

7-28-2022

Income Earner Status and Couple Type and Its Impact on Marital Satisfaction

Yudiana Ratnasari

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 16424, Indonesia, yudianaratnasari@gmail.com

Fath Fatheya

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 16424, Indonesia, fatheya.fath@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/hubsasia>



Part of the [Clinical Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ratnasari, Y., & Fatheya, F. (2022). Income Earner Status and Couple Type and Its Impact on Marital Satisfaction. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 26(1), 14-24. <https://doi.org/10.7454/hubs.asia.2171121>

This Original Article is brought to you for free and open access by UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Income Earner Status and Couple Type and Its Impact on Marital Satisfaction

Status Pencari Nafkah dan Tipe Pasangan terhadap Kepuasan Pernikahan

Yudiana Ratnasari* & Fath Fatheya

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 16424, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The rise of opportunities for females to work outside household settings in Indonesia has changed the division of traditional roles and responsibilities among married couples and thus may affect the quality of marital relationships. This study aims to observe how income earner status (single or dual earner) within families and couple type play roles in marital satisfaction. The participants comprised 224 spousal couples who are analyzed individually and together to categorize couple types measured using the Relational Dimension Instrument and Couple Satisfaction Index. Results indicate that for income earner status, no significant predominant effect on marital satisfaction was observed. The average marital satisfaction scores between couples with single- and dual-income statuses were insignificantly different, suggesting that dual- or single-income status does not have a direct effect on marital satisfaction. Based on couple type, traditional and separated types showed the highest marital satisfaction mean scores and lowest marital satisfaction scores among other types, respectively. These results reveal that interdependence and conflict resolution communication are important aspects in determining marital satisfaction levels among the Indonesian couples who participated in this study.

ABSTRAK

Meningkatnya kesempatan wanita bekerja diluar rumah yang terjadi di Indonesia tentunya mengubah pembagian peran dan tanggungjawab yang terjadi pada pasangan, dan hal ini berdampak pada kualitas hubungan dalam perkawinan. Penelitian ini memiliki tujuan untuk melihat bagaimana status pencari nafkah dalam keluarga dan tipe pasangan berperan dalam kepuasan pernikahan. Partisipasi dalam penelitian ini 224 individu yang merupakan pasangan suami dan istri yang dianalisis secara individual maupun berpasangan menggunakan *Relational Dimensions Instrument* dan *Couple Satisfaction Index*. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa tipe pencari nafkah, tidak berpengaruh secara signifikan terhadap kepuasan pernikahan. Tidak adanya efek interaksi yang signifikan antara status pencari nafkah dan tipe pasangan terhadap kepuasan pernikahan. Ditemukan adanya pengaruh utama yang signifikan antara tipe pasangan dan kepuasan pernikahan. Tipe traditional memiliki skor rata-rata kepuasan pernikahan yang paling tinggi sebaliknya, tipe pasangan separated ditemukan memiliki skor rata-rata kepuasan pernikahan yang paling rendah. Dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa kepuasan perkawinan tidak ditentukan oleh status pencari nafkah tetapi yang terpenting adalah peran dari tipe pasangan yang menunjukkan bahwa interdependensi, komunikasi penyelesaian konflik menjadi aspek yang penting dalam menentukan tingkat kepuasan pernikahan pasangan.

Original Article

*Correspondence Author:

Yudiana Ratnasari
E-mail: yudianaratnasari@gmail.com

Received: 10 October 2019

Revised: 12 October 2021

Accepted: 17 November 2021

Keywords: dual and single earner, couple type, and marital satisfaction

Cite this article: Ratnasari, Y., & Fatheya, F. (2022). Income earner status and couple type and its impact on marital satisfaction. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 26(1), 14-24.
<https://doi.org/10.7454/hubs.asia.2171121>

1. Introduction

Based on data from Indonesia's Ministry of Manpower, the number of female workers increased from 2014 to 2016, reaching up to 55,374 individuals (Indonesian Central Statistics Agency, 2017). The United Nations for Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) in Indonesia (2015) also predicted an increase in the number of dual-earner couples since a 2010 population census. This

increase is assumed to be caused by the rising number of females with higher education; the rise of living costs; and the need to improve self-identities, materialistic orientations, and awareness on social status (UNFPA, 2015; Patra & Suar, 2009). As an impact of the growing number of females with careers within families, the traditional family model in which only males functioned as breadwinners (single-income earners) are gradually becoming less relevant to current marital conditions.

Every couple has their own adjustment mechanism to balance work and household affairs. The amount of time spent working may have different psychological and physical influences on every marital relationship (Doumas et al., 2008). For instance, individuals who are intensely involved in work roles psychologically may dedicate a significant amount of their energies into their work and thus reduce the number of tasks or quality of husbandly or wifely roles into their family. The boundaries between family and work can therefore be often unclear, as sociologist Hochschild (Olson et al., 2011) suggested that work may feel like home and home is perceived as a job. When work and family affairs are unbalanced, marriage issues may precipitate (DeGenova, 2008).

