Journal of Innovative and Creativity
Journal Homepage: https://joecy.org/index.php/joecy
e-mail: journaljoecy@gmail.com

Faculty of Education
University of Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai
ISSN 2775-771X (Online)
ISSN 2962-570X **(Printed)**
6 (1) 2026, Page 7499-7515

Gewe Acceptance, Conjugal Moral Configuration, and the Plurality of Marital Resilience: A Comparative Analysis of Gender Role Ideology in Indonesian Couples

Iwan Zaenul Fuad[1], Mohammad Fateh[2], Anindya Aryu Inayati[3], Abdul Hamid[4]
[1,2,3,4] UIN KH. Abdurrahman Wahid Pekalongan
iwan.zaenul.fuad@uingusdur.ac.id

ABSTRAK

Studi ini menganalisis pengaruh ideologi peran gender terhadap stabilitas perkawinan melalui dua lensa: pertama, penerimaan Kesetaraan Gender dan Pemberdayaan Perempuan (GEWE); dan kedua, struktur Penilaian Moral Perkawinan (CMJ) dan Ketahanan Moral Perkawinan (CMR). Studi ini melibatkan tiga kelompok ideologis: Egaliter (N=84), Patriarkal (N=13), dan Matriarkal (N=16). Dalam hal penerimaan GEWE, semua kelompok menunjukkan penerimaan yang umumnya positif, dengan kelompok Egaliter memiliki penerimaan rata-rata tertinggi, tetapi semua kelompok menunjukkan penolakan yang seragam terhadap agenda Kesehatan Reproduksi (RH) (M=2,48), yang menunjukkan batasan moral yang meluas terkait dengan fondasi Kesucian. Temuan utama adalah ditemukannya pluralitas strategi moral dalam menjaga integritas perkawinan. Secara struktural, kelompok Egaliter menunjukkan Kesenjangan Institusional yang signifikan dalam CMJ, memprioritaskan fondasi individualisasi (Perhatian dan Keadilan) jauh di atas fondasi pengikat (Kesetiaan dan Otoritas). Yang terpenting, penelitian ini memperkenalkan konsep CMR dan mengukurnya menggunakan Deviasi Standar (SD) sebagai indikator konsensus moral internal.Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kelompok Patriarkal menerapkan Strategi Institusional Seragam dengan SD CMR terendah (SD=0,13), yang menandakan konsensus moral dan prediktabilitas tertinggi. Sebaliknya, kelompok Egaliter menggunakan Strategi Individual Fleksibel dengan SD CMR yang relatif lebih tinggi (SD=0,16), yang menunjukkan negosiasi dan adaptasi moral yang lebih besar. Penelitian ini memberikan kontribusi substantif dengan menggeser fokus dari "apa yang diyakini" ke "seberapa seragam keyakinan tersebut" (diukur dengan SD), membuktikan bahwa ideologi gender tidak hanya menentukan konfigurasi moral tetapi juga konsistensi mekanisme ketahanan perkawinan. Temuan ini merekomendasikan bahwa kebijakan penguatan keluarga harus mengakomodasi pluralitas strategi—baik berbasis institusi (Patriarkal/Matriarkal) maupun berbasis individu (Egaliter)—daripada memaksakan keseragaman.

Kata kunci: Ideologi Kesetaraan Gender, Ketahanan Moral Perkawinan (CMR), Teori Landasan Moral (MFT), Konsensus Moral, Pluralitas Strategi Moral.

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the influence of gender role ideology on marital stability through two lenses: first, the acceptance of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE); and second, the structure of Conjugal Moral Judgment (CMJ) and Conjugal Moral Resiliency (CMR). The study involved three ideological groups: Egalitarian (N=84), Patriarchal (N=13), and Matriarchal (N=16). In terms of GEWE acceptance, all groups showed generally positive acceptance, with the Egalitarian group having the highest average acceptance, but all groups exhibited uniform rejection toward the Reproductive Health (RH) agenda (M=2.48), indicating a pervasive moral boundary related to the Sanctity foundation. The primary finding is the discovery of a plurality of moral strategies in maintaining marital integrity. Structurally, the Egalitarian group demonstrates a significant Institutional Gap in CMJ, prioritizing individualizing foundations (Care and Fairness) far above binding foundations (Loyalty and Authority). Crucially, this study introduces the concept of CMR and measures it using Standard Deviation (SD) as an indicator of internal moral consensus. The results show that the Patriarchal group employs a Uniform Institutional Strategy with the lowest CMR SD (SD=0.13), signifying the highest moral consensus and predictability. In contrast, the Egalitarian group utilizes a Flexible Individual Strategy with a relatively higher CMR SD (SD=0.16), indicating greater moral negotiation and adaptation. This research contributes substantively by shifting the focus from "what is believed" to "how uniform is that belief" (measured by SD), proving that gender ideology dictates not only moral configuration but also the consistency of marital resilience mechanisms. The findings recommend that family strengthening policies must accommodate the plurality of strategies—whether institution-based (Patriarchal/Matriarchal) or individual-based (Egalitarian)—rather than imposing uniformity.

