# THE EFFECT OF RELIGIOSITY AND SOCIAL SUPPORT ON MARRIAGE READINESS IN THE YOUNG ADULT AGE GROUP

#### Nur Syifa Ramdani, Tin Herawati, Musthofa

Department of Family and Consumer Sciences, Faculty of Human Ecology, IPB University Dramaga Bogor, West Java Bogor 16680, Indonesia

\*)E-mail: syifaaramdani29@gmail.com

#### Abstract

Indonesia has experienced a decline in marriage rates in the last ten years. Religiosity and social support have an important role in preparing individuals for marriage. This study aims to analyze the influence of young adult characteristics, family characteristics, religiosity, social support, on marital readiness in the young adult age group. The research design used was a cross-sectional study with a quantitative approach. This study involved unmarried young adults aged 21 to 30 years. Respondents in this study totaled 60. The research location was in the Central Bogor Sub-district, Bogor City, West Java. Nonprobability sampling was conducted using purposive sampling technique. The results of the t test obtained a significant difference between the religiosity of men and women. The correlation test shows that there is a significant positive relationship between respondents' age, number of families, religiosity, social support and marital readiness. The regression test results show that income, number of family members, and religiosity have a significant positive effect on marital readines.

Keywords: marital readiness, religiosity, social support, young adults

# PENGARUH RELIGIUSITAS DAN DUKUNGAN SOSIAL TERHADAP KESIAPAN MENIKAH PADA KELOMPOK USIA DEWASA MUDA

#### Abstrak

Indonesia telah mengalami penurunan angka pernikahan dalam sepuluh tahun terakhir. Religiusitas dan dukungan sosial memiliki peran penting dalam mempersiapkan individu untuk menikah. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh karakteristik dewasa muda, karakteristik keluarga, religiusitas, dukungan sosial, terhadap kesiapan menikah pada kelompok usia dewasa muda. Desain penelitian yang digunakan adalah studi cross-sectional dengan pendekatan kuantitatif. Penelitian ini melibatkan dewasa muda yang belum menikah dengan rentang usia 21 hingga 30 tahun. Responden dalam penelitian ini berjumlah 60 orang. Lokasi penelitian berada di Kecamatan Bogor Tengah, Kota Bogor, Jawa Barat. Pengambilan sampel dilakukan secara nonprobability sampling dengan teknik purposive sampling. Hasil uji t diperoleh perbedaan yang signifikan antara religiusitas laki-laki dan perempuan. Uji korelasi menunjukkan bahwa terdapat hubungan positif yang signifikan antara usia responden, jumlah keluarga, religiusitas, dukungan sosial dan kesiapan menikah. Hasil uji regresi menunjukkan bahwa pendapatan, jumlah anggota keluarga, dan religiusitas berpengaruh positif signifikan terhadap kesiapan menikah.

Kata kunci: dewasa muda, dukungan sosial, kesiapan menikah, religiusitas

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Indonesia has recently become one of the countries experiencing a decline in marriage rates. A report from the Central Bureau of Statistics (2022) data states that in the last 10 years there has been a decrease in the marriage rate by 2,8 percent. BPS data (2022) recorded that there were 1.742.049 marriages in 2021, while in 2020 there were 1.792.548 marriages. Based on this data, the marriage rate has decreased by 50.499. According to Ningtias (2022) the decline in the marriage rate in Indonesia is due to various changes in the way young people, both men and women, think in terms of career, success, education, and the large number of divorce cases. In addition, the decline in marriage in Indonesia is indirectly a factor in the population growth rate, which is the fourth most populous country in the world (Ningtias, 2022).

BPS data (2022) reports that the age of first marriage for young Indonesians is 22-24 years old for men and 19-21 years old for women. These ages fall into the young adult category. According to Duffy and Atwater (2005), one of the main tasks in young adulthood is to build a marriage and form a family of their own. Therefore, there is a need for readiness before marriage. Sari and Sunarti (2013) explain the differences in marriage readiness factors between men and women. Role readiness that needs to be prepared by women and financial readiness by men. Marriage readiness is defined as the way individuals view themselves in carrying out the functions and roles of marriage Holman and Li (1997).

In addition to marriage readiness, the role of religion in preparing for marriage is an important factor in making the decision to marry (Sigalow et al., 2012). According to Keldal (2022) a high level of religiosity is related to feeling ready for family life and family roles, as well as readiness to take social responsibility. Fitriani and Handayani (2021) explain about religiosity which means how deep a person's knowledge, beliefs, application of worship and rules and appreciation of the religion they adhere to. Furthermore, there is social support which also has a big role in determining a person's readiness to make the decision to get married (Larson & Holman, 1994). Sarafino et al. (2006) states that social support refers to providing comfort to others and caring for or valuing them. Social support is in the form of encouragement or assistance to individuals obtained from other people or the environment.

