

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

FAMILY CONFLICT RESOLUTION THROUGH *MAQASID AL-SHARI'AH*: RECONSTRUCTING CONTEMPORARY ISLAMIC FAMILY LAW IN INDONESIA



Miftakur Rohman^{1*}, Ach. Syarifuddin Abdulloh², Muhammad Machbub³,
Muhammad Naufal 'Adani⁴, Samir Salman⁵

*Correspondence :

Email :
miftah.care86@gmail.com

Affiliation :

- ¹ Universitas Kiai Abdullah
Fa'iqh Gresik, *Indonesia*
- ² Universitas Kiai Abdullah
Fa'iqh Gresik, *Indonesia*
- ³ Universitas Kiai Abdullah
Fa'iqh Gresik, *Indonesia*
- ⁴ Universitas Kiai Abdullah
Fa'iqh Gresik, *Indonesia*
- ⁵ Al Ahqaf University, *Yemen*

Article History :

Submission : February 11, 2026
Revised : July 10, 2026
Accepted : August 26, 2026
Published : October 10, 2026

Keywords : Family Conflict,
Family Resilience, Islamic Law,
Legal Protection, Maqasid Al-
shari'ah

Abstract

This study develops a normative framework for managing Muslim family conflicts in Indonesia by integrating *maqasid al-shari'ah*, family law, and family resilience to determine when reconciliation is appropriate and when protection and access to divorce should take priority. It employs normative legal research using statutory and conceptual approaches. The analysis examines legal provisions on marriage, religious courts, mediation, domestic violence, family development, and personal data protection, alongside classical *maqasid* texts and contemporary scholarship. Textual, systematic, and purposive interpretation distinguishes existing legal obligations from proposed institutional arrangements. The findings reveal three principal results. First, the five essential protections provide interconnected criteria for assessing threatened interests, while dignity operates across these protections. Second, reconciliation obligations must be interpreted alongside safeguards against violence and the legal possibility of resolving ancillary claims when reconciliation fails. Third, existing institutional mandates provide a basis for developing referral arrangements without establishing a parallel adjudicative body. The study concludes that effective family conflict management requires differentiated responses rather than treating reconciliation as a universal objective. Protection should take priority when violence or coercion compromises safe participation, whereas counseling or mediation may be appropriate when participation remains safe and meaningful. The academic contribution lies in developing a structured normative decision framework connecting Islamic legal objectives, Indonesian family law, and family resilience within a single analytical model. This framework supports institutional adaptation and empirical testing without presuming improved outcomes. Future evaluation should assess safety, rights fulfillment, child welfare, and access to justice alongside reconciliation.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan mengembangkan kerangka normatif untuk mengelola konflik keluarga Muslim di Indonesia dengan mengintegrasikan *maqasid al-shari'ah*, hukum keluarga, dan ketahanan keluarga guna menentukan kapan rekonsiliasi tepat dilakukan dan kapan perlindungan serta akses terhadap perceraian harus diprioritaskan. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode penelitian hukum normatif dengan pendekatan perundang-undangan dan konseptual. Analisis dilakukan terhadap ketentuan hukum mengenai perkawinan, peradilan agama, mediasi, kekerasan dalam rumah tangga, pembangunan keluarga, dan perlindungan data pribadi, serta teks klasik *maqasid* dan kajian kontemporer. Penafsiran tekstual, sistematis, dan teleologis digunakan untuk membedakan kewajiban hukum yang telah berlaku dari pengaturan kelembagaan yang diusulkan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan tiga temuan utama. Pertama, lima perlindungan pokok menyediakan kriteria yang saling berkaitan untuk menilai kepentingan yang terancam, sementara martabat manusia menjadi prinsip yang melintasi seluruh perlindungan tersebut. Kedua, kewajiban rekonsiliasi harus ditafsirkan bersama dengan perlindungan terhadap kekerasan dan kemungkinan