Keywords: *Gender Equality Ideology, Conjugal Moral Resiliency (CMR), Moral Foundations Theory (MFT), Moral Consensus, Plurality of Moral Strategies..*

© The Author(s). 2026 Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

INTRODUCTION

The rapid modernization and the significant shift in women's roles in Indonesia have created a crucial tension between traditional values and egalitarian expectations, directly impacting the moral integrity and resilience of households. This tension necessitates a deep understanding of how married couples navigate their gender roles, as failure to adapt often leads to increased conflict and divorce rates (Brown & Lin, 2022; Hald et al., 2020). Academically, the study of conjugal morality is vital for identifying the ethical foundations that sustain family stability amidst rapid structural and social change (Wang & Azam, 2024). Firstly, data from the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics (2023) indicate a significant increase in divorce rates, often triggered by disputes over the division of responsibilities and emotional support within the marriage. Secondly, the increasing dominance of women in the workforce and education system has challenged traditional models of leadership and authority within the household, requiring a redefinition of roles (Gillard & Okonjo-Iweala, 2022a; Longman & Bray, 2024). Thirdly, despite modernization, Indonesian households still highly prioritize group-based moral values such as loyalty and sanctity, which often clash with the demands of moral foundations based on individual rights (Garvey & Ford, 2014; Imelwaty et al., 2024; Napier & Luguri, 2013). Therefore, this research is urgently needed to delineate the specific moral dynamics upheld by Indonesian couples in response to the urgency of these shifting gender roles.

Although the literature has extensively discussed gender role ideology and family dynamics, previous research shows a limiting tendency that restricts a comprehensive understanding of the actual structure of conjugal morality. This dominant tendency generally fails to integrate a deep morality framework (such as Moral Foundations Theory) with studies of gender ideology beyond the simple egalitarian versus patriarchal dichotomy. Consequently, there is a causal deficit in explaining how gender ideology structurally shapes couples' daily ethical priorities in maintaining marital integrity (Miskolci, 2018a; Wasser & Lins França, 2020). Firstly, most studies tend to focus on sociological and behavioral dimensions, measuring the division of domestic labor or women's economic participation (Breitkreuz & Baird, 2025; Daffa et al., 2024; Gillard & Okonjo-Iweala, 2022b; Gugan et al., 2024; Sarma, 2019), without analyzing the underlying moral foundations (Graham et al., 2009). Secondly, research utilizing morality approaches is often limited to political or general cross-cultural contexts, and rarely applies it specifically to the conjugal moral domain in Indonesia (Cappelen et al., 2022; Elbæk et al., 2023; Kirkland et al., 2023). Thirdly, existing ideology analyses tend to oversimplify gender attitudes merely as acceptance or rejection of the Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) agenda, neglecting the complex nuances of moral configuration among these ideological groups (Chen & Liu, 2022; Jameel et al., 2024; Turner-Zwinkels et al., 2021). This literature gap underscores the necessity for research that explicitly

connects the variable of gender role ideology with conjugal moral configuration to fill the void in explaining ethical causality at the household level.

The main objective of this study is to thoroughly identify and analyze how gender role ideology influences the conjugal moral configuration of spouses in Indonesia. The establishment of this goal is a direct response to the failure of previous literature to integrate ideological and moral dimensions within the specific context of the household. Thus, this research projects findings that will provide a holistic understanding of the moral pillars supporting marital integrity amidst differing gender views. This objective is realized through a series of investigations: Firstly, identifying the differences in the level of acceptance towards the gender equality agenda (GEWE) among patriarchal, egalitarian, and matriarchal ideological groups. Secondly, elucidating the conjugal moral configuration—especially the Care, Fairness, Loyalty, Authority, and Sanctity foundations—for each ideological group. Thirdly, assessing whether the aforementioned conjugal moral configuration is adequate for fostering and maintaining marital harmony and resilience. The achievement of these objectives will yield a more nuanced explanatory model of family morality, previously untouched by earlier studies.

The primary argument of this research is that gender role ideology does not only influence the acceptance of the equality concept, but also fundamentally shapes the priorities and structure of the moral foundations used by couples in evaluating marital integrity. We argue that differences in ideology (patriarchal, egalitarian, or matriarchal) will result in distinct moral configurations, particularly in the distance between individual-based moral foundations (Fairness, Care) and group-based moral foundations (Loyalty, Authority, Sanctity) (Brisbane et al., 2023; Miskolci, 2018b; Miskolci & Campana, 2017). These differing moral structures ultimately determine how couples define and achieve marital integrity (Leavitt et al., 2024; Matsumura, 2019). This argument is detailed as follows: Firstly, we predict that the egalitarian group will show a moral configuration that emphasizes Care and Fairness more than group-based foundations, which aligns with individualistic values. Secondly, the patriarchal group is predicted to show a balanced configuration, or even emphasize Authority and Loyalty as the main pillars of conjugal morality. Thirdly, we test the hypothesis that a higher level of GEWE acceptance will correlate positively with the emphasis on the Fairness foundation and negatively with the emphasis on the Authority foundation. Based on this argument, the research will prove the existence of a significant causal relationship between gender ideology categories and the pattern of conjugal moral evaluation utilized by Indonesian spouses.

METHOD

The main unit of analysis in this research is individuals currently engaged in a marriage (husband or wife) grouped based on their gender role ideology. The inclusion of spouses as the unit of analysis

aims to capture the dynamics of moral and role interaction that occur within the actual institution of marriage. This is crucial because an individual's attitude towards Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) (Goulart et al., 2021) often differs when confronted with practical application and moral commitment (Graham et al., 2009, 2012) within the household context. Thus, this unit of analysis allows for the personalized measurement of Conjugal Moral Judgment (CMJ) and Conjugal Moral Resiliency (CMR), extending beyond mere socio-political views to specifically capture the domain of relational morality.