In research conducted by Fitriani and Handayani (2021), it is explained that there is a significant positive relationship between religiosity and readiness to marry. Non-religious families, weak religious observance, and families where there is no obligation to religion have problems that can lead to divorce (Hawari, 2006). Meanwhile, marriage readiness can be seen from how much social support is provided from the surrounding environment. This is supported by research by Larson and Holman (1994) which states that social support has a major influence on marriage readiness. This study suspects a relationship between religiosity and social support. Robins and Fiske (2009) explain that religiosity is related to social support through religious community participation, values, and religious teachings that encourage social support and psychological support provided through religious beliefs and practices. Social support is also related to religiosity through strengthening religious identity, inspiration, and motivation in carrying out worship practices (Wardoyo and Aditya, 2021). However, no previous research has examined the relationship between religiosity, social support and marriage readiness in the young adult age group. Based on the above problems, this study aims to analyze the effect of religiosity and social support on marriage readiness in young adults.

### **METHODS**

This research design is a cross-sectional study, which is data collected at one time and there is no continuity. This research was conducted in the Central Bogor Sub-district area of Bogor City. Sampling in the study used non-probability sampling method with purposive sampling technique. The population used in the study is young adults aged 21-30 years with the criteria that respondents live in Central Bogor District and are not married. Respondents in this study total 60 people. The data collection technique was carried out offline in March-April 2023. This research uses primary data. Primary data include young adult characteristics (age, gender, and education level), family characteristics (parents' age, per capita income, parents' marital status, and number of family members), religiosity, social support, and marriage readiness. Primary data were obtained using a questionnaire that was self-administered offline.

Religiosity in the operational definition means belief in God with commitment and following everything that has been believed and determined. The religiosity instrument was measured using The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS) developed by Huber and Huber (2012) and modified by the researcher with 5 dimensions, namely intellect, ideology, public practice, private practice, and experience. The questionnaire consisted of 15 questions with 3 questions for each dimension. Each question used a 1-4 answer scale (1= never; 2= sometimes; 3= often; 4= always) with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0,746.

Social support is help or encouragement obtained from people around young adults. The social support instrument was measured using an instrument developed by Zimet et al. (1998), namely MSPSS (Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support) and modified by researchers with a total of 12 questions with a 4-point Likert scale. This instrument has a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0,879. Each question uses a 1-5 response scale (1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= agree; 4= strongly agree). This variable includes group factors that are sources of support, namely family, friends, and significant others.

Marriage readiness refers to how individuals prepare for family life through age readiness, physical readiness, financial readiness, moral readiness, moral readiness, social readiness, intellectual readiness, interpersonal readiness, and life skills. Marriage readiness is measured using an instrument from

BKKBN (2018) with a total of 50 questions. Each question uses a Guttman scale with the answer options "no" and "yes" with a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0,667.

Data were processed using Microsoft Office Excel 2016 and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 25. Descriptive analysis in this study was used to identify variables of young adult characteristics, family characteristics, religiosity, social support, and marriage readiness. Furthermore, a difference test was conducted on religiosity, social support, and marriage readiness based on 4 gender. Meanwhile, relationship analysis used the Pearson correlation test to determine the relationship between young adult characteristics, family characteristics, religiosity, social support, and marriage readiness. Regression analysis was used to analyze the influence of young adult characteristics, family characteristics, religiosity and social support on marriage readiness.

## RESULTS

### **Characteristics of Young Adults and Family Characteristics**

Respondents in this study were aged 21-30 years. The age of respondents is included in the young adult category. The average age of male respondents was 23,57 years and the average age of female respondents was 23.37 years. The average length of education for male respondents was 12.03 years and the average length of education for female respondents was 12,50 years. The average age distribution of respondents' fathers was 54,37 years and the average age of respondents' mothers was 50,53 years. Based on the Bogor City poverty line (2021), half of the respondent families (50%) were in the non-poor category with an average monthly per capita income of IDR786.085,32. Almost half of the respondents' families were in the small category (48,3%). The marital status of the respondents' parents (71,7%) is a complete family and the rest are from divorced families.

### Religiosity

The results show that religiosity with a total average index score of 79,81 is included in the moderate category. Male respondents have higher religiosity than female respondents. It is known that the average index score of male respondents of 82,37 is included in the high category, while female respondents have an average index score of 77,25 including in the medium category. The religiosity of male and female respondents in the ideology dimension, personal practice dimension, and experience dimension is included in the high category with an average index score above 80. The ideology dimension in the religiosity of male respondents shows that almost all respondents (96,7%) are included in the high category. The high religiosity of male respondents in this dimension is indicated by the high belief that god is something that deserves to be worshiped (100%), the belief in life after death (93,3%), and the belief that god has the highest power (96,7%).

