




Exploring the Role of Shared Values and Emotional Intimacy in Predicting Long-Term Marital Commitment

Yaliu Yang¹, Intan. Sari^{2*}

¹ Marriage and Family Therapy Department, Iona College, New Rochelle, NY, United States

² Department of Child and Family Studies, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia

* Corresponding author email address: intan.sari@unpad.ac.id

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Seyed Hamid Atashpour  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran hamidatashpour@gmail.com	Reviewer 1: Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri  Associate Professor (Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mahdi Khanjani  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the introduction, the sentence “Commitment is not merely a static pledge but a dynamic psychological state...” would benefit from a brief mention of the specific theoretical frameworks used to conceptualize marital commitment, such as Johnson’s commitment model or Sternberg’s Triangular Theory of Love.

The paragraph beginning with “Furthermore, emotional intimacy is not only a predictor of commitment...” lacks a clear transition from the prior paragraph. Consider adding a bridging sentence to maintain logical flow and cohesion between theoretical and therapeutic discussions.

The paragraph starting with “Shared values, defined as the degree to which partners agree on core beliefs...” would benefit from including a specific psychological theory (e.g., social exchange theory or similarity-attraction hypothesis) to contextualize how shared values translate into marital outcomes.

In the paragraph beginning with “This research is particularly relevant to the Indonesian context...” please expand on how Indonesia’s collectivist norms may uniquely influence emotional expression and value alignment, possibly with citation of cultural psychology literature.

In the Methods section under “Study Design and Participants,” the sentence “A total of 400 participants were selected using stratified random sampling...” requires more detail about the stratification criteria (e.g., by region, gender, or marital duration), as this affects representativeness.

In Table 2, the correlation between shared values and emotional intimacy ($r = .54$) is strong enough to consider potential multicollinearity. Although VIF values are given later, an explicit discussion of potential overlap between predictors would strengthen interpretation.

In the regression results, the finding that emotional intimacy had a slightly stronger beta ($\beta = .44$) than shared values ($\beta = .38$) deserves more interpretive emphasis in the discussion section, especially in cultural contexts where emotional intimacy is often constrained.

In the paragraph beginning with “The integration of shared values and emotional intimacy as joint predictors...,” the authors could benefit from including interaction effects in future models, as synergy between variables is suggested but not tested.

In the Limitations section, the sentence “Participants may have overestimated their levels of intimacy or value alignment...” should be expanded by discussing how social desirability bias could be mitigated, such as through anonymity assurances or indirect questioning.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the sentence “For instance, Umami et al. (2024) analyzed depictions of emotional intimacy in literature...,” using literary analysis as evidence in a psychological article may weaken the empirical foundation. Consider replacing it with findings from a psychological or sociological study for stronger evidentiary support.

In the paragraph beginning with “Another relevant dimension in this discussion...,” the phrase “psychological constructs such as emotion regulation and cognitive flexibility” is introduced without theoretical anchoring. Elaborate briefly on how these constructs operate within relational contexts to enhance conceptual clarity.

The Measures section would benefit from reporting Cronbach’s alpha values based on the current study’s data rather than relying solely on prior literature. This would confirm internal consistency reliability within this specific sample.

In the subsection “Emotional Intimacy,” the description of the Emotional Intimacy Scale (EIS) lacks mention of whether the instrument was culturally validated or translated for use with Indonesian participants. Please clarify the localization process, if applicable.

In the Data Analysis section, the statement “The assumptions of normality, linearity, and multicollinearity were tested...” is strong, but the manuscript should also mention how outliers were handled, if any existed, as they could affect regression estimates.

In the Findings section, the demographic breakdown is thorough, but it would be informative to include a short commentary on whether marital satisfaction scores varied by demographic groups (e.g., gender or age), even if this was not the focus of inferential analysis.

In the first paragraph of the Discussion section, the authors write, “These findings provide empirical support for the hypothesis...” but no formal hypotheses were stated in the introduction or methods. Please clearly state hypotheses earlier in the manuscript for consistency.

The sentence “This interpretation aligns with the findings of Jitaru and Turliuc (2022)...” would be strengthened by elaborating on the specific mechanisms of emotion regulation (e.g., reappraisal, suppression) that were found to moderate marital outcomes.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.