Journal of Family Sciences Vol 11, No 1
June 2026, p: 148-167, e-ISSN: 2460-2329 DOI: https://doi.org/10.29244/jfs.v11i1.72429

When Resilience Does Not Protect: Work–Family Conflict and Marital Satisfaction Among Indonesian Fathers

Bagas Rahmatullah[1*)], Adhi Anggra Kusuma Putra[1]
[1]Berbagi Cerita Indonesia, Kota Jakarta Selatan, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta, 12210, Indonesia

*) Corresponding author: bagas.rahmatullah@berbagicerita.id

Abstract

Rapid economic shifts in Indonesia force working fathers to navigate competing demands between traditional provider expectations and family involvement, yet their coping mechanisms remain under-researched. This study investigates how psychological resilience moderates the effects of work–family conflict (WFC) and perceived social support on marital satisfaction among Indonesian fathers. Data from married, employed fathers were collected through a quantitative cross-sectional design and analyzed using multiple regression. Surprisingly, WFC did not significantly predict marital satisfaction, nor did resilience buffer this relationship, indicating that resilience alone fails to shield fathers from work-family strain. Instead, marital satisfaction was heavily driven by perceived social support. More importantly, a significant interaction emerged between social support and resilience, revealing that the positive impact of social resources is strongly amplified for fathers with higher resilience. These findings suggest that while resilience does not directly protect fathers from role strain, it enables them to better capitalize on available social support to sustain marital well-being. Interventions should therefore focus on expanding accessible social support systems rather than generic resilience-building.

Keywords: Indonesian fathers, marital satisfaction, protective factors, psychological resilience, work–family conflict

Abstrak

Pergeseran ekonomi yang pesat di Indonesia memaksa para ayah bekerja untuk menyelaraskan tuntutan ekspektasi tradisional sebagai pencari nafkah dan keterlibatan keluarga, namun mekanisme koping mereka masih jarang diteliti. Penelitian ini menguji bagaimana resiliensi psikologis memoderasi pengaruh *work–family conflict* (WFC) dan persepsi dukungan sosial terhadap kepuasan pernikahan pada ayah di Indonesia. Data dari para ayah bekerja yang telah menikah dikumpulkan melalui desain kuantitatif lintas seksional dan dianalisis menggunakan regresi berganda. Menariknya, WFC tidak memprediksi kepuasan pernikahan secara signifikan, dan resiliensi juga tidak terbukti memoderasi hubungan tersebut. Hal ini mengindikasikan bahwa resiliensi semata tidak mampu melindungi paraayah dari tekanan konflik peran. Sebaliknya, kepuasan pernikahan didorong kuat oleh persepsi dukungan sosial. Yang terpenting, ditemukan efek interaksi yang signifikan antara dukungan sosial dan resiliensi, dampak positif sumber daya sosial teramplifikasi secara kuat pada ayah dengan tingkat resiliensi lebih tinggi. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa meskipun resiliensi tidak melindungi ayah secara langsung dari tekanan peran, kapasitas ini membuat mereka lebih mampu memanfaatkan dukungan sosial demi menjaga kesejahteraan pernikahan. Oleh karena itu, intervensi sebaiknya berfokus pada perluasan sistem dukungan sosial dibanding pelatihan resiliensi umum.

Kata kunci: ayah Indonesia, kepuasan pernikahan, faktor pelindung, resiliensi psikologi, konflik kerja-keluarga

Article history
Received: April 2, 2026
Received in Revised:
April 19, 2026
May 11, 2026
June 14, 2026
June 25, 2026
Accepted: June 30, 2026

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s).
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Introduction

The phenomenon of working fathers in Indonesia currently involves a dual-role challenge, navigating the tension between the traditional role as the primary breadwinner and the modern expectation of involved fatherhood. This imbalance often triggers Work–Family Conflict (WFC), which has been consistently identified as a negative determinant of family well-being and overall quality of life, research within the Indonesian context demonstrates that conflict between work and family roles is one of the primary factors capable of significantly diminishing the quality of family life (Ramadhanti et al., 2022). This is further supported by data from the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS, 2025b), which indicates that the male Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR) in Indonesia has reached 84.40%, signifying a male dominance within formal economic labor.

This study acknowledges the concerning rates of divorce in Indonesia, with a significant proportion attributed to ongoing disputes, underscoring the urgent need for research into factors that can bolster marital stability in this context (Surijah et al., 2021). Based on data from the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS, 2025a), divorce rates in Indonesia reached a total of 438.163 cases, comprising 91.652 instances of divorce by application and 346.516 instances of divorce by petition. These figures underscore that poorly managed conflict poses a significant threat to domestic stability in Indonesia. Consequently, this investigation extends existing theoretical frameworks by examining how the "spillover" and "crossover" theories, often applied in Western contexts, manifest within the Indonesian familial and professional spheres (Juniarly et al., 2020).

In Indonesia, this challenge is further complicated by cultural demands on fathers to fulfill dual roles as both economic breadwinner and household leader. This traditional role structure not only has the potential to increase the intensity of WFC but also determines how social support is interpreted and utilized (Prahara et al., 2023). Marital satisfaction is an emotional state representing an individual's subjective evaluation of their marital relationship as a whole, which encompasses aspects of satisfaction, attachment, and investment in the relationship (Hendrick, 1988). Unfortunately, existing academic discourse tends to neglect local cultural uniqueness, such as ethnicity-based parenting practices, which shape family interactions and fathers' participation in parenting (Parung & Ferreira, 2017).