Based on the results of research on the dimensions of public practice, men are higher when compared to women. The public practice dimension of male respondents has an average index score of 71,67 in the medium category, while the public practice dimension of female respondents has an average index score of 55 in the low category. It is shown that more than half of female respondents do not participate in religious activities (60%), while male respondents often participate in religious activities (40%), it is important to participate in religious activities (66,7%), and it is important to join religious communities (50%). The intellectual dimension, it is known that male respondents and female respondents have an average index score that is categorized as low, namely 52,5 and 56,67. Low intellectuality can be seen from the lack of thinking about religious issues (46.7%).

	Gender				<b>m</b> ( 1		
Category	Male		Female		Total		p-value
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Intellectual Religiosity							0,459
Low (<60)	18	60	16	53,3	34	56,6	
Medium (60-80)	9	30	9	30	18	30	
High (>80)	3	10	5	16,7	8	13,3	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum	0-100		25-100				
Mean ± Standard Deviation	52,5	± 22,60	56,67	± 20,69			
Ideological religiosity							0,013**

Iucological religiosity

		Ger	nder		Total		
Category	Male		F	emale	10141		p-value
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Low (<60)	0	0	1	3,3	1	1,6	
Medium (60-80)	1	3,3	8	26,7	9	15	
High (>80)	29	96,7	21	70	50	83,3	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum	7	5-100	12.	5-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	98,	3±5,42	89,16	$\pm 18,78$			
Public Practice Religiosity		,	,	,			0,004**
Low (<60)	8	26,7	16	53,3	24		,
Medium (60-80)	11	36,7	11	36,7	22		
High (>80)	11	36,7	3	10	14		
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		,5-100		5-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation		$7 \pm 21,50$		£ 20,91			
Personal Practice Religiosity	,	,		,			0,917
Low (<60)	2	6,7	1	3,3	3	5	-,
Medium (60-80)	6	20	6	20	12	20	
High (>80)	22	73,3	23	76,7	45	75	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		0-100		)-100	00	100	
Mean ± Standard Deviation		$\pm 16,24$		$\pm 14,68$			
Experience Religiosity	01,71	- 10,21	07,0	_ 11,00			0,106
Low (<60)	1	3,3	2	6,7	3	5	0,100
Medium (60-80)	6	20	9	30	15	25	
High (>80)	23	76,6	19	63,3	42	70	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		0-100		)-100	00	100	
Mean ± Standard Deviation		$\pm 14,18$		$\pm 17,10$			
Total Religiosity	20,11	1,10	00,70	_ 17,10			0,053*
Low (<60)	0	0	2	6,7	2	3,3	0,055
			17		31		
Medium (60-80) Uration ( $> 80$ )	14 16	46,7		56,7	31 27	51,6 45	
High (>80)		53,3	11	36,7			
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		,2-97,7		5-95,5			
Mean $\pm$ Standard Deviation		$7 \pm 10,03$	77,25	± 10,01			

<b>T</b> 11 1 <b>D</b> 1	<b>a a</b>				/ · ·
Table 1 Distribution	of examples	hased on	religiosity	dimensions	(continue)
	of examples	buseu on	rengiosity	unnensions	(commuc)

*Notes*: \*Significant at p<0,1; \*\*Significant at p<0,05

### **Social Support**

The results showed that social support was included in the moderate category with an average index score of 68,47. Based on gender, the results of research on men and women have an average index score included in the moderate category, namely 70,09 and 66,85. Social support in male respondents shows that the social support dimensions of family, friends, and significant others are included in the moderate category. Social support in female respondents shows that the family social support dimension and the significant other social support dimension are included in the moderate category with an average index score of 70 and 72,7. However, the social support dimension of friends on female respondents was in the low category with an average index score of 57,7. This can be seen from half of the respondents disagreeing to rely on friends when problems occur (50%).

	Gender				<b>m</b> ( 1		
Category	Male		F	emale	- Total		p-value
	n	%	n	%	n	%	_
Family Social Support							0,104
Low (<60)	5	16,7	9	30	14	23,3	
Medium (60-80)	9	30	12	40	21	35	
High (>80)	16	53,3	9	30	25	41,6	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum	2	5-100	25	5-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	78,3	± 18,25	70 ±	± 20,71			
Friends Social Support							0,537
Low (<60)	12	40	16	53,3	28	46,6	
Medium (60-80)	9	30	9	30	18	30	
High (>80)	9	30	5	16,7	14	23,3	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum	C	-100	0	-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	61,94	1 ± 27,30	57,7	± 24,65			
Significant Others							0,669
Low (<60)	7	23,3	9	30	16	26,6	
Medium (60-80)	12	40	9	30	21	35	
High (>80)	11	36,7	12	40	23	38,3	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum	C	-100	16,	6-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	70 :	± 25,67	72,7	± 24,46			
Total Social Support							0,447
Low (<60)	6	20	9	30	15	25	
Medium (60-80)	14	46,7	13	43,3	27	45	
High (>80)	10	33,3	8	26,7	18	30	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum	27	,7-94,4	27,	,7-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation		$9 \pm 16,58$	66,85	± 18,42			