This study employs a quantitative comparative (inter-group comparison) research design based on a survey (Barkin et al., 2021; Billiet, 2013; Schedler & Mudde, 2010). The quantitative design was chosen to measure complex variables such as gender role ideology (Egalitarian, Patriarchal, Matriarchal) and conjugal morality in a structured manner, allowing for strong statistical validation and inference. The use of a survey permits data collection from a sufficiently large and diverse sample, thereby facilitating statistical analysis to test hypotheses and identify patterns of moral relationships. This design aims to explicitly compare the mean (M) and variability (SD) of support for GEWE and MFT configurations through statistical procedures such as Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

Research data were collected from respondents geographically dispersed across Indonesia. These spouses were selected based on their identified gender role ideology groupings: Egalitarian (N=84), Patriarchal (N=138), and Matriarchal (N=16). The smaller proportion of the Matriarchal sample reflects its rarity in the general Indonesian population and the limitations inherent in the quota sampling used. Data collection from these three ideological groups was conducted to ensure representation across the relevant spectrum of gender role views in society. Despite utilizing non-probability sampling (quota/purposive), the representational heterogeneity of ideological views strengthens the external validity of the findings regarding the spectrum of gender ideology attitudes in Indonesia.

Data collection techniques utilized a modified Self-Report Questionnaire (Chauliac et al., 2020; Pike et al., 2021; Siepsiak et al., 2020). This questionnaire was designed to measure two primary dimensions: acceptance of the GEWE concept, and Conjugal Morality (CMJ and CMR) within the household. CMJ and CMR were adopted from the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ) (Graham et al., 2012; Haidt, 2012, 2013; Zhang et al., 2020). For balance and ease of relational analysis, each instrument (GEWE, CMJ, and CMR) consists of 16 items. CMJ and CMR measure five moral foundations (Care, Fairness, Loyalty, Authority, Sanctity), and GEWE measures seven indicators. Examples of GEWE items: “Sexual relations must be based on the mutual agreement of the spouses” (Socio-Cultural Indicator). Example of CMJ items: “Harming/causing distress to one's spouse is evil” (Care Foundation). Example of CMR items: “Marriage can be sustained if the husband is able to lead the wife and family” (Authority Foundation). Questionnaire instruments were utilized due to their efficiency

in measuring respondents' subjective attitudes, values, and moral beliefs. Detailed steps in the distribution of the questionnaire were carried out online to reach dispersed respondents, ensuring the validity and reliability of the instrument through preliminary statistical testing.

Data analysis was conducted quantitatively through Comparative Analysis and Descriptive Analysis (Bozhkova et al., 2021; Oller Alonso & Barredo, 2013). One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test for significant differences in the means (M) of GEWE acceptance and moral foundations across the three gender ideology groups. Descriptive analysis (M and SD) was employed to identify patterns of Moral Configuration (Moral Foundation Profile) and to measure moral variability (SD), which is key to identifying internal moral consensus within the Conjugal Moral Resiliency (CMR) of each group. This analysis stage enables the discovery of the "Institutional Gap" in the Egalitarian group and the "Institutional Uniform Strategy" in the Patriarchal group, which are central to understanding the relationship between gender ideology and marital resilience.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Acceptance of GEWE Based on Gender Ideology

The statistical data (Table 1) demonstrate that all three gender role ideology groups (Egalitarian, Patriarchal, and Matriarchal) generally exhibit a positive level of acceptance towards the overall Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) agenda, yet with highly varied levels of internal consensus. This phenomenon indicates that ideology functions as a filter, determining not only the extent to which GEWE is accepted but also the uniformity of that acceptance within the group. First, the Egalitarian group (N=84) recorded the highest overall acceptance of GEWE (M3.83) but also displayed relatively high internal volatility (SD=0.60), particularly regarding the issue of Women's Leadership (SD=0.960). Second, the Matriarchal group (N=16) registered a considerably high overall acceptance mean (M=3.55) and showed the most homogeneous level of total consensus (SD=0.55), although they exhibited extreme volatility on the issue of Women's Psychology (SD=0.707). Third, the Patriarchal group (N=138) showed the lowest acceptance mean (M=3.38) but with the highest internal variability (SD=0.69), driven by extreme volatility on the issues of Women's Leadership (SD=1.077) and Security and Justice for Women (SD=0.668). These data clarify that the Matriarchal group is the most uniform in its acceptance of GEWE, while the Patriarchal group is the most internally fractured (highest SD).

Tabel 1. Acceptance Level of GEWE Agenda (Scale 0-5)

This table compares the mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD) of the respondents' acceptance levels toward the dimensions of the Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) agenda, grouped by Gender Role Ideology.

No.	GEWE Agenda Dimension	Egalitarian (N=84)	Patriarchy (N=138)	Matriarchy (N=16)	Dimension Mean (M)
		M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	
1	Economic	3.83 (0.370)	3.19 (0.519)	3.13 (0.530)	3.38
2	Health	2.65 (0.648)	2.15 (0.547)	2.63 (0.177)	2.48
3	Human Development	4.15 (0.042)	3.61 (0.149)	3.88 (0.177)	3.88
4	Leadership	3.46 (0.960)	2.85 (1.077)	3.50 (0.000)	3.27
5	Psychological	4.08 (0.194)	3.87 (0.447)	3.50 (0.707)	3.82
6	Security and Justice	4.39 (0.197)	3.93 (0.668)	4.25 (0.433)	4.19
7	Sociocultural	4.24 (0.321)	4.04 (0.103)	4.00 (0.250)	4.09
	Total GEWE Mean	**3.83 (0.60)**	**3.38 (0.69)**	**3.55 (0.55)**	**3.59**

Gender role ideology no longer operates as a binary determinant (pro or contra) of equality but rather as a filter that regulates the level, priority, and consensus of acceptance of the agenda. This affirms that ideological labels should not be equated with total rejection or full support but must be viewed as a spectrum measuring two dimensions: Intensity (M) and Homogeneity (SD). This interpretation is necessary for readers to understand that the Patriarchal group, although conservative, shows the largest variability (highest SD), and the Matriarchal group, despite having relatively high acceptance, exhibits the most uniform internal consensus (lowest SD). First, the Patriarchal group has the lowest M but the highest SD, indicating a great diversity of interpretations and significant internal divisions, especially on the issue of Women's Leadership (SD=1.077). Second, the Egalitarian group, despite being progressive (highest M), still possesses considerable internal division on the issue of Women's Leadership (SD=0.960). Third, the highly specific resistance to the Reproductive Health (RH) issue (M=2.48) reflects an uncompromisable moral boundary, even though the consensus on this resistance is relatively high. Thus, gender ideology influences the degree, boundaries of acceptance, and the level of uniformity (consensus) of GEWE acceptance.