penyelesaian tuntutan hukum tambahan ketika rekonsiliasi gagal. Ketiga, kewenangan kelembagaan yang telah ada dapat menjadi dasar pengembangan mekanisme rujukan tanpa membentuk badan peradilan paralel. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa pengelolaan konflik keluarga yang efektif memerlukan pendekatan yang berbeda sesuai dengan kondisi yang dihadapi, bukan menjadikan rekonsiliasi sebagai tujuan universal. Perlindungan harus diprioritaskan ketika kekerasan atau pemaksaan menghambat partisipasi yang aman, sedangkan konseling atau mediasi dapat diterapkan apabila partisipasi berlangsung secara aman dan bermakna. Kontribusi akademik penelitian ini terletak pada pengembangan kerangka pengambilan keputusan normatif yang menghubungkan tujuan hukum Islam, hukum keluarga Indonesia, dan ketahanan keluarga dalam satu model analitis. Kerangka ini mendukung penyesuaian kelembagaan dan pengujian empiris tanpa mengasumsikan adanya peningkatan hasil. Evaluasi selanjutnya perlu menilai aspek keselamatan, pemenuhan hak, kesejahteraan anak, dan akses terhadap keadilan, selain keberhasilan rekonsiliasi.

INTRODUCTION

The management of Muslim family conflicts in Indonesia raises a fundamental normative question: under what conditions should institutions encourage reconciliation, and when should they prioritize protection and lawful separation? Marriage can provide emotional care, social cooperation, and material support, but maintaining a harmful relationship may expose spouses and children to violence, deprivation, and coercion (Jones & Aftab, 2023; Maula & Ariyanti, 2022). Family welfare therefore cannot be assessed solely through marital continuity or declining divorce rates. Instead, institutions require clear criteria for distinguishing conflicts that can be resolved through reconciliation from situations requiring protective intervention. Indonesian family law provides an important starting point. Article 39 of Law No. 1 of 1974 requires judicial divorce proceedings after reconciliation efforts have failed, while Government Regulation No. 9 of 1975 and the Compilation of Islamic Law establish relevant grounds and procedures for marital dissolution. These provisions must also be considered alongside Law No. 23 of 2004 on the Elimination of Domestic Violence, which emphasizes protection against domestic violence. The relationship between reconciliation, protection, and enforceable rights consequently requires further normative examination.

Previous studies have approached Muslim family conflict through different theoretical and institutional perspectives. Maqasid al-sharia provides a framework for evaluating legal decisions according to their implications for essential human interests. Al-Ghazali identifies the protection of religion, life, intellect, offspring, and property as central concerns of Islamic law, while al-Shatibi explains the relationship between essential, complementary, and refining interests (Al-Ghazali, n.d.; Al-Shatibi, n.d.). Auda (2008) further develops a systems approach that emphasizes interdependence, context, and the wider purposes of legal interpretation. Other studies examine family law reform, divorce regulation, Quranic approaches to mediation, and family resilience (Arrasyid et al., 2024; Fadhillah et al., 2025; Iqbal et al., 2025; Latifa et al., 2024). Although these studies contribute important theoretical and contextual insights, their different analytical focuses leave room for a more explicit synthesis of maqasid, Indonesian reconciliation obligations, domestic violence protection, and institutional decision-making. The specific gap addressed here is the need for normative criteria that connect threatened interests with appropriate interventions and safeguards without assuming that preserving marriage always produces the best outcome for family welfare.

Evaluating the existing literature requires distinguishing its contributions from the analytical task undertaken in this study. Research on *maqasid* and legal reform demonstrates how Islamic legal objectives can inform contemporary judicial reasoning, while studies of divorce restrictions clarify the normative boundaries governing marital dissolution (Arrasyid et al., 2024; Fadhilah et al., 2025). Research on family mediation highlights equality and welfare, whereas studies of family resilience examine relationships among communication, religiosity, and family functioning (Iqbal et al., 2025; Latifa et al., 2024). Walsh (2016) conceptualizes resilience as a dynamic process involving family belief systems, organizational arrangements, communication, and adaptation. Indonesian Law No. 52 of 2009 similarly connects family resilience and welfare with independence and material and spiritual well-being. Nevertheless, resilience should not be equated with the absence of divorce, because safe care and family functioning may also be maintained after separation. Existing institutional arrangements, including marriage guidance through the Office of Religious Affairs (KUA) and initiatives associated with BP4 and Pusaka Sakinah, provide a practical context for this analysis. Building on these contributions, the study proposes a normative decision matrix linking threatened interests, warning signs, intervention options, and legal safeguards.