Dual-income earners are at a greater risk for inter-role conflicts than single-income earners, as suggested by Powell and Fine (2009) who stated that the condition of dual-income earners within marriages potentiates great conflicts within families. Such inter-role conflicts are related to husbandly or wifely roles and roles as professional workers. Dual-income couples are frequently confronted with conflicts relating to family and work schedules, fatigue, and other situations that affect family life matters (Ehrenberg et al., 2001), which may affect the psychological condition of either wives or husbands and further affect the quality of their marital relationship.

The income earner status in marriages is strongly associated with marital relations in terms of how work dynamics can be conveyed into household matters (Doumas et al., 2008), particularly psychological states at work that may be projected into household matters, a condition termed spillover. "Spillover" suggests that individuals' pressures, emotions, and behaviors at work will spillover into marital life (Piotrkowski et al., 1987). For instance, negative experiences that husbands have at work will increase withdrawn behavior at home, whereas working wives tend to exhibit irritability or become easily angered (Schulz et al., 2004). Moreover, fatigue from work may drain couples' energies and affect their functionality as partners or parents in a household. When husbands or wives experience exhaustion from work, they may bring a negative mood back home and consequently have a negative perception of the household atmosphere (Chan & Margolin, 1994). Conversely, if couples perceive their work conditions positively, it is positively associated with warmth and lowered conflicts in a household setting (Doumas et al., 2008). The income earner status in marriages also influences the psychological states of unemployed husbands, with a possibility of reduced psychological well-being. By contrast, working wives are known to have better physical and emotional health than nonworking wives (Doumas et al., 2008). Similar to spillover, individuals' workload also influences their

partner's psychological condition known as a crossover, whereby individuals' pressures, moods, and behaviors in the workplace may affect their partner's experience of marital life. For instance, when husbands experience excessive workload, it may reduce familial warmth and increase conflict with wives (Crouter et al., 2001). Furthermore, when husbands work with lower hours, wives admit to receiving more expressions of warmth when their husbands are at home.

Attitudes and behaviors between dual- and single-income earners toward marital life also vary (Bird et al., 1990), and the interaction from such differences produces different couple typologies. Fitzpatrick (1988) formulated couple types to have an improved understanding of the internal working model of couples within three dimensions: ideology, interdependency, and communication. Ideology is evaluated through perceptual beliefs in conventional or nonconventional husband or wife gender roles. Interdependency is evaluated through coordination in each other's schedules, how they share space and time physically and psychologically, and financial privacy. Communication is evaluated through the context of conflict resolution, explaining how couples are interactively involved during conflicts. From these three dimensions, individuals can be categorized into three types in perceiving marriage: traditional, independent, and separated. Moreover, each individual is matched with their partner to determine whether they possess similar views on their marriage. If a spousal couple possesses different views, then they are categorized as a mixed couple type.

Barnett and Hyde (2001) discussed the roles of conventional or nonconventional ideologies on the typical male and female roles in marital relations. The ideology a couple possesses moderates their roles and the quality of the roles itself. For instance, when men are involved in parenting, despite assuming that the role should be played by women, men feel inept in child rearing in some cases. Another example is when working women believe that taking care of children and their home are their responsibilities, they likely sense a lack of purpose in their career roles. Therefore, gender role ideologies may influence how dual- and single-income couples interact to a significant extent, in a way that they hold different meanings toward their roles at work and in their families. Barnett and Hyde (2001) concluded that couples with nonconventional gender roles feel a great advantage when they are part of a dual-income marriage. This finding applies contrarily, whereby couples with conventional gender roles feel benefited when only husbands are employed or when they are part of a single-income marriage. These perceptual or meaning differences play a role in generating marital satisfaction in each individual within their marriage. To support this notion, Ramu (1989) compared Indian families of single- and dual-income earners and the involvement of each

Table 1. Schematic Representation of Marital Typology Formation

	Conventional Ideology		Nonconventional Ideology	
	High Conflict	Low Conflict	High Conflict	Low Conflict
High interdependency	Traditional		Independent	
Low interdependency	Separated			

individual in household roles. The study discovered an egalitarian interactive pattern among dual-income couples, whereby the wives of dual-income earners hold greater marital happiness than those of single-income earners. This finding corresponds to Barnett and Baruch’s (1985) study that revealed how working wives have healthier psychological states than their unemployed counterparts.

Other than the ideologies that couples have, communication patterns between single- and dual-income earners may also vary. Communication with partners with regard to work and household matters, including conflict resolution, is salient in marital relations (Ogletree, 2015). This is related to the well-being of husbands or wives in carrying out work and domestic duties (Abdullah & Bakar, 2013). In comparison to single-income couples, dual-income couples are required to cooperate and communicate more effectively in terms of planning and evaluating marital relations to achieve and maintain marital success (Abdullah & Bakar, 2013). When communication is hindered, marital satisfaction or even failure may occur as a result of lack of cooperation and mismanagement within domestic affairs (Fitzpatrick, 1990).

