ORIGINAL ARTICLE   **OPEN ACCES**

INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO THE DYNAMICS OF ISLAMIC FAMILY LAW PRACTICES IN INDONESIA, MALAYSIA, AND EGYPT

Muhammad Febri Eka Saputra[1*] , Sukriyani[2]

*Corespondence :
Email :
febri75saputra@gmail.com

Affiliation:
[1] Universitas Islam Negeri Sjech M, Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi, *Indonesia*
[2] Oxford University, *United Kingdom*

Abstract

This study aims to explore the dynamics of Islamic family law practices in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Egypt through an interdisciplinary approach that integrates social, cultural, and jurisprudential perspectives. The research seeks to identify how these three dimensions interact in shaping the interpretation and implementation of Islamic family law across different national contexts. Methodologically, the study employs a comparative qualitative design, combining doctrinal analysis of statutory and jurisprudential sources with socio−legal observations of social practices and cultural norms in family−related disputes and policy implementation. Primary data from legal documents and court decisions are examined alongside secondary sources, including scholarly works and policy reports, to ensure a holistic and balanced understanding. The findings reveal significant variations: Indonesia reflects a pluralistic system where social realities, cultural expectations, and jurisprudential interpretations intersect between state law and religious courts; Malaysia illustrates how federal−state relations influence cultural identity and Islamic legal autonomy; and Egypt demonstrates the enduring impact of classical jurisprudence while gradually adapting to modern social and cultural changes. Despite these differences, all three contexts highlight the tension between tradition and modernity in regulating marriage, divorce, and inheritance. The study concludes that only by integrating social, cultural, and jurisprudential analyses can the complexities of Islamic family law be adequately understood, since purely doctrinal or sociological approaches risk oversimplification. Academically, the research contributes to comparative Islamic legal studies by offering a replicable model that foregrounds the social, cultural, and jurisprudential interplay in Muslim−majority contexts, thus advancing interdisciplinary inquiry beyond rhetorical claims toward substantive, evidence−based insights.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi dinamika praktik hukum keluarga Islam di Indonesia, Malaysia, dan Mesir melalui pendekatan interdisipliner yang mengintegrasikan perspektif sosial, budaya, dan yurisprudensi. Riset ini berupaya mengidentifikasi bagaimana ketiga dimensi tersebut berinteraksi dalam membentuk interpretasi dan implementasi hukum keluarga Islam di berbagai konteks nasional. Secara metodologis, penelitian ini menggunakan desain kualitatif komparatif dengan menggabungkan analisis doktrinal terhadap sumber-sumber perundang-undangan dan yurisprudensi dengan observasi sosio-yuridis atas praktik sosial dan norma budaya dalam sengketa keluarga serta implementasi kebijakan. Data primer berupa dokumen hukum dan putusan pengadilan dianalisis bersamaan dengan sumber sekunder, termasuk karya ilmiah dan laporan kebijakan, guna memperoleh pemahaman yang holistik dan seimbang. Temuan penelitian mengungkap variasi yang signifikan: Indonesia mencerminkan sistem pluralistik di mana realitas sosial, ekspektasi budaya, dan interpretasi yurisprudensi saling beririsan antara hukum negara dan peradilan agama; Malaysia menunjukkan bagaimana hubungan federal dan negara bagian memengaruhi identitas budaya dan otonomi hukum Islam; sedangkan Mesir memperlihatkan pengaruh berkelanjutan dari yurisprudensi klasik sembari secara bertahap beradaptasi dengan

perubahan sosial dan budaya modern. Meskipun terdapat perbedaan, ketiga konteks tersebut menyoroti ketegangan antara tradisi dan modernitas dalam pengaturan perkawinan, perceraian, dan warisan. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa hanya dengan mengintegrasikan analisis sosial, budaya, dan yurisprudensi kompleksitas hukum keluarga Islam dapat dipahami secara memadai, karena pendekatan yang semata-mata doktrinal atau sosiologis berisiko menyederhanakan persoalan. Secara akademik, penelitian ini berkontribusi pada studi hukum Islam komparatif dengan menawarkan model yang dapat direplikasi untuk menyoroti keterjalinan sosial, budaya, dan yurisprudensi di negara-negara mayoritas Muslim, sehingga mendorong kajian interdisipliner melampaui klaim retoris menuju wawasan substantif berbasis bukti.

INTRDUCTION

The significance of examining Islamic family law in contemporary Muslim societies arises from its deep entanglement with social realities, cultural norms, and jurisprudential traditions. Marriage, divorce, and inheritance, as central institutions of family law, are not only legal constructs but also social practices and cultural performances that shape access to rights, responsibilities, and power within communities (Hakim, 2023). In Indonesia, Malaysia, and Egypt, codification and judicial reforms have translated aspects of classical fiqh into statutory rules and procedures, yet everyday practice continues to be mediated by customary traditions, gender dynamics, and institutional capacity. This coexistence of formal rules and lived practices produces tensions between normative ideals and practical realities, often leaving vulnerable groups, particularly women and children, in precarious positions. The salience of these issues is evident in ongoing debates over gender equality, legal pluralism, and judicial reform, where questions of legitimacy, authority, and cultural authenticity converge. In this sense, Islamic family law operates not in isolation but within a multidimensional context shaped by overlapping legal, social, and cultural influences. Addressing these dynamics is crucial to understanding how law functions not only as a system of rules but as a lived and contested process embedded in everyday social life, thereby justifying the need for interdisciplinary inquiry.

Existing scholarship has made important contributions by analyzing the doctrinal foundations of Islamic family law and by documenting its socio−cultural manifestations; however, the two strands often proceed in isolation from one another. Doctrinal analyses typically privilege scriptural texts, juristic reasoning, and madhhab selection while downplaying how law is mediated by structural factors such as class, gender, and institutional constraints (Chen & Yu, 2024). By contrast, socio−legal and anthropological studies emphasize lived realities, cultural practices, and everyday negotiations but often leave the internal logic of juristic argumentation under−specified. Comparative studies, where they exist (Nafisah, Nasrudin, Meidina, & Zain, 2024), frequently juxtapose jurisdictions descriptively, without developing an analytic lens that permits systematic evaluation or replication across contexts. As a result, the literature risks fragmentation: one body of work treats Islamic family law as essentially a doctrinal enterprise, while another views it primarily as a socio−cultural phenomenon, with limited dialogue between the two. This division leads to explanatory gaps in understanding why similar legal rules can produce divergent outcomes across different jurisdictions or how reform initiatives might align normative aspirations with lived realities in sustainable ways. Scholars increasingly call for interdisciplinarity, yet such calls often remain rhetorical, lacking a clear methodological framework that demonstrates how doctrinal, social, and cultural dimensions can be examined together transparently and rigorously.

This study positions itself within this debate by offering an integrated, interdisciplinary framework for analyzing Islamic family law. Moving beyond classical fiqh as a self－contained frame, it conceptualizes law through a triadic lens that brings together jurisprudential reasoning, social structures, and cultural practices as co－constitutive forces. Jurisprudential analysis is undertaken through doctrinal sources, codification choices, and interpretive traditions that structure the rules governing marriage, divorce, and inheritance. Social dimensions are explored through institutional capacity, gender relations, access to justice, and the distribution of power that condition the application or avoidance of rules in practice. Cultural aspects are examined through local customs (ʿurf), kinship systems, and ritual practices that imbue legal norms with social meaning and legitimacy. By treating these three dimensions as interdependent, the article provides a more precise account of how Islamic family law is produced, contested, and reformed in contemporary settings. This approach not only clarifies recurring tensions between doctrine and practice but also offers a systematic basis for comparative evaluation and reform design, advancing the study of Islamic family law from rhetorical interdisciplinarity to substantive, evidence－based analysis.

The aim of this study is to address the central question of how doctrinal, social, and cultural forces interact in shaping the interpretation and practice of Islamic family law across jurisdictions. It pursues three objectives, namely mapping the interplay of doctrinal, social, and cultural dynamics that influence family law outcomes, developing a replicable analytical framework known as the Doctrine－Society－Culture (DSC) grid that transforms this triad into observable indicators and coding rules for systematic comparison, and applying comparative illustrations from Indonesia, Malaysia, and Egypt to identify reform levers that reconcile textual fidelity with contextual ijtihad while improving access to justice for vulnerable groups. The working hypothesis is that the DSC framework does not replace juristic evaluation but clarifies the mechanisms through which doctrinal positions are mediated by social and cultural contexts, thus providing a structured basis for critique and reform. This article integrates three contributions by explaining how scriptural norms and juristic reasoning operate through social and cultural dynamics while introducing a reproducible coding grid that links doctrinal mapping with socio－legal realities for cumulative comparison. It also identifies practical reform levers—such as stronger mediation safeguards, enforceable inheritance decisions, and improved service standards—to reduce cost and delay and align legal design with the higher objectives of Islamic law while retaining local legitimacy.

METHODS

This study employed a comparative qualitative design with an interdisciplinary orientation, combining doctrinal legal analysis, socio－legal observation, and content review of statutory, jurisprudential, and cultural sources. Data were collected in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Egypt between January and June 2024. The dataset comprised forty－five judicial decisions, fifteen policy documents, and statutory provisions concerning marriage, divorce, and inheritance. Purposive sampling was used to ensure relevance to the research questions. Socio－legal observations were conducted in Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur, and Cairo by trained research associates operating under standardized protocols to minimize observer bias. Semi－structured interviews with thirty family law practitioners and court officials were carried out with informed consent, ensuring ethical compliance. Instruments included case note templates, interview guides, and observation protocols, all pilot－tested in February 2024 for clarity and consistency. Fieldwork spanned six months, followed by two months of transcription, coding, and preliminary categorization.

Data analysis followed a multi−stage process designed to ensure rigor, reliability, and validity. Doctrinal sources—statutory texts, judicial precedents, and fatwa compilations—were systematically coded to identify recurring legal themes and patterns of interpretation. Socio−legal data, including interview transcripts and observation records, were analyzed using grounded theory techniques to trace convergences and divergences across social practices, cultural norms, and jurisprudential reasoning. Triangulation was applied across legal documents, interview data, and observational findings to enhance validity and reduce interpretive bias. Descriptive statistics were employed for categorical variables, such as frequency of divorce grounds and inheritance disputes, to complement qualitative insights. The analytical framework drew on legal hermeneutics, sociology of law, and cultural anthropology, providing a rationale for privileging qualitative approaches while incorporating limited quantitative checks. Reliability was reinforced through inter−coder agreement, and validity was maintained by aligning findings with established benchmarks in Islamic family law scholarship.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

Doctrinal Reasoning and Codification Dynamics in Islamic Family Law

Doctrinal accounts of Islamic family law often assume that classical fiqh travels intact into contemporary statutes, yet codification inevitably requires selection among competing opinions and translation into legislative language. This translation clarifies obligations and rights but narrows interpretive flexibility in hard cases. The resulting architecture is best read as a designed system rather than a mere reflection of tradition. Understanding why particular opinions were privileged illuminates the legal possibilities and constraints that citizens and judges now face (Aziz, 2018). Marriage rules offer a precise illustration of this design logic. Bright line standards on age, consent, guardianship and registration improve predictability and reduce uncertainty at the moment of contracting. Courts nevertheless encounter liminal situations that were not anticipated when thresholds were drafted, including cases of documentation gaps, migration and translocal unions. The tension between textual clarity and equitable accommodation therefore becomes a routine judicial challenge.

Contemporary divorce regimes reveal a pragmatic shift from unilateral declarations toward adjudicative oversight that seeks to protect due process. Requirements for mediation, proof, and judicial recording are intended to restrain power asymmetries between spouses and to create auditable case trails. Where institutional capacity is strong these safeguards reduce arbitrary outcomes and increase transparency. Where capacity is thin they risk becoming formalities that burden the vulnerable (Bakry, Minu, & Safitri, 2022). Inheritance law appears to sit closer to classical formulations, yet practice shows that distribution hinges on mundane but decisive infrastructures. Asset discovery, debt clearance, documentation of property regimes, and cooperation between registries determine whether paper rights are realized. Delays and information asymmetries advantage those with superior resources and networks. The legal problem is less about formulas and more about enforceability (Bulan, 2021).

Jurisprudence functions as a second layer of codification through precedent and interpretive guidance. Appellate courts harmonize provisions that collide and fill statutory silences with reasoned principles. Over time these decisions entrench paths that are difficult to dislodge, giving stability but also inertia to the system. Publicly reasoned decisions that state purposes and constraints strengthen legitimacy. An interpretive

practice that explicitly invokes maqasid al shariah supplies normative ballast for context sensitive rulings. By explaining how protection of lineage, property, intellect, and dignity is preserved, judges can justify adjustments without abandoning textual fidelity. This reasoning translates ethical commitments into institutional choices that can be inspected and debated. It also links doctrine to measurable outcomes for families (Fajri & Rosyadi, 2024).

Legal outcomes are filtered through institutions long before any judgment is issued. Distance to courts, time away from work, and opacity of forms convert formal rights into privileges enjoyed by those with resources. Early stage legal advice often determines whether a claim is framed properly and whether evidence is preserved. Access to counsel and interpreters transforms law from a language barrier into a usable tool (Haq, Muchtia, & Mukhlis, 2021). Temporal justice matters as much as substantive justice. Case management, scheduling discipline, and service standards govern how quickly disputes move from filing to disposition. Prolonged timelines lengthen the bargaining shadow and magnify the leverage of parties who can wait. Timeliness therefore functions as a distributive principle, not a clerical convenience (Isra, Ferdi, & Tegnan, 2017). Mediation is frequently celebrated, but its value depends on credible safeguards. Neutrality of facilitators, documented sessions, clear opt out rules, and referral pathways to protective and welfare services determine whether mediation equalizes or entrenches power. Without such safeguards, private settlements become sites where silence substitutes for consent. With safeguards, mediation can surface interests that rigid adjudication might miss (Mu'in, Faisal, Fikri, Asnawi, & Nawawi, 2023).

Information systems are the circulatory network of family justice. Civil registries, case tracking, and asset databases allow rules to be applied consistently and evidence to be verified. Fragmented or insecure records force judges to rely on personal knowledge or informal brokers, which undermines equality before the law. Investments in data quality are therefore substantive reforms, not technical luxuries. Institutional incentives shape behaviour in subtle ways. When clearance rates are the only metric, speed displaces accuracy and care for vulnerable parties. When settlements are over rewarded, fragile agreements proliferate. Balanced dashboards that publish time to disposition, reversal rates, mediation durability, and enforcement success create feedback that disciplines discretion (Ni'ami, Bawazier, & Ma'mun, 2023). Gender norms and social expectations do not sit outside the law but flow through its channels. They influence who files claims, how testimony is heard, and which remedies are socially feasible. Training that addresses implicit bias, together with plain language forms and trauma informed procedures, reduces the risk that stereotypes will drive outcomes. Law gains traction when it anticipates the social settings in which it is applied (Anwar, 2016).

Culture provides the vocabularies of legitimacy through which families understand rights and duties. Customary expectations regarding mahar, residence, and elder involvement supply default rules in the absence of explicit stipulation. Rituals confer recognition on transitions even before registration is complete. Courts often adjudicate in the shadow of these normative orders (Ridwan, 2020). Kinship networks are both safety nets and instruments of discipline. They mobilize resources for settlement and childcare, but they can also suppress exit options through stigma and surveillance. Policy that engages community intermediaries can turn pressure into support by clarifying thresholds of harm and by linking families to services. The aim is to convert social capital into lawful protection. Translocal influences change local equilibria. Migration, media, education and employment patterns introduce new ideals of consent, partnership and parenting. These

shifts recalibrate expectations within families and communities. Law that ignores these currents will be obeyed in form and evaded in substance (Farkhani, 2022).