This study addresses three research questions: how can *maqasid al-sharia* inform the assessment of family conflicts without reducing welfare to marital continuation; how should Indonesian reconciliation obligations, protection rules, and institutional responsibilities guide intervention decisions; and what implications follow for family communication, rights and obligations, Islamic counseling, and resilience assessment? It argues that reconciliation should be supported when participation is safe, voluntary, and capable of producing meaningful improvements in family relationships. Conversely, credible threats to life, dignity, property, or other essential interests require protection and access to lawful remedies to take priority over pressure to preserve marriage. This argument draws on the relationship between *maqasid al-sharia*, Indonesian family legislation, and contemporary approaches to family resilience (Auda, 2008; Walsh, 2016). The proposed framework is intended as a normative analytical instrument rather than an empirically validated screening tool or a claim that existing institutions universally fail. Its contribution lies in specifying decision criteria that can help clarify when reconciliation is appropriate, when protective intervention is necessary, and how family welfare can remain a central consideration in either outcome.

METHODS

This study employs normative legal research using statutory and conceptual approaches (I, 2011; Peter Mahmud Marzuki, 2014). Its unit of analysis comprises the relationships among legal provisions, Islamic legal principles, and proposed decision-making criteria for managing Muslim family conflicts in Indonesia. Data collection involves documentary research rather than interviews, observations, or surveys. The research materials include legislation, regulations, classical Islamic texts, scholarly publications, and relevant institutional documents. Documentary identification and verification were completed on 2 October 2026. No human participants or empirical sample were involved because the study examines normative legal relationships rather than actual mediation practices or changes in family resilience. The research focuses on Indonesian law, while comparative scholarship informs the literature discussion without constituting an independent comparative legal design. Empirical publications are used only as contextual evidence, with their original limitations acknowledged. Accordingly,

the findings concern the interpretation of selected legal materials and the development of a proposed normative framework, rather than measured institutional performance or demonstrated improvements in family conflict outcomes.

The research materials were selected purposively according to their relevance to family conflict, reconciliation, domestic violence protection, family resilience, and access to justice. Primary legal materials include marriage legislation, religious court legislation, domestic violence legislation, family development legislation, Supreme Court regulations on mediation and adjudication, and personal data protection legislation. The Compilation of Islamic Law (KHI) was examined alongside Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 1991, with its legal status distinguished from that of parliamentary statutes. Classical Islamic texts and contemporary scholarship provided the conceptual foundation for interpreting *maqasid al-shari'ah*. Documentary searches used combinations of Indonesian and English terms, including *maqasid*, family conflict, mediation, family resilience, *perceraian*, *ketahanan keluarga*, and *kekerasan dalam rumah tangga*. Exact regulation numbers, article titles, and official legal documentation platforms, including JDIH BPK and the Supreme Court's JDIH, supported source verification. Duplicate records, irrelevant publications, unsupported statistics, and references that could not substantiate their associated claims were excluded.

Data analysis proceeded through four connected stages using textual, systematic, and purposive interpretation. First, textual analysis identified the obligations, permissions, and limitations established by the relevant legal provisions. Second, systematic analysis examined the relationship between reconciliation requirements and safeguards concerning domestic violence, women's legal agency, children's rights, and ancillary legal claims. Third, purposive interpretation assessed these provisions through the five essential protections of *maqasid al-shari'ah*, the concept of family resilience, and Auda's systems approach. Fourth, normative synthesis translated the analysis into proposed criteria for assessment, referral, and institutional evaluation. The framework was examined through constructed illustrative scenarios to assess conceptual consistency; these scenarios were not actual court cases or empirical tests. Methodological rigor was supported by verifying legal materials against official documentation, distinguishing existing legal requirements from normative proposals, and checking consistency across the selected sources. The study did not employ statistical software, report inter-coder reliability, or claim stakeholder validation. Its limitations include the absence of field testing and institutional feasibility assessments. Future empirical research should evaluate safety, rights fulfillment, child welfare, and access to justice.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

The *Maqasid al-Shari'ah* Framework for Family Conflicts

The first analytical result is that a *maqasid*–based assessment must identify what an intervention protects before selecting reconciliation as its preferred outcome. The classical formulation used here comprises *hifz al-din*, *hifz al-nafs*, *hifz al-aql*, *hifz al-nasl*, and *hifz al-mal*. Al-Ghazali's account of essential interests and al-Shaṭībī's classification of needs supply the doctrinal foundation (Al-Ghazalī, n.d.). Dignity, discussed through *hifz al-ird*, operates in this article as a concern across these five protections. The analysis does not claim a universally accepted sixth objective or place honor above the essential interests.