Income earner status has been found to affect the quality of marriage differently in several Asian countries (Ruppaner, 2015). Primarily among dual-income couples, conflicts between work and domestic matters more likely occur than among single-income couples. In Japan and South Korea, dual-income couples that work full-time are not as affected by conflicts between work and household issues. In the Philippines, dual-income couples in which wives work part-time likely experience conflicts between work and domestic matters. The situation differs in Taiwan, whereby single-income earners experience less conflicts between work and household matters than dual-income couples. The differences in work and domestic conflict aspects may directly influence and lessen marital satisfaction that can be attributed to various cultural principles, despite studies conducted within a predominantly Eastern society (Yucel, 2017).

These differences also apply to couple types (further known as couple typology) that may variably influence marital satisfaction. Couple typology helps researchers compose the science and understanding of human

relations (VanLear, 2009). Out of various typologies in marriage, one that is still influential in marital typology is Fitzpatrick’s formulation (Fincham, 2004; VanLear et al., 2006; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2009). Fitzpatrick’s typology (1988) is considered superlative in theory and empirical validation through observation. The dimensions that constitute marital typology are based on relevant theories on marriage. The grouping of types represents a natural behavioral structure that is in accordance with the theoretical concept of marital behavior (Vanlear et al., 2006 Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2009). This typology provides an understanding on how couples have similar basic functions, whereby each has their own unique ways of interaction on a daily basis. This typology is divided into three dimensions—interdependence, ideology, and communication styles in conflict resolution—each interacting and thus producing couple typology and each bearing its own advantages and disadvantages based on their respective interactive patterns.

The dimensions above formulate three couple types, with each type categorized under different dimensions (see tabel 1). Individuals perceive their marriage in personal ways, which may be different from their perception as a couple. When individuals perceive their marriage similarly with their partners, they are categorized as pure traditional/pure independent/pure separated. If a husband and wife perceive their spouse type differently, for instance, when a husband perceives his partner as traditional yet the wife perceives her partner as independent, then this couple is categorized as a mixed type.

Fitzpatrick (1988) and Givertz et al. (2009) investigated American couples and found that traditional and separated marriage types hold the highest and lowest marital satisfaction levels among other types, respectively. Specifically, both studies were conducted among a majority of Caucasian samples, in which Caucasians are considered predominantly Western-cultured and individualistic. For a comparison to Eastern samples, Mustafa et al. (2012) investigated couple types in great detail within a sample of Malaysian couples and across four different ethnic groups. They learned that certain ethnicities have couples with different satisfaction levels. For example, Malay and Bumiputera ethnic groups held the highest marital satisfaction levels within traditional couple types. By contrast, Chinese and Indian

ethnic groups with the highest marital satisfaction levels were among independent couple types. The findings across these ethnicities warrant further research on what differences exist between couples from Western and Eastern cultures on gender role, income, or occupational load that may influence marital satisfaction.

Given that prior studies on income earner status, marital satisfaction, and couple type generated findings that may be beneficial in the clinical practice of family psychology, the present study aims to observe the effects of income earner status (of dual-/single-income couples) and couple type on marital satisfaction among a sample of Indonesian couples. Based on previously mentioned theories, an indication points out that dual- and single-income couples have distinctive marital dynamics, as suggested through role division and by current evidence concerning intercouple interactions. With a different sociocultural context from Western customs, Indonesian couple types may have various differences that further affect marital satisfaction. A majority of the Indonesian society holds traditional gender role patterns. However, female contribution to professional work has reportedly increased over the past few years, and the question remains whether conflict between work and domestic matters will appear more frequently in dual-income couples and consequently produce different marital satisfaction levels among these couples.

2. Methods

This study applies a comparative design (Walliman, 2011), which compares several groups with certain differences and similarities across them. It aims to investigate marital satisfaction among couples who both work or only with a single income. Specifically, a 4 x 2 factorial design is used in which measurements are made on the basis of the mean scores of dependent variables in each cell (Kerlinger & Lee, 2005). An independent factorial design hence suits this study best (Field, 2009) in which several predictors can be drawn through the measurement of different marital groups.

Participants

Characteristics considered in this study are couples with married statuses, with both or either individual currently holding a job, have monthly incomes, and reside in Indonesia. The individuals should hold at least a high school degree to understand the questions within the questionnaire. The minimum marriage duration is one year. On the basis of these criteria, 122 couples are retrieved, with 60 single-earning couples and 184 dual earners. The average marriage duration is at 6.43 years.

Instruments

Two psychological instruments are used to measure marital satisfaction (Couple Satisfaction Index – CSI-16) and couple type (Relational Dimension Instrument –

RDI). Reliability and validity tests for CSI-16 are conducted with IBM SPSS 20. The CSI comprises 16 items on a six-point scale, except for Item 1 that is measured on a seven-point scale. The CSI measures marital satisfaction as a unidimensional variable. The participants provide answers scored from 0 to 5, except for Item 1 that is scored from 0 to 6. Items 12 and 15 are scored in reverse. The CSI is scored by totaling the scores from each item. Reliability tests are administered beforehand to determine whether the participants have provided consistent responses (Anastasia & Urbina, 1997). Instrument reliability tests are measured with Cronbach's alpha coefficient from 160 married individuals. A 0.948 Cronbach's alpha coefficient is generated, indicating that the CSI-16 has a good overall internal consistency. The result also shows that 94% of the observed scores are true score variances, and 6% of observed scores are error variances, stemming from item heterogeneity or sampling errors. The validity of the CSI is measured through corrected inter-item correlation analysis from 160 married individuals. This technique analyzes the internal consistency of one item by correlating each item with the total score of a dimension in an instrument (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). A validity coefficient range of 0.493–0.851 is generated from the CSI-16. With reference to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), the minimum validity correlation coefficient that is deemed acceptable is 0.2; therefore, the CSI-16 is considered valid in measuring marital satisfaction.