Data analysis yields three main patterns of tendency in GEWE acceptance among Indonesian respondents. These patterns reflect how respondents from various ideologies selectively absorb aspects of modernity, adapting them into existing ideological frameworks, while also demonstrating the locus of internal consensus and conflict. First, there is the Functional Consensus Pattern, where all groups show a high M acceptance toward GEWE agendas that offer functional benefits (such as Human Development and Security), but with the highest consensus (low SD) within the Egalitarian group across almost all non-RH indicators. Second, the Sensitive Issue Heterogeneity Pattern is clearly visible in the Women's

Leadership indicator, where the Patriarchal group recorded the highest SD (SD=1.077) and the Egalitarian group was also high (SD=0.960), demonstrating that this issue is the most internally divisive. Third, the Uncompromisable Moral Boundary Pattern is observed, where all respondents (including Egalitarians) showed the lowest M score on the RH issue (M=2.48), signaling a binding cultural/religious boundary. These three patterns collectively conclude that gender role ideology functions as a selection mechanism that filters GEWE based on functional benefits and inviolable moral boundaries, and determines the level of uniformity in its acceptance.

Conjugal Moral Judgment (CMJ) Configuration Polarization

Data analysis (Table 2) proves that gender role ideology significantly creates a Moral Foundation Gap, distinguishing the ethical priority structure of the Egalitarian group from that of the Patriarchal group. This structural difference impacts not only the Mean (M) values but also the Standard Deviation (SD), which subsequently triggers significant differences in marital stability and moral homogeneity between the groups. This finding validates the main argument that gender ideology fundamentally shapes moral configuration, especially in prioritizing individualizing foundations (Care, Fairness) versus binding foundations (Loyalty, Authority, Sanctity). This divergent moral configuration reflects fundamentally different definitions of the source of marital integrity across the respective groups. First, the Egalitarian group shows the largest moral gap, with individualizing (Care, M=4.60; Fairness, M=4.52) and religious (Sanctity, M=4.41) foundations consistently above 4.40, far surpassing the hierarchy-based foundations (Loyalty, M=3.67; Authority, M=3.89). More crucially, the SD score for the Loyalty foundation (SD=0.74) is the highest SD among all foundations across all groups, even higher than the group's overall SD. This extreme data dispersion indicates that Egalitarian couples have the lowest internal agreement (homogeneity) regarding the absolute standard for institutional Loyalty, a hallmark of the Negotiative-Individualistic Ethics Pattern, where traditional values are questioned and negotiated. Second, the Patriarchal group places Care (M=4.68) and Sanctity (M=4.60) as the highest foundations.

This configuration is more balanced between the individual and institutional dimensions, with Authority (M=4.23) being notably prominent. Although the Loyalty SD score (SD=0.52) still shows a high SD, its value is lower than the Egalitarian group's Loyalty SD, implying that the Patriarchal group has a more managed and homogeneous level of internal conflict in demanding hierarchy compared to the Egalitarian group. Third, the Matriarchal group exhibits the most striking SD findings. With an SD of 0.00 on the Authority and Sanctity foundations, this indicates either perfect moral consistency or absolute rigidity in defining the standards of marital obedience and sanctity among this group. Although their mean foundation scores tend to be lower, when they decide upon an ethical standard for Authority and Sanctity, all members agree without any variation. Overall, gender ideology serves as a key determinant in creating or nullifying the gap and volatility between individual and institutional moral

foundations in the conjugal domain. This updated SD analysis reinforces the finding: Egalitarians are the most morally fractured concerning Loyalty, while Matriarchals are the most rigid (perfect homogeneity) regarding Authority and Sanctity.

Table 2. Conjugal Moral Judgment (CMJ) Configuration (Scale 0-5)

This table compares the mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD) of the respondents' judgment levels toward the five Conjugal Moral Foundations, grouped by Gender Role Ideology.

No.	Fondasi Moral	Egalitarian (N=84)	Patriarchy (N=138)	Matriarchy (N=16)	Dimension Mean (M)
		M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	
I	Individualizing Foundation				
1	Care	4.60 (0.07)	4.68 (0.03)	4.31 (0.13)	4.53
2	Fairness	4.52 (0.18)	4.49 (0.16)	4.08 (0.14)	4.37
I	Binding Foundation				
3	Loyalty	3.67 (0.74)	3.94 (0.52)	3.92 (0.63)	3.84
4	Authority	3.89 (0.34)	4.23 (0.29)	4.00 (0.00)	4.04
5	Sanctity	4.41 (0.13)	4.60 (0.13)	4.25 (0.00)	4.42
	Rata-Rata Total Fondasi Moral	**4.22 (0.29)**	**4.39 (0.23)**	**4.11 (0.18)**	**4.24**

This structural difference confirms that gender ideology moderates how couples interpret the Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) in the domain of marriage, operating as a filter that regulates the role of individual morality versus institutional morality. This interpretation is crucial because it indicates that Care functions as a universal "Super Foundation," but ideology determines which secondary foundation (Fairness, Sanctity, or Authority) will be used to support it. First, the wide moral gap in the Egalitarian group (with the lowest Loyalty/Authority scores) underscores that they do not see absolute obedience and loyalty as moral prerequisites for integrity, but rather as mere consequences of good Fairness and Care. Second, the Patriarchal group effectively "closes" this gap by elevating the scores of Sanctity and Authority, showing a conscious effort to integrate individual morality (Care) into an institutional framework (Sanctity/Authority). Third, the high average Fairness score in the Patriarchal group (4.49) suggests an adaptive effort to accommodate individualistic values promoted by GEWE, but without undermining the structure of Authority and Sanctity. Thus, gender role ideology dictates the ethical strategy of couples in integrating relational and institutional morality.