Applied to family conflict, protection of religion supports ethical responsibility and religious practice without permitting religious language to compel acceptance of harm. Protection of life directs attention to physical safety and serious threats to well-being. Protection of intellect concerns the ability to understand, deliberate, and seek appropriate assistance (Sharifnia et al., 2025). Protection of offspring concerns children's care and development. Protection of property concerns access to resources and protection from deprivation. These are the article's contemporary applications of the classical categories, rather than a verbatim scheme found in either classical text.

Several interests may be threatened simultaneously. Economic deprivation can endanger nutrition, housing, and children's education. Threats can undermine a spouse's ability to negotiate even without visible injury (Johnson et al., 2022). Accordingly, an assessment should record the nature, severity, persistence, and likely consequences of harm. It should not assume that a dispute involving money concerns only property or that a dispute involving children necessarily favors continued cohabitation (Lohmann et al., 2024). The relevant question is which available response protects the affected persons under the circumstances.

The Qur'anic basis for reconciliation must also be read with the prohibition on harmful retention of a spouse. Qur'an 4:35 addresses the appointment of representatives in marital discord; (*Surat An-Nisa' Ayat 35: Arab, Latin, Terjemah dan Tafsir Lengkap / Quran NU Online*, n.d.). 4:19 concerns honorable treatment; (*Surat An-Nisa' Ayat 19: Arab, Latin, Terjemah dan Tafsir Lengkap / Quran NU Online*, n.d.) and 2:231 rejects retaining women to cause harm (*Surat Al-Baqarah Ayat 231: Arab, Latin, Terjemah dan Tafsir Lengkap / Quran NU Online*, n.d.). Read together, these passages support a relational ethic in which reconciliation serves welfare rather than formal continuity alone (Al-Qur'an, n.d., 2:231, 4:19, 4:35). This interpretive connection supports the proposed framework but does not replace the legal grounds and procedures required for divorce in Indonesia.

Table 1 translates Auda's six systems features into questions for the present analysis (Auda, 2008). The features guide interpretation rather than operate as measured variables. Their application requires an assessor to consider incomplete knowledge, connected interests, relevant expertise, and the consequences of intervention. The proposed questions and documentary outputs are developed here.

Table 1. Application of Auda's Systems Features to Conflict Assessment

Systems Feature	Question for This Framework	Proposed Record or Safeguard
Cognitive nature	Which conclusions are interpretations, and what information remains uncertain?	Separate reported facts, legal rules, and assessor judgments
Wholeness	How will the response affect spouses, children, and dependent relatives?	Assess consequences beyond a single disputed claim
Openness	What legal, psychological, health, or welfare expertise is needed?	Refer issues beyond the assessor's competence
Interrelated hierarchy	How do several protected interests interact in this situation?	Record reasons when urgent protection limits reconciliation
Multi-dimensionality	Do consent, resources, power, and safety point toward different responses?	Avoid reducing the assessment to one risk or one desired outcome

Purposefulness	What observable protection or improvement should follow?	Review safety, rights fulfillment, and care arrangements
----------------	--	--

The feature labels derive from Auda. The questions and records are this article's proposed application. This approach matters where legal duties appear to pull in different directions. Article 39 of the Marriage Law requires an attempt at reconciliation before judicial divorce. Articles 5–9 of Law No. 23 of 2004 prohibit physical, psychological, and sexual violence and domestic neglect (Undang–Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 23 Tahun 2004 tentang Penghapusan Kekerasan dalam Rumah Tangga, 2004). A systematic reading does not allow the reconciliation requirement to become permission for these harms. Equally, it does not authorize a counselor to dissolve a marriage or to invent an exemption from court procedure. Protective support, legal advice, and compliance with judicial requirements must be organized together (Law No. 1 of 1974, art. 39; Law No. 23 of 2004, arts. 5–10).

The tension therefore concerns the interpretation and execution of reconciliation, not necessarily a direct contradiction between statutes. Article 4 of Law No. 23 of 2004 includes maintaining a harmonious and intact household among its purposes, alongside preventing violence, protecting victims, and taking action against perpetrators. An interpretation that isolates household continuity would disregard the other purposes within the same provision. A duty to attempt peace does not require a party to accept an unsafe agreement. This distinction is reinforced by Article 27(2) of Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2016, which constrains settlement terms that violate law, public order, or morality, harm third parties, or cannot be implemented (Indonesia, 2016). The framework uses these limits to evaluate the substance of an agreement rather than treating a signature as sufficient evidence of fairness.

