Article

Understanding the Relationship between Religiosity and Marital Commitment to Marital Stability: An Investigation on Indonesian Female Journalists

Rena Latifa * , **Salsabila Salsabila and Heri Yulianto**

Faculty of Psychology, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Banten 15412, Indonesia; salsabilaaulya31@gmail.com (S.S.); heripsi@yahoo.co.id (H.Y.)
* Correspondence: rena.latifa@uinjkt.ac.id; Tel.: +62-812-2256-8454

Abstract: The complete understanding of marital stability is hindered by limitations of theory and method, especially investigation on female journalists. The purpose of the current study was to test the effect of religiosity and marital commitment on the marital stability, by assessing Indonesian female journalists. This research used a quantitative approach with multiple regression analysis methods. The sample of this study involved 200 married female journalists residing in Jakarta and were taken using non-probability sampling techniques, specifically purposive sampling. The measurements used in this study were adaptations of the (1) Marital Stability Scale; (2) Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS-15); and (3) Inventory of Marital Commitments. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to test the validity of each scale. The results of the *F*-test showed a *p*-value = 0.000 (significant), and a total variance explained (R^2 value) of 0.224. This finding indicated that religiosity and marital commitment have a significant effect on marital stability (sig < 0.05). The direction of the coefficient regression of the religiosity variable and marital commitment is positive, indicating that the higher the religiosity and marital commitment, the higher the marital stability.

Keywords: marital stability; religiosity; CRS (Centrality of Religiosity Scale); marital commitment

1. Introduction

Prior to the 21st century, changes in the modern era revolutionized the social roles of both males and females. According to Livingston and Judge (2008), historically, the realms of work and household have been gendered, whereby men dominate in workplaces and women dominate in nurturing the lives of families and fulfilling household's chores. However, nowadays many women take parts in the male role, namely working and earning a living for the family. The data from the BPS (Indonesian Central Statistic Agency) in Indonesia for the last four years show the number of working women in Jakarta has increased from year by year, resulting in common encounters with working wives. This shows the increasing contribution of wives in workplaces in Jakarta who are actively working for the family from year to year. According to Duffy and Atwater (2007), work may result in conflict between husband and wife, consequently reducing harmony and stability of the marriage.

One of the difficulties for a female journalist is to divide her efforts in the workplace and at home. According to Mallat and Melki (2016) in their qualitative interview, female journalists tend to see marriage and motherhood as obstacles for their career. There are many obstacles experienced by female journalists who are married, triggering conflicts between roles, both at work and in household life. According to a pilot study conducted by researchers, 63.6% of female journalists felt burdened by their work and 54.5% of female journalists felt that being a journalist adds to the stress of life. Other data also state that 59.1% of female journalists find it difficult to manage their time working as a journalist and being a wife at home. This difficulties may increase the risk of divorce (Becker et al. 1977;

Cooke and Gash 2010). The consequences of separation and divorce can be severe. Research indicates that individuals who are separated from their spouses or divorced experience greater rates of psychopathology, physical illness, suicide, homicide, violence, and mortality from disease (Carrere et al. 2000). In light of this risk, identifying the factors that help marriages survive has important implications. Furthermore, understanding the factors that influence marital stability will help build a theory of marital stability. This was the objective of the present study.

1.1. Marital Stability

Marital stability is operationalized as a set of behaviors shown by individuals when interacting with their partners that influence the sustainability of marital relationship. Buehlman and Gottman (in Carrere et al. 2000) defines marital stability as the frequency of fondness/affection, we-ness, expansiveness, negativity, disappointment-disillusionment, chaos, and volatility. Meanwhile, marital instability is the tendency for a couple to go their separate ways, even though divorce may not be the final decision (Booth et al. 1983). According to Nye et al. (1973), the terms marital stability and marital instability are two opposite sides of the same coin. In other words, the terms marital stability and marital instability actually measure the same thing. Nye et al. (1973) added that the things that increase stability will conversely reduce instability and vice versa.

Suleyiman and Zewdu (2018) argued that there are no plans for divorce in a stable marriage. In contrast, marital instability is the tendency to divorce one's spouse determined by the presence of thoughts or actions leading to separation in marriage. Therefore, a stable marriage is where the partners enjoy a healthy relationship; one where the partner is a source of emotional support, friendship, sexual satisfaction, and financial support for one another. Moreover, Suleyiman and Zewdu (2018) explained that several studies examine the effects of socio-demographic variables on marital stability. These studies report that gender (Jose and Alfons 2007), number of years in marriage (Carstensen et al. 1996), educational status (Johnson and Booth 1990), and age (Delkhamoush 2009) have a statistically significant average effect on marital stability between spouses.

1.2. Work-household Spill-over Effects

Cherlin (in Cooke and Gash 2010) argued that wives with independent income are less motivated to solve problems in a marriage. This perspective resulted in what became known as the independence hypothesis, in which the work of a wife is thought to increase the risk of divorce (Becker et al. 1977). This greatly affects the marital stability in the household life of married couples. Wives with independent finance will feel less obliged to solve problems in their household due to the beliefs that they will still live well even without their husbands.

Cooke and Gash (2010) also found the effects of wives' employment on marital stability vary across the countries. In West Germany with its high-quality part-time employment, couples where the wife works part time are significantly more stable. In the more liberal British and US labor markets, neither wives' part- nor full-time employment significantly alters divorce risk. In the United States, however, mothers working part time have significantly lower divorce risk. West German and British husbands' unemployment proves more detrimental to marital stability than wives' employment. These results highlight the importance of the socioeconomic context in structuring the optimal employment participation of both partners.

1.3. Marital Commitment

Marriage is certainly associated with commitment. According to Adams and Jones (1997), marital commitment is one of the important variables in understanding marital stability. Marital commitment is a variable that has a big role in explaining marital stability (Gunter 2004). Marital commitment refers to a decision to maintain the current marriage relationship (Surra et al. 1999). According to Johnson et al. (1999), marital commitment

cannot be seen as a single unit, but rather consists of three different types of commitment experiences: Personal commitment, structural commitment, and moral commitment. He argues that each type of commitment performs according to its own function, thus commitment cannot be reviewed as a whole.