The RDI is measured on a seven-point Likert scale. To fill in Item 47-7, the seven-point Likert scale comprises the following options: always, regularly, frequently, occasionally/sometimes, seldom, not regularly, and never. For Item 47-7, the Likert scale consists of the following options: strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The RDI is scored by giving a 1–7 score on participants' answers on each scale. The scoring for each participant's answers 47is in accordance with the scale selected, except for 10 unfavorable items that are scored in reverse. The result of the RDI's overall reliability test is 0.66. Validity tests for the RDI are performed using the corrected inter-item correlation method, and content validity testing is an item evaluation consideration. Content validity is an evaluation of how well items are by selecting examples of behavior from a measured domain (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). Content validity is performed by examining each item's correspondence to the theoretical framework developed by Fitzpatrick (1988) and its accordance with the Indonesian cultural context.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected from 8 April 2018 to 9 May 2018. The first step was distributing electronic posters of this study through online media, such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and broadcast messages through WhatsApp,

Line, and Facebook Messengers. The electronic posters led prospective participants to become respondents by filling in preliminary personal information, such as name initials, contact numbers or emails. The researcher used online questionnaires through survey.ui.ac.id as the data collection platform. Of the retrieved personal information, each prospective participant was contacted individually through WhatsApp, short message service, and email. When the researcher contacted the prospective participants, a link for the online questionnaire that was created using survey.ui.ac.id was provided. A unique code for each spousal couple was also given. The unique codes comprised letters and numbers, and each spouse received the same code. These codes were used as participants' identity replacement. By inputting the same couple code, the researcher was able to identify that the data were from a specific husband or wife.

The retrieved data were analyzed with IBM SPSS Statistics 20 by applying the following statistical methods: descriptive statistics, K-means cluster analysis, and ANOVA factorial analysis. The descriptive statistics used among others were frequencies and averages. Frequency values were used to identify demographic distributions, such as couple type, domicile, ethnicity, age, marital duration income, and number of children. Average values were used to identify participants' mean age and marital duration.

K-means cluster was used to process RDI data for categorizing participants into couple types. This technique divides data into groups by using a centroid model whereby a group's mean scores are denominated K as a parameter (Tan et al., 2005). By using the Euclidean method, the set centroid values carry out several iterations to generate an optimum and stable centroid value to differentiate clusters. In this study, the RDI group data were divided into three groups: traditional, independent, and separated. In the result sheets, each participant picked among 1, 2, and 3 cluster codes to represent the couple type they perceive themselves as. The researcher then conducted qualitative evaluation to determine which cluster suits each couple best on the basis of their characteristics and replaced the 1, 2, and 3 cluster codes into traditional, independent, and separated labels, respectively. After each individual personally evaluated which couple type they are, the researcher matched the couples as to whether they have similar perceptions. If a couple shares similar perceptions

(for instance, a couple perceives themselves as an independent couple type), then the couple will be categorized as a pure independent type. If both share different perceptions on their marital couple type (for instance, a husband has a traditional perception, whereas a wife perceives them as separated), then the couple will be categorized as a mixed couple. Mixed couple types are a combination of husband–wife perceptions and a combination of different couple types, such as traditional–independent, traditional–separated, and independent–separated.

ANOVA statistical processing is conducted to determine whether statistically significant differences between two or more groups are evident based on mean scores (Nayak & Singh, 2015). ANOVA factorial analysis assisted the researcher in processing dependent variable data on a continuous scale and two or more independent variables on a categorical scale. This factorial technique was used to observe variations among two or more independent variables independently or as they interact with each other in generating variations within dependent variables (Kerlinger & Lee, 2005).

3. Result

The retrieved demographic data of the respondents are as follows: recent education level with a college diploma (D-4)/bachelor's degree (S-1) (67.6%), master's degree (15.2%), high school and junior college diploma (D-1) (11.4%), D-3 (4.3%), and doctorate degree (1.2%). The ethnic majority of retrieved data are of Javanese group at 42%. Moreover, 59.8% of the participants have been married for 1–5 years. The lowest marital duration was one year, whereas the longest was 36 years. The average marital duration was 6.43 years. Most participants (77.5%) have at least one child. Based on monthly income grouping, most participants generate a Rp 3,000,000–Rp 7,500,000 monthly income range.

This study retrieved 60 individuals/30 pairs of single-income couples and 184 individuals/92 pairs of dual-income couples (see table 2). Of 244 individuals, 40 are under the mixed couple type, 76 belong to the separated couple type, 24 are under the independent couple type, and 104 are of the mixed type. Moreover, 16.3% of the participants belong to the pure traditional couple type, whereas the mixed type has the highest frequency at 42.6%.

Table 2. Couple Distribution based on Income Earner Status and Couple Type

Income Earner Status	Couple Type			
	Traditional	Separated	Independent	Mixed
Single	12	18	8	22
Dual	28	58	16	82
Frequency	40	76	24	104
Percentage	16.3	31.3	9.8	42.6

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Income Earner Status and Couple Type

Couple Type	Income Earner Status	Marital Satisfaction	Standard	N (Individuals)
		Mean	Deviation	
Traditional	Single income	75.55	2.382	12
	Dual income	70.96	10.793	28
	Total	172.26	9.414	40
Independent	Single income	56.25	9.035	8
	Dual income	61.44	13.560	16
	Total	59.71	12.288	24
Separated	Single income	62.72	10.046	18
	Dual income	61.84	9.653	58
	Total	62.05	9.687	76
Mixed	Single income	68.95	10.031	22
	Dual income	65.77	11.994	82
	Total	66.44	11.634	104
Total	Single income	66.56	10.657	60
	Dual income	64.95	11.616	184
	Total	65.34	11.390	243

Based on the analysis of the descriptive data in table 3, the traditional type has the highest mean marital satisfaction scores among the remaining types. Traditional single-income couples also exceed the mean marital satisfaction scores compared with other dual-income couples. By contrast, independent couples have the lowest mean marital satisfaction scores among all couple types. Contrary to traditional couples, dual-income independent couples have higher marital satisfaction means than single-income couples.

A requirement for ANOVA testing is the assumption of a dependent variable's homogeneity variance as compared within groups to generate accurate statistical results (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007). The researcher performed Levene's untransformed test to examine raw marital satisfaction data toward each independent variable. Levene's test is used to test the hypothesis that assumes each variance error within marital satisfaction will be equal across all groups. Levene's test for each couple type as independent variables resulted in $p = 0.0097-0.74$. All generated p values were greater than the set significance level at 0.05, meaning that the variance of each couple type was either equal or homogenous. Based on Levene's test on income earner status as a dependent variable, the results generated $p = 0.13-0.592$, also indicating that the variance of each income earner status type was either equal or homogenous. Therefore, according to the base assumption that the homogeneity of variance in the study population is homogenous, results can be interpreted accurately.

This work mainly investigated the varying marital satisfaction levels that can be accounted by income earner status, couple type, and the interaction between these two variables. Based on the ANOVA on income

earner status, the generated results were $F(3,1) = 0.231$; $p > 0.05$; $\eta^2 = 0.001$, indicating no significant main effect of income earner status on marital satisfaction. According to Cohen (1988), a 0.001 effect size test result (η^2) shows that income earner status has a small effect size on marital satisfaction.

The ANOVA on couple type toward marital satisfaction was $F(1,3) = 10.425$; $p < 0.05$; $\eta^2 = 0.117$, suggesting a main significant effect of couple type on marital satisfaction, although an η^2 value of 0.117 shows that couple type has a small effect size on marital satisfaction. For the interaction effect between income earner status and couple type, a $F(1,3) = 1.050$; $p > 0.05$; $\eta^2 = 0.013$ result was generated, showing no significant interaction effect between income earner status and couple type toward marital satisfaction.

Post Hoc Test Results

The researcher intended to analyze which couple type has a significant score difference toward marital satisfaction through post hoc analysis. Gravetter and Wallnau (2007) stated that post hoc analysis is an ancillary test to the main hypothesis testing, after ANOVA tests are carried out to determine which group's mean score is significant and insignificant. The analysis of the main effects of couple types on marital satisfaction can be advanced to post hoc testing with the following requirements; Post hoc analyses are similar to one-way ANOVAs, with couple type and marital satisfaction serving as variables.

Based on post hoc analysis (see table 4), the traditional couple type had a positive and significant mean score difference with the separated type ($p < 0.05$), suggesting that traditional couples experience greater marital satisfaction than separated couples. The independent

Table 4. Pairwise Comparison of Test Results on Couple Type

Couple Type (I)	Couple Type (J)	Mean Score Difference (I-J)	Standard Error	Sig
Traditional	Separated	14.411*	2.408	0.000
	Independent	5.893	3.022	0.000
	Mixed	-3.440	2.314	0.069
Independent	Separated	-3.440	2.751	1.000
	Traditional	-12.411*	3.022	0.000
	Mixed	-8.518*	2.669	0.010
Separated	Traditional	-10.971*	2.408	0.000
	Independent	3.440	27.51	1.000
	Mixed	-5.078	1.947	0.058
Mixed	Separated	5.078	1.947	0.058
	Traditional	-5.893	2.314	0.069
	Independent	8.518*	2.669	0.010

couple type showed a negative and significant mean score difference with the traditional type ($p < 0.05$) and mixed type. This result indicates that independent couples have lower marital satisfaction than traditional and mixed couples. For the separated couple type, a negative and significant mean score difference with the traditional type was found ($p < 0.05$), meaning that separated couples experience lower marital satisfaction than traditional couples. The mixed couple type had a positive and significant score difference with the independent couple type ($p < 0.05$), suggesting that mixed couples experience greater marital satisfaction than independent couples.