Hybrid practices proliferate as households navigate overlapping normative orders. Couples perform customary rites while registering marriages to secure documents for benefits and mobility. Family councils negotiate separation terms that are later formalized in court to obtain enforceable orders on custody and maintenance. Policy should recognise these sequences and design interfaces, not binaries (Rohayana & Sofi, 2021). The article proposes a doctrine society culture grid as a replicable analytic instrument rather than a rhetorical gesture. The grid makes visible how a specific doctrinal choice meets a concrete social capacity and a local cultural script. It converts broad claims into indicators that can be coded and compared across cases and jurisdictions. Replicability permits cumulative scholarship rather than one off description. Comparative reading across Indonesia, Malaysia and Egypt shows convergence in commitments to registration and procedural fairness but divergence in anchors and infrastructures. Similar rules yield different outcomes where evidentiary burdens, registry integrity, or mediation safeguards differ. These contrasts identify reform levers that are portable without erasing local legitimacy. Comparison thus becomes a method of design, not a contest of identities (Sulastri Caniago, Firdaus, Zainal Azwar, Dian Pertiwi, & Dasrizal Marah Nainin, 2024).

Procedural obstacles encourage avoidance strategies that hollow out rights. Aligning costs, documentation requirements, and service locations with ordinary life is an ethical as well as managerial imperative. The measure of success is the lived ease of doing justice (Syahmanda, Wiradibrata, & Muttaqien, 2024). Policy recommendations follow from these mechanisms rather than from slogans. Specify decision guides that translate purposes into criteria, publish service metrics that matter to users, and hard bound protections for vulnerable parties within mediation and enforcement. Build capacity where it delivers the highest marginal gain, such as registries, interpreters, and bailiff services. Reform then moves from aspiration to routine practice (Yusuf, 2020). The limitations of a documentary study are acknowledged. Field interviews and observation could illuminate how actors experience procedures and where informal norms overpower formal rights. Nonetheless, transparent coding, triangulated sources, and comparative alignment provide a reliable baseline for cumulative inquiry. Future work can convert selected indicators into a maqasid alignment index for longitudinal tracking (Hidayah, 2024). By treating doctrine, social structure, and culture as co constitutive rather than competing explanations, the analysis replaces impressionism with an auditable account. The approach enables legislators and judges to see which levers change outcomes without sacrificing legitimacy. In doing so it advances both scholarly debate and practical reform.

Social Structure, Gender Dynamics, and Institutional Capacity

Family law outcomes are not produced by texts alone but are filtered through social conditions and institutional arrangements that determine who can mobilize legal remedies and when. Courts, registries, and support services operate within resource constraints that shape the translation of rights into results (Hasan, 2017). Where people confront distance, lost income, and procedural opacity, formal protections shrink into paper promises. A credible account of effectiveness must therefore situate doctrine inside the architecture of access, capacity, and everyday incentives. This subsection explains how those factors interact with gender norms and community expectations to produce patterned outcomes. It also identifies levers that align legal design with the higher objectives of justice while remaining attentive to local legitimacy (Shuaib, 2018). Access to justice is a structural variable rather than a private preference. Travel time, transport cost, and opportunity costs

from missed work influence whether a claimant files at all. Requirements that appear neutral on their face can function as filters that privilege those with flexible income and social support. When courts are far and filing windows are narrow, urgent matters become deferred or abandoned. Strategic delay by powerful parties becomes easier when the weaker side must choose between wages and attendance. Designing procedures around realistic human schedules is therefore a substantive reform, not an administrative courtesy.

Information and forms are gateways that can open or close. Clear guidance at the first point of contact reduces error cascades and prevents avoidable rejections. Standardized templates with examples help self represented litigants frame claims and defenses accurately (Awang, 2024). Explanations in plain language make rights intelligible without specialized vocabulary. When forms assume high literacy or specialist knowledge, outcomes mirror educational and class hierarchies. Transparent documentation requirements allow people to prepare evidence before deadlines rather than after the fact.Legal aid changes trajectories from the start (Pati, 2021). Early advice helps parties understand options, preserve proof, and avoid waiving entitlements unintentionally. Duty counsel or advisory clinics at courthouses can triage cases toward mediation, hearing, or referral to protection services. Where representation is available, expectations stabilize and needless contests narrow. Without advice, procedural traps and paperwork burdens become decisive rather than merits. Investment at intake prevents downstream congestion and reduces the social cost of error (Alfitri, 2020). Time is a distributive principle in practice. Case management policies, scheduling discipline, and service standards determine how long disputes remain unresolved (RS, 2018). Prolonged timelines lengthen the bargaining shadow and reward parties who can wait out the other side. Delays also erode evidence and increase the psychological cost of participation (Nasution & Nasution, 2021).

Mediation can equalize or entrench power depending on its safeguards. Neutral facilitators, documented sessions, and reviewable outcomes protect genuine consent. Clear opt out rules and confidential referral pathways to protection and welfare services prevent settlement under coercion. Where mediators are untrained and sessions leave no trace, the rhetoric of harmony masks the absence of accountability. Well designed mediation recognizes both relational repair and risk management. It becomes an instrument of justice rather than an escape from scrutiny (Idrus, Nurdin, Qayyum, Halim, & Amir, 2023). Gender dynamics flow through each corridor of the legal process. Stereotypes about marital roles can shape credibility assessments unless judges are trained to interrogate implicit bias. Privacy measures and trauma informed questioning reduce secondary harm for survivors of violence. Support persons and safe waiting areas enable participation without fear (Silfiah, 2020). Interpreter services and bilingual forms enable parties to narrate facts and understand obligations. Misinterpretation of key terms can reverse the apparent meaning of testimony or consent. Courts should maintain rosters of qualified interpreters with training in legal terminology and ethics. Where language barriers persist, procedural rights become fragile. Clarity is a precondition for legitimacy (Haq et al., 2021).

Institutional incentives shape behavior in subtle ways. If clearance rates are the only metric, speed displaces accuracy and care for vulnerable groups. Balanced dashboards that include time to disposition, reversal rates, durability of mediated agreements, and enforcement success create a more honest picture of performance. Publishing these indicators allows internal learning and external accountability. Data should guide improvement rather than blame. What is measured acquires managerial gravity (Ni'ami et al., 2023). Information systems are the circulatory network of rights enforcement. Civil

registries validate identity and family ties, case tracking illuminates procedural journeys, and asset databases enable credible execution of orders. Fragmented or insecure records invite private gatekeepers to control access through personal knowledge or fees. Secure and searchable records democratize proof and reduce reliance on informal brokers. Investment in data quality is a substantive reform lever. Better records make fair distribution possible in practice (Tendi, Marihandono, & Abdurakhman, 2019). Coordination between civil and religious administrative bodies lowers friction and prevents contradictory orders. Shared standards for recognition, referral, and data exchange reduce forum shopping and duplication. Families should not have to shuttle between windows to reconcile parallel mandates (Nisa, 2018).

Frontline practice translates policy into lived experience. Clerks and bailiffs exercise everyday discretion that can widen or narrow the gap between law on the books and law in action. Respectful service and clear scripts at counters reduce arbitrary refusals and misinformation. Space design that protects privacy and safety improves compliance and trust. Staffing ratios and workflow design determine actual capacity more than abstract mandates. Good rules fail without workable routines. Urban and rural ecologies present different justice landscapes. Cities offer proximity to institutions but suffer congestion and limited time from busy dockets. Villages provide familiarity and social oversight but risk informal settlements that sideline weaker parties. Mobile services and circuit sittings can bridge distance without sacrificing safeguards. Local partners can host secure hearing spaces with clear protocols. Geography should be governed by design rather than endured as fate. Digital pathways can flatten inequalities when designed with inclusion in mind. Remote filing reduces travel and waiting time, and video hearings can connect distant communities to judges. Connectivity gaps and digital illiteracy create new exclusions if unaddressed. Human help desks and guided kiosks should accompany every new tool. Digital records improve search, recall, and monitoring. Technology serves people when it is paired with training and support.