Table 2 Distribution of examples based on social support dimensions

### **Marriage Readiness**

Overall, the largest proportion of marriage readiness falls into the ready category (65%) with an average index score of 82,23. This means that 65 percent of respondents are ready to get married. Based on gender, 63,3 percent of male respondents were in the ready category and 36,7 percent were categorized as not ready. The readiness to marry for male respondents has an average index score of 82,73. This means that male respondents are in the category of being ready to get married. Readiness to get married in female respondents as many as 66,7 percent of respondents were in the ready category, while 33,3 percent were categorized as not ready. Female respondents have an average index score of 81,73. This means that female respondents are also ready to get married. The results of the research on each dimension show that male and female respondents are not ready for the dimension of financial readiness. It can be seen that more than half of the respondents do not have a regular income (55%).

	1311104110	n of exampl		maina	Be reau		
Catagory	Gender		Total				
Category	<u> </u>	Male %	<u> </u>	emale %	n	%	p-value
Age Readiness	Ш	/0	11	/0	n	/0	
Not Ready (<80)	0	0	0	0			
Ready (60-80)	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum	00	100	50	100	00	100	
Mean ± Standard Deviation	1	$00 \pm 0$	1(	$100 \pm 0$			
Physical Readiness		00 2 0					0,111
Not Ready (<80)	10	33,3	15	50	25	41,6	0,111
Ready (60-80)	20	66,7	15	50	35	58,3	
Fotal	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Ainimum-Maximum		75-100		0-100	00	100	
Mean $\pm$ Standard Deviation		$7 \pm 11,98$		$3 \pm 15,65$			
Financial Readiness	/1,0	<i>i</i> / <u>±</u> 11,70	00,01	$5 \pm 10,00$			0,454
Not Ready (<80)	18	60	19	63,3		61,6	0,404
Ready (60-80)	13	40	19	36,7	23	38,3	
Total	30	100	30	100	23 60	100	
Ainimum-Maximum		0-100		)-100	00	100	
Mean $\pm$ Standard Deviation		$57 \pm 40,96$		$3 \pm 44,49$			
Mental Readiness	50,0		40,5	/ _ ++,+/			0,149
Not Ready (<80)	3	10	6	20	9	15	0,149
Ready (60-80)	27	10 90	24	20 80	51	85	
Fotal	30	90 100	24 30	80 100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		2,2-100		22-100	00	100	
Mean $\pm$ Standard Deviation		,					
Emotional Readiness	92,2	$40 \pm 8,18$	09,2	$5 \pm 8,49$			0,627
	9	20	6	20	15	25	0,027
Not Ready (<80)		30 70	6	20	15	25 75	
Ready (60-80)	21	70	24	80	45	75	
Fotal	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		8,3-100		,3-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	63,2	$27 \pm 11,92$	05,0	± 10,01			0.075*
Social Readiness	7	<b>1</b> 2 2	10	40	10	21 6	0,075*
Not Ready (<80)	7	23,3	12	40	19	31,6	
Ready (60-80)	23	76,7	18	60 100	41	68,3	
Fotal Maximum Maximum	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		40-100		0-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	91,6	7 ± 12,61	86,3	3 ± 9,99			0.209
Moral Readiness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,398
Not Ready (<80)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ready (60-80)	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		5-100		5-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	98,33	$5 \pm 4,32$	99,16	± 3,17			0.270
nterpersonal Readiness	1	2.2	•		2	-	0,379
Not Ready (<80)	1	3,3	2	6,7	3	5	
Ready (60-80)	29	96,7	28	93,3	57	95 100	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		6-100		5-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	94,99	9 ± 8,91	92,7 <del>1</del>	: 10,43			
Life Skills							0,021**
Not Ready (<80)	10	33,3	3	10	13	21,6	
Ready (60-80)	20	66,7	27	90	47	78,3	
Fotal	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum		-100		8-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	84,16	$\pm 14,57$	92,2 ±	: 11,56			
Intellectual Readiness							0,432

Table 3 Distribution of examples based on marriage readiness

		Gender			– Total		p-value
Category	Male		Female				
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Not Ready (<80)	7	23,3	7	23,3	14	23,3	
Ready (60-80)	23	76,7	23	76,7	46	76,6	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum	50	)-100	37,	5-100			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	85,83	$\pm 15,30$	89,16	±17,28			
Marriage Readiness Total							0,658
Not Ready (<80)	11	36,7	10	33,3	21	35	
Ready (60-80)	19	63,3	20	66,7	39	65	
Total	30	100	30	100	60	100	
Minimum-Maximum	6-	4-96	60	)-94			
Mean ± Standard Deviation	82,73	$3 \pm 8,60$	81,73	$\pm 8,78$			