Traditional couples have a more positive difference than separated and independent couples. By contrast, independent couples have a more negative difference than traditional and mixed couples. Moreover, the mixed type is positively different compared with the independent type. Previous studies that conducted descriptive analysis identified that traditional and independent types have the highest and lowest marital satisfaction mean scores, respectively. With these significant differences, traditional couples can be concluded to experience greater marital satisfaction than other couples, whereas independent couples experience lower marital satisfaction than other couples.

4. Discussion

The findings showed no combined effect between income earner status as the independent variable and couple type toward marital satisfaction. Among dual- or single-income earners, no significant differences in marital satisfaction were also found. That is, dual- or single-income earners perceive marital satisfaction at similar levels. Moreover, couple types were found to significantly influence marital satisfaction. Each couple

type has their own marital satisfaction varieties that are significantly different.

Among single-income couples, the study discovered the traditional couples to have significantly different marital satisfaction levels compared with separated and independent couples, indicating that among single-income couples, traditional ones experience higher satisfaction than other couples. When single-income couples are the separated or independent type, they tend to feel less satisfied with their marriages than the traditional type. Similar to dual-income couples, traditional couples showed greater marital satisfaction than separated and independent couples. In both income earner statuses, the independent couple type held lower marital satisfaction than traditional and separated couple types. However, independent and separated couples reported less marital satisfaction when they are single-income earners. In other words, independent and separated couples experience great marital satisfaction when both couples work. Meanwhile, traditional couples equally feel most satisfied whether being dual- or single-income earners among other types.

Traditional couples are those who possess the highest traditionalistic ideology, interpersonal interdependence, and communication in settling differences in conflict resolution among other types. By having a deeply held traditional ideology, traditional couples appear to have clear gender role responsibilities whereby the husband is the head of the family and the wife is responsible for domestic matters. Even among dual-income couples, this ideology is the basis of behavior and in engaging in marital life. This observation corresponds to the findings by Stevens et al. (2001) that among dual-income earners, the division of household and domestic responsibilities based on gender ideology is a significant predictor of marital satisfaction. Equal gender role division is also an

essential domain in forming marital satisfaction according to Fowers and Olson (1993).

Communication is a core aspect among various interpersonal relationship factors within couples, expressing affection and appreciation, expressing needs for support and providing support toward partners, and handling inevitable conflicts and distress that tend to occur relationships (Bartholomew, 2009). The communication process is the most influential aspect in the effort to generate satisfaction and a durable relationship (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2009; Olson et al., 2013). In this study, each couple type has their own communication pattern that affects the variety of marital satisfaction as perceived by each couple. For instance, traditional types were found to have the highest interpersonal communication, followed by independent types, then separated types. This observation corresponds to Fitzpatrick's (1988) findings on traditional types showing the highest average marital satisfaction scores. However, other factors may explain the low marital satisfaction among independent types in comparison to traditional or separated types apart from the communication process. This study postulates that nontraditional ideologies held by independent couples affect the way they give meaning to or evaluate their marriages.

A large majority of retrieved samples in this study had marital satisfaction levels above Funk and Rogge (2007) cut-off points. The set cut-off limit is 51.5, and this study found the lowest mean score at 56.2 within single-income independent couples. This overall high marital satisfaction score may be explained by the fact that most participants (67.6%) hold a bachelor's degree or a bachelor's equivalence. Stanley, Amato, Johnson, and Markman (2006) suggested that education level is strongly associated with high marital satisfaction and associated with low destructive conflict level. The current research learned that the education factor influences how couples maintain and give meaning to marital relations. Furthermore, 61.1% of the participants have a Rp 3,000,000–5,000,000 income range or are within a middle socioeconomic class in which the standards of living are considered adequate. Financial capacity therefore may have influenced the high rates of perceived marital satisfaction, considering that if a couple struggles economically, then it may generate a negative evaluation toward marital relations and thus lower marital satisfaction (Conger et al., 2010).

The impact of Indonesia's collectivist culture not only plays a role in how an entire family takes part in parenting as previously mentioned but also shapes gender roles and expectations among modern couples. The collectivist culture prioritizes harmony and other people's consideration in decision-making related to personal needs (Quek & Fitzpatrick, 2013), meaning that the

traditional gender role point of view demands a wife to respect and adhere to her husband's opinion with regard to career decision-making (Richardson-Bouie, 2003). A wife's decision to have a career beyond the household setting is usually an agreement made between spousal couples, whether the husband allows his wife to work outside the household setting. Although this study did not attempt to identify the reason behind a husband and wife's decision to seek income dually, the wife's decision to work is likely based on her husband's prior consent. That is, both sides have reached an understanding to equally have careers. An agreement and mutual understanding between dual-income earners may eventually maintain a sense of satisfaction in their marriages. Similar to single-income couples who are estimated to have lesser conflicts than dual-income couples, satisfaction may be generated from mutual understanding on carrying out traditional gender roles in marriages. Therefore, either dual- or single-income couples have corresponding marital satisfaction levels.

This study was carried out with an eye on several notable limitations. First, it may benefit from repeated data collection to observe the effect of time on marital satisfaction, in addition to couple typology and income status. For example, will single- or dual-income couples have better satisfaction outcomes as affected by age or by improvements in the economic climate? Do differences exist between children of dual- or single-income couples? Which group will fare best later in life? Second, a degree of bias is introduced when data are analyzed from self-reports. Self-report measures are challenges to quantitative research primarily when constructs related to cultural ideology are measured. In this sense, gender role ideology can be expressed in different ways—whether single- or dual-income couples or couples who hold traditional or nonconventional views truly accept such views within their marriages. Despite these limitations, the findings highlight the central importance of moderating factors in marital satisfaction, such as good communication and mutual understanding, which may enhance family cohesion.

5. Conclusion

In summary, single- and dual-income couples have similar perceptions on marital satisfaction. This finding is concomitant to Indonesia's cultural and social contexts, whereby Indonesia practices collectivism in which family cohesion and unity are paramount compared with personal interest (Quek & Fitzpatrick, 2013). When dual-income couples work in Western cultures, role conflicts may be triggered, primarily for the roles of child-rearer and professional worker (Ehrenberg et al., 2001). Child rearing increases the risks of conflict and stress upon individuals who carry out dual roles with a significant psychological load (i.e., concurrent breadwinner and homemaker), which may further

negatively affect the quality of marriage. In Indonesia, as a collectivist culture in which it is customary for a married person to still live in their parents' house (Collins & Bahar, in Richardson-Bouie, 2003), leaving child rearing to the parents of either couple is common for dual-income couples. The additional help in parenting reduces the burden and risk of role conflicts among dual-income couples. Therefore, the availability of additional help does not hamper marital satisfaction among married couples in Indonesia. Education and middle-upper economic conditions also contributed to the findings. Adequate education certainly provides better career opportunities and may further improve the financial capacity and satisfaction of families from a decent standard of living. Last, as Indonesia consists of hundreds of ethnicities spread across developing cities and rural areas, additional details can be provided in the compared rates of marital satisfaction between single- and dual-income couples in urban or rural settings. If differences exist between city and countryside groups, then data can be used as a benchmark for family practitioners to tailor specific approaches toward each group and governments can establish additional employment opportunities, which may benefit familial income and consequently improve community welfare.

References

- Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing (7th ed.)*. Prentice Hall.
- Acitelli, L. (2009). Marriage, benefits of. In H. T Reiss, & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human relationships*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412958479.n331>.
- Abdullah, M. Y., & Bakar, N. R. (2013). The sustainability of dual earner at the workplace in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, 9(7). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n7p192>.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2015). *Statistical yearbook of Indonesia 2015*. Statistik Indonesia.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2017). *Statistical yearbook of Indonesia 2018*. Statistik Indonesia.
- Barnett, R. C., & Baruch, G. K. (1985). Women's involvement in multiple roles and psychological distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 135-45. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.49.1.135>.
- Barnett, R. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist*, 56(10), 781-796. doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.781
- Bartholomew, K. (2009). *Stressed Out about Communication Skills* HCPro, Marblehead, MA.
- Bird, G. A., Day, S., & Cavell, M. (1990). Housing and household characteristics of single- and dual-earner families. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 19(1), 29-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077727X9001900104>
- Chan, C. J., & Margolin, G. (1994). The relationship between dual-earner couples' daily work mood and home affect. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11, 573-586. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407594114005>
- Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J., & Martin, M. J. (2010). Socioeconomic process, family process, and individual development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 685-704 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x>.
- Crouter, A. C., Bumpus, M. F., Head, M. R., & McHale, S. M. (2001). Implications of overwork and overload for the quality of men's family relationship. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 404-416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00404.x>
- Cohen, R. J., Swerdlik, M. E., & Sturman, E. D. (2013). *Psychological testing and assessment: An introduction to test and measurement*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- DeGenova, M. K. (2008). *Intimate relationships, marriage, and families*. McGraw-Hill.
- Doumas, D. M., Margolin, G., & John, R. S. (2008). Spillover patterns in single-earner couples: Work, self-care, and the marital relationship. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 29, 55-73 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-007-9091-6>
- Ehrenberg, M. F., Gearing-Small, M., Hunter, M. A., & Small, B. J. (2001). Childcare task division and shared parenting attitudes in dual-earner families of young children. *Family Relations*, 50(2), 143-153 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2001.00143.x>
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using spss (3rd ed.)*. SAGE Publication Inc.
- Fincham, F. D. (2004). Communication in marriage. In A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Handbook of family communications* (pp. 83-103). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1988). *Between husbands & wives: Communication in marriage*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Models of marital interaction. Dalam H. Giles & W. P. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social psychology* (pp. 433-450). John Wiley & Sons.
- Fowers, B. J., & Olson, D. H. (1993). ENRICH Marital Satisfaction Scale: A Brief Research and Clinical Tool.

- Journal of Family Psychology*, 7(2), 176-185. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.7.2.176>
- Frisco, M. L., & Williams, K. (2003). Perceived housework equity, marital happiness, and divorce in dual-earner households. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(1), 51-73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X02238520>
- Funk, J. L., & Rogge, R. D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: Increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21(4), 572-583. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.572>
- Givertz, M., Segrin, C., & Hanzal, A. The association between satisfaction and commitment differs across marital couple types. *Communication Research*, 36(4), 561-584. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650209333035>
- Gravetter, F.J., & Wallanau, L.B.(2007). *Statistic for The Behavioral Sciences (7th Ed)*. Thomson Wadsworth
- Gravetter, F. J., & Forzano, L. B. (2012). *Research Methods for the Behavioral Sciences (4th ed.)*. CA Wadsworth.
- Hammer, L. B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T. D. (1997). Work-family conflict in dual-earner couples: Within-individual and crossover effects of work and family. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 185-203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1557>
- Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2005). *Foundations of behavioral research (4th ed)*. Wadsworth/ Thomson Learning.
- Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A.(2009). Communication in intact families. In A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Handbook of family communications* (pp. 177-195). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Mustafa, H., Hasim., M. J. M., Aripin, N., & Hamid, H. A. (2012). Couple types, ethnicity, and marital satisfaction in Malaysia. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*.
- Nayak, J. K., & Singh, P. (2015). *Fundamentals of research methodology: Problems and prospects*. SSDN Publishers & Distributions. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309732183>
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric theory (3rd ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
- Ogletree, S. M. (2015). Gender role attitudes and expectations for marriage. *Journal of Research on Women and Gender*, 5, 71-82.
- Olson, D. H., DeFrain, J., & Skogrand, L. (2011). *Marriage and families: Intimacy, diversity, and strengths (7th ed)*. McGraw-Hill.
- Piotrkowski, C. S., Rapoport, R. N., & Rapoport, R. (1987). Families and work. In M. B. Sussman & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family* (pp. 251-284). Plenum Press.
- Powell, D., & Fine, M. A. (2009). Relationship dissolutions, causes. In H. T. Reis & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human relationships* (pp 436-446). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412958479.n331>.
- Quek, K. M., & Fitzpatrick, J. (2013). Cultural values, self-disclosure, and conflict tactics as predictors of marital satisfaction among singaporean husband and wives. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 21(2), 208-216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480712466822>.
- Ramu, G. N. (1989). *Women, work, and marriage in urban India: A study of dual- and single-earner couples*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Richardson-Bouie, D. (2003). Ethnic variation/ ethnicity. In, J. J. Ponzetti, Jr (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of marriage and family: Vol 2 (2nd ed.)* (pp.523-529). Macmillan Reference USA.
- Ruppanner, L. (2015). Working couples: The dual-income family. In S. R. Quah (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of families in Asia* (pp. 261-274). Routledge.
- Patra, A., & Suar, D. (2009). Factors influencing happiness & satisfaction in single & dual-career families. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44(4), 672-686.
- Schulz, M. S., Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C., & Brennan, R. T. (2004). Coming home upset: Gender, marital satisfaction, and the daily spillover of workday experience into couple interactions. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18, 250-26. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.18.1.250>
- Shaver, P.R & Miklincer, M (2009). Attachment in Adulthood: Structure, Dynamics and Change. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 37, 179-180 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-009-0193-5>
- Steven,D., Kiger., G Riely, P.J (2001) Working hard and hardly working: DomesticLabor and Marital Satisfaction among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(2), 514-526.

- Sillars, A., Canary, D. J., & Tafoya, M. (2004). Communication, conflict, and the quality of family relationship. In A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Handbook of family communications* (pp.413-446). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Stanley, S., Amato, M., Johnson, C. A., & Markman, H. J. (2006). Premarital education, marital quality, and marital stability: Findings from a large, random household survey. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*(1), 117-126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.20.1.117>
- Tan, P., Steinbach, M., & Kumar, V. (2005). *Introduction to data mining (1st ed.)*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc.
- United Nations for Fund for Population Activities Indonesia. (2015). *Women and girls in indonesia: Progress and challenges*. UNFPA Indonesia Monograph Series(5).
- VanLear, A. C. (2009). Families, definitions and typologies. In H. T. Reis & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human relationships: Vol. 2* (pp. 600-604). Sage.
- VanLear, C. A., Koerner, A., & Allen, D. M. (2006). Relationship Typologies. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 91-110). Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511606632.007>
- Walliman, N. (2011). *Research Methods: The Basic*. Routledge.
- Wilkie, J. B., Ferree, M. M., & Ratcliff, K. S. (1998). Gender and fairness: Marital satisfaction in two-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 60*(3), 577-594. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353530>
- Yucel, D. (2017). Work-family balance and marital satisfaction: The mediating effects of mental and physical health. *Society and Mental Health, 7*(3), 175-195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869317713069>