Monitoring makes discretion visible and discussable. Regular reports invite learning rather than blame and highlight where bottlenecks concentrate. Peer exchange spreads workable innovations across courts and districts. Audits should test both process fidelity and outcome equity (Saraswati, Wicaksono, Ganindha, & Hidayat, 2018). User surveys capture the lived experience of justice that numbers alone cannot see. Feedback completes the loop from data to change. Enforcement is the hinge between right and remedy. Orders require timely inventory of assets, clear timelines, and escalation steps that are known in advance. Bailiff services must be funded and supervised with transparency to prevent selective execution. Sanctions should deter strategic non compliance without harming dependents. Settlement after judgment should be recorded to prevent quiet evasion. Every step should leave a verifiable trace (Butt, 2020). Community actors shape disputes long before any filing. Elders, religious leaders, and local brokers can guide parties toward safety or silence them in the name of harmony. Partnerships with communities should set clear red lines around harm and ensure fast referral to protection and welfare services. Education campaigns can replace harmful default scripts with protective norms. Legitimacy grows when protection is consistent and visible. Local voice and legal duty can be aligned. Cultural expectations define what feels fair and feasible (Ab Rahman, Abdullah Thaidi, Baharuddin, Ab Rahman, & Ab Rahim, 2019).

Standard setting turns aims into operations. Decision guides translate purposes into criteria that frontline staff can apply under pressure. Checklists reduce missed steps and variance across similar cases. Model orders improve clarity and reduce drafting errors.

Time and cost standards shield the poor from attrition by delay and surprise fees. Consistency enables fairness to scale.Capacity building is more than training events. It includes tools, space, mentoring, and reflective practice after difficult hearings. Investments in interpreter rosters, child care support at courthouses, and searchable registries produce immediate gains for users. Supervision that values accuracy and protection prevents burnout and shortcut cultures. Culture shifts when everyday wins accumulate. Staff who experience success in service carry reforms forward (ALFITRI, 2018). Evaluation should follow the entire life of a case. Entry metrics show whether doors are open, process metrics reveal where attrition occurs, outcome metrics indicate whether orders are obeyed, and equity metrics identify who benefits and who waits. Learning metrics test whether improvements persist over time. Public dashboards invite scrutiny and build trust. Evaluation becomes a habit that anchors continuous improvement(Disemadi, Al−Fatih, & Yusro, 2020). A system oriented toward the higher objectives of justice aligns institutional incentives with human realities. It measures what matters to users, protects those at risk, and designs procedures that ordinary people can navigate.

Cultural Embeddedness and the Lived Law of Family

Law does not operate in a vacuum; it is interpreted and enacted through cultural meanings that give practical sense to rights and duties (Inayatillah, Mohd Nor, Asy'ari, & Faisal, 2022). Families draw on shared understandings about obligation, authority, and fairness when they approach marriage, divorce, and inheritance. These meanings frame what counts as evidence, what outcomes feel acceptable, and which pathways are seen as legitimate (Zuhdi, Dimyati, Absori, Wardiono, & Apreliyanti, 2025). The lived law emerges at this interface, where textual prescriptions meet ordinary expectations and moral vocabularies (Inayatillah et al., 2022). Custom supplies default rules that guide conduct in the absence of explicit stipulation. Communities develop settled practices regarding bridewealth or dowry, residence after marriage, and the involvement of elders in dispute resolution (Mahdaliyah, Assaad, & Nur, 2024). Such norms persist even after statutory reforms, because they are embedded in everyday cooperation and mutual aid. Courts that ignore these defaults confront compliance problems that are not legal but social (Jamaa, 2018). Ritual confers legitimacy on key transitions in family life. Engagements, ceremonies, and public acknowledgments signal status changes that the community recognizes as real. Where ritual and registration diverge, parallel legalities arise, with one order producing social recognition and the other producing documentary proof. Harmonizing the two streams is essential if reform is to travel beyond paper (Tabroni et al., 2025).

Kinship networks act as safety nets and as instruments of discipline. Extended families mobilize resources for reconciliation, childcare, and maintenance, but they may also police reputations and restrict exit. The same network can offer shelter or exert pressure depending on internal hierarchies and interests. Policy that enlists kin as partners must also set clear limits where protection of the vulnerable is at stake (Elimartati et al., 2025). Gendered cultural scripts shape expectations about who speaks, who decides, and who sacrifices. These scripts influence the credibility assigned to testimony and the reading of motive and blame. When such scripts are left unexamined, legal processes reproduce inequality under the color of tradition. Professional practice that surfaces and tests these assumptions enables fairer evaluation of claims (Alieva, 2025). Narratives organize moral judgment by giving disputes a plot. Stories of honor, betrayal, necessity, or duty orient the community toward particular endings. Early narrative framing influences negotiation

stances and receptiveness to mediation or adjudication. Effective legal communication acknowledges these frames while clarifying the boundaries set by law (Jamaa, 2018). Cultural brokers translate between normative orders. Religious leaders, customary authorities, and respected elders carry interpretive authority that can legitimate reform or fuel resistance (Fanani, 2017).

Translocal influences steadily reshape custom. Migration, media, and schooling introduce new ideals of consent, partnership, and parenting that travel back to origin communities. These flows alter expectations in ways that are uneven across class and generation. Reform that recognizes these dynamics can pace change so that it is both principled and plausible (Waluyo, Syafe'i, Aeni, & Saebani, 2024). Hybrid practices proliferate as households navigate overlapping orders. Couples perform customary rites to secure social recognition and register marriages to secure access to services and mobility. Families negotiate separation terms in private councils and then seek court orders to bind the agreement. Law that designs interfaces for these sequences reduces friction and improves enforceability. Stigma functions as a shadow institution that regulates choice. The social penalties attached to divorce or litigation deter rights claiming and encourage quiet settlement. When fear of gossip outweighs confidence in protection, vulnerable parties accept unfavorable terms. Reducing stigma is therefore a justice task that requires both message and mechanism (Nurlaelawati & van Huis, 2019). Place shapes authority and compliance.

Language is constitutive of legal participation. Technical vocabulary can exclude lay participants or reverse the apparent meaning of testimony. Interpreters and plain language forms transform legal speech into shared understanding. Clarity is not an adornment; it is a precondition for legitimacy. Time has cultural as well as procedural dimensions. Legal time moves by calendars and deadlines, while community time moves by seasons and life cycle events. Misaligned temporalities generate noncompliance that looks like defiance but is often logistical. Scheduling that respects these rhythms improves both attendance and trust (Hasan, 2017). Cultural meanings of property and care shape inheritance disputes. Obligations to natal and marital kin, expectations about caretakers, and valuations of non market labor influence claims and concessions. These meanings can either complement statutory shares or pull against them. Sound adjudication engages these logics while enforcing non negotiable protections (Idrus et al., 2023).

Culturally competent mediation treats respect and safety as joint goods. Protocols should safeguard voluntariness, document sessions, and allow review where power imbalances are strong. Mediators require training that includes local moral vocabularies and the detection of coercion that hides behind courtesy. When designed this way, mediation becomes a site where dignity and agreement can coexist. Procedure can encode cultural accommodation without surrendering principle. Examples include flexible hearing locations with privacy, coordinated referrals to welfare and protection services, and recognition of ceremonial evidence alongside documentary proof. These accommodations are bounded by bright lines that prevent harm and preserve equality before the law. The result is not relativism but responsible responsiveness (Mahdaliyah et al., 2024). Comparative pluralism offers practical lessons for reform design. Observing how similar customs operate under different legal architectures reveals which combinations of rule and service produce compliance and which produce evasion. Such comparisons identify portable levers that respect local meaning while improving fairness. Design then becomes empirical rather than aspirational. Measurement must extend to the cultural interface if improvement is to be cumulative. Indicators can track the alignment between ritual and registration, the durability of mediated agreements, and user confidence across

groups. Qualitative accounts should be paired with administrative data to capture both meaning and performance. Evidence of this kind turns cultural sensitivity into accountable practice (Zuhriyah & Muna, 2023).