The configuration analysis yields three distinct Conjugal Morality Configuration Patterns, reflecting the ethical adaptation mechanisms to the relational and institutional demands of marriage. These patterns provide a more nuanced causal explanation of how ideology influences conflict-resolution mechanisms in marriage. Understanding these patterns is important for predicting sources of household conflict. First, the Egalitarian group employs the Negotiative-Individualistic Ethics Pattern, defined by Care and Fairness as the primary filters for conflict resolution, leading to a rejection of blind obedience (lowest Loyalty). Second, the Patriarchal group adopts the Institutional-Religious Ethics Pattern, marked by a high commitment to Care and Sanctity, where household integrity is maintained through sacralized institutional obedience (prominent Authority). Third, the Matriarchal group applies the Moderate Collective Ethics Pattern, which, although centered on Care, shows lower average scores across all foundations, indicating a stable yet less intense moral commitment in demanding ethical idealism. These three structural patterns prove a strong causal link between gender role ideology and the structure of moral judgment used by couples.

Strategy and Homogeneity of Conjugal Moral Resiliency (CMR) in Maintaining Marriage

This finding analyzes the strategies utilized by each ideology in sustaining moral commitment and marital continuity through the measurement of Conjugal Moral Resilience (CMR). First, the Patriarchal group recorded the highest average CMR score (M=4.53) with the lowest Total CMR Standard Deviation (SD=0.13), indicating the most uniform, stringent, and intensive resilience mechanism among all groups. Second, this high homogeneity in the Patriarchal group is supported by a very low SD in the Loyalty foundation (SD=0.16), demonstrating a high consensus on Loyalty as the primary recovery mechanism. Third, the Egalitarian group has a high CMR score (M=4.42) but with a relatively high Total CMR SD (SD=0.16), driven by the highest SD in institutional foundations (Loyalty=0.30; Authority=0.35). Fourth, the Matriarchal group recorded the lowest CMR score (M=4.28) and has the same Total CMR SD as the Egalitarian group (SD=0.16), yet displays extreme rigidity on Loyalty (SD=0.00), implying an invariant standard for recovery. The significant differences in M and SD scores prove that gender ideology directly influences the intensity and homogeneity of resilience strategies.

Tabel 3. Conjugal Moral Resiliency (CMR) Configuration (Scale 0-5)

No.	Moral Foundation	Egalitarian (N=84)	Patriarchy (N=138)	Matriarchy (N=16)	Dimension Mean (M)
		M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	
I.	Individualizing Foundation				
1	Care	4.60 (0.04)	4.64 (0.04)	4.38 (0.14)	4.54
2	Fairness	4.65 (0.02)	4.57 (0.07)	4.17 (0.14)	4.46
II.	Binding Foundation				
3	Loyalty	4.23 (0.30)	4.43 (0.16)	4.25 (0.00)	4.30
4	Authority	4.10 (0.35)	4.36 (0.29)	4.17 (0.14)	4.21

5	Sanctity	4.54 (0.09)	4.65 (0.09)	4.42 (0.38)	4.54
	Total CMR Mean	4.42 (0.16)	4.53 (0.13)	4.28 (0.16)	

This table compares the mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD) of the respondents' Moral Resilience levels in the context of marriage, grouped by Gender Role Ideology.

The interpretation of the CMR data shows that although all three groups possess a high average resilience (all above M=4.25), they achieve this resilience through significantly different methods, which are directly influenced by their gender ideology. First, the Patriarchal group employs a highly efficient and Uniform Institutional Strategy centered on collective adherence to Loyalty, evidenced by the lowest Total CMR SD (0.13). Second, the Egalitarian group utilizes a Flexible and Individual Strategy, evidenced by a relatively high Total CMR SD (0.16), which allows each couple to find unique coping mechanisms, in line with the Negotiative Ethics that open space for individual adaptation. Third, the Matriarchal group, with a zero SD on Loyalty (SD=0.00), maintains resilience through Absolute Rigidity on Loyalty, without room for negotiation, reflecting a lack of variation in the application of moral standards. Thus, ideology not only shapes morality but also determines the consistency and type of recovery mechanism couples use in response to moral conflict.

The analysis of moral resilience strategies yields three contrasting principal patterns. First, the Most Uniform Institutional Resilience Pattern (Patriarchy), characterized by the highest M score (4.53) and the lowest Total CMR SD (0.13), affirms that hierarchical obedience and rigid loyalty are the default and most consistent mechanisms for facing conflict. Second, the Most Flexible Negotiative Resilience Pattern (Egalitarian), marked by a high Total CMR SD (0.16) and driven by high institutional SD (Loyalty=0.30, Authority=0.35), indicates that the ability to individually negotiate and adapt to conflict becomes their main resilience strategy. Third, the Absolute Resilience Pattern (Matriarchy), evidenced by a zero SD (SD=0.00) on Loyalty, implies that for this group, the Loyalty recovery mechanism is binary (present or absent) and absolute, without variation in its interpretation or application. These three CMR patterns comprehensively explain how gender ideology acts as a guide in selecting relationship recovery mechanisms when facing moral pressure.

The connectivity of the key findings in this study can be explained through the mechanism of the Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) personalized within the context of gender role ideology. The uniform rejection of the Reproductive Health (RH) issue (Manze et al., 2020; Oh, 2024) across all groups, including Egalitarians, indicates the existence of a Sanctity Morality Threshold in Indonesia. Although Egalitarians accept equality in the economic and leadership domains (driven by the Fairness and Care foundations), when the RH issue touches the Sanctity/Degradation domain (related to the body, sexual morality, and religious roles), the Sanctity foundation overrides Fairness, creating a similar boundary of acceptance across all three ideologies. The CMJ Institutional Gap in Egalitarians (much lower

Loyalty/Authority) and their high CMR flexibility (SD CMR=0.28) are two sides of the same coin: the rejection of traditional hierarchical obedience. If the Egalitarian ideology rejects gender role hierarchy (Patriarchy and Matriarchy), morally, they also tend to place institutional Authority and Loyalty in a negotiable position, thereby prioritizing the fulfillment of individual needs (Fairness and Care) as the main strategy for maintaining marriage.

This research offers significant novelty to the Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) literature and gender studies in Indonesia. Traditional MFT research by Haidt and colleagues (Atari et al., 2023; Graham et al., 2012; Haidt & Graham, 2007, 2009) tends to identify liberals (Egalitarians) as relying only on individual foundations (Care and Fairness), while conservatives (Patriarchs) utilize all five foundations equally. This study demonstrates a unique adaptation of MFT in the Indonesian context: the Sanctity foundation occupies a very high position across all ideologies, including Egalitarians. This differs from the Western pattern where Sanctity is lower among liberals/egalitarians. The second novelty is the finding that the Patriarchal ideology in Indonesia shows a higher consensus (low SD) in Conjugal Moral Resilience (CMR) compared to Egalitarians. This refutes the assumption that Patriarchy is a rigid and vulnerable ideology (Harrington et al., 2015), instead showing that moral uniformity (low SD) is a functional resilience mechanism for institutional structures. The third novelty is the framing of gender ideology as a filter of GEWE acceptance rather than merely a dichotomy of rejection/acceptance (Goulart et al., 2021; Tiessen et al., 2021), by measuring Intensity (M) and Homogeneity/Consensus (SD)

These findings can be interpreted as a reflection of Indonesia's social-historical and ideological dynamics. The high acceptance of GEWE in the economic domain by all groups reflects the functional pragmatism (Buch & Elkjaer, 2015, 2020; Curran et al., 2022; Korte, 2022) of Indonesian society. In the modern social context, the economic empowerment of women is seen as an added family value, not a threat to gender roles, as long as it does not interfere with the Sanctity or Authority domain within the household. The Egalitarian CMJ Institutional Gap is an interpretation of the meaning of their ideology: equality means individual justice (Fairness), which inherently rejects blind obedience to traditional hierarchy (Authority and Loyalty) within marriage. Therefore, for the Egalitarian group, marriage is maintained by happiness and fair human treatment, not by adherence to structure. On the other hand, Matriarchy and Patriarchy interpret marital continuity through the lens of rigid collective obedience, where Sanctity and Authority (especially in Patriarchy) are unmovable fences. This phenomenon indicates a shift in values from an ethics of institutional duty toward an ethics of individual happiness in Indonesian society, led by the Egalitarian group

The main functional implication of the research results is that marital resilience has many faces, and this diversity of moral strategies serves to prevent marital breakdown. The function of the Egalitarian Flexible Strategy (high M on Fairness/Care, high SD on Loyalty/Authority) is to allow constant

adaptation, negotiation, and role renewal, which may be more sustainable in a dynamic social environment. Its dysfunction is the potential for greater internal conflict (high SD) due to the lack of agreed-upon absolute standards. Conversely, the function of the Patriarchal Uniform Strategy (high M across all foundations, low SD) is stability and predictability. Its dysfunction is the potential for rigidity and difficulty adapting to changing equality values, as well as limiting the couple's negotiation space. This finding reflects that in the Indonesian context, modernity (Egalitarian) brings with it increased moral complexity (high SD), while tradition (Patriarchy) offers simplicity and binding consensus (low SD).

The results of this study have profound policy implications for supporting family resilience. First, Social Policy Implications: The government (through the Ministry of Religious Affairs or the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection) must shift from promoting a single ideal family model (Patriarchy or Matriarchy) to promoting a plurality of marital resilience strategies based on different values (Care/Fairness for Egalitarians, Loyalty/Sanctity for Patriarchs/Matriarchs). Marriage guidance programs need to be modularly designed: one module focusing on Conflict Negotiation Skills (for Egalitarians with high SD) and another module focusing on Strengthening Institutional Commitment (for Patriarchs/Matriarchs). Second, Ideological Policy Implications: Given that the RH issue is a mutually agreed-upon moral boundary, GEWE policies must strategically avoid or rephrase the RH issue so as not to trigger Sanctity-based rejection, and instead focus energy on the Fairness and Care domains (economy and security) which have high acceptance levels across all ideologies. The action plan must include reforming the marriage guidance curriculum to incorporate an understanding of the Moral Foundation Gap in conjugal conflict.

CONCLUSION

The most important finding of this study is the discovery of a plurality of moral strategies in maintaining marital integrity rooted in different gender role ideologies, rather than just one ideal model. This is an essential scholarly lesson because it demonstrates that the view of marital resilience (Conjugal Moral Resiliency / CMR) structurally varies between the Egalitarian group (Individual Flexible Strategy) and the Patriarchal/Matriarchal groups (Institutional Uniform Strategy). This difference arises because the Egalitarian group shows a significant Institutional Gap in the Conjugal Morality Configuration (CMJ), prioritizing the Care and Fairness foundations over Loyalty and Authority. Therefore, the takeaway lesson is that family strengthening programs should not enforce value uniformity, but rather must accommodate and facilitate negotiation between the individual-based moral strategies (Egalitarian) and the institution-based strategies (Patriarchy/Matriarchy).