This research's conceptual framework focuses on the interaction between work stressors and family outcomes, with WFC positioned as a key negative determinant. WFC is defined as a form of interrole conflict in which role demands, pressures, and fulfillment of responsibilities in the work domain directly interfere with or hinder the implementation of responsibilities in the family domain (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). In this context, professional role pressures directly erode marital satisfaction by disrupting domestic harmony. Conversely, perceived social support acts as a crucial external resource that acts as a buffering mechanism, strengthening fathers' capacity to maintain relationship quality amidst work pressures (Trikanti et al., 2025; Zahra & Mahestu, 2021). Perceived social support is defined as the extent to which individuals feel the adequacy and availability of external support sourced from three main domains, namely

family, friends, and those closest to them, in helping them face the dynamics of life (Zimet et al., 1988). For married couples in Indonesia, positive interactions and reciprocal emotional support are fundamental to marital satisfaction and subjective family well-being (Martinea & Sunarti, 2019). This aligns with findings showing that marital quality is significantly influenced by how couples interact and manage expectations within the household (Rosiana et al., 2022)

The role of psychological resilience as an internal moderator remains a subject of dynamic theoretical debate. Psychological resilience is defined as a dynamic process in which individuals demonstrate positive psychological adaptation even though they are experiencing or are faced with significant life difficulties (Luthar et al., 2000). On the one hand, traditional frameworks position resilience as a buffering capacity expected to strengthen individuals' ability to utilize social support and mitigate the adverse impacts of WFC (Lestari et al., 2023; Mardliyah et al., 2025).

This research is based on Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory, which states that individuals have a fundamental drive to acquire and protect resources for psychological well-being (Hobfoll, 1989). Domestically, marital satisfaction is a crucial "condition resource" for fathers. However, WFC often catalyzes resource depletion, as professional pressures drain the emotional energy and time needed to maintain quality relationships (Ramadhanti et al., 2022). To cope with these stressors, fathers mobilize external resources in the form of social support and internal resources in the form of psychological resilience. According to COR principles, when the intensive resources investment is not replenished by environmental resources, such as perceived social support, individuals become highly susceptible to a "resource loss spiral" (Holmgreen et al., 2001). In chronic conflict scenarios, the unmitigated depletion of internal coping reservoirs without external renewal accelerates severe psychological burnout and resource deficits (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999).

Focusing on an individual level of analysis, this study examines how a father's subjective psychological landscape and internal resources account for variations in his marital evaluation. By doing so, these findings are expected to provide an empirical foundation for developing targeted family interventions and workplace policies aimed at sustaining marital well-being among working individuals in Indonesia. Driven by the integration of the aforementioned theoretical frameworks, four central hypotheses are proposed. First, work–family conflict (WFC) is hypothesized to significantly and negatively predict marital satisfaction among Indonesian fathers. Conversely, perceived social support is expected to serve as a vital environmental resource that significantly and positively predicts their marital satisfaction. Beyond these direct effects, this investigation considers the conditional role of internal adaptive capacities. Specifically, the third hypothesis posits that psychological resilience significantly moderates the relationship between WFC and marital satisfaction. Finally, it is hypothesized that psychological resilience also functions as a significant moderator in the relationship between perceived social support and marital satisfaction within this population.

Methods

Participants

This study employed a quantitative approach with a correlational design and moderation analysis. This design was chosen to examine the relationship between Work-Family Conflict (WFC) and perceived social support on marital satisfaction, and to identify whether psychological resilience acts as a significant internal moderator within these dynamics. This approach was deemed appropriate given the psychological nature of the variables studied and the inability to manipulate them experimentally. Rather than conducting an intervention, this study focused on observing the phenomenon as it exists within the social and family contexts of fathers in Indonesia. Data collection was carried out digitally over a five-month period, spanning from November 2025 to March 2026, targeting respondents across various regions in Indonesia.

Participants in this study were fathers in Indonesia who met specific criteria related to their dual roles in the work and family spheres. From a total of 302 responses collected in the initial stage, a data cleaning process was conducted, resulting in a final sample of 246 participants. A purposive sampling technique was applied, assuming that individuals who are married, have children, and are actively working are the most representative subjects in experiencing the dynamics of role interactions that are the focus of this study. The web-based survey platform (Google Forms) was distributed through a multi-channelled online outreach strategy, including major social media platforms such as Instagram, localized fatherhood and parenting communities, as well as personal professional networks. To maintain strict methodological control, automated screening questions based on the inclusion criteria were embedded at the absolute entry point of the online survey, filtering out ineligible respondents before they could access the psychometric instruments.

Inclusion criteria defined participants as men aged at least 25 years. This age threshold was chosen because data from the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) shows that the majority of young people in Indonesia marry between the ages of 19-24 (Indonesia Baik, 2023). By setting the minimum age at 25, this study ensured that participants had passed the early stages of marriage and were more likely to experience the demands of full-time work and parenthood simultaneously, making them highly representative of the role dynamics being studied. Other criteria for participants include being legally married and living with their wives, having at least one child (either living with them or as a dependent), and working full-time in the formal or informal sector. Exclusion criteria apply to men who are divorced or separated, have no children, and do not have a permanent job or only work part-time. To avoid ambiguity, "full-time work" in this study refers to spending at least 35 to 40 hours per week on professional or business duties. This baseline allowed us to include both permanent and contract employees, as long as their contract required full-time hours and provided a regular, predictable income while this research was ongoing. We also included self-employed fathers under the full-time category, provided their business served as their primary, daily livelihood and met the same weekly hours. This ensured they genuinely experienced the day-to-day friction between work and family boundaries that we aimed to investigate. Consequently, we excluded men who were divorced, separated, childless,

or lacked a stable primary income-such as those who were unemployed, underemployed, or working strictly on a casual, part-time basis of less than 35 hours a week.

Because inquiries into work-family strain and marital evaluation inevitably probe highly sensitive and private domains of personal life, strict ethical protocols were maintained throughout the execution of the study. Prior to accessing any psychological scales, all prospective respondents were required to read and authorize a digital informed consent document. This interface delineated the overarching goals of the research, reinforced the completely voluntary nature of their involvement, and explicitly stated their prerogative to abandon the survey at any point without institutional or personal penalty. Furthermore, to address the risk of social desirability bias-a critical consideration highlighted during the institutional review process for sensitive domestic research- the consent protocol provided ironclad guarantees of absolute anonymity and data confidentiality. Participants were explicitly reassured that their individual inputs would be de-identified and analyzed collectively for academic reporting. The overarching research protocol underwent formal review and was granted ethical clearance by the Ethics Committee of the Konsorsium Psikologi Ilmiah Nusantara (KPIN), which approved the study under a controlled-risk designation.