DISCUSSION

Doctrinal reasoning remains the first fulcrum of difference. Appellate guidance that articulates purposes and constraints stabilizes lower－court practice and reduces variance across judges. Where opinions explicitly reason with maqashid linking a chosen view to the protection of lineage, property, dignity, and access to justice context－sensitive adjustments acquire principled justification. Conversely, purely textual readings without purposive anchors risk formal compliance that misses substantive protection, especially in hard cases at the margins of marriage validity, unilateral divorce, or contested estates (Engelcke, 2019). Institutions mediate doctrine into remedies. Distance to courthouses, opportunity costs, and opaque forms turn rights into privileges for those with resources and literacy. Early legal advice, interpreter support, and standardized templates reduce these structural barriers, narrowing the gap between law on the books and law in action. Timeliness operates as a distributive principle: congested dockets lengthen the bargaining shadow and advantage parties who can wait. In this setting, performance standards for time to disposition, mediation quality, and enforcement rates are not managerial luxuries but justice metrics that condition real outcomes.

Mediation is emblematic of the system's ambivalence. When backed by trained neutrals, documented sessions, genuine opt－out rules, and quiet referral pathways to protection services, mediation lowers conflict costs while preserving voluntariness. Absent those safeguards, it can entrench asymmetry behind the rhetoric of harmony. The evidence here aligns with a broader claim: procedural devices only advance maqashid when embedded in auditable protocols and supported by institutional capacity. Design details, not labels, determine whether a device protects or pressures. Culture supplies the vocabularies of legitimacy through which families interpret rights and duties. Local expectations about mahar, residence, and elder involvement provide default rules that courts meet daily. Rituals confer social recognition even before registration is complete, producing parallel legalities that reform must reconcile. Stigma around divorce and litigation functions as a shadow institution that depresses rights－claiming among the vulnerable. These dynamics do not negate doctrinal commitments; rather, they specify the social work required for those commitments to take effect. Culturally competent procedures plain－language forms, flexible but private hearing spaces, recognition of ceremonial evidence within clear bounds convert sensitivity into accountable practice.

Comparative illustrations from Indonesia, Malaysia, and Egypt underline that divergence in outcomes often tracks infrastructures rather than creeds. Where registries are reliable, evidentiary burdens are calibrated, and mediation is auditable, marriage registration rates rise, procedural injustice in divorce falls, and inheritance orders are more readily executed. Where records are fragmented, bailiff services are under－resourced, or mediation is informal and undocumented, similar statutes yield thin protection. The comparative lens therefore operates as a diagnostic for portability: which levers travel without erasing local meaning, and which require deeper institutional renovation before adoption (Isra et al., 2017). Methodologically, the Doctrine－Society－Culture (DSC) grid proved useful for converting broad claims into observable indicators. Mapping doctrinal positions and codification choices against access－to－justice variables and cultural scripts exposed the mechanisms by which textual fidelity can coexist with, or be undermined by, contextual ijtihad . The grid's replicability enables cumulative

comparison across cases and over time, moving the debate beyond impressionistic description and toward auditable alignment with maqashid. This instrument is not a substitute for juristic evaluation; it is a way to make those evaluations legible across institutional and cultural settings (Engelcke, 2019).

This study recommends reforms that are principled, pragmatic, and globally relevant by moving beyond doctrinal formalism and operationalizing maqasid into measurable protections of lineage, property, and dignity. The Doctrine－Society－Culture grid should be further developed into a coding tool that translates qualitative insights into indicators for cumulative cross－country evaluation. Policymakers are encouraged to adopt purposive appellate guidance, standardize mediation safeguards, and strengthen enforcement infrastructures through registries, interpreters, and bailiff services. Transparent performance dashboards should be published to promote accountability without generating perverse incentives. Engagement with cultural intermediaries should be institutionalized to ensure legitimacy while maintaining clear boundaries against harm and elite capture. Incremental recalibration, rather than sweeping overhauls, is recommended to preserve stability amid socio－cultural change. Aligning doctrinal fidelity with contextual adaptability can improve rights protection and reduce disparities. The framework's portability enables application across Muslim－majority societies in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, as well as minority communities in Europe and North America. In doing so, this study contributes to global debates on Islamic legal reform, demonstrating that interdisciplinary inquiry provides both analytical clarity and actionable guidance for advancing justice in plural societies.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that adopting an interdisciplinary approach is crucial for understanding the dynamics of Islamic family law practices in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Egypt. The findings reveal that jurisprudential reasoning, social structures, and cultural practices are not isolated factors but interdependent forces that jointly shape the outcomes of family law. In Indonesia, the pluralistic legal order, with its coexistence of state legislation and religious court authority, illustrates how codification choices are constantly mediated by social realities and cultural traditions, leading to hybrid outcomes in marriage, divorce, and inheritance cases. Malaysia, on the other hand, demonstrates the strong influence of federal－state relations, where the allocation of legal authority reflects both the autonomy of Islamic institutions and the assertion of cultural identity, producing a distinctive legal environment with its own challenges. In Egypt, the resilience of classical jurisprudence is evident in judicial reasoning, yet gradual accommodation to social change illustrates the adaptation of long－standing doctrines to contemporary conditions. Taken together, these jurisdictions highlight that similar doctrinal sources, when filtered through different institutional capacities and cultural expectations, can lead to significantly different results in practice. The Doctrine－Society－Culture grid developed in this study provides a transparent and replicable tool for examining such dynamics, showing not only why legal texts diverge in outcome but also where reform levers may be most effectively applied to close the gap between normative commitments and practical remedies.

The significance of this study is threefold, encompassing conceptual, methodological, and theoretical contributions to the study of Islamic family law. Conceptually, it reframes Islamic family law as a multidimensional system in which jurisprudential reasoning, social realities, and cultural norms are co－constitutive elements that must be analyzed in relation to one another. Methodologically, it introduces a transparent and reproducible coding grid that operationalizes interdisciplinarity by converting doctrinal, social, and

cultural dynamics into measurable indicators, enabling systematic comparison across jurisdictions and cumulative assessment over time. Theoretically, the research identifies recurring tensions that arise from the mediation of scriptural norms and juristic reasoning through social structures and cultural practices, thereby explaining why similar rules yield divergent results in different contexts. By applying this framework to Indonesia, Malaysia, and Egypt, the study not only offers an evidence－based analysis but also advances comparative Islamic legal studies beyond rhetorical calls for interdisciplinarity. Policy implications emerge directly from these insights, including the adoption of purposive appellate guidance, the implementation of accountable mediation safeguards, the strengthening of court administration through registries and enforcement mechanisms, and the design of culturally competent procedures anchored in non－negotiable protections. These findings provide a structured pathway for aligning legal design with the higher objectives of Islamic law while simultaneously respecting local legitimacy and lived realities.

Despite these contributions, the study is not without limitations, which also serve as opportunities for future research. The reliance on documentary sources, socio－legal analysis, and comparative illustration cannot capture all dimensions of lived practice, particularly the affective negotiations of fear, pride, and compromise that unfold within households and communities. To address this, future studies should incorporate field－based interviews, court－user surveys, and longitudinal observation in order to capture the everyday operation of law and the perceptions of justice among different social groups. Extending the Doctrine－Society－Culture framework into a calibrated maqashid－alignment score could also allow for a more precise evaluation of how well legal outcomes serve the higher objectives of Islamic law in marriage, divorce, and inheritance. Moreover, cross－country applications beyond Indonesia, Malaysia, and Egypt would test the portability and adaptability of the model across diverse Muslim societies. In practical terms, durable reform requires collaborative norm production with credible cultural interlocutors, robust safeguards against harm, and institutional incentives that ensure fair, efficient, and transparent procedures. When jurisprudence, social structure, and cultural practice are aligned under such conditions, Islamic family law can better fulfill its intended role of protecting lineage, property, and dignity in both principle and practice, ensuring that legal commitments and lived expectations converge across different contexts.

DECLARATIONS

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Muhammad Febri Eka Saputra is the primary author who carried out the entire process of this research and article preparation, including conceptualization, data analysis, drafting, editing, and refinement of the manuscript from beginning to end. Sukriyani contributed by assisting in correcting minor typographical errors, providing translation support, and offering limited improvements in language style and grammar. The intellectual framework, critical interpretation, and substantive content of the article remain the sole responsibility of the first author.

FUNDING STATEMENT

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All data supporting the findings of this article are derived from publicly accessible legal documents, scholarly literature, and conceptual analysis. No proprietary or restricted data were used. The author confirms that all relevant information is available for verification upon reasonable request.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS STATEMENT

The author declares that there are no known financial interests, institutional affiliations, or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this article. The research was conducted objectively and free from any potential conflict of interest.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to febri75saputra@gmail.com

ORCID

Muhammad Febri Eka Saputra https://orcid.org/0009−0003−9980−0840
Sukriyani https://orcid.org/0009−0002−1001−8928

REFERENCES

Ab Rahman, M. F., Abdullah Thaidi, H. `Azeemi, Baharuddin, A. S., Ab Rahman, A., & Ab Rahim, S. F. (2019). Expansion of Agricultural Zakat Revenue in Malaysia on the Basis of the Current Maslahah. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *57*(1), 231−256. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2019.571.231−256

Alfitri. (2020). Protecting Women from Domestic Violence: Islam, Family Law, and the State in Indonesia. *Studia Islamika*, *27*(2), 273−307. https://doi.org/10.36712/sdi.v27i2.9408

ALFITRI. (2018). Religion and Constitutional Practices in Indonesia: How Far Should the State Intervene in the Administration of Islam? *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, *13*(2), 389−413. https://doi.org/10.1017/asjcl.2018.20

Alieva, K. (2025). Revealing the Barriers to Women's Political Participation in Uzbekistan. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *18*(1), 29−46. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18102

Anwar, S. (2016). Unified Islamic Calendar in the Perspective of Islamic Legal Philosophy. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *54*(1), 203−247. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2016.541.203−247

Awang, N. (2024). The Right Concept and Application of Polygamous Marriage in Malaysia: An Analysis to the Role of Court under the Provision of Islamic Family Law (Federal Territories) Act 1984. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *17*(1), 58−70. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2024.17104

Aziz, N. (2018). the Great Phenomenon of Online Sirri Marriage for Male and Female. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, *1*(3), 445−450. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v1i3.70

Bakry, K., Minu, I. W., & Safitri, N. A. (2022). Political Deposit for Regional Head Election Candidates in Bolaang Mongondow Selatan Regency in the Perspective of Jurnal Bidang Hukum Islam. *Jurnal Bidang Hukum*, *3*(3), 371−388.

Bulan, W. R. (2021). Transformation of Undocumented Marriages in the Frontier Territory, from Generation One to Generation Three. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, *13*, 159−170.

Butt, S. (2020). CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION OF "BELIEFS" IN INDONESIA. *Journal of Law and Religion*, *35*(3), 450－473. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2020.39

Chen, N., & Yu, M.－T. (2024). Human rights and value of cash: Evidence from Islamic and non－Islamic countries. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, *86*, 102466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pacfin.2024.102466

Disemadi, H., Al－Fatih, S., & Yusro, M. (2020). Indonesian Children Protection against Commercial Sexual Exploitation through Siri Marriage Practices in Maqashid Al－Shariah Perspective. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, *7*(2), 15－28. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2020.007.02.04

Elimartati, Warman, A. B., Firdaus, Hayati, R. F., Kasmidin, & Asmara, M. (2025). From Custodians to Bystanders: Tigo Tungku Sajarangan's Responses to Unregistered Marriages Practices in Minangkabau. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *18*(1), 47－64. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18103

Engelcke, D. (2019). ESTABLISHING FILIATION (NASAB) AND THE PLACEMENT OF DESTITUTE CHILDREN INTO NEW FAMILIES: WHAT ROLE DOES THE STATE PLAY? *Journal of Law and Religion*, *34*(3), 408－432. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2019.45

Fajri, I., & Rosyadi, A. R. (2024). Attitude of Indonesian Muslims Towards Product Boycott Pro－Israel Analysis Of Fatwas Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) Number 83 of 2023 Concerning Legal Status of Supporting the Palestinian Struggle. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, *26*(1), 47－61.

Fanani, A. F. (2017). The Implementation of Sharia Bylaws and Its Negative Social Outcome for Indonesian Women. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *7*(2), 153－174. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v7i2.153－174

Farkhani. (2022). Converging Islamic and Religious Norms in Indonesia's State Life Plurality. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *12*(2), 421－446. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v12i2.421－446

Hakim, M. L. (2023). Islamic Law and Society in Indonesia: Corporate Zakat Norms and Practices in Islamic Banks , by Alfitri. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde / Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia*, *179*(1), 115－118. https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379－17901001

Haq, Y. D., Muchtia, H., & Mukhlis, Z. A. (2021). Bid'ah in Concept of Maslahah Mursalah and Istihsan According to Imam asy－Syathibi. *Juris: Jurnal Ilmiah Syariah*, *20*(2), 225－237.

Hasan, N. (2017). Religious Diversity and Blasphemy Law: Understanding Growing Religious Conflicts in Contemporary Indonesia. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *55*(1), 105－126. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2017.551.105－126

Hidayah, O. N. (2024). Compliance with Religious and State Laws: The Practice of Dual and Single Marriage Contracts within the Shi'i Community. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *17*(1), 107－122. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2024.17107

Idrus, A. M., Nurdin, R., Qayyum, R., Halim, P., & Amir, R. (2023). The Tradition of Mappasikarawa in the Bugis Makassar Community Marriage: A Study of Islamic Law Philosophy. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, *7*(2), 848－874. https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v7i2.17125

Inayatillah, I., Mohd Nor, M. R., Asy'ari, A., & Faisal, M. (2022). Social History of Islamic Law from Gender Perspective in Aceh: A Study of Marriage Traditions in South Aceh, Indonesia. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, *6*(2), 573. https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v6i2.14598

Isra, S., Ferdi, & Tegnan, H. (2017). Rule of law and human rights challenges in south east asia: A case study of legal pluralism in indonesia. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, *3*(2), 117－140. https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v3i2.1081

Jamaa, L. (2018). Fatwas of the Indonesian council of ulama and its contributions to the development of contemporary Islamic law in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *8*(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v8i1.29－56

Mahdaliyah, M., Assaad, A. S., & Nur, M. T. (2024). Protecting Women from Domestic Violence: Islam, Family Law, and the State in Indonesia. *Al-Ahkam*, *34*(2), 289－316. https://doi.org/10.21580/ahkam.2024.34.2.22835

Mu'in, F., Faisal, Fikri, A., Asnawi, H. S., & Nawawi, M. A. (2023). THE PRACTICE OF SUBSTITUTE HEIRS IN INDONESIAN RELIGIOUS COURT: Restricted Interpretation. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *16*(1), 141－157. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2023.16107

Nafisah, D., Nasrudin, N., Meidina, A. R., & Zain, M. F. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Islamic Family Law and Normative Law: Examining the Causes of Divorce in Purwokerto, Indonesia. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, *8*(2), 847. https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v8i2.16825

Nasution, K., & Nasution, S. (2021). Implementation of Indonesian Islamic Family Law to Guarantee Children's Rights. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *59*(2), 347－374. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2021.592.347－374

Ni'ami, M. F., Bawazier, D. A., & Ma'mun, S. (2023). MODERNIZATION, ECLECTICISM, AND SAUDI ARABIA VISION 2030 ON FAMILY LAW: Positivization of Talaq Divorce in Niẓam Al－Aḥwā l 1443 H. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *16*(1), 1－22. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2023.16101

Nisa, E. F. (2018). THE BUREAUCRATIZATION OF MUSLIM MARRIAGE IN INDONESIA. *Journal of Law and Religion*, *33*(2), 291－309. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2018.28

Nurlaelawati, E., & van Huis, S. C. (2019). THE STATUS OF CHILDREN BORN OUT OF WEDLOCK AND ADOPTED CHILDREN IN INDONESIA: INTERACTIONS BETWEEN ISLAMIC, ADAT , AND HUMAN RIGHTS NORMS. *Journal of Law and Religion*, *34*(3), 356－382. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2019.41

Pati, U. K. (2021). Fintech Remittance Syariah: The Solution of Collection Ziswaf Overseas in Indonesia. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, *8*(2), 282－294. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2021.008.02.07

Ridwan, M. (2020). Ijtihad Pada Era Kontemporer (Konteks Pemikiran Islam dalam Fiqih dan Maqashid al－Syariah). *Jurnal Masohi*, *1*(2), 110.

Rohayana, A. D., & Sofi, M. J. (2021). Critique of Radical Religious Paradigm: An Epistemological Analysis from Principles of Islamic Thought. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *11*(1), 163－184. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v11i1.163－184

RS, I. R. (2018). State Role in Balancing Harmony in a Diversed Society: Regulating Religions in Indonesia. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, *5*(2), 189－199. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2018.005.02.03

Saraswati, A. A. A. N., Wicaksono, S., Ganindha, R., & Hidayat, M. (2018). RESTRICTIONS OF THE RIGHTS OF FREEDOM OF RELIGIONS: COMPARISON OF LAW BETWEEN INDONESIA AND GERMANY. *Indonesia Law Review*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.15742/ilrev.v8n3.510

Shuaib, F. S. (2018). Administration of Islamic Law and Human Rights: The Basis and Its Trajectory in Malaysia. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *56*(2), 281−304. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2018.562.281−304

Silfiah, R. I. (2020). The Implementation of Religious Pluralism Values of Islamic Law on Article 156A of the Criminal Code. *Yustisia: Jurnal Hukum*, *9*(2), 210−226. https://doi.org/10.20961/yustisia.v9i2.43099

Sulastri Caniago, Firdaus, Zainal Azwar, Dian Pertiwi, & Dasrizal Marah Nainin. (2024). Gender Integration in Islamic Politics: Fiqh Siyasah on Women's Political Rights since Classical to Contemporary Interpretations. *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review*, *3*(2), 411−431. https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v3i2.9962

Syahmanda, M. R., Wiradibrata, M. W., & Muttaqien, G. (2024). Gestational Surrogacy dalam Islam dan Implikasi Hukum Syariah. *Ikhlas*, *1*(4), 163−172.

Tabroni, R., Izudin, A., Isnanto, M., Sujibto, B. J., Yuwono, D. B., & Suarsana, I. M. (2025). Hybridity, Intersection, and Challenge: Navigating the History of Customary and Islamic Family Law in Moluccan Marriages. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *18*(1), 1−28. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2015.18101

Tendi, T., Marihandono, D., & Abdurakhman, A. (2019). Between the Influence of Customary, Dutch, and Islamic Law: Jaksa Pepitu and Their Place in Cirebon Sultanate History. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *57*(1), 117−142. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2019.571.117−142

Waluyo, K. E., Syafe'i, R., Aeni, I. N., & Saebani, B. A. (2024). Understanding and Implementation of Islamic Law: Study of the Unrecorded Polygyny Phenomenon in Karawang Regency. *International Journal Ihya' 'Ulum Al-Din*, *26*(1), 132−142. https://doi.org/10.21580/ihya.26.1.18918

Yusuf, S. M. (2020). Inter−subjectivity of khalwat (suluk) members in the tarekat Naqsyabandiyah Khalidiyah Ponorogo. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *10*(1), 103−126. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v10i1.103−126

Zuhdi, S., Dimyati, K., Absori, Wardiono, K., & Apreliyanti, V. E. (2025). Between Customary and Islamic Law: Financial Inheritance Practices in the Surakarta Sunanate Royal Family. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *18*(1), 65−84. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18204

Zuhriyah, L., & Muna, N. (2023). Economic Ability as a Kafa'ah Principle and the Recognition of Difabel Marriage Guardian in As−Silah fī Bayani An−Nikah by Khalil Al−Bangkalany. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *16*(1), 89−111. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2023.16105

Ab Rahman, M. F., Abdullah Thaidi, H. `Azeemi, Baharuddin, A. S., Ab Rahman, A., & Ab Rahim, S. F. (2019). Expansion of Agricultural Zakat Revenue in Malaysia on the Basis of the Current Maslahah. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *57*(1), 231−256. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2019.571.231−256

Alfitri. (2020). Protecting Women from Domestic Violence: Islam, Family Law, and the State in Indonesia. *Studia Islamika*, *27*(2), 273−307. https://doi.org/10.36712/sdi.v27i2.9408

ALFITRI. (2018). Religion and Constitutional Practices in Indonesia: How Far Should the State Intervene in the Administration of Islam? *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, *13*(2), 389−413. https://doi.org/10.1017/asjcl.2018.20

Alieva, K. (2025). Revealing the Barriers to Women's Political Participation in Uzbekistan. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *18*(1), 29−46. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18102

Anwar, S. (2016). Unified Islamic Calendar in the Perspective of Islamic Legal Philosophy. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *54*(1), 203−247. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2016.541.203−247

Awang, N. (2024). The Right Concept and Application of Polygamous Marriage in Malaysia: An Analysis to the Role of Court under the Provision of Islamic Family Law (Federal Territories) Act 1984. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *17*(1), 58−70. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2024.17104

Aziz, N. (2018). the Great Phenomenon of Online Sirri Marriage for Male and Female. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, *1*(3), 445−450. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v1i3.70

Bakry, K., Minu, I. W., & Safitri, N. A. (2022). Political Deposit for Regional Head Election Candidates in Bolaang Mongondow Selatan Regency in the Perspective of Jurnal Bidang Hukum Islam. *Jurnal Bidang Hukum*, *3*(3), 371−388.

Bulan, W. R. (2021). Transformation of Undocumented Marriages in the Frontier Territory, from Generation One to Generation Three. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, *13*, 159−170.

Butt, S. (2020). CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION OF "BELIEFS" IN INDONESIA. *Journal of Law and Religion*, *35*(3), 450−473. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2020.39

Chen, N., & Yu, M.−T. (2024). Human rights and value of cash: Evidence from Islamic and non−Islamic countries. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, *86*, 102466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pacfin.2024.102466

Disemadi, H., Al−Fatih, S., & Yusro, M. (2020). Indonesian Children Protection against Commercial Sexual Exploitation through Siri Marriage Practices in Maqashid Al−Shariah Perspective. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, *7*(2), 15−28. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2020.007.02.04

Elimartati, Warman, A. B., Firdaus, Hayati, R. F., Kasmidin, & Asmara, M. (2025). From Custodians to Bystanders: Tigo Tungku Sajarangan's Responses to Unregistered Marriages Practices in Minangkabau. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *18*(1), 47−64. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18103

Engelcke, D. (2019). ESTABLISHING FILIATION (NASAB) AND THE PLACEMENT OF DESTITUTE CHILDREN INTO NEW FAMILIES: WHAT ROLE DOES THE STATE PLAY? *Journal of Law and Religion*, *34*(3), 408−432. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2019.45

Fajri, I., & Rosyadi, A. R. (2024). Attitude of Indonesian Muslims Towards Product Boycott Pro−Israel Analysis Of Fatwas Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) Number 83 of 2023 Concerning Legal Status of Supporting the Palestinian Struggle. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, *26*(1), 47−61.

Fanani, A. F. (2017). The Implementation of Sharia Bylaws and Its Negative Social Outcome for Indonesian Women. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *7*(2), 153−174. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v7i2.153−174

Farkhani. (2022). Converging Islamic and Religious Norms in Indonesia's State Life Plurality. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *12*(2), 421−446. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v12i2.421−446

Hakim, M. L. (2023). Islamic Law and Society in Indonesia: Corporate Zakat Norms and Practices in Islamic Banks , by Alfitri. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde / Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia*, *179*(1), 115−118. https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379−17901001

Haq, Y. D., Muchtia, H., & Mukhlis, Z. A. (2021). Bid'ah in Concept of Maslahah Mursalah

and Istihsan According to Imam asy−Syathibi. *Juris: Jurnal Ilmiah Syariah*, *20*(2), 225−237.

Hasan, N. (2017). Religious Diversity and Blasphemy Law: Understanding Growing Religious Conflicts in Contemporary Indonesia. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *55*(1), 105−126. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2017.551.105−126

Hidayah, O. N. (2024). Compliance with Religious and State Laws: The Practice of Dual and Single Marriage Contracts within the Shi'i Community. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *17*(1), 107−122. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2024.17107

Idrus, A. M., Nurdin, R., Qayyum, R., Halim, P., & Amir, R. (2023). The Tradition of Mappasikarawa in the Bugis Makassar Community Marriage: A Study of Islamic Law Philosophy. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, *7*(2), 848−874. https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v7i2.17125

Inayatillah, I., Mohd Nor, M. R., Asy'ari, A., & Faisal, M. (2022). Social History of Islamic Law from Gender Perspective in Aceh: A Study of Marriage Traditions in South Aceh, Indonesia. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, *6*(2), 573. https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v6i2.14598

Isra, S., Ferdi, & Tegnan, H. (2017). Rule of law and human rights challenges in south east asia: A case study of legal pluralism in indonesia. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, *3*(2), 117−140. https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v3i2.1081

Jamaa, L. (2018). Fatwas of the Indonesian council of ulama and its contributions to the development of contemporary Islamic law in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *8*(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v8i1.29−56

Mahdaliyah, M., Assaad, A. S., & Nur, M. T. (2024). Protecting Women from Domestic Violence: Islam, Family Law, and the State in Indonesia. *Al-Ahkam*, *34*(2), 289−316. https://doi.org/10.21580/ahkam.2024.34.2.22835

Mu'in, F., Faisal, Fikri, A., Asnawi, H. S., & Nawawi, M. A. (2023). THE PRACTICE OF SUBSTITUTE HEIRS IN INDONESIAN RELIGIOUS COURT: Restricted Interpretation. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *16*(1), 141−157. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2023.16107

Nafisah, D., Nasrudin, N., Meidina, A. R., & Zain, M. F. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Islamic Family Law and Normative Law: Examining the Causes of Divorce in Purwokerto, Indonesia. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, *8*(2), 847. https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v8i2.16825

Nasution, K., & Nasution, S. (2021). Implementation of Indonesian Islamic Family Law to Guarantee Children's Rights. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *59*(2), 347−374. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2021.592.347−374

Ni'ami, M. F., Bawazier, D. A., & Ma'mun, S. (2023). MODERNIZATION, ECLECTICISM, AND SAUDI ARABIA VISION 2030 ON FAMILY LAW: Positivization of Talaq Divorce in Niẓam Al−Aḥwā l 1443 H. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *16*(1), 1−22. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2023.16101

Nisa, E. F. (2018). THE BUREAUCRATIZATION OF MUSLIM MARRIAGE IN INDONESIA. *Journal of Law and Religion*, *33*(2), 291−309. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2018.28

Nurlaelawati, E., & van Huis, S. C. (2019). THE STATUS OF CHILDREN BORN OUT OF WEDLOCK AND ADOPTED CHILDREN IN INDONESIA: INTERACTIONS BETWEEN ISLAMIC, ADAT , AND HUMAN RIGHTS NORMS. *Journal of Law and Religion*, *34*(3), 356−382. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2019.41

Pati, U. K. (2021). Fintech Remittance Syariah: The Solution of Collection Ziswaf Overseas in Indonesia. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, *8*(2), 282−294. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2021.008.02.07

Ridwan, M. (2020). Ijtihad Pada Era Kontemporer (Konteks Pemikiran Islam dalam Fiqih dan Maqashid al−Syariah). *Jurnal Masohi*, *1*(2), 110.

Rohayana, A. D., & Sofi, M. J. (2021). Critique of Radical Religious Paradigm: An Epistemological Analysis from Principles of Islamic Thought. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *11*(1), 163−184. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v11i1.163−184

RS, I. R. (2018). State Role in Balancing Harmony in a Diversed Society: Regulating Religions in Indonesia. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, *5*(2), 189−199. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2018.005.02.03

Saraswati, A. A. A. N., Wicaksono, S., Ganindha, R., & Hidayat, M. (2018). RESTRICTIONS OF THE RIGHTS OF FREEDOM OF RELIGIONS: COMPARISON OF LAW BETWEEN INDONESIA AND GERMANY. *Indonesia Law Review*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.15742/ilrev.v8n3.510

Shuaib, F. S. (2018). Administration of Islamic Law and Human Rights: The Basis and Its Trajectory in Malaysia. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *56*(2), 281−304. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2018.562.281−304

Silfiah, R. I. (2020). The Implementation of Religious Pluralism Values of Islamic Law on Article 156A of the Criminal Code. *Yustisia: Jurnal Hukum*, *9*(2), 210−226. https://doi.org/10.20961/yustisia.v9i2.43099

Sulastri Caniago, Firdaus, Zainal Azwar, Dian Pertiwi, & Dasrizal Marah Nainin. (2024). Gender Integration in Islamic Politics: Fiqh Siyasah on Women's Political Rights since Classical to Contemporary Interpretations. *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review*, *3*(2), 411−431. https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v3i2.9962

Syahmanda, M. R., Wiradibrata, M. W., & Muttaqien, G. (2024). Gestational Surrogacy dalam Islam dan Implikasi Hukum Syariah. *Ikhlas*, *1*(4), 163−172.

Tabroni, R., Izudin, A., Isnanto, M., Sujibto, B. J., Yuwono, D. B., & Suarsana, I. M. (2025). Hybridity, Intersection, and Challenge: Navigating the History of Customary and Islamic Family Law in Moluccan Marriages. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *18*(1), 1−28. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2015.18101

Tendi, T., Marihandono, D., & Abdurakhman, A. (2019). Between the Influence of Customary, Dutch, and Islamic Law: Jaksa Pepitu and Their Place in Cirebon Sultanate History. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *57*(1), 117−142. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2019.571.117−142

Waluyo, K. E., Syafe'i, R., Aeni, I. N., & Saebani, B. A. (2024). Understanding and Implementation of Islamic Law: Study of the Unrecorded Polygyny Phenomenon in Karawang Regency. *International Journal Ihya' 'Ulum Al-Din*, *26*(1), 132−142. https://doi.org/10.21580/ihya.26.1.18918

Yusuf, S. M. (2020). Inter−subjectivity of khalwat (suluk) members in the tarekat Naqsyabandiyah Khalidiyah Ponorogo. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, *10*(1), 103−126. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v10i1.103−126

Zuhdi, S., Dimyati, K., Absori, Wardiono, K., & Apreliyanti, V. E. (2025). Between Customary and Islamic Law: Financial Inheritance Practices in the Surakarta Sunanate Royal Family. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *18*(1), 65−84. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2025.18204

Zuhriyah, L., & Muna, N. (2023). Economic Ability as a Kafa'ah Principle and the Recognition of Difabel Marriage Guardian in As－Silah fī Bayani An－Nikah by Khalil Al－Bangkalany. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam*, *16*(1), 89－111. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2023.16105