Table 2 Distribution	of avamplas	hazad on	manniaga	roodinooo	(aantinua)
Table 3 Distribution	of examples	Dascu on	mannage	Icaumess (	(commue)

*Notes:* \*Significant at p<0,1; \*\*Significant at p<0,05,

#### Relationship between Young Adult Characteristics, Family Characteristics, Religiosity, Social Support, and Marriage Readiness

The results of the Pearson correlation test in Table 2 show that there is a significant negative relationship between respondent age and religiosity. This shows that the higher the age of the respondent will be associated with a decrease in religiosity. The number of family members is significantly positively related to religiosity and readiness to marry, which means that the more the number of family members, the better the religiosity and readiness to marry. Parents' marital status is significantly positively related to religiosity. This can be interpreted that the better the parents' marital status will be related to religiosity. Religiosity is significantly positively related to social support and religiosity is significantly positively related to readiness to marry, which means that the better the religiosity, the better the social support felt and the better the religiosity, the more ready to get married. Social support is significantly positively related to readiness to get married, the better the social support, the more ready to get married.

Table 4. Relationship between young adult characteristics, family characteristics, religiosity, social support, and marriage readiness

Variables	Religiosity	Social Support	Merriage Readiness
Age of respondent	-0,285*	-0,010	0,116
Gender of respondent	-0,251	-0,094	-0,058
Length of responden's education	-0,069	0,069	0,009
Father's age	-0,097	-0,110	0,088
Mother's age	-0,102	-0,138	-0,011
Income per capita	-0,061	0,039	0,201
Number of family members	0,305*	0,051	0,285*
Marital status of parents	0,263*	0,244	0,190
Religiosity	1	0,324*	0,440**
Social support	0,342*	1	0,273*
Marriage readiness	0,440**	0,273*	1

*Notes:* \*significant at p<0,05; \*\*significant at p<0,01

#### The Influence of Young Adult Characteristics, Family Characteristics, Religiosity, Social Support, on **Marriage Readiness**

The results of the linear regression test of the variables model on marriage readiness in Table 3 show an Adjusted R Square number of 0,253. The model shows that 25,3 percent of the model variables affect marriage readiness and 74,7 percent are influenced by other variables outside of the study. The results showed that income per capita ( $\beta = 0.375$ ; p = 0.027) has a significant influence on readiness to marry. This shows that every one hundred thousand increase in per capita income will increase readiness to marry by 3.856E-6 points. The number of family members ( $\beta = 0.294$ ; p = 0.061) has a significant positive effect on marriage readiness. This shows that every one unit increase in the number of family members will increase readiness to marry by 1.558 points. The results also show that religiosity ( $\beta = 0.345$ ; p = 0.050) has a significant positive

effect on marriage readiness. This shows that every one unit increase in religiosity will increase readiness to marry by 0,270 points.

Table 5 Influence of young adult	characteristics, fam	ily characteristics,	religiosity, so	ocial support, and
readiness to marry				

Variables	Unstandardized coefficient	Standardized coefficient	Sig.
	В	β	5
(Constant)	31,281		0,088
Characteristics of young adults			
Age of respondent	0,680	0,223	0,144
Gender	-1,633	-0,102	0,480
Length of education	-0,462	-0,104	0,505
Father's age	0.143	0,134	0,558
Mother's age	-0.052	-0,043	0,842
Income per capita	3,856E-6	0,375	0,025**
Number of family members	1,558	0,294	0,052*
Religiosity	0,270	0,345	0,050*
Social support	0,079	0,160	0,270
F test			2,525
Sig			0,021 <sup>b</sup>
R Square			0,419
Adjusted R Square			0,253
Notes: *Significant at p<0.1. **Significant at	n<0.05		

*Notes:* \*Significant at p<0,1; \*\*Significant at p<0,05

### DISCUSSION

Young adulthood is a transitional period from adolescence to adulthood. According to Hurlock (1980) the young adult period starts from the age of 18 to 40 years. During this period a person has several developmental tasks including running a career, finding a partner, building a family, caring for children, managing a household, being involved in society, and sharing benefits with social groups (Mariyati and Rezania, 2021). The average respondent completes 12 years of education or is equivalent to the Senior High School (SMA) level. According to Sari and Sunarti (2013), high education in women can open up opportunities to pursue careers before marriage, while in men it is an opportunity to get a good job and accelerate financial readiness. The age of the father and mother in the respondent's family is in the middle adulthood category. This age ranges from 40 to 60 years (Hurlock, 1980). Most of the respondents' families' per capita income level was categorized as non-poor with an average monthly per capita income of IDR786.082,32. The marital status of the respondents' parents was mostly from complete families. According to Segrin and Taylor (2006), a child from a complete family is more committed to marriage.