The distinction among *ḍarūriyyat*, *ḥajīyyat*, and *tahsīniyyat* concerns the importance of protected interests. It is not itself a validated classification of clinical or legal risk. Table 2 therefore uses two connected assessments: the observable threat and the level of interest affected. The classification remains provisional and should change when new information emerges. A single credible indication of serious danger can justify protective referral without waiting for a cumulative score. Such a referral is a precautionary service decision, not a judicial finding that violence occurred.

Table 2. Proposed Assessment Matrix for Selecting Family Conflict Interventions

Observable Situation	Interests and Level Potentially Affected	Proposed Response	Safeguard and Review Point
Threats, violence, sexual coercion, confinement, or danger to a child	Life, intellect, offspring, and dignity; essential interests	Prompt specialist assessment, safety support, health care, legal assistance, and access to competent authorities	Do not condition help on reconciliation; review contact safety and urgent needs
Persistent deprivation of maintenance or essential resources; serious intimidation or	Property, life, and offspring, and dignity; potentially essential interests	Legal advice and support assessment; consider mediated ancillary issues only where	Assess dependency and coercion privately; reconsider referral if harm escalates

repeated violations	rights	participation can be made safe	
Recurrent disputes about care, finances, or responsibilities without identified coercion or serious danger	Connected family interests; often complementary needs	Structured counseling or mediation with clear tasks and realistic commitments	Reassess safety and participation throughout; allow access to legal remedies
Disagreements about communication habits or household preferences without identified rights deprivation	Refining interests, subject to contextual assessment	Voluntary educational support and negotiated routines	Do not minimize repeated humiliation or misclassify concealed abuse

These are proposed indicators for professional adaptation and testing, not diagnostic thresholds or new legal categories. The highest serious threat identified should guide the initial response. Any category may change after a separate conversation or further assessment. The matrix prevents two interpretive errors. First, it avoids treating all recurrent arguments as equivalent to violence. Second, it prevents the absence of visible injury from being treated as proof that joint negotiation is safe. The categories require examination of control, deprivation, and the ability to refuse an agreement. This extends the analysis beyond a simple ranking of conflict intensity while retaining the *maqasid* concern with threatened interests.

Three constructed examples clarify the decision rule. A disagreement about household expenditure, where both spouses can speak freely and essential needs remain met, would initially support counseling or structured negotiation. If the same disagreement includes deliberate restriction of food or threats for seeking help, its financial subject does not justify treating it as a routine budgeting problem; protective and legal assessment becomes necessary. If spouses decide not to reconcile but can safely negotiate a lawful maintenance arrangement, the framework recognizes the resulting protection of rights without calling it divorce prevention. These examples demonstrate internal differentiation within the proposed rules. They do not establish the frequency of such situations or the effectiveness of the recommended responses.

Preventing Divorce through Conflict Management Strategies

The second analytical result concerns the meaning of successful conflict management under Indonesian mediation law. Article 31(1) of Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2016 provides that, where divorce is joined with other claims and the parties do not agree to resume married life, mediation continues regarding those other claims (Indonesia, 2016). This provision distinguishes marital reconciliation from the negotiated resolution of related rights. Its legal structure therefore supports an evaluation that recognizes an agreement on eligible ancillary claims even when the divorce itself proceeds.

Read with Article 41 of the Marriage Law (Undang – Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 16 Tahun 2019 tentang Perubahan atas Undang – Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 1974

tentang Perkawinan, 2019), this distinction has practical significance for arrangements concerning children and financial responsibilities after divorce. It also changes the proposed performance measure: an institution should record whether a legally permissible agreement protects relevant rights, not merely whether a divorce petition is withdrawn. An agreement must remain subject to the applicable procedural requirements and settlement safeguards. The legal effect of each agreement depends on its terms and the competent court's treatment; the framework does not make all informal agreements automatically enforceable (Law No. 1 of 1974, art. 41; Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2016, arts. 27 and 31).

The KHI similarly requires court-based divorce following unsuccessful reconciliation efforts and recognizes specified grounds for dissolution (Departemen Agama Republik Indonesia, 2015). Its provisions on family responsibilities should be interpreted alongside these routes to relief, rather than used to require the continuation of every relationship (KHI, arts. 77, 115–116, and 143–145; Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 1991). Government Regulation No. 9 of 1975 likewise places reconciliation efforts within a procedural framework that recognizes grounds for divorce, including cruelty or serious maltreatment and continuing disputes under the conditions stated in Article 19. The synthesis developed here is consequently compatible with reconciliation and with lawful dissolution when its requirements are met.

The proposed framework does not create a mandatory cooling-off period before a person may file a case. Nor does it require a certificate of failed community counseling as a new prerequisite for judicial access. Neither administrative condition follows from the provisions analyzed. Court mediation obligations remain governed by Article 4 of Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2016 and its applicable exceptions. Recommendations to avoid unsafe joint encounters should be implemented through lawful procedural decisions, professional assessment, and protective referral. They must not be presented as an automatic statutory exemption that this study has established.

Islah describes an orientation toward repairing relationships or disputes. Mediation is a facilitated negotiation process governed, in court, by procedural rules. Counseling concerns relational functioning and support. A *hakam* has a distinct position in Islamic marital dispute discourse and Indonesian religious court law. These mechanisms can inform one another, but their purposes and authority should not be collapsed into a single category. Qur'an 4:35 provides the scriptural reference for representatives from the two families in marital discord. Article 76 of Law No. 7 of 1989 addresses *hakam* within judicial consideration of *shiqaq* and permits the court to appoint persons from the families or others after hearing evidence about the discord. The provision is read within the statute as amended by Laws No. 3 of 2006 and No. 50 of 2009. It does not justify treating every community elder as an arbitrator with binding authority over divorce, custody, or property. The proposed role of trusted relatives therefore remains subordinate to consent, safety, impartiality, and the powers granted by applicable law.

Counselors should likewise recognize the limits of their competence. They may assist clients to clarify concerns, understand choices, and develop communication practices. Legal disputes require appropriate legal advice; health needs require qualified health professionals. Where coercion prevents free expression, the immediate task is to arrange suitable individual support and protective assessment. The World Health Organization's (2013) guidance supports coordinated responses, professional training, privacy, and appropriate assistance for women subjected to violence. It informs the safeguards proposed here, while remaining health-sector guidance rather than Indonesian

mediation law. Supreme Court Regulation No. 3 of 2017 adds an essential perspective for adjudication involving women (Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 3 Tahun 2017 tentang Pedoman Mengadili Perkara Perempuan Berhadapan dengan Hukum, 2017). Attention to unequal status, power relations, and discriminatory assumptions should inform the framework's interpretation of meaningful participation. Agreement cannot be evaluated solely through formal equality between the parties. A person who lacks access to money, documents, transport, or independent advice may require additional support before a choice becomes practically available. This is a proposed application of the regulation's protective orientation, not a claim that every counseling service is directly governed by all its judicial provisions.

Electronic mediation also needs a separate assessment. Supreme Court Regulation No. 3 of 2022 supplements the mediation framework by regulating electronic processes; it does not replace Regulation No. 1 of 2016 in its entirety. Digital participation may improve access in some circumstances. It can also expose a party to monitoring or unsafe contact if a device or room is controlled by another person. The proposed service protocol should therefore check privacy, practical access, and the participant's ability to stop or seek help. Technology should not be presumed to remove power imbalances. The institutional recommendation is to develop coordination among existing services rather than establish a new body with overlapping powers. BP4's stated role and KUA family service initiatives provide relevant points of entry. The documented Tegalrejo Pusaka Sakinah initiative illustrates the existence of this service orientation, but does not establish its results across localities. (Trianto, 2023) A proposal for coordination must therefore begin with a local inventory of actual personnel, service availability, and referral capacity.

Premarital preparation also has an existing regulatory basis. Regulation No. DJ.II/542 of 2013 provides a documentary antecedent for premarital courses. More directly, Article 5 of Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation No. 30 of 2024 requires marriage guidance for prospective spouses who have registered their intention to marry. The contribution proposed here concerns content and referral quality within this setting. It is not a proposal to introduce a requirement that does not yet exist. Guidance could use realistic scenarios about shared responsibilities, money, care work, conflict, and help-seeking, with procedures for confidential individual questions. The proposed referral sequence has five stages. At entry, the receiving service explains its role and the limits of confidentiality. A suitably trained worker then offers a private assessment of urgent concerns and practical needs. The worker documents the reasons for recommending counseling, mediation, specialist support, or legal assistance. With an appropriate lawful basis, the receiving service transfers only the information needed for the referral and confirms whether the destination accepted it. Finally, follow-up reviews the person's safety and access to the agreed service. A referral should remain open to revision; urgent protection should not wait for completion of the sequence.

Table 3 specifies functional responsibilities without claiming that a new national protocol already exists. A local arrangement would require authorization within each participating institution's competence. Cooperation documents may clarify contact persons, response expectations, and resource commitments, but cannot enlarge adjudicative powers or amend court procedures. Staffing and funding should be determined after a workload and service-capacity assessment. This study provides neither a validated staffing ratio nor a cost estimate.

Table 3. Proposed Responsibilities within a Coordinated Service Arrangement

Actor	Appropriate Contribution	Boundary or Requirement	Accountability
KUA and participating BP4 services	Marriage guidance, initial information, and referral within available competence	Do not decide contested rights or make counseling a prerequisite for filing a case	
Qualified counselors and relevant health or social services	Individual or family support and specialist assessment	Use professional competence limits and safe contact arrangements	
Accredited legal aid providers or other qualified legal professionals	Explain rights, available procedures, and implications of proposed agreements	Preserve independent advice and access to remedies	
Court mediators	Facilitate negotiation under applicable procedural rules	Assess settlement legality and avoid equating reconciliation with all mediation outcomes	
Judges and competent protection authorities	Determine matters within their respective legal powers	Maintain due process, protective responsibilities, and institutional independence	
A designated referral contact within each participating service	Confirm receipt and continuity of referrals	Hold only necessary information and maintain a reviewable access record	

This is an allocation of proposed functions, not evidence that each locality already offers every service or a legal instrument establishing new authority. Privacy is a substantive condition of this arrangement. Law No. 27 of 2022 requires attention to principles of processing and lawful bases for personal data use (Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia Nomor 3 Tahun 2022 tentang Mediasi di Pengadilan secara Elektronik, 2022). Consent is relevant but is not the only possible legal basis under Article 20. A local protocol should state the basis, purpose, recipient, retention period, and access permissions for each information transfer. The proposed approach favors minimum necessary disclosure and clear explanations of legal reporting obligations. It does not promise absolute confidentiality in circumstances where law requires action (Law No. 27 of 2022, arts. 16 and 20).

SIMKAH serves marriage administration under Article 21 of Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation No. 30 of 2024 and the Ministry's public portal (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2026). The existence of this platform does not itself authorize adding sensitive counseling narratives or violence reports to it. Integration should begin with agreed referral responsibilities and lawful information exchange, not an assumption that all agencies should share a comprehensive family file. Religious leaders and community groups may publicize access to services, but the framework does not recommend community surveillance of households or public identification of families in conflict.

DISCUSSION

The third analytical result is a distinction between the resources that may support family functioning and the legal or institutional outcomes used to evaluate conflict management. Communication may help spouses discuss care, finances, and expectations, but its value depends on the conditions under which people speak. An invitation to

disclose feelings has different implications in a relationship marked by disagreement than in one marked by intimidation. The proposed framework treats safe expression, the ability to disagree, and freedom from retaliation as conditions for communication – focused intervention. Latifa et al, provide relevant contextual evidence through a quantitative study of 406 Muslim respondents (Latifa et al., 2024). Their reported associations between communication, religiosity, and resilience support further investigation of these relationships. They do not demonstrate that a communication intervention prevents divorce, nor do they validate the present assessment matrix. Yusoff et al, examine communication and marital satisfaction among married teachers in Terengganu (Yusoff et al., 2025). The population and outcome differ from Indonesian service users and from family resilience. That study is therefore used only as a bounded comparison concerning marital communication, not as evidence of the effectiveness of an Indonesian policy.

Evidence from disaster settings requires similar care. Sriyono et al, examine resilience, coping, and preparedness in the ISTIFAR Lombok study (Sriyono et al., 2024). Its relevance is the attention it gives to family adaptation under adversity. Its setting does not establish whether counseling or court mediation changes divorce outcomes. Bringing these studies into dialogue requires preservation of their separate constructs: resilience, satisfaction, preparedness, and settlement are related topics but are not interchangeable measures. The practical implication is to specify the activity that counseling seeks to improve. Examples include discussing expenditure without threats, making care arrangements explicit, and seeking assistance before unresolved problems accumulate. These are proposed targets, not effects demonstrated here. Where joint communication is unsafe, individual assistance and suitable legal or protective action take precedence. A service must not interpret refusal of a joint session as proof that a person lacks commitment to family resilience.

An adequate account of responsibilities should explain both mutual commitments and legal remedies. Article 31 of the Marriage Law recognizes the balance of spouses' rights and positions and each spouse's capacity to perform legal acts, while also assigning gendered household roles. Articles 33 and 34 address mutual support and responsibilities, including recourse when obligations are neglected. This combination requires careful interpretation. Counseling should not isolate a role provision and present it as a waiver of legal agency, protection, or access to relief Law No. 1 of 1974, arts. 31, 33 – 34 (*UU No 1 Tahun 1974*, 2000). The proposed framework reads household responsibilities alongside the prohibition of violence and neglect. A discussion of financial maintenance, for example, should establish what the law requires, what resources exist, what deprivation is alleged, and what help or remedy is available. It should not assume that all financial disputes reflect poor communication. Equally, the framework should distinguish poverty or inability from intentional deprivation rather than assigning responsibility without an adequate assessment. The normative objective is accountable fulfillment of rights with an appropriate factual inquiry.

Children's interests continue after marital dissolution. Article 41 of the Marriage Law provides a basis for discussing continuing parental duties. In the proposed framework, arrangements concerning care, education, financial support, and safe contact should receive separate attention from the adults' decision about reconciliation. Children should not be used to pressure an adult into returning to a dangerous setting. Any mechanism for hearing children's views requires age – appropriate expertise and applicable safeguards; this article does not prescribe an untested interview protocol. This interpretation also avoids equating family resilience with the distribution of

responsibilities before divorce. Resilience may involve reorganizing care and support when a household changes. A family can remain legally intact while failing to provide safe care; a separated family can also face serious unmet needs. The assessment must examine those functions directly. This is the article's normative implication drawn from the legal responsibilities and the process–oriented understanding of resilience, not a comparative empirical claim about married and divorced families Law No. 52 of 2009, art. 1(11) (Undang–Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 50 Tahun 2009 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang – Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 1989 tentang Peradilan Agama, 2009) (Walsh, 2016).

Islamic counseling can draw on *Islah*, mutual responsibility, *ṣabr*, and *tawakkul* when these concepts help clients understand choices and pursue constructive action. Their use must respect the person's circumstances and capacity to choose. *Ṣabr* should not be prescribed as an obligation to remain exposed to violence, and *tawakkul* should not displace efforts to obtain legal, health, or social assistance. Qur'anic references to honorable treatment, non – harm, and consultation provide a basis for a counseling ethic that combines moral responsibility with protection Al – Qur'an, n.d., 2:231, 3:159, 4:19. Zainuri et al, develop marital interaction value –based counseling in their study of Muslim family resilience.(Zainuri et al., 2025) The counseling concept belongs to that study and is not claimed as an invention of this article. The contribution here is to specify conditions under which a value –oriented approach should connect with legal advice, protective referral, and evaluation. The small qualitative setting discussed by Zainuri and colleagues offers contextual insight; it does not establish national effectiveness or validate the referral protocol proposed here.

Values therefore serve as interpretive and practical resources within a rights – protecting service relationship. Counselors should ask how a value supports a person's informed decision rather than prescribe a single outcome in its name. A person seeking a lawful divorce may still pursue responsible care, fairness, and religious commitment. Conversely, a decision to reconcile requires attention to whether harmful conduct has ceased and whether the agreed arrangements are realistic. The framework makes these consequences relevant without assuming that religious language alone changes behavior.

The indicators are candidates for development, not a validated scale. Data collection requires ethical review where applicable, safe contact procedures, and clearly defined follow – up periods. The framework yields three propositions for empirical investigation. First, documenting safety and power concerns at entry may change the appropriateness of referrals compared with an approach that initially directs all families toward joint counseling. Second, access to independent advice may influence whether parties understand settlement consequences and whether agreements address applicable rights. Third, evaluