinan, pengasuhan, dan kecerdasan emosi anak terhadap prestasi belajar anak. *Media Gizi Dan Keluarga*, 29(1), 34–40. Retrieved from <https://journal.ipb.ac.id/index.php/mediagizi/issue/view/1080>
- Suryani, A., & Nurwidawati, D. (2016). Self disclosure dan trust pada pasangan dewasa muda yang menikah dan menjalani hubungan jarak jauh. *Jurnal Psikologi Teori Dan Terapan*, 7(1), 9–15. doi: 10.26740/jptt.v7n1.p9-15
- Wakhidah, U. W., Yusuf, A., & Kurnia, I. D. (2020). Pengalaman mahasiswa yang

- menjalani long distance marriage (LDM) di Surabaya. *Jurnal Keperawatan Jiwa*, 2(1), 26–37. doi: 10.20473/pnj.v1i1.17936
- Walen, H. R., & Lachman, M. E. (2000). Social support and strain from partner, family, and friends: Costs and benefits for men and women in adulthood. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 17(1), 5–30. doi: 10.1177/0265407500171001
- Wardhani, N. D. W., & Widiyasavitri, P. N. (2020). Coping strategies on wives in a long-distance marriage and live with in-laws. *Psikodimensia*, 19(1), 106–121. doi: 10.24167/psidim.v19i1.2309
- Wijayanti, Y. T. (2021). Long distance marriage couple communication pattern during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 6(1), 208–221. doi: 10.24329/aspikom.v6i1.849
- Winta, M. V. I., & Nugraheni, R. D. (2019). Coping stress pada istri yang menjalani long distance married. *PHILANTHROPY: Journal of Psychology*, 3(2), 123–136. doi: 10.26623/philanthropy.v3i2.1711
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 30–41. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_2