This research provides a substantive scientific contribution by introducing the concept of Conjugal Moral Resiliency (CMR) as a new variable in Indonesian family resilience studies. The CMR

concept is robust because it does not merely measure the general moral attitudes of couples, but measures the internal moral consensus (seen from the low Standard Deviation / SD value) in maintaining marriage, which is proven to differ significantly across ideological groups. For instance, it was found that the Patriarchal group has the lowest CMR SD, indicating the highest level of consensus (homogeneity) in maintaining marriage, while the Egalitarian group has the highest SD, showing greater flexibility as well as moral negotiation. This data contribution effectively shifts the research question from merely "What do they believe?" to "How uniform is that belief?," opening a new approach to understanding moral resilience within households in various cultural contexts.

The main limitation of this study lies in the socio-demographic variables used and the quantitative nature of the data collected. As a consequence of the research limitations focusing only on gender role ideology and moral foundations, this study has not deeply linked the findings with contextual variables such as education level, socio-economic status, or religious affiliation. This is important because gender role ideology does not operate in a vacuum but is strongly influenced by the respondents' socio-economic context. To obtain more comprehensive results, it is recommended to conduct further research using a mixed-methods approach, combining these quantitative findings with in-depth qualitative case studies on Egalitarian couples to explore how they manage and negotiate the high moral variability (high SD) in their households.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was financially supported by the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia) through the Litapdimas funding scheme, under the Directorate General of Islamic Education. The authors express their deepest gratitude for this vital support.

REFERENCES

Atari, M., Haidt, J., Graham, J., Koleva, S., Stevens, S. T., & Dehghani, M. (2023). Morality Beyond the WEIRD: How the Nomological Network of Morality Varies Across Cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *125*(5). https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000470

Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia. (2023). Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia. In *Statistik Indonesia 2020* (Vol. 1101001).

Barkin, J. S., Chase, V. M., & van Wees, S. (2021). Interpretive methodologies, quantitative methods, and comparative environmental politics. In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Environmental Politics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197515037.013.11

Billiet, J. (2013). Quantitative methods with survey data in comparative research*. In *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy, Second Edition*. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781782546535.00024

Bozhkova, T., Musurlieva, N., & Slavchev, D. (2021). Comparative Study Qualitative and Quantitative Techniques in the Study of Occlusion. *BioMed Research International*, *2021*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/1163874

Breitkreuz, R., & Baird, M. (2025). Women's economic empowerment: A global pathway to gender equality? *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 1–19.

Brisbane, L., Hua, W., & Jamieson, T. (2023). Morality and the Glass Ceiling: How Elite Rhetoric Reflects Gendered Strategies and Perspectives. *Politics and Gender*, *19*(3). https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X2200023X

Brown, S. L., & Lin, I. F. (2022). The Graying of Divorce: A Half Century of Change. *Journals of Gerontology - Series B Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *77*(9). https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbac057

Buch, A., & Elkjaer, B. (2015). Pragmatism and practice theory. In *Paper presented at OLKC 2015*.

Buch, A., & Elkjaer, B. (2020). PRAGMATISM AND PRACTICE THEORY: CONVERGENCES OR COLLISIONS. *Caderno de Administração*, *27*(2). https://doi.org/10.4025/cadadm.v27i2.52244

Cappelen, A. W., Enke, B., & Tungodden, B. (2022). *Moral universalism: Global evidence*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Chauliac, M., Catrysse, L., Gijbels, D., & Donche, V. (2020). It is all in the surv-eye: Can eye tracking data shed light on the internal consistency in self-report questionnaires on cognitive processing strategies? *Frontline Learning Research*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v8i3.489

Chen, F., & Liu, S. (2022). Personality Traits and Whistleblowing on Twitter: The Moderating Roles of Moral Identity and Politics Perceptions. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v18n1p117

Curran, K., Bao, J., Oakley, H., Gili, A., & Fouseki, K. (2022). Combining theory and practice. In *Routledge Handbook of Sustainable Heritage*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038955-5

Daffa, D. R., Arthuro, D., Fernanda, J. A., & Pratama, M. B. W. (2024). Gender Role Dynamics in Economic Development: Challenges and Opportunities for Women's Empowerment. *International Journal Of Education, Social Studies, And Management (IJESSM)*, *4*(2), 357–367.

Elbæk, C. T., Mitkidis, P., Aarøe, L., & Otterbring, T. (2023). Subjective socioeconomic status and income inequality are associated with self-reported morality across 67 countries. *Nature Communications*, *14*(1), 5453.

Garvey, K. J., & Ford, T. G. (2014). Rationality, Political Orientation, and the Individualizing and Binding Moral Foundations. *Letters on Evolutionary Behavioral Science*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.5178/lebs.2014.29

Gillard, J., & Okonjo-Iweala, N. (2022a). *Women and leadership: Real lives, real lessons*. MIT Press.

Gillard, J., & Okonjo-Iweala, N. (2022b). *Women and leadership: Real lives, real lessons*. MIT Press.

Goulart, C. M., Purewal, A., Nakhuda, H., Ampadu, A., Giancola, A., Kortenaar, J.-L., & Bassani, D. G. (2021). Tools for measuring gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) indicators in humanitarian settings. *Conflict and Health*, *15*(1), 1–16.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*(5), 1029.

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., & Haidt, J. (2012). The Moral Stereotypes of Liberals and Conservatives: Exaggeration of Differences across the Political Spectrum. *PLoS ONE*, *7*(12). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0050092

Gugan, S. S., Stuward, J. J., & Subhashini, A. (2024). The role of women in economic development. *Journal of Economics*, *12*(2), 94–103.

Haidt, J. (2012). The righteous mind. *Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion …*, *January*.

Haidt, J. (2013). Moral psychology for the twenty-first century. *Journal of Moral Education*, *42*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2013.817327

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-007-0034-z

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2009). Planet of the Durkheimians, Where Community, Authority, and Sacredness Are Foundations of Morality. In *Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195320916.003.015

Hald, G. M., Strizzi, J. M., Ciprić, A., & Sander, S. (2020). The Divorce Conflict Scale. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, *61*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2019.1627150

Harrington, A., Dunne, J. D., Toal, R. A., Herschkopf, M. D., Peteet, J. R., Hall, G. C. N., McLemore, C. W., Court, J. H., Johnson, W. B., Eng, E., Sperry, L., Peteet, J. R., Watson, G., Yarhouse, M. A., Throckmorton, W., Del Rio, C. M., White, L. J., Phillips, D. G., Mandlebaum, H., … Tapsoba, J. d. D. (2015). News and notes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *30*(2).

Imelwaty, S., Gunawan, F., Kuraedah, S., Mardiana, W., Wardhana, D. E. C., & Boulahnane, S. (2024). Moral values in Indonesian primary school thematic textbooks: the marrying of language appraisal

and moral foundation theories. *Education 3-13*, *52*(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2022.2120771

Jameel, A., Khan, M. M., & Ahmed, S. S. (2024). When identity is sanctity: servant leadership guarding against moral disengagement through building strong moral identity in the presence of organizational politics. *Kybernetes*, *53*(11). https://doi.org/10.1108/K-03-2023-0509

Kirkland, K., Crimston, C. R., Jetten, J., Rudnev, M., Acevedo-Triana, C., Amiot, C. E., Ausmees, L., Baguma, P., Barry, O., & Becker, M. (2023). Moral expansiveness around the world: The role of societal factors across 36 countries. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *14*(3), 305–318.

Korte, R. (2022). *Implications of Pragmatism and Practice Theories for Engineering Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-79207-6_1

Leavitt, C. E., Hendricks, J. J., Clarke, R. W., Marks, L. D., Dollahite, D. C., & Rose, A. H. (2024). Integrity and fidelity in highly religious marriages. *Family Relations*, *73*(3). https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12983

Longman, K. A., & Bray, D. L. (2024). The role of purpose and calling in women's leadership experiences. In *Handbook of research on gender and leadership* (pp. 202–219). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Manze, M. G., Romero, D. R., Sumberg, A., Gagnon, M., Roberts, L., & Jones, H. (2020). Women's perspectives on reproductive health services in primary care. *Family Medicine*, *52*(2). https://doi.org/10.22454/FamMed.2020.492002

Matsumura, K. (2019). The Integrity of Marriage. *William & Mary Law Review*, *61*(2).

Miskolci, R. (2018a). The moral crusade on "gender ideology." *Journal of the Brazilian Sociological Society*, *4*(2), 44–59.

Miskolci, R. (2018b). The Moral Crusade on "Gender Ideology": notes on conservative political alliances in Latin America. *Journal of the Brazilian Sociological Society*, *4*(2).

Miskolci, R., & Campana, M. (2017). "{Gender} ideology": {Notes} for a genealogy of a contemporary moral panic. *Sociedade e Estado*, *32*(3).

Napier, J. L., & Luguri, J. B. (2013). Moral Mind-Sets: Abstract Thinking Increases a Preference for "Individualizing" Over "Binding" Moral Foundations. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *4*(6). https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550612473783

Oh, S. W. (2024). Women's Health and Primary Care. In *Korean Journal of Family Medicine* (Vol. 45, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.4082/kjfm.45.1E

Oller Alonso, M., & Barredo, D. (2013). International comparative studies: towards the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods. *European Scientific Journal*, *9*(17).

Pike, A. C., Serfaty, J. R., & Robinson, O. J. (2021). The development and psychometric properties of a self-report Catastrophizing Questionnaire. *Royal Society Open Science*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.201362

Sarma, M. (2019). Women Contribution and Entrepreneurial Marketing to Family Welfare. *Economics Development Analysis Journal*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.15294/edaj.v8i3.26626

Schedler, A., & Mudde, C. (2010). Data usage in quantitative comparative politics. *Political Research Quarterly*, *63*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912909357414

Siepsiak, M., Śliwerski, A., & Dragan, W. Ł. (2020). Development and psychometric properties of misoquest—A new self-report questionnaire for misophonia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(5). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17051797

Tiessen, R., Rao, S., & Lough, B. J. (2021). International Development Volunteering as Transformational Feminist Practice for Gender Equality. *Journal of Developing Societies*, *37*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0169796X20972260

Turner-Zwinkels, F. M., Johnson, B. B., Sibley, C. G., & Brandt, M. J. (2021). Conservatives' Moral Foundations Are More Densely Connected Than Liberals' Moral Foundations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *47*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220916070

Wang, J., & Azam, W. (2024). Natural resource scarcity, fossil fuel energy consumption, and total greenhouse gas emissions in top emitting countries. *Geoscience Frontiers*, *15*(2), 101757.

Wasser, N., & Lins França, I. (2020). In the line of fire: sex (uality) and gender ideology in Brazil. *Femina Politica–Zeitschrift Für Feministische Politikwissenschaft*, *29*(1), 138–141.

Zhang, H., Hook, J. N., & Johnson, K. A. (2020). Moral Foundations Questionnaire. In *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24612-3_1252