Religiosity means how deep a person's knowledge, beliefs, application of worship, and rules and appreciation of the religion they adhere to (Fitriani & Handayani, 2021). This study shows a difference in results between male and female religiosity. Male religiosity is high. This shows that men have high trust and commitment to God, while women's religiosity is in the medium category. This can mean that the level of piety in women has not been achieved optimally. In line with Ahmad (2020) states that religiosity is the level of individual piety to practice their religion as a belief with a form of commitment based on knowledge, beliefs, practices, feelings, and consequences. According to Siroj et al. (2019) men have higher religiosity than women. The high religiosity of men in the study can also be seen from the dimension of public practice. Men often participate in religious activities and join religious communities. This is in line with Hackett et al. (2016) Muslim men attend religious events more often than Muslim women.

Social support is encouragement or assistance obtained by individuals from other people or the environment. Puspitawati (2012) explains that social support is obtained by individuals from friends, friends, family, spouses, children, and communities in the neighborhood. Overall, the social support of men and women is in the moderate category, both from family social support, friend social support, and significant other social support. However, women's social support in the friend dimension was categorized as low. Low social support can be seen from some women who rely on friends when problems occur. The results of the study are not in line with Dennis et al. (2005) states that support from friends has a stronger role in students in social adjustment than family support.

Marriage readiness is the way individuals view themselves to carry out the functions and roles of marriage (Holman & Li, 1997). The results showed that in general, young adults' readiness to marry was in the ready category. This is in line with research conducted by the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (2018) which states that marriage readiness in Indonesia has increased with the high public awareness of the importance of marriage preparation and better access to information such as social media and the internet. According to Carroll et al. (2009) explain that marriage readiness is a process of developing 9 interpersonal skills, gaining the capacity to care for others, and carrying out lifelong commitments. However, most of the readiness to marry in the financial readiness dimension is categorized as not ready. This means that they do not yet have a fixed income and are independent in financial terms. Sari et al. (2016) explain that financial readiness is very influential on marital satisfaction in the long term which can affect economic stability for the physical and mental sustainability of family members later.

The results of the correlation test on young adult characteristics found that age is significantly negatively related to religiosity. This means that the higher the age, the lower the religiosity. In line with research by Hood et al. (2014) which states that individuals in young adulthood are said to tend to be less religious when compared to older adults. Novianty and Garey (2021) concluded that the decline in young adult religiosity is related to individuals who begin to have a personal approach in exploring religion, a lack of confidence in religious institutions, an increasingly secular social environment, moving from the city of residence to a new place and increasing focus on other activities.

Family characteristics found a significant positive relationship between the number of family members and religiosity. Aqsho (2017) explained that the interaction between parents in the family, attention, and togetherness in the family provide good religious practice. In addition, the results showed a significant positive relationship between the number of members and readiness to marry. In line with the findings of Sari and Sunarti (2013) that the number of family members affects marriage readiness. A large family has a strong influence on one's marriage readiness with support and assistance in marriage (Kusumawati, 2018). However, Santrock (2016) states that family size can have a positive relationship with religiosity. This means that individuals who come from complete families have good religiosity. Family has a role in shaping a person's religiosity which is very influential for future life, especially parents as the first means for children to receive socialization (Dachrud & Yusra, 2018).

The results showed that religiosity was significantly positively related to social support. The higher the individual's religiosity, the better the social support obtained. Maurizka and Maryatmi (2019) state that positive social support provides trust and good self-adjustment so that this can increase high confidence in practicing the teachings of their religion. Religiosity is also significantly positively related to marriage readiness. In line with Fitriani and Handayani (2021), it is explained that there is a significant positive relationship between religiosity and readiness to marry. Sigalow et al. (2012) state that the level of religiosity influences a person's decision in choosing a career or job and this level of religiosity affects marriage decision making. Based on the results of social support, it is significantly positively related to marriage readiness. This is in line with Larson and Holman (1994), which states that social support has a big influence on marriage readiness. There are background factors, individual traits and attitudes, surrounding people or important people who can directly or indirectly influence how ready individuals are for marriage (Holman & Li, 1997).

The regression test in the study shows that per capita income has a significant effect on marriage readiness. In line with Sari and Sunarti (2012), it is stated that sufficient family financial conditions provide a sense of security in financial support by getting married. This means that individuals who have a good family income will be more ready to get married because of financial support from the family. In addition, the number of family members also affects marriage readiness. The greater the number of family members will affect a person's readiness to marry. Mambaya and Stang (2011) explain that the greater the number of family members, the greater the possibility of a younger age of marriage. In line with Amato and Booth (1991), large families affect marriage readiness based on the influence of social norms. It is explained that families that have social norms allow a person to marry at a young age, while in other families that have social norms are more flexible towards the age of marriage. The results also showed a significant positive effect between religiosity on readiness to marry. Keldal (2022) states that a high level of religiosity is strongly related to a great belief in the meaning of marriage and affects financial readiness, emotional readiness, and more interpersonal readiness. In line with Saputra and Agustina's research (2021) that religion has a very important role in making a marriage decision as the presence of religiosity that can lead humans to good and positive things. This research uses non-probability sampling techniques so that the results found cannot be generalized. In addition, this study only uses a quantitative approach so that the results in this study do not get more in-depth answers from respondents.

# **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION**

This study shows that the average age of respondents is 23 years old. The average length of education was twelve years or equivalent to high school graduation. The average age of the father and mother is in middle adulthood. The family's per capita income is above the poverty line at IDR786.085,32. The number of families is in the small category. Some families are married in their parents' marriage. The largest percentage of religiosity and social support is in the moderate category, while marriage readiness is in the ready category. The results of the t-test showed a significant difference in the religiosity of men and women. The correlation test results showed a significant positive relationship between sample age and religiosity. In addition, the results showed a significant positive relationship between the number of family members, parents' marrial status, religiosity, social support, and marriage readiness. Regression test results show that income per capita, number of family members, and religiosity have a significant positive effect on marriage readiness.

Based on the results of the study, the author provides several recommendations for young adults to attend pre-marital classes, webinars, and seminars on marriage in order to obtain information related to the science of marriage. Young adults, especially women, can participate in religious studies, be active in religious organizations, and other religious communities to increase 11 religiosity. Young adults also need to prepare themselves financially such as having a permanent job so that they can be independent in terms of finance to prepare for marriage finance.

### REFERENCES

- Ahmad, J. (2020). Religiosity, Reflection and Religious Subjectivity. Yogyakarta(ID): Deepublish.
- Amato, P. R., & Booth, A. (1991). Consequences of parental divorce and marital unhappiness for adult wellbeing. Social Forces, 69(3), 895-914. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/69.3.895
- Aqsho, M. (2017). Keharmonisan dalam keluarga dan pengaruhnya terhadap pengamalan agama. *Almufida: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Keislaman, 2*(1), 36-51. https://doi.org/10.46576/almufida.v2i1.83
- [BPS] Badan Pusat Statistik. (2022). Perkawinan dan perceraian menurut Provinsi 2019-2021. Retrieved from: https://www.bps.go.id/publication/2022/02/25/0a2afea4fab72a5d052cb315/ statistik-indonesia-2022.html.
- [BPS] Badan Pusat Statistik. (2022). Statistik Pemuda Indonesia 2022. Jakarta (ID): BPS.
- Carroll, J. S., Badger, S., Willoghby, B. J., Nelson, L. j., Madsen, S. D., McNamara, & Barry, C. (2009). Ready or not? Criteria for marriage readiness among emerging adults. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 24(3), 349-375. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558409334253
- Dachrud, M., & Yusra. Y. (2018). Pendidikan berbasis islam dan multikultural dalam keluarga sebagai pembentuk religiusitas. *Potret Pemikiran.* 22(2), https://doi.org/10.30984/pp.v22i2.782
- Dennis, J.M., Phinney, J.S., & Chuateco, L.I. (2005). The role of motivation, parental support, and peer support in the academic success of ethnic minority first-generation college students. *Journal of College Student Development.* 46(3), 223-236. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0023
- Duffy, K.G., & Atwater E. (2005). Psychology for living (8thth ed). New Jersey(US): Pearson Education.
- Duvall, E.R.M., & Miller, B.C. (1985). *Marriage and family development (9th ed)*. New York(US): Harper and Row Publishe.
- Fitriani, D.A., & Handayani, A. (2021). hubungan kematangan emosi dan religiusitas dengan kesiapan pernikahan pada mahasiswa Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Islam Sultan Agung Semarang. Prosiding Konstelasi Ilmiah Mahasiswa Unissula (KIMU) Klaster Humanoira.
- Ghalili, Z., Etemadi, O., Ahmadi, S., Fatehizadeh, M., & Abedi, M.R. (2012). Marriage readiness criteria among young adults of isfaham: a qualitative study. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business, 4*(4), 1076-1083.
- Hackett, C., Murphy, C., & Mc Clendon, D., (2016). *The Gender Gap in Religion around The World*. Washington DC(US): Pew Research Center.
- Hawari, D. (2006). Management of Stress, Anxiety, And Depression. Depok (ID): University of Indonesia.
- Holman, T.B., & Li, B.D., (1997). Premarital factors influencing perceived readiness for marriage. *Journal of Family Issues*, 18(2), 124-144. https://doi.org/10.1177/019251397018002002
- Hood, J.r., R.W., Hill, P. C., & Spilka, B. (2018). *The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Approach (5th Ed.).* NewYork(US): Guilford Press.
- Hurlock, E.B. (1980). Developmental Psychology an Approach Across The Life Span, 5th Edition. Jakarta(ID): Erlangga.
- Karim, K., & Yoenanto, N., H. (2021). Dukungan sosial dan religiusitas terhadap kecemasan masyarakat yang hidup sendiri di masa pandemi covid-19. Jurnal Psikologi, 17(2), 102-113. https://doi.org/10.24014/jp.v17i2.11034