Measurement

This study employs four instruments to measure related variables. Work-Family Conflict (WFC) is defined as a form of inter-role conflict in which pressures from work and family domain conflict in certain aspects (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The WFC variable was measured using the WFC subscale of the Work-Family Conflict Scale (WFCS) developed by Haslam et al. (2014). This instrument consists of 5 statements rated on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). This original scale demonstrated excellent reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.92 (Haslam et al., 2014). Higher scores represent a more severe level of role conflict experienced by the individual. The actual reliability coefficient obtained from our current sample of Indonesian fathers was 0.909. Higher scores on this scale represent a more severe level of role conflict experienced by the individual.

Perceived social support in this study refers to the theoretical framework of Zimet et al. (1988), which emphasizes the extent to which individuals feel emotionally and practically supported by important figures in their lives. This variable was measured using the Indonesian adaptation of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS; Zimet et al., 1988) by Sulistiani et al. (2022). This scale consists of 12 items covering three main sources of support: family, friends, and significant others. Assessments were made using a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree), with higher scores reflecting stronger perceptions of social support. Consistently, this instrument demonstrated excellent reliability with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of approximately 0.90. The actual internal consistency score for this instrument within our sample was 0.725, with higher scores reflecting stronger perceptions of social support.

Marital satisfaction in this study refers to the framework of Roach et al. (1981), which is defined as marital satisfaction with subjective attitudes on a continuum

extending from very satisfied to very dissatisfied. Measurement of this variable was conducted using the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMSS; Schumm et al., 1986) Indonesian adaptation version by Sari et al. (2025). This instrument consists of three statements with a 7-point Likert Scale, ranging from 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 7 (very Satisfied). Higher scores indicate a higher level of marital satisfaction, with a consistent reliability Cronbach's alpha coefficient of approximately 0.90, whereas the actual alpha reliability calculated from our data was 0.696.

Finally, the resilience variable was measured using the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS; Smith et al., 2008). This instrument consists of five statements with a 5-point Likert Scale, designed to reflect the subject's capacity to bounce back or recover from stress. Based on the data collected from our respondents, the BRS demonstrated an actual Cronbach's alpha of 0.641, with higher scores indicating a better resilience capacity in the participant.

Analysis

The collected data was analyzed quantitatively using Jamovi statistical software version 2.6.4. The analysis procedure began with prerequisite tests and descriptive statistics to map respondent characteristics and score distribution for each research variable. Next, to test the research hypothesis, a moderation analysis was conducted. This stage aims to identify whether the established moderator analysis was conducted. This stage aims to identify whether the established moderator variables significantly strengthen or weaken the relationship between the independent and dependent variables in this research model.

Findings

Respondent Characteristic

A total of 302 responses were initially collected. After data screening, 246 responses were retained for analysis. The remaining 56 responses were excluded because they did not meet the exclusion criteria, which applied to men who were divorced or separated, had no children, or did not hold permanent, full-time employment. The detailed characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Respondent demographic data

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age	25-29 years	29	11.8
	30-34 years	56	22.8
	35-39 years	86	35
	40-44 years	65	26.4
	45-49 years	9	3.7
	55-59 years	1	0.4

Table 1. Respondent demographic data (Continue)

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Highest education level	Junior high school (SMP)	1	0.4
	Senior high school (SMA)	44	17.9
	Bachelor's degree (S1)	162	65.9
	Master's degree (S2)	31	12.6
	Doctoral degree (S3)	8	3.3
Island / Region	Sumatra	76	30.9
	Java	87	35.4
	Kalimantan	18	7.3
	Sulawesi, Maluku, North Maluku	35	14.2
	Bali, NTB, NTT	15	6.1
	Papua	15	6.1
Length of marriage	0-4 years	33	13.4
	5-9 years	116	47.2
	10-14 years	52	21.1
	15-19 years	39	15.9
	20-24 years	5	2
	25-29 years	1	0.4
Number of children	1 child	74	30.1
	2 children	100	40.7
	3 children	56	22.8
	4 children	16	6.5
Current living arrangement	With wife and children only	194	78.9
	With wife, children, and extended family	52	21.1
Industrial Background	Non-Profit & Social Organizations (NGOs, foundations, social communities, religious institutions)	5	2.0
	Media, Creative & Entertainment (Television, publishing, advertising, graphic design, film, music)	10	4.1
	Education & Training (Schools, universities, course institutions, corporate training)	12	4.9
	Professional Services (Consulting, legal, accounting, psychology, architecture)	13	5.3
	Financial Services & Banking (Bank, fintech, insurance, investment)	14	5.7
	Information Technology & Communication (Software development, IT services, startups, telecommunications)	15	6.1

Table 1. Respondent demographic data (Continue)

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Industrial Background	Agriculture, Plantation & Fisheries (Agro-industry, livestock, fisheries, forestry)	16	6.5
	Healthcare & Pharmaceuticals (Hospitals, clinics, pharmacies, pharmaceutical companies, medical devices)	19	7.7
	Manufacturing Industry (Automotive, electronics, textiles, food & beverage, furniture)	21	8.5
	Government & Public Administration (Ministries, government agencies, state-owned enterprises, regional offices)	22	8.9
	Transportation & Logistics (Expedition, airlines, ports, couriers, ride-hailing)	22	8.9
	Energy & Mining (Oil & gas, electricity, renewable energy, coal/metal mining)	24	9.8
	Tourism, Hotels & Restaurants (Hospitality, restaurants, travel agencies, event organizers)	26	10.6
	Trade & Retail (Supermarkets, e-commerce, distributors, retail stores)	27	11.0
Employment status	Permanent employee	111	45.1
	Self-employed	83	33.7
	Contract employee	52	21.1
Year of employement	0-4 years	45	18.3
	5-9 years	133	54.1
	10-14 years	54	22
	15-19 years	14	5.7

Among the 246 retained respondents, most fathers were aged 35-39 years (35.0%), followed by those aged 40-44 years (26.4%) and 30-34 years (22.8%). Smaller proportions were found among respondents aged 25-29 years (11.8%), 45-49 years (3.7%), and 55-59 years (0.4%). These findings show that most respondents were in early to middle adulthood. Based on region, the largest proportion of respondents lived in Java Island (35.4%), followed by Sumatra (30.9%), Sulawesi, Maluku, North Maluku (14.2%), and Bali, NTB, NTT (6.1%). Regarding the year of marriage, nearly half had been married for 5-9 years (47.2%), followed by 10-14 years (21.1%), 15-19 years (15.9%), and 0-4 years (13.4%). Only a small proportion had been married for 20-24 years (2.0%) and 25-29 years (0.4%).

In terms of family characteristics, most respondents had two children (40.7%), followed by one child (30.1%), three children (22.8%), and four children (6.5%). Most respondents lived only with their wife and children (78.9%), while 21.1% lived with their wife, children, and extended family. Regarding employment status, 45.1% of respondents were permanent employees, 33.7% were self-employed, and 21.1% were contract employees. More than half had worked in their current job for 5-9 years

(54.1%), followed by 10-14 years (22.0%), 0-4 years (18.3%), and 15-19 years (5.7%). For educational background, most respondents held a bachelor's degree (65.9%), followed by senior high school graduates (17.9%), master's degree holders (12.6%), doctoral degree holders (3.3%), and junior high school graduates (0.4%).

Regarding industrial background, the largest proportion of respondents worked in Trade & Retail (11.0%), followed by Tourism, Hotels & Restaurants (10.6%), Energy & Mining (9.8%), Government & Public Administration and Transportation & Logistics (9.0% each), Manufacturing Industry (8.5%), Healthcare & Pharmaceuticals (7.7%), Agriculture, Plantation & Fisheries (6.5%), Information Technology & Communication (6.1%), Financial Services & Banking (5.7%), Professional Services (5.3%), Education & Training (4.9%), Media, Creative & Entertainment (4.1%), and Non-Profit & Social Organizations (2.0%). Overall, the final analytic sample consisted mostly of married fathers in early to middle adulthood, living with their nuclear family, holding a bachelor's degree, having relatively stable employment experience, and working across diverse industrial sectors.

Table 2. Correlation Matrix of Work-Family Conflict, Social Support, Marital Satisfaction, and Resilience

	Work Family Conflict	**Social Support**	**Marital Satisfaction**
Work Family Conflict	-	-	-
Social Support	-0.404***	-	-
Marital Satisfaction	-0.415***	0.535***	-
Resilience	-0.501***	0.503***	0.427***

Note: * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was conducted to examine the bivariate relationships among Work-Family Conflict (WFC), social support, marital satisfaction, and resilience based on a sample of 246 respondents. WFC demonstrated significant negative correlations with Social Support ($\rho = -0.404$, $p < .001$), marital satisfaction ($\rho = -0.415$, $p < .001$), and resilience ($\rho = -0.501$, $p < .001$), indicating that higher work-family conflict is associated with lower levels of social support, marital satisfaction, and resilience. Conversely, positive and significant intercorrelations were observed among the protective factors: Social support was positively correlated with marital satisfaction ($\rho = 0.535$, $p < .001$) and resilience ($\rho = 0.503$, $p < .001$), and marital satisfaction was also positively correlated with resilience ($\rho = 0.503$, $p < .001$). To assess potential multicollinearity among the predictor variables, the correlation matrix was carefully examined, as multicollinearity is typically considered problematic when intercorrelations exceed 0.80 or 0.90. In this dataset, the highest correlation among predictors was between social support and marital satisfaction at $\rho = 0.535$, followed by correlations of 0.503 between social support and resilience and between marital satisfaction and resilience all well below the conventional threshold of 0.80. Therefore, there is no indication of severe multicollinearity among the independent variables; the moderate intercorrelations suggest that while the predictors share some common variance, each retains sufficient unique explanatory value for inclusion in subsequent

regression analyses, supporting the appropriateness and stability of the regression models.

Table 3. Descriptives analysis of work-family conflict, social support, marital satisfaction, and resilience among participants

Characteristic	Category	N	WFC M (SD)	WFC SE	SS M (SD)	SS SE	MS M (SD)	MS SE	RS M (SD)	RS SE
Number of Children	1 child	74	19.14 (8.06)	0.94	5.47 (0.67)	0.08	17.14 (2.32)	0.27	21.16 (2.73)	0.32
	2 children	100	20.68 (8.21)	0.82	5.44 (0.59)	0.06	16.79 (2.81)	0.28	21.14 (2.55)	0.25
	3 children	56	22.84 (7.21)	0.96	5.39 (0.68)	0.09	16.04 (2.98)	0.4	20.36 (2.32)	0.31
	4 children	16	21.06 (8.47)	2.12	5.31 (0.60)	0.15	17.25 (2.82)	0.7	21.19 (2.32)	0.58
Living Arrangement	With wife and children only	194	20.13 (8.32)	0.6	5.48 (0.65)	0.05	16.87 (2.54)	0.18	21.10 (2.48)	0.18
	With wife, children, and extended family	52	22.96 (6.43)	0.89	5.23 (0.55)	0.08	16.33 (3.34)	0.46	20.50 (2.74)	0.38
Employment Status	Contract employee	52	25.00 (4.49)	0.62	5.19 (0.56)	0.08	15.79 (2.95)	0.41	19.94 (2.40)	0.33
	Permanent employee	111	20.88 (7.99)	0.76	5.42 (0.63)	0.06	16.61 (2.67)	0.25	20.95 (2.63)	0.25
	Self-employed	83	17.86 (8.62)	0.95	5.59 (0.65)	0.07	17.54 (2.46)	0.27	21.65 (2.31)	0.25
Length of Employment	0–4 years	45	24.04 (5.82)	0.87	5.24 (0.65)	0.1	16.16 (2.04)	0.3	20.18 (1.84)	0.27
	5–9 years	133	20.71 (8.05)	0.7	5.50 (0.60)	0.05	16.93 (2.61)	0.23	20.86 (2.63)	0.23
	10–14 years	54	18.04 (8.68)	1.18	5.50 (0.67)	0.09	16.72 (3.29)	0.45	21.85 (2.65)	0.36
	15–19 years	14	20.64 (8.15)	2.18	5.14 (0.66)	0.18	17.07 (3.34)	0.89	21.21 (2.55)	0.68

Note: N = 246. WFC = work-family conflict; SS = social support; MS = marital satisfaction; RS = resilience. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; SE = standard error. Values are rounded to two decimal places.

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and standard errors, for work–family conflict, social support, marital satisfaction, and resilience across respondents' number of children, living arrangement, employment status, and length of employment in the current job.

Regarding the number of children, the mean score for work–family conflict tended to increase with the number of children, rising from 19.14 (SD = 8.06) among respondents with one child to 22.84 (SD = 7.21) among those with three children. However, respondents with four children reported a slightly lower mean (M = 21.06, SD = 8.47) compared to those with three children. For social support, mean scores decreased slightly as the number of children increased, from 5.47 (SD = 0.67) for one child to 5.31 (SD = 0.60) for four children. Marital satisfaction was lowest among respondents with three children (M = 16.04, SD = 2.98) and highest among those with four children (M = 17.25, SD = 2.82). Resilience scores were relatively stable across

groups, ranging from 20.36 (SD = 2.32) for three children to 21.19 (SD = 2.32) for four children.

With respect to living arrangement, respondents who lived only with their wife and children reported higher mean scores for work–family conflict (M = 20.13, SD = 8.32) compared to those who lived with extended family (M = 22.96, SD = 6.43). A similar pattern was observed for social support, with higher scores among those living only with wife and children (M = 5.48, SD = 0.65) than among those living with extended family (M = 5.23, SD = 0.55). Marital satisfaction was also slightly higher among those living only with wife and children (M = 16.87, SD = 2.54) compared to those with extended family (M = 16.33, SD = 3.34). Likewise, resilience scores were higher among respondents living only with wife and children (M = 21.10, SD = 2.48) than among those living with extended family (M = 20.50, SD = 2.74).

Regarding employment status, contract employees reported the highest mean score for work–family conflict (M = 25.00, SD = 4.49), followed by permanent employees (M = 20.88, SD = 7.99), and self-employed respondents reported the lowest (M = 17.86, SD = 8.62). For social support, self-employed respondents reported the highest mean (M = 5.59, SD = 0.65), while contract employees reported the lowest (M = 5.19, SD = 0.56). Marital satisfaction followed a similar pattern, with self-employed respondents reporting the highest mean (M = 17.54, SD = 2.46) and contract employees the lowest (M = 15.79, SD = 2.95). Resilience was also highest among self-employed respondents (M = 21.65, SD = 2.31) and lowest among contract employees (M = 19.94, SD = 2.40).

For length of employment in the current job, respondents with 0–4 years of tenure reported the highest mean score for work–family conflict (M = 24.04, SD = 5.82), whereas those with 10–14 years reported the lowest (M = 18.04, SD = 8.68). Social support scores were similar between respondents with 5–9 years (M = 5.50, SD = 0.60) and 10–14 years (M = 5.50, SD = 0.67), while those with 15–19 years reported the lowest (M = 5.14, SD = 0.66). Marital satisfaction was highest among respondents with 15–19 years of tenure (M = 17.07, SD = 3.34) and lowest among those with 0–4 years (M = 16.16, SD = 2.04). Resilience scores were highest among respondents with 10–14 years of tenure (M = 21.85, SD = 2.65) and lowest among those with 0–4 years (M = 20.18, SD = 1.84).

Overall, the descriptive results suggest that respondents with more children, those living only with their wife and children, self-employed individuals, and those with moderate to longer employment tenure tended to report relatively higher mean scores across the study variables. However, notable exceptions exist, particularly for contract employees who reported the highest work–family conflict but the lowest scores on social support, marital satisfaction, and resilience. These patterns provide preliminary insights into how demographic and occupational factors relate to the primary study variables.

Table 4. Model Summary for Hierarchical Multiple Regression (N = 246)

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	RMSE	F(df1, df2)	p
1	0.525	0.276	0.267	2.32	30.70 (3, 242)	< 0.001
2	0.542	0.293	0.282	2.29	25.00 (4, 241)	< 0.001
3	0.559	0.312	0.298	2.26	21.80 (5, 240)	< 0.001

Note. N = 246. RMSE = root mean square error. All models were statistically significant.

In Model 1 (Table 4), the three predictors collectively produced a multiple correlation of R = 0.525, with an R^2 of 0.276, indicating that 27.6% of the variance in the dependent variable was explained. The adjusted R^2 was 0.267, and the root mean square error (RMSE) was 2.32. This model was statistically significant, F (3, 242) = 30.7, p < .001.

Model 2 included one additional predictor, resulting in R = 0.542 and R^2 = 0.293, meaning the model now explained 29.3% of the variance. The adjusted R^2 increased to 0.282, and the RMSE slightly decreased to 2.29. This represented a modest improvement of 1.7% in explained variance over Model 1. The model remained highly significant, F (4, 241) = 25.0, p < .001.

Model 3, which incorporated the full set of five predictors, achieved the strongest fit with R = 0.559 and R^2 = 0.312, accounting for 31.2% of the variance in the outcome. The adjusted R^2 was 0.298, and the RMSE was 2.26, the lowest among the three models. The increase in R^2 from Model 2 was 1.9%, and the model was again statistically significant, F (5, 240) = 21.8, p < .001.

Table 5. Regression Result

			95% Confidence Interval					
Names	Estimate	SE	Lower	Upper	β	df	t	p
(Intercept)	16.3419	0.1941	15.9596	16.72427	0.0000	240	84.201	<.001
Work Family Conflict	-0.0403	0.0295	-0.0985	0.01781	-0.1186	240	-1.367	0.173
Resilience	0.0116	0.0788	-0.1436	0.16677	0.0108	240	0.147	0.883
Social Support	1.5899	0.3075	0.9842	2.19564	0.3692	240	5.171	<.001
Work Family Conflict ✻ Resilience	-0.0154	0.0108	-0.0366	0.00580	-0.1154	240	-1.431	0.154
Resilience ✻ Social Support	0.2776	0.1085	0.0639	0.49134	0.1641	240	2.559	0.011

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the direct and interactive effects of work–family conflict, perceived social support, and psychological resilience on marital satisfaction. The model included work–family conflict, perceived social support, and psychological resilience as independent variables, along with the two-way interaction terms (Work–Family Conflict × Psychological Resilience and Perceived Social Support × Psychological Resilience). The full regression results are presented in Table 5.

The regression results revealed that work–family conflict did not significantly predict marital satisfaction, b = –0.040, SE = 0.030, 95% CI [–0.099, 0.018], $t(240)$ = –1.367, p = 0.173. Although the coefficient was negative, the result was not statistically

significant, indicating that higher work–family conflict was not significantly associated with lower marital satisfaction in the final model.

Perceived social support significantly and positively predicted marital satisfaction, b = 1.590, SE = 0.308, 95% CI [0.984, 2.196], β = 0.369, t (240) = 5.171, p < .001. This result indicates that fathers who perceived higher social support tended to report significantly higher marital satisfaction, suggesting that social support serves as a strong positive predictor of marital well-being.

Psychological resilience did not have a significant direct effect on marital satisfaction, b = 0.012, SE = 0.079, 95% CI [–0.144, 0.167], β = 0.011, t(240) = 0.147, p = .883. This suggests that resilience alone did not significantly predict marital satisfaction after accounting for work–family conflict, perceived social support, and the interaction terms in the model.

The interaction between work–family conflict and psychological resilience was not significant, b = –0.015, SE = 0.011, 95% CI [–0.037, 0.006], t (240) = –1.431, p = 0.154. Therefore, psychological resilience did not significantly moderate the relationship between work–family conflict and marital satisfaction. This finding indicates that the effect of work–family conflict on marital satisfaction did not vary as a function of resilience levels; in other words, resilience did not buffer the negative impact of work–family conflict on marital satisfaction.

However, the interaction between perceived social support and psychological resilience was significant, b = 0.278, SE = 0.109, 95% CI [0.064, 0.491], β = 0.164, t(240) = 2.559, p = 0.011. This finding indicates that psychological resilience significantly moderated the relationship between perceived social support and marital satisfaction. Specifically, the positive association between perceived social support and marital satisfaction became stronger when psychological resilience was higher. In other words, fathers with higher resilience were better able to capitalize on their social support resources, leading to greater marital satisfaction.

Overall, the findings partially support the proposed research framework. Perceived social support emerged as a significant direct predictor of marital satisfaction, and psychological resilience played a significant moderating role, but only in the relationship between perceived social support and marital satisfaction. In contrast, work–family conflict did not significantly predict marital satisfaction, and psychological resilience did not significantly buffer the relationship between work–family conflict and marital satisfaction. These results suggest that social support is a more robust predictor of marital satisfaction among fathers, and its beneficial effect is amplified when combined with higher levels of psychological resilience.

Discussion

This study explores how work-family conflict (WFC), social support, and psychological resilience collectively shape marital satisfaction among Indonesian fathers. Our findings offer a nuanced perspective that challenges some of the simpler assumptions often found in positive psychology. Rather than acting as an automatic, universal shield against everyday stressors, psychological resilience seems to operate

conditionally. Specifically, its strength lies in how it syncs with external environmental resources, rather than acting as a standalone buffer against severe domain conflicts.

A key unexpected finding was that WFC did not directly predict marital satisfaction nor did its interaction with resilience yield a statistically significant. This indicates that the way fathers evaluate their marriage under work-family pressure does not simply depend on how resilient they are internally. To understand this, it helps to look closely at the demographic variations within our sample. Most participants were in established adulthood 35–39 years and had already navigated the early, often volatile years of marriage 5–9 years of marriage duration. More importantly, our descriptive data shows that employment stability changes the entire dynamic. For example, self-employed fathers reported much lower conflict and higher marital satisfaction than contract employees, who faced the highest levels of WFC, and the lowest marital satisfaction. This sharp contrast implies that work-family strain is highly fragmented by job security. When analyzed together as a single macro-level sample, these opposing realities likely washed out the direct and interaction effects.

Household structures also appear to introduce their own boundary dynamics. Our descriptive data indicates that fathers living with extended families reported higher work-family conflict and lower social support than those living in nuclear households and respectively. Viewed through Hobfoll's (1989) Conservation of Resources (COR) theory, this pattern implies that within the cultural context of Indonesian patriarchies, an extended family might sometimes add multi-generational role frictions or unwritten domestic obligations rather than acting as a built-in relief system. Under high role strain, a highly resilient father might feel culturally pressured to pour his limited psychological energy into securing his professional standing to remain the primary provider (Kokubo et al., 2023; Zhang, 2023). This focus could leave fewer internal resources for navigating complex family dynamics at home. Because this study did not directly measure specific coping behaviors or immediate resource loss, this mechanism should be treated as a plausible conceptual interpretation that needs longitudinal tracking, rather than an established empirical certainty.

On the other hand, internal resilience became a clear asset when paired with external support. Although resilience by itself did not show a direct effect on marriage quality, its interaction with perceived social support was both positive significant. This interplay, backed by the strong direct impact of social support, suggests that a father's inner adaptive capacity works best when he is anchored in a reliable interpersonal ecosystem. In COR theory terms, individuals with higher resilience are simply better at mobilizing and capitalising on a "caravan of resources" around them (Hobfoll et al., 2018). When a resilient father notices and accepts adequate social support-especially the close, concentrated support typical of a nuclear household—he is better equipped to turn that external backing into real relationship quality, collaborative coping, and shared expectations (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Rosiana et al., 2022).

These insights have clear practical implications for counselors and family practitioners. For one, workplace wellness programs should move away from individualistic, "grit-only" messaging that places the entire weight of stress management on the employee's shoulders. Instead, the focus needs to shift toward building supportive peer networks and structural boundaries, particularly for contract workers

in precarious positions. For marriage therapists, the takeaway is that boosting a father's internal resilience will yield the best results if done in tandem with improving communication, helping him actively reach out for and use the partner support available within his immediate home.

Several limitations in this study look at how our data should be interpreted and where future research needs to go. A major practical hurdle was the prolonged data collection process, largely due to the "time poverty" and heavy workloads typical of working fathers in Indonesia. Because recruiting this demographic was challenging, our final pool may carry some self-selection bias; the fathers who managed to participate might have different psychological resilience profiles or experience work-family strain differently than those who could not find the time. This recruitment constraint also means our sample does not capture the full socio-economic, regional, and ethnic diversity of the Indonesian archipelago, meaning we should be careful about generalising these findings to the broader population of Indonesian fathers.

From a methodological standpoint, the study relies on a cross-sectional design, which captures data at a single point in time and prevents us from drawing firm causal conclusions or ruling out bidirectional paths. This is compounded by the exclusive use of self-report measures. Given the sensitive and deeply personal nature of evaluating one's own marriage, self-reports are naturally vulnerable to social desirability and common method bias. Furthermore, marriage is inherently a two-way street, but our data only captures a one-sided perspective. Gathering data solely from fathers, without matching inputs from their wives, limits our capacity to map out a truly comprehensive, dyadic picture of marital satisfaction.

There are also specific conceptual boundaries worth noting, particularly regarding the cultural interpretations we have advanced. While our discussion relies heavily on concepts like traditional patriarchal roles and collectivism to make sense of the patterns, these cultural dimensions were not directly operationalised or measured in our surveys. Future studies would benefit from incorporating explicit cultural value scales to verify these links empirically. On a final psychometric note, we acknowledge that the initial drafts contained some ambiguities regarding instrument scoring procedures. Although these scoring issues were thoroughly resolved and corrected before the final analysis, this experience underlines how critical it is for future Indonesian family studies to develop and pre-validate highly rigorous, culturally adapted psychometric tools from the outset.

Moving forward, these limitations point to clear opportunities for future research. Shifting toward longitudinal designs would allow researchers to track how the interplay between resilience and social support actually unfolds over longer periods. To build a more diverse and representative sample, future projects might partner directly with corporate human resource departments or local community organizations to ease the data collection burden on working parents. Most importantly, moving toward a dyadic research framework that surveys both husbands and wives will offer a much deeper, more realistic look at how work-family strain impacts the shared reality of the marital unit.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Conclusion

This study shows that looking at work-family conflict (WFC) and marital satisfaction through a simple direct link doesn't capture the full reality for Indonesian fathers. In our final model, WFC wasn't a standalone predictor of how satisfied these fathers were in their marriages. Its impact is far too fragmented by messy, real-world factors like job security and how their households are set up. Instead, the real driver behind paternal marital satisfaction is perceived social support, which serves as the primary external anchor keeping the relationship stable.

These findings also help redraw the boundaries of what psychological resilience can actually do within the Indonesian cultural context. Resilience isn't some magic, universal shield that protects a father from work-family strain. Its value is highly conditional, meaning that a father's inner adaptive capacity only really kicks in when it is paired with a supportive social environment. When backed by solid social support-especially the close, focused kind found in nuclear families-highly resilient fathers are simply better at turning that outside help into collaborative coping and genuine relationship quality.

What this ultimately means for family psychology is that we need a much more culturally sensitive approach when looking at fathers. For men navigating the combined pressures of patriarchal expectations and collectivist norms, relying on inner grit alone just isn't enough. Family counselors and workplace wellness programs need to move away from isolated resilience workshops that place all the pressure on the individual employee. Instead, the focus should shift toward building better structural boundaries and collaborative support networks, helping working fathers successfully balance their professional obligations without losing their marital harmony.

Recommendations

Given that social support emerged as the single most powerful driver of marital satisfaction in this study, practical recommendations should focus heavily on strengthening the relational networks around working fathers. On a personal level, this means fathers need to actively step away from the traditional, hyper-independent "stoic provider" mindset. Because the data shows that internal resilience functions best when paired with external backing, learning to ask for and accept help within the marriage is crucial. Receiving emotional and practical support from a partner isn't a sign of weakness; it is a practical way to make one's own inner resilience actually work. This also means couples need to focus on building a more collaborative home environment. Since raw social support directly lifts marriage quality, wives and immediate family members can make a major difference simply by validating the heavy dual-role pressures these fathers face and keeping channels open for honest communication.

This stable connection between social support and marital well-being also means that employers and organizational leaders cannot view employee performance in a vacuum. Companies need to look into realistic, father-friendly workplace practices that protect a parent’s family time. Implementing flexible working hours, setting clear boundaries against after-hours messaging, and actively dismantling the stigma around

men prioritizing family duties are straightforward steps that can help—especially for contract workers who face the most intense role strain.

For family therapists and community practitioners, these findings suggest a clear shift away from generic resilience workshops that merely tell men to "tough it out." Since inner grit requires an external catalyst to truly benefit a marriage, counseling programs should focus on relational integration instead. Therapists should design practical modules that teach couples how to build collaborative coping habits. Ultimately, marriage preparation courses and family outreach programs—including those run by local community or religious groups—need to actively show modern Indonesian fathers how to effectively tap into and embrace the support networks already available in their immediate ecosystem.

References

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2025a). *Nikah dan cerai menurut provinsi (kejadian), 2025*. https://www.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/3/VkhwVUszTXJPVmQ2ZFRKamNIZG9RMVo2VEdsbVVUMDkjMw==/nikah-dan-cerai-menurut-provinsi.html

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2025b). *Tingkat partisipasi angkatan kerja menurut jenis kelamin, 2025*. https://www.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/2/MjIwMCMy/tingkat-partisipasi-angkatan-kerja-menurut-jenis-kelamin.html

Balogun, A. G. (2023). Moderating effects of personal resources on work engagement and work-family conflict. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *49*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v49i0.2052

Bernuzzi, C., Setti, I., Maffoni, M., & Sommovigo, V. (2021). From moral distress to burnout through work-family conflict: The protective role of resilience and positive refocusing. *Ethics & Behavior*, *32*(7), 578–600. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2021.1955682

De Sousa, C., Viseu, J., Pimenta, A. C., Vinagre, H., Ferreira, J., Matavelli, R., José, H., Sousa, L., Romana, F. A., & Valentim, O. (2024). The effect of coping on the relationship between work-family conflict and stress, anxiety, and depression. *Behavioral Sciences*, *14*(6), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14060478

Haslam, D., Filus, A., Morawska, A., Sanders, M. R., & Fletcher, R. (2014). The work-family conflict (WAFCS): Development and initial validation of a self-report measure of work family conflict for use with parents. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development, 46*(3), 346-357. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-014-0476-0

Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *50*(1), 93-98. https://doi.org/10.2307/352430

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*, 513-524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, *50*(3), 337-421. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062

Holmgreen, L., Tirone, V., Gerhart, J., & Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). Conservation of resources theory: Applications to health and organizational psychology. *Handbook of*

occupational health psychology, *1*, 57-80. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118993811.ch27

Indonesia Baik. (2023). *Mayoritas pemuda di indonesia menikah muda*. https://indonesiabaik.id/infografis/mayoritas-pemuda-di-indonesia-menikah-muda

Grandey, A. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). The conservation of resources model applied to work–family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *54*(2), 350-370. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1998.1666

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(1), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.2307/258214

Greenhaus, J. H., Allen, T. D., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Health consequences of work–family conflict: The dark side of the work–family interface. In *Research in occupational stress and well-being, 5*, 61-98. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1479-3555(05)05002-x

Juniarly, A., Pratiwi, M., Purnamasari, A., & Nadila, T. F. (2020). Work-family conflict, social support and marriage satisfaction on employees at Bank X. *Jurnal Psikologi*, *19*(4), 343–356. https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.19.4.343-356

Kokubo, A., Yoshikawa, K., & Wu, C. (2023). Facilitating transition from maternity leave to work for working mothers: A self-efficacy intervention study. *Cambridge Prisms: Global Mental Health*, *10*(18), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1017/gmh.2023.6

Lestari, S., Nurani, G. A., & Hertinjung, W. S. (2023). Psychometric analysis of the social support scale among Indonesian academicians. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *12*(2), 977–989. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.12.2.977

Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71*(3), 543-562. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00164

Mardliyah, A., Hayuputri, F. M., & Sovitriana, R. (2025). The influence of resilience and work-family conflict on the stress of working mothers in long-distance marriages. *Dinasti Health and Pharmacy Science*, *1*(3), 80–84. https://doi.org/10.38035/dhps.v1i3.1627

Martinea, S., & Sunarti, E. (2019). The influence of husband-wife interaction and parent-child interaction on family subjective well-being in KB and non-KB villages. *Journal of Family Sciences*, *4*(2), 91–104. https://doi.org/10.29244/jfs.4.2.91-104

Obrenovic, B., Jianguo, D., Khudaykulov, A., & Khan, M. A. S. (2020). Work-family conflict impact on psychological safety and psychological well-being: A job performance model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 475. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00475

Parung, G. E., & Ferreira, N. (2017). Work-life balance, couple satisfaction, and father involvement: A cross-cultural study. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal*, *32*(4), 201–216. https://doi.org/10.24123/aipj.v32i4.851

Prahara, S. A., Soeharto, T. N. E. D., & WahyuKuncoro, M. (2023). *What is the husband's role in supporting his working wife to be involved in social life? In Environmental issues and social inclusion in a sustainable era (1st ed.)*. CRC Press.

Ramadhanti, H. F., Simanjuntak, M., & Johan, I. R. (2022). The effect of work-family conflict, communication pattern, social support, and stress Levels toward Family quality of life during the covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Family Science, 7*(2), 119-135. https://doi.org/10.29244/jfs.v7i2.41937

Roach, A. J., Frazier, L. P., & Bowden, S. R. (1981). The Marital Satisfaction Scale: Development of a measure for intervention research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *43*(4), 937–946. https://doi.org/10.2307/351349

Rosiana, E., Zaman, A. A., Lutfiani, F., Simanjuntak, M., & Riany, Y. E. (2022). Analysis of factors affecting marriage satisfaction in married couples during pandemic. *Journal of Family Sciences*, 42–56. https://doi.org/10.29244/jfs.vi.36537

Sahrah, A., & Yunareza, N. (2023). Konflik kerja-keluarga dan kepuasan pernikahan: Peran mediasi komunikasi interpersonal. *Jurnal Psikologi Integratif*, *11*(1), 89-105. https://doi.org/10.33558/soul.v15i1.9709

Sari, E. P., Helmi, A, F., & Febriani, A. (2025). Validation of the Kansas marital satisfaction scale in an Indonesia context. *International Conference on Social Science, 4*(1). https://doi.org/10.59188/icss.v4i1.239

Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 15(3), 194-200. doi:10.1080/10705500802222972

Sulistiani, W., Fajrianthi, F., & Kristiana, I. F. (2022). Validation of the Indonesian version of the Multidimensional scale of perceived social support (MSPSS): A rasch model approach. *Jurnal Psikologi, 21*(1), 89-103. https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.21.1.89-103

Surijah, E. A., Prasad, G. H., & Saraswati, M. R. A. (2021). Couple resilience predicted marital satisfaction but not well-being and health for married couples in Bali, Indonesia. *Psikohumaniora: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, *6*(1), 13–32. https://doi.org/10.21580/pjpp.v6i1.6520

Treglown, L., Palaiou, K., Zarola, A., & Furnham, A. (2016). The dark side of resilience and burnout: A moderation-mediation model. *PLoS ONE*, *11*(6), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0156279

Trikanti., Hadis, F. A., & Rahardjo, W. (2025). Kontribusi dukungan sosial keluarga terhadap kepuasaan pernikahan pada suami yang menjalani hubungan pernikahan jarak jauh. *Jurnal Ilmu Multidisiplin, 4*(4), 2417-2422. https://doi.org/10.38035/jim.v4i4.1286

Tuffour, J. K., Bortey, F. M., & Nyanyofio, J. G. T. (2021). Work-family conflict and family satisfaction: Evidence from small enterprise managers. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, *23*(8). 67-81. https://doi.org/10.33423/jabe.v23i8.4874

Yu, K. (2016). Better and worse: A dual-process model of the relationship between core self-evaluation and work-family conflict. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*, 1579. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01579

Zahra, F., & Mahestu, G. (2021). Perceived social support as a predictor of marital satisfaction among early adult fathers. *Indonesian Journal of Psychology*, *18*(2), 210–225. https://doi.org/10.22146/gamajop.65213

Zhang, L. (2023). The dark side of resilience in the workplace: Finding a balance. *Journal of Student Research*, *12*(4). https://doi.org/10.47611/jsrhs.v12i4.5474

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *52*(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa52012