According to Swensen and Trahaug (1985), a high level of commitment to a person is associated with a smaller number of marriage problems. This creates more conducive conditions for marriage survivability. Therefore, commitment is said to be the main reason for the predictor of marital stability (Lauer and Lauer 1986). There is also research on marital commitment and marital stability in individuals with high religiosity.

1.4. Religiosity

Another factor that might affect marital stability is religiosity. Indonesia is well known as the biggest Muslim population in the world. For Muslims, religiosity is usually a guidance in problem solving when facing difficult situations and stressful situations. Regarding marital life, when individuals are able to manage themselves in stressful marital situations, their marriages tend to become more stable than individuals who do not have the ability to manage themselves in stressful situations (Ellison 1991). Moreover, Latifa and Amelia (2018) have found that commitment to Islamic values significantly predicts marital stability.

A study by Brown et al. (2008) found that there was a relationship between religiosity and marital stability in white Americans and black Americans. By using the theory of religiosity, it increases the ability to solve problems in difficult situations and stressful situations (Ellison 1991), such as when individuals are able to manage themselves in stressful situations, their marriages tend to be more stable than individuals with no ability to manage themselves in stressful situations.

Chinits and Brown (2001) mention that a high level of religiosity will reduce the level of conflict in marriage; in that regard, marital stability will also increase. Research conducted by Lambert and Dollahite (2006), shows that individual religiosity strengthens the desire to maintain a permanent relationship (in other words, affects marital commitment), which in turn helps couples in dealing with occurring conflicts. Sullivan (2001) found that with a high level of religiosity, the level of commitment will increase and marital instability will decrease (increased marital stability). Latifa and Amelia (2018) also found that commitment to religiosity (assessed via religious participation and religious belief), especially for Muslims, significantly predicts marital stability ($R^2 = 0.487$). Involvement in religious activity can encourage individuals to survive and struggle successfully in difficult situations throughout their marriage life, resulting in a low desire to divorce.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher is interested in examining the influence of religiosity and marital commitment on marital stability in Indonesian female journalists. We questioned whether or not religiosity and marital commitment predict marital stability in Indonesian female journalists. The hypothesis assumes that higher religiosity and higher marital commitment may predict behaviors shown by an individual in the couple interactions and, in consequence, influence the longevity of marital relationship (defined as 'marital stability').

2. Method

2.1. Participants and Sampling Procedures

Participants of this research are 200 female journalists from Indonesia, who were recruited using non-random sampling procedures. Participants were identified through news agencies and journalist communities and registered as formal journalists from news agencies or television companies or online news agencies. The description of demography is listed below:

Based on Table 1, the participants' average age is 25 years old, with a mean duration of marriage of around 7 years.

Table 1. Participant demography.

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age (in years)	19	43	25.72	3.37
Duration of marriage	1	30	7.40	6.82

2.2. Measurement and Data Analysis

Researchers used the marital stability scale according to Buehlman, Gottman, and Katz interview guidance (this guidance then developed in a scale using Indonesian language by Latifa 2015), the religiosity scale adapted from Huber and Huber (2012), and the marital commitment adapted from Johnson et al. (1999). The validity construct of the variables: Religiosity, marital commitment, and marital stability were analyzed using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). We use MPlus 8.4 (Muthen&Muthen Los Angeles, CA, USA) software in analyzing the CFA and SPSS v 25 (IBM: New York, NY, USA) for test of hypothesis.

a. Marital stability construct

The measurement of the marital stability scale developed by Latifa (2015) was used based on Buehlman et al. (1992) interview guidance, namely the frequency of fondness/affection, we-ness, expansiveness, negativity, disappointment-disillusionment, chaos, and volatility. The scale is a Likert scale with a range of four points, namely: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Often, and 4 = Always. Latifa (2015) found that the marital stability construct is a one-factor model.

In the test of the construct validity of marital stability, using CFA analysis, the model fit criteria are the chi-square value > 0.05, *p*-value < 0.01, RMSEA < 0.05, CFI and TLI > 0.90.

b. Religiosity construct

In this study, the religiosity scale was measured with the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS-15) (Huber and Huber 2012), which is based on a multidimensional and interreligious model of religiosity (Huber 2003). The CRS-15 has 15 items and consists of 5 dimensions, namely intellect, ideology, public practice, private practice, and religious experience, which are adapted to the Indonesian language. The translation procedure uses first-round back translation.

The response of this scale uses a Likert scale with a range of four points (the Indonesian adaptation scale usually hinders the center score, thus we use a four-point scale rather than a five-point scale). The modification of responses are for item numbers 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, and 15 (response modification: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Often, and 4 = Always), item number 2 and 7 (response modification: into 1 = Absolutely disbelief, 2 = Do not believe, 3 = Believe, and 4 = Strongly believes), item number 6 (response modification: 1 = Very disinterested, 2 = Not interested, 3 = Interested, and 4 = Very interested), item number 8, 9, and 13 (response modification: 1 = Very unimportant, 2 = Not important, 3 = Urgent, and 4 = Very important), and item number 12 (response modification: 1 = Very impossible, 2 = Impossible, 3 = Maybe, and 4 = Very likely).

In the test of the construct validity of religiosity, we use a multiple-factor model of analysis. Using CFA analysis, the model fit criteria are the chi-square value > 0.05, *p*-value < 0.01, RMSEA < 0.05, CFI and TLI > 0.90.

c. Marital commitment construct

Marital commitment measured by the Marital Commitment Inventory questionnaire by Johnson et al. (1999). This Marital Commitment Inventory is to measure the personal commitment, moral commitment, and structural commitment that an individual has in his current marriage. The filling of this scale uses a Likert scale with a range of four points, namely: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree. The scale translation procedure uses first-round back translation.

In the test of the construct validity of marital commitment, we use a multiple-factor model of analysis. Using CFA analysis, the model fit criteria are the chi-square value > 0.05, *p*-value < 0.01, RMSEA < 0.05, CFI and TLI > 0.90.

3. Results

3.1. Scale Validation

3.1.1. Marital Stability Scale Validation Result

In the test of the construct validity of marital stability, using CFA analysis, the model did not fit with the chi-square value = 922.642, df = 377, *p*-value < 0.01, RMSEA = 0.085, so the model was modified until a fit model was obtained (RMSEA < 0.05). As seen in Table 2, after 4-times syntax modification, the chi-square value = 495.292, df = 337, *p*-value < 0.01, RMSEA = 0.048, CFI and TLI > 0.90, meaning that the model fit.

Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) result of Marital Stability Scale.

Fit Index	Before Modification	After Modification	Notes
CHI-SQUARE	922.642; df = 377; *p*-value < 0.01	495.292; df = 337; *p*-value < 0.01	Modify = 40 times
RMSEA	0.085	0.048	
CFI	0.939	0.982	
TLI	0.934	0.979	

The following is the factor loading coefficient for marital stability items:

From Table 3, all 29 items from marital stability scale have a positive estimate (EST/SE: >1.96) and *p*-value < 0.05 and a positive loading factor coefficient, which means it is significant, so all items in the construct of marital stability meet the fit model criteria (RMSEA < 0.05 after modification) and can be included in the next analysis.

Table 3. Loading factors for marital stability.

Item (See Appendix A.1)	Estimate	Standard Error (SE)	Estimate/Standard Error (EST/SE)	Two-Tailed *p*-Value
1	0.494	0.051	9.670	0.000
2	0.634	0.049	13.032	0.000
3	0.469	0.059	7.954	0.000
4	0.559	0.057	9.761	0.000
5	0.649	0.056	11.492	0.000
6	0.602	0.05	12.111	0.000
7	0.391	0.064	6.152	0.000
8	0.476	0.057	8.377	0.000
9	0.581	0.052	11.144	0.000
10	0.805	0.03	27.016	0.000
11	0.175	0.071	2.477	0.013
12	0.704	0.036	19.753	0.000
13	0.755	0.038	19.961	0.000
14	0.858	0.034	25.282	0.000
15	0.912	0.026	35.434	0.000
16	0.977	0.025	39.343	0.000
17	0.701	0.041	16.928	0.000
18	0.828	0.032	25.914	0.000
19	0.725	0.041	17.746	0.000
20	0.751	0.037	20.108	0.000
21	0.706	0.037	18.883	0.000
22	0.778	0.035	21.934	0.000
23	0.839	0.049	17.193	0.000

Table 3. *Cont.*

Item (See Appendix A.1)	Estimate	Standard Error (SE)	Estimate/Standard Error (EST/SE)	Two-Tailed *p*-Value
24	0.824	0.031	26.546	0.000
25	0.81	0.044	18.312	0.000
26	0.516	0.059	8.786	0.000
27	0.763	0.048	15.893	0.000
28	0.721	0.048	15.046	0.000
29	0.545	0.071	7.708	0.000

3.1.2. Religiosity Scale Validation Result

In the test of the construct validity of religiosity, we used a multiple-factor model of analysis. We tested the construct validation using CFA analysis. From the results of the CFA validity test using three models (first order, second order, and five correlated factors), it can be seen in Table 4 that the value of each index fit where the three models did not fit because the *p*-value < 0.01 and the RSMEA value > 0.05. However, from Table 4, it can be seen that the five-correlated-factor model has a better index than the other two models, namely the lowest RMSEA index (0.070), CFI (0.976), and TLI (0.968).

Table 4. CFA validity test for Religiosity.

INDEX FIT	1st ORDER	2nd ORDER	5 CORRELATED FACTORS
CHI-SQUARE	389.989; df = 90; *p*-value < 0.01	620.886; df = 86; *p*-value < 0.01	159.308; df = 80; *p*-value < 0.01
RMSEA	0.129	0.176	0.070
CFI	0.908	0.836	0.976
TLI	0.892	0.799	0.968

The next step is to make modifications to the five-correlated-factor model, where measurement errors on several items are freed to correlate with each other so that after five-times syntax modification, the following results (Table 5) are obtained.

Table 5. CFA result of Religiosity.

INDEX FIT	5-CORRELATED FACTORS	Notes
CHI-SQUARE	111.572; df = 75; *p*-value = 0.0039	Model Not fit
RMSEA	0.049	Model fit
CFI	0 989	Model fit
TLI	0.984	Model fit

From Table 5, we can see that after obtaining the RSMEA index value of 0.049 (<0.05), the CFI index of 0.989 (>0.090), and the TLI index of 0.984 (>0.090), it can be stated that the five-correlated-factor model is acceptable, meaning that the five dimensions of religiosity are independent but correlated with each other.

From the test results in Table 6 above, it shows that each factor has a strong and positive correlation with other factors. After finding a fit model, we then checked the estimation of each item to determine whether the item was valid or not. This test was done by looking at the z value for each coefficient, as shown in Table 7 below.

Based on Table 7, it can be seen that item number 12 was significant, but the item had a negative estimate (EST/SE: <1.96). Meanwhile the other 14 items had a positive estimate (EST/SE: >1.96), *p*-value < 0.05, and a positive loading factor coefficient, which means it was significant. The possibility of a negative score of item number 12 is probably because the statement of the item is less representative of the 'Ideology' dimension, especially for Muslims.

Table 6. Correlation between factors of Religiosity.

	Intellectual	Ideology	Public Practice	Private Practice	Religious Experience
INTELLECTUAL	-	-	-	-	-
IDEOLOGY	0.732	-	-	-	-
PUBLIC PRACTICE	0.769	0.599	-	-	-
PRIVATE PRACTICE	0.717	0.880	0.440	-	-
RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE	0.778	0.807	0.432	0.922	-

Table 7. Loading factors for Religiosity.

	Item (See Appendix A.2)	Estimate	Standard Error (SE)	Estimate/Standard Error (EST/SE)	Two-Tailed *p*-Value
INTELLECTUAL	1	0.244	0.073	3.349	0.001
	6	0.847	0.047	18.126	0.000
	11	0.758	0.046	16.375	0.000
IDEOLOGY	2	0.916	0.064	14.237	0.000
	7	0.642	0.066	9.741	0.000
	12	−0.166	0.07	−2.360	0.018
PUBLIC PRACTICE	3	0.605	0.036	16.630	0.000
	8	0.915	0.036	25.434	0.000
	13	0.907	0.032	28.646	0.000
PRIVATE PRACTICE	4	0.804	0.044	18.381	0.000
	9	0.868	0.042	20.898	0.000
	14	0.802	0.035	23.039	0.000
RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE	5	0.844	0.036	23.373	0.000
	10	0.885	0.024	36.239	0.000
	15	0.893	0.029	30.337	0.000

3.1.3. Marital Commitment Scale Validation Result

In the test of the construct validity of religiosity, we used a multiple-factor model of analysis. We tested the construct validation using CFA. From the results of the CFA validity test using three models (first order, second order, and three correlated factors), it can be seen from Table 8 that the value of each index fit where the three models did not fit because the *p*-value < 0.01 and the RSMEA value > 0.05. However, the 3-correlated-factor model had a better index than the other two models, namely the lowest RMSEA index (0.101), CFI (0.828), and TLI (0.819).

Table 8. CFA result for Marital Commitment.

INDEX FIT	1st ORDER	2nd ORDER	3 CORRELATED FACTORS
CHI-SQUARE	3926.533; df = 819; *p*-value < 0.00	2550.062; df = 817; *p*-value < 0.00	2473.410; df = 816; *p*-value < 0.00
RMSEA	0.138	0.103	0.101
CFI	0.678	0.821	0.828
TLI	0.662	0.811	0.819

The next step was to make modifications to the three-correlated-factor model, where measurement errors on several items are freed to correlate with each other so that after 133-times syntax modification, the following results were obtained (Table 9):

Table 9. Modifications of factor model of Marital Commitment.

INDEX FIT	3-CORRELATED FACTORS	Notes
CHI-SQUARE	1033.412; df = 685; *p*-value = 0.0039	Model Not fit
RMSEA	0.050	Model fit
CFI	0.964	Model fit
TLI	0.955	Model fit

After obtaining the RSMEA index value of 0.050 (<0.05), the CFI index of 0.964 (>0.090), and the TLI index of 0.955 (>0.090), it can be stated that the three-correlated-factor model is acceptable, meaning that the three dimensions of marital commitment are independent but correlated with each other.

From the test results in Table 10 above, it shows that each factor had a strong and positive correlation with other factors. After finding a fit model, we then checked the estimation of each item to determine whether the item was valid or not. This test was done by looking at the *z* value for each coefficient, as shown in Table 11 below.

Table 10. Correlation between factors of Marital Commitment.

	PERSONAL	MORAL	STRUCTURAL
PERSONAL	-	-	-
MORAL	0.889	-	-
STRUCTURAL	0.410	0.570	-

Table 11. Loading factors for Marital Commitment.

	Item (See Appendix A.5)	Estimate	Standard Error (SE)	Estimate/Standard Error (EST/SE)	Two-Tailed *p*-Value
PERSONAL	1	0.772	0.043	17.867	0
	2	0.664	0.054	12.311	0
	3	0.785	0.042	18.787	0
	4	0.660	0.050	13.103	0
	5	0.671	0.047	14.433	0
	6	0.542	0.063	8.639	0
	7	0.781	0.041	19.001	0
MORAL	8	0.599	0.050	12.091	0
	9	0.670	0.050	13.289	0
	10	0.563	0.053	10.635	0
	11	0.579	0.058	10.051	0
	12	0.631	0.050	12.610	0
	13	0.755	0.043	17.511	0
	14	0.752	0.038	19.711	0
	15	0.353	0.060	5.871	0
	16	0.764	0.040	18.968	0
	17	0.601	0.053	11.248	0
	18	0.497	0.054	9.150	0
	19	0.513	0.061	8.409	0
	20	0.506	0.057	8.929	0
STRUCTURAL	21	0.271	0.064	4.240	0
	22	0.555	0.049	11.386	0
	23	0.640	0.043	14.739	0
	24	0.651	0.043	15.084	0
	25	0.605	0.050	12.170	0
	26	0.028	0.062	−0.457	0.648
	27	0.377	0.064	5.896	0
	28	0.858	0.027	31.984	0
	29	0.638	0.046	13.923	0
	30	0.596	0.046	12.920	0
	31	0.695	0.037	18.872	0
	32	0.618	0.046	13.514	0
	33	0.431	0.051	8.483	0
	34	0.474	0.049	9.703	0
	35	0.783	0.031	25.519	0
	36	0.503	0.054	9.329	0
	37	0.587	0.047	12.480	0
	38	0.856	0.028	30.115	0
	39	0.946	0.016	59.079	0
	40	0.812	0.030	27.003	0
	41	0.754	0.033	22.896	0
	42	0.712	0.037	19.408	0

Based on Table 11, it can be seen that there is one item that was not significant, namely item 26 with EST/SE < 1.96 and *p*-value > 0.05. This item was then eliminated and then the 41 other items had a positive estimate (EST/SE: >1.96) and *p*-value < 0.05 and a positive loading factor coefficient, which means they were significant. After eliminating item number 26, all items in the construct of marital commitment met the model criteria (RMSEA < 0.05 after modification) and could be included in the next analysis (test of hypothesis).

3.2. Test of Hypothesis

The hypothesis test was carried out to determine the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable with multiple regression analysis techniques. First the researcher looked at the R Square magnitude to find out what percentage (%) the proportion of the variance of the dependent variable was explained by the independent variable, which can be seen in Table 12 as follows.

Table 12. Model summary of regression analysis.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.473 [a]	0.224	0.216	4.072

[a] Predictors: (Constant), Religiosity, Commitment.

Based on Table 12, it can be seen that the R-Square is 0.224 or 22.4%. This means that the influence of variables of religiosity and marital commitment on marital stability explained 22.4%, while the remaining is influenced by other variables that cannot be explained this study.

In the second step, the researcher analyzed the effect of all independent variables religiosity and marital commitment) on the dependent variable (marital stability). The results of the *F* test can be seen in Table 13.

Table 13. Analysis of variance [a].

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	940.843	2	470.421	28.357	0.000 [b]
1	Residual	3268.084	197	16.589		
	Total	4208.927	199			

[a] Dependent Variable: Marital Stability. [b] Predictors: (Constant), Marital Commitment, Religiosity.

Based on the results of the *F* test in Table 13, it can be seen that the *p* value (sig.) is 0.000 or *p* = 0.0000 with a *p* value < 0.05. Thus, there is a significant effect of the independent variables on marital stability.

Table 14 explains that all independent variables had a significant effect on marital stability (sig. < 0.05). The direction of the coefficient regression of variable religiosity and marital commitment is positive, indicating that the higher the religiosity and marital commitment, the higher the marital stability.

Table 14. Coefficients [a].

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	16.851	7.568		2.227	0.027
1	Commitment	0.311	0.046	0.431	6.802	0.000
	Religiosity	0.348	0.150	0.147	2.315	0.022

[a] Dependent Variable: Marital Stability.

Based on Table 15, it can be seen that the results of the *F* test (hypothesis test) was 50.248 with sig. 0.000 (sig. < 0.05), so the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant effect between the variables religiosity and marital commitment to marital stability, is rejected. This means that there is a significant correlation between the religiosity variable and marital commitment on marital stability.

Table 15. ANOVA [a].

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	851.931	1	851.931	50.248	0.000 [b]
1	Residual	3356.996	198	16.955		
	Total	4208.927	199			
	Regression	940.843	2	470.421	28.357	0.000 [c]
2	Residual	3268.084	197	16.589		
	Total	4208.927	199			

[a] Dependent Variable: Marital Stability. [b] Predictors: (Constant), Marital Commitment. [c] Predictors: (Constant), Marital Commitment, Religiosity.

From Table 16, the regression coefficient value can be seen in the standardized coefficient column (betha). For marital commitment, the regression coefficient value is 0.431 and the significance is 0.000 (sig. < 0.05). This means that there is a significant effect of marital commitment to marital stability. The standardized coefficient (betha) is positive, meaning that the higher the marital commitment of female journalists, the higher their marital stability. The same thing applies to religiosity, whereby the regression coefficient is 0.147 with a significance of 0.022 (sig. > 0.05); this means that the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant effect between the religiosity variable on marital stability, is rejected. The value of standardized coefficient (betha), which is positive, means that the higher the religiosity of female journalists, the higher the marital stability.

Table 16. Coefficients [a].

	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	33.555	2.308		14.537	0.000
1	Marital Commitment	0.325	0.046	0.450	7.089	0.000
	(Constant)	16.851	7.568		2.227	0.027
2	Commitment	0.311	0.046	0.431	6.802	0.000
	Religiosity	0.348	0.150	0.147	2.315	0.022

[a] Dependent Variable: Marital Stability.

4. Discussion

Based on the results of the data analysis described in the results section, there is a significant effect of religiosity and marital commitment on marital stability. The results of the *F* test, which tested all independent variables on the dependent variable, showed a value of $p = 0.000$ (significant), and a total variance explained (R^2 value) of 0.224 or 22.4%, meaning that 22.4% of the high or low marital stability is influenced by the independent variable in this study.

Table 16 explains that all independent variables have a significant effect on marital stability (sig. < 0.05). The religiosity variable and marital commitment have positive regression coefficients, indicating that the higher the religiosity and marital commitment, the higher the marital stability.

This study can be complementary to the studies by Brown et al. (2008), Chinits and Brown (2001), and Sullivan (2001), about the relationship between religiosity and marital stability. The theory of religiosity, defined by Huber and Huber (2012), describes religiosity as the thoughts and beliefs a person has in viewing the world, known as a personal construct system. The five dimensions, namely intellectual, ideology, public practice, private practice, and religious experience, may increase marital stability. Marital stability is a set of behaviors shown by an individual as the couple interacts and in consequence influence the longevity of marital relationship. When this set of behaviors is religious behavior, individuals (female journalists) will perceive the marriage as more stable.

As Muslims constituted the majority of the participants in this research (95%), Islamic religiosity values might contribute to marital stability. For Muslims, religiosity is usually a guidance in problem solving when facing difficult situations and stressful situations. When individuals are able to manage themselves in stressful situations, their marriages tend to become more stable than individuals who do not have the ability to manage themselves in stressful situations (Ellison 1991). Moreover, Latifa and Amelia (2018) found that commitment to Islamic values significantly predicts marital stability. Commitment to Islamic values are assessed via religious participation and religious beliefs. Involvement in religious activity can encourage individuals ('shared-belief' experience) to survive and struggle successfully in difficult situations throughout their marital life resulting in low desire to divorce. Participants who possess religious believe and implement the religious values in various activities had experienced relatively high increased functions of the family and stability of marriage. The commitment to the religious values does have an important role in shaping attitudes in marriage. The values are prioritized to avoid divorce when confronted by the difficult conditions in the household life.

With commitment on religious teachings, the individual also has the problem-solving ability in a difficult and stressful situation: Be patient and find a way to pray and avoid negative emotions. When individuals are able to manage themselves in a situation like this, it would be more likely to result in a more stable marriage than for individuals who do not have this capability. In addition, participation in religious activities as part of a religious commitment is found as a contributor to the marital stability. Religious activities as a social resource can help improve the welfare of marriage and improve the resilience during marriage life. Socializing with people who have the noble values and norms may lead to modelling behavior that can reflect on commending behaviors to family members at home.

Involvement in religious activities may foster the teaching of religious beliefs, so that individuals and couples have positive spirit to face any problems or pressures encountered throughout actual married life, and this principle has to be maintained while believing that there must be solutions to all problems. Whenever the individual participates in religious activities along with her/his partner, it tends to be more stable than someone who just attends alone while her partner never participates in religious activities. Behavioral differences between the individual and their partner can increase the risk of disunity in the marital relationship, for if the individuals are present as a couple, the solidarity may increase and can be a refrain from the distractions of the household, resulting in individuals and couples having developed views, and applying family values together in agreement.

Research conducted by Lambert and Dollahite (2006) shows that individual religiosity gives a desire to maintain a permanent relationship (in other words, affects marital commitment), which then helps couples in dealing with occurring conflicts. Chinits and Brown (2001) also mentioned, a high level of religiosity will reduce the level of conflict in marriage, so that marital stability will also increase. Sullivan (2001) found that with high level of religiosity, the level of commitment will increase and marital instability will decrease (increased marital stability).

The second variable that significantly predict marital stability in this study is marital commitment. Marital commitment using Johnson et al. (1999) theory is defined as a form of the couple's conception of the future of their relationship and their motivation to continue the relationship. A high level of commitment is associated with a number of marital problems that the person can overcome. These conditions are more conducive to the marriage longevity. Therefore, commitment is said to be the main reason for the creation of marital stability (Lauer and Lauer 1986).

5. Conclusions and Outlook

The research findings give some implications for female journalists, stating that religiosity and marital commitment are the two things that may help marital stability, whereas marital stability can contribute to psychological well-being and their career development. As Suleyiman and Zewdu (2018) stated, a stable marriage is when the partner enjoys a healthy relationship; one where the partner is a source of emotional support, friendship, sexual satisfaction, and financial support for one another.

For future research, path analysis between religiosity and marital commitment to marital stability should be taken into account. Adding another variable that might give a bigger contribution to predict marital stability in female journalists is also a recommended procedure for future research. Another possibility is explicating the same variables for other professions that vulnerably influence marital stability, such as being a nurse, celebrity, or policewoman.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, R.L.; Data curation, S.S.; Formal analysis, R.L., S.S. and H.Y.; Methodology, R.L.; Project administration, S.S.; Software, H.Y.; Supervision, R.L.; Validation, R.L. and H.Y.; Writing—original draft, R.L. and S.S.; Writing—review & editing, R.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement: All subjects gave their informed consent for inclusion before they participated in the study.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study. There are no anticipated risks associated with the study. Information of this study is anonymous, meaning that no names or identifying data will be collected. Survey data collected will be maintained and kept for research or educational purpose only.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Appendix A.1. Marital Stability Scale

Item	Indonesian Version	English Version
1	Melakukan aktivitas berdua pasangan	Doing activities both partners
2	Menceritakan aktivitas harian saya pada pasangan	Tell my partner about my daily activities
3	Merasakan adanya identitas 'ke-kami-an'	Feeling a 'we-ness' identity
4	Responsif/peduli pada perilaku/perkataan pasangan	Responsive/caring about the behavior/words of your partner
5	Merasa membutuhkan pasangan	Feeling the need for a partner
6	Banyak pencapaian yang telah diraih bersama pasangan selama menikah	Many achievements have been achieved with the couple during marriage
7	Merasa berhasil melalui masa-masa sulit dalam pernikahan	Feeling successful through difficult times in marriage
8	Mempersepsikan pernikahan kami akan semakin kuat setelah melalui masa-masa sulit	Perceiving our marriage will be even stronger after going through difficult times
9	Saya merasa mampu melewati masa-masa sulit bersama pasangan	I feel able to go through difficult times with my partner
10	Merasa tidak bahagia bersama pasangan	Feeling unhappy with your partner
11	Tidak menyadari hal apa yang membuat diri dapat tertarik pada pasangan	Not realizing what makes you attracted to your partner
12	Relasi dengan pasangan terasa renggang	Relationships with partners feel tenuous
13	Merasa pasangan adalah orang yang menyusahkan	Feeling a partner is a troublesome person
14	Menyerah atas situasi hubungan dengan pasangan	Give up on the situation with your partner
15	Merasa ingin bercerai saja	Just feel like divorcing
16	Pernikahan ini sudah tidak dapat diperbaiki lagi	This marriage is beyond repair
17	Merasa tidak percaya pada pasangan	Feeling distrustful of your partner
18	Merasa terlalu banyak masalah-masalah pernikahan yang terjadi	Feeling that there are too many marriage problems that occur
19	Merasa bahwa pasangan tidak dapat memahami diri saya sepenuhnya	Feeling that my partner cannot fully understand me
20	Merasa tidak dapat berkomunikasi secara intim dengan pasangan	Feeling unable to communicate intimately with your partner
21	Komunikasi terasa hambar dan seperlunya	Communication feels bland and necessary
22	Pasangan dirasa tidak mampu membuat prioritas keluarga	Couples feel unable to make family priorities
23	Berpikir untuk mengganti posisi pasangan dengan orang lain	Thinking of changing your partner's position with someone else
24	Merasa pasangan tak mau mengubah dirinya untuk kebaikan	Feeling the partner does not want to change himself for good
25	Kepada pasangan saya pernah mengutarakan ingin bercerai	I once told my partner that I wanted a divorce
26	Pergi meninggalkan pasangan saat kami sedang bertengkar	Leave the couple when we are fighting
27	Sempat mengutarakan pada teman/keluarga saya tentang kemungkinan terjadi cerai antara saya dan pasangan	Had told my friends/family about the possibility of a divorce between me and my partner
28	Pisah ranjang dengan pasangan saat sedang bertengkar	Separate the bed with your partner when you are fighting
29	Sempat menghitung-hitung dan membedakan harta saya dan pasangan, untuk menjaga-jaga jika terjadi perceraian	Had to calculate and differentiate between me and my partner's assets, in case of divorce

Appendix A.2. Religiosity Scale

Item	English Version	Indonesian Version
1	How often do you think about religious isssues?	Seberapa sering anda memikirkan isu yang berkaitan dengan agama?
2	To what extent do you believe that God or something divine exists?	Sejauh apa anda memercayai adanya Tuhan?
3	How often do you take part in religious service?	Seberapa sering anda berpartisipasi dalam kegiatan keagamaan?
4	How often do you pray?	Seberapa sering anda beribadah/berdo'a?
5	How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine intervenes in your life?	Seberapa sering anda merasa bahwa ada campur tangan Tuhan dalam kehidupan anda?
6	How interested are you in learning more about religious topics?	Seberapa tertarikah anda untuk mempelajari tentang topik—topik agama?
7	To what extend do you believe in an afterlife—e.g., immortality of the soul, resurrection of the dead or reincarnation?	Sejauh apa kamu mempercayai adanya kehidupan setelah kematian?
8	How important is to take part in religious services?	Seberapa pentingkah menurut anda berpartisipasi dalam kegiatan keagamaan?
9	How important is personal prayer for you?	Seberapa penting do'a/ibadah individu bagi anda?
10	How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine wants to communicate or to reveal something to you?	Seberapa sering anda merasa bahwa Tuhan ingin berkomunikasi atau ingin menunjukan sesuatu untuk anda?
11	How often do you keep yourself informed about religious questions through radio, television, internet, newspapers, or books?	Seberapa sering anda mencari informasi terkini yang berkaitan dengan agama melalui radio, televisi, internet, koran, atau buku?
12	In your opinion, how probable is it that a higher power really exists	Menurut pendapat anda, seberapa mungkin keberadaan makhluk yang memiliki kekuatan lebih tinggi?
13	How important is it for you to be connected to a religious community?	Seberapa pentingkah bagi anda untuk selalu berhubungan dengan komunitas keagamaan?
14	How often do you pray spontaneously when inspired by daily situations?	Seberapa sering anda melakukan ibadah/berdo'a secara spontan saat terinspirasi dari situasi sehari—hari?
15	How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine is present?	Seberapa sering anda merasakan bahwa Tuhan itu ada atau dekat?

Appendix A.3. Marital Commitmen Scale

Item	English Version	Indonesian Version
1	To what extent di you love [partner's name] at this stage	Sejauh mana Anda mencintai suami anda pada saat ini?
2	How much do you need [partner's name] at this stage?	Berapa banyak yang Anda membutuhkan suami anda pada saat ini?
3	Describe your marriage over the past 2 months	Gambarkan hubungan pernikahan Anda selama 2 bulan terakhir.

Appendix A.4. Marital Commitmen Scale

Item	English Version	Indonesian Version
4	Using this scale, please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied have you been with your marriage over the past two months, all things considered?	Seberapa puas atau tidak puas Anda dengan pernikahan Anda selama dua bulan terakhir?
5	You would miss the sense of being a couple	Anda akan merindukan rasanya menjadi pasangan
6	Being married helps you feel good about yourself	Menikah membantu Anda merasa nyaman dengan diri sendiri
7	You really like being a [husband/wife]	Anda sangat suka menjadi seorang istri
8	You would be disappointed in yourself because you had broken a sacred vow	Anda akan kecewa pada diri sendiri karena Anda telah melanggar sumpah suci pernikahan
9	Getting divorce violates your religious beliefs	Bercerai melanggar keyakinan agama Anda
10	It's all right to get a divorce if things are not working out. (reversed scored)	Tidak masalah untuk bercerai jika semuanya tidak berhasil
11	If a couple works hard at making their marriage succeed and still cannot get along, divorce is the best things that they can do (reversed score)	Jika pasangan bekerja keras untuk membuat pernikahan mereka berhasil dan masih tidak berhasil, perceraian adalah hal terbaik yang dapat dilakukan
12	When you agree to get marriage, you are morally bound to stay married	Ketika Anda setuju untuk menikah, Anda secara moral terikat untuk tetap menikah
13	You would feel bad about getting divorce because you promised [partner's name] you would stay with [him/her] forever	Anda akan merasa sedih jika bercerai karena Anda berjanji pada suami Anda akan tinggal bersamanya selamanya
14	You could never leave [partner's name] because [he/she] needs you too much	Anda tidak akan pernah bisa meninggalkan suami anda karena dia sangat membutuhkan Anda
15	It would be difficult to tell [partner's name] that you wanted a divorce	Akan sulit untuk memberi tahu suami anda bahwa Anda ingin bercerai
16	You could never leave [partner's name] because you would feel guilty about letting [him/her] down	Anda tidak akan pernah bisa meninggalkan suami anda karena Anda akan merasa bersalah telah mengecewakannya
17	Whenever you promise to do something, you should see it through	Setiap kali Anda berjanji untuk melakukan sesuatu, Anda harus menyelesaikannya
18	It's important to stand by what you believe in	Penting untuk mendukung apa yang Anda yakini
19	You feel that you should always finish what you start	Anda merasa bahwa Anda harus selalu menyelesaikan apa yang Anda mulai
20	Even when things get hard, you should do the things you have promised to do	Bahkan ketika keadaan menjadi sulit, Anda harus melakukan hal-hal yang telah Anda janjikan untuk lakukan
21	If you and [partner's name] were to break up, you would miss important income, insurance, or other property	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kehilangan penghasilan penting, asuransi, atau properti lainnya
22	You would miss just having somebody around	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kehilangan seseorang yang anda miliki di sekitar anda
23	You would miss living in your house	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan merindukan tinggal di rumah Anda
24	You would miss the help you get around the house from having a partner	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kehilangan bantuan yang Anda dapatkan di rumah ketika memiliki pasangan
25	You would miss being able to see your [child/children] regularly	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kehilangan kesempatan untuk melihat anak-anak Anda secara teratur

Appendix A.5. Marital Commitmen Scale

Item	English Version	Indonesian Version
26	You would not have to work around the house so much (reversed scored)	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda tidak perlu terlalu banyak bekerja di rumah
27	You would be upset because you would lose your place or standing in the community	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kecewa karena Anda akan kehilangan tempat atau posisi Anda di komunitas
28	You would be upset because your family would be uncomfortable with your breaking up	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kecewa karena keluarga Anda akan merasa tidak nyaman dengan perpisahan Anda
29	You would be upset because your in-laws would be uncomfortable with your breaking up	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kecewa karena mertua Anda akan merasa tidak nyaman dengan perpisahan Anda
30	You would be upset because you would lose some respect from friends	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kecewa karena Anda akan kehilangan rasa hormat dari teman
31	It would be difficult to face your friends and family after you broke up	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Akan sulit untuk menghadapi teman dan keluarga Anda setelah Anda berpisah
32	You would lose some of your [child/children's] love	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kehilangan sebagian dari cinta anak-anak Anda
33	It would be hard to work out who would get what property	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Akan sulit untuk membagikan harta yang telah dikumpulkan
34	It would be hard for you to find a new place to live	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Akan sulit bagi Anda untuk menemukan tempat tinggal yang baru
35	Having to move your things would be burden	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Harus memindahkan barang-barang Anda akan menjadi beban
36	Dealing with legal system would be difficult	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Berurusan dengan system hukum akan sulit
37	It would be hard to work out who would get the kid(s)	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Akan sulit untuk mengetahui siapa yang akan mendapatkan hak asuh anak
38	It would be awfully difficult to do the things necessary to get a divorce	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Akan sangat sulit untuk melakukan hal-hal yang diperlukan untuk bercerai
39	You would lose all the time you had to put into the marriage	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kehilangan semua waktu Anda pada pernikahan ini
40	You would feel like all the effort you had put into keeping the two of you together had been wasted	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan merasa seperti semua upaya yang telah Anda lakukan untuk menjaga Anda dan suami bersama-sama telah sia-sia
41	You would lose money you'd put into the marriage	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan kehilangan uang yang Anda keluarkan dalam pernikahan anda
42	You would feel like you'd wasted the best years of your life	Jika Anda dan suami berpisah, Anda akan merasa seperti Anda telah menghabiskan tahun-tahun terbaik dalam hidup Anda