- Keldal, G. (2022). Associations between religiosity and marital beliefs among emerging adults. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, *12*(65):248-261. https://doi.org/10.17066/tpdrd.1138281
- [KEMEN PPPA] Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak. (2018). Kesiapan Pernikahan di Indonesia. Jakarta(ID): KEMEN PPPA
- Kusumawati, A. (2018). Factors affecting marriage readiness in students of the Faculty of Psychology, University of X. Journal of Psychology, 15(1), 1-10.
- Larson, J.H, & Holman, T.B. (1994). Premarital predictors of marital quality and stability. *Family Relations*, 43(2), 228-237. https://doi.org/10.2307/585327
- Mambaya, E., & Stang, S. (2011). Faktor yang berhubungan dengan pernikahan dini di Desa Pangli Kecamatan Sesean Kabupaten Toraja Utara. *Jurnal Media Kesehatan Masyarakat Indonesia Universitas Hasanuddin*, 7(2), 105-110.
- Mariyati, L.I., & Rezania, V. (2021). Psikologi Perkembangan Manusia. Umsida Press, 1-145. https://doi.org/10.21070/2021/978-623-6292-34-1
- Maurizka, A., & Maryatmi, A.S. (2019). Hubungan Religiusitas Dan Dukungan Sosial Teman Sebaya Terhadap Kesejahteraan Psikologis Pada Remaja Pengguna Hijab Di Karang Taruna Masjid Al-amin Jakarta Selatan. *IKRA-ITH Humaniora: Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, *3*(3), 207-218.
- Saputra, A. N., & Agustina, T. (2021). Peran agama dalam menentukan keputusan pernikahan pada generasi milenial. *Familia: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga*, 2(1), 35-52. doi: 10.24239/familia.v2i1.24.
- Ningtias, I.S. (2022). Factors influencing the decline in marriage rates in Indonesia. *Journal of Registratie*. 4(2):87-98. https://doi.org/10.24239/familia.v2i1.24
- Novianty, A., & Garey, E. (2021). Memahami makna religiusitas/spiritualitas pada individu dewasa muda melalui photovoice. *Jurnal Psikologi Integratif, 8*(2), 61-79. https://doi.org/10.14421/jpsi.v8i2.2115
- Puspitawati, H. (2012). Gender dan Keluarga. Bogor(ID): IPB Press.
- Santrock, J. W. (2016). Life-Span Development. Jakarta (ID): Erlangga
- Robins, A.L., & Fiske, A.P. (2009). Explaining the relation between religiousness and reduced suicidal behavior: Social support rather than specific beliefs. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 39(4), 386-395. https://doi.org/10.1521/suli.2009.39.4.386
- Sarafino, E. P., & Graham, J. A. (2006. Development and psychometric evaluation of an instrument to assess reinforcer preferences: The preferred items and experiences questionnaire. *Behavior modification*, 30(6), 835-847. https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445506291393
- Sari, F., & Sunarti, E. (2013). Kesiapan menikah pada dewasa muda dan pengaruhnya terhadap usia menikah. Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga & Konsumen, 6(3):143-153. https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2013.6.3.143.
- Sari, Y., Khasanah, A.N., & Sartika, S. (2016). Kajian kesiapan menikah pada remaja muslim dewasa. Prosiding SNaPP: Kesehatan (Kedokteran, Kebidanan, Keperawatan, Farmasi, Psikologi), 2(1), 193-204.
- Segrin, C., & Taylor, M. (2006). A social cognitive analysis of the effects of parental divorce on premarital couples' communication skills. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 46(1-2), 57-83. https://doi.org/10.1300/J087v46n01\_04
- Sigalow, E., Shain, M., & Bergey, M.R. (2012). Religion and decisions about marriage, residence, occupation, and children. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 51(2), 304-323. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2012.01641.x
- Siroj, E. Y., Sunarti, E., & Krisnatuti, D. (2019). Keberfungsian agama di keluarga, ancaman, interaksi teman sebaya, dan religiusitas remaja. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga & Konsumen, 12*(1), 13-25. https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2019.12.1.1
- Wardoyo, J. T., & Aditya, Y. (2021). Religiusitas versus dukungan sosial: manakah yang lebih berkontribusi bagi well-being mahasiswa?. Jurnal Studi Pemuda, 10(2), 163-174. https://doi.org/10.22146/studipemudaugm.73873