References

Adams, Jeffrey M., and Warren H. Jones. 1997. The conceptualization of marital commitment: An integrative analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 72: 1177–96. [CrossRef]

Becker, Gary S., Elisabeth M. Landes, and Robert T. Michael. 1977. An economic analysis of marital instability. *Journal of Political Economy* 85: 1141–87. [CrossRef]

Booth, Alan, David R. Johnson, and John N. Edwards. 1983. Measuring marital instability. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 45: 387–94. [CrossRef]

BPS (Indonesian Central Statistic Agency). 2019. Available online: https://www.bps.go.id/statictable/2012/04/19/1605/persentase-rumah-tangga-menurut-daerah-tempat-tinggal-kelompok-umur-jenis-kelamin-kepala-rumah-tangga-dan-status-pernikahan-2009-2018.html (accessed on 15 November 2019).

Brown, Edna, Terry L. Orbuch, and Jose A. Bauermeister. 2008. Religiousity and marital stability among black american and white american couples. *Journal of Family Relations* 57: 186–97. [CrossRef]

Buehlman, Kim T., John M. Gottman, and Lynn Fainsilber Katz. 1992. How a couple views their past predicts their future: Predicting divorce from an oral history interview. *Journal of Family Psychology* 5: 295–318. [CrossRef]

Carrere, Sybil, Kim T. Buehlman, John M. Gottman, James A. Coan, and Lionel Ruckstuhl. 2000. Predicting marital stability and divorce in newlywed couples. Americn Psychological Association. *Journal of Family Psychology* 14: 42–58. [CrossRef]

Carstensen, Laura L., Jeremy Graff, Robert W. Levenson, and John M. Gottman. 1996. Affect in intimate relationships: The developmental course of marriage. In *Hand Book of Emotion, Adult Development and Aging*. Edited by Magai C. and Mc Fadden S. H. Cambridge: Academic Press, pp. 227–47.

Chinits, Joshua G., and Robert A. Brown. 2001. Religious homogamy, marital conflict, and stability in same-faithh and interfaith jewish marriages. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40: 723–33. [CrossRef]

Cooke, Lynn Prince, and Vanessa Gash. 2010. Wives' part-time employment and marital stability in great britain, west germany and the united states. *Sociology* 44: 1091–108. [CrossRef]

Delkhamoush, M. T. 2009. Hierarchy of marriage values among the Iranian youth. *Journal of Family Research* 5: 207–30.

Duffy, Karen Grover, and Eastwood Atwater. 2007. *Psychology for Living: Adjustment, Growth, and Behavior Today*, 9th ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Ellison, C. 1991. Religious involvement and subjective well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 32: 80–99. [CrossRef]

Gunter, Jason S. 2004. An Examination of the Dimensions of Commitment and Satisfaction across Years Married. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA.

Huber, Stefan. 2003. *Zentralität und Inhalt: Ein Neues multidimensionales Messmodell der Religiosität [Centrality and Content: A New Multidimensional Measurement Model of Religiosity]*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Huber, Stefan, and Odilo W. Huber. 2012. The centrality of religiosity scale (CRS). *Religions* 30: 710–24. [CrossRef]

Johnson, David R., and Alan Booth. 1990. Rural economic decline and marital quality: A panel of farm marriage. *Family Relations* 39: 159–65. [CrossRef]

Johnson, Michael P., John P. Caughlin, and Ted L. Huston. 1999. The tripartite nature of marital commitment: Personal, moral, structural reasons to stay married. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61: 160–77. [CrossRef]

Jose, Orathinkal, and Vansteenwegen Alfons. 2007. Do demographics affect marital satisfaction? *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy* 33: 73–85.

Lambert, Nathaniel M., and David C. Dollahite. 2006. How religiosity helps couples prevent, resolve, and overcome marital conflict. *Family Relations* 55: 439–49. [CrossRef]

Latifa, Rena. 2015. Model Stabilitas Pernikahan Dewasa Awal Berdasarkan Atribusi Kognisi, Regulasi Emosi Dan Gaya Konflik. *Disertation, Program Pascasarjana Universitas Padjadjaran Bandung*, Unpublished.

Latifa, Rena, and Febyorita Amelia. 2018. How commitment to Islamic values maintain marital stability. *Hamdard Islamicus* 41: 107–32.

Lauer, Robert H., and Jeanette C. Lauer. 1986. Factors in long-term marriage. *Journal of Family Issues* 7: 382–90. [CrossRef]

Livingston, Beth A, and Timothy A. Judge. 2008. Emotional responses to work-family conflict: An examination of gender role orientation among working men and women. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 93: 207–16. [CrossRef]

Mallat, Sarah E., and Jad P. Melki. 2016. Block Her Entry, Keep Her Down and Push Her Out. *Journalism Studies* 17: 57–79. [CrossRef]

Nye, F. Ivan, Lynn White, and James S. Frideres. 1973. A preliminary theory of marital stability: Two models. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family* 3: 102–22.

Suleyiman, Muna, and Atinkut Zewdu. 2018. Determinant Factors for Couple Communication and Marital Stability among Adults in Assela Town, Oromia Region, Ethiopia. *Global Journal of HUMAN-SOCIAL SCIENCE: H Interdisciplinary* 18: 31–42.

Sullivan, Kieran. T. 2001. Understanding the relationship between religiosity and marriage: An investigation of the immediate and longitudinal effects of religiosity on newlywed couples. *Journal of Family Psychology* 15: 610–26. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Surra, Catherine. A., Debra K. Hughes, and Susan E. Jacquet. 1999. The Development of Commitment to Marriage. In *Handbook of Interpersonal Commitment and Relationship Stability*. Edited by Jeffrey M. Adams and Warren H. Jones. New York: Springer Science.

Swensen, Clifford H., and Geir Trahaug. 1985. Commitment and the long-term marriage relationship. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 47: 939–45. [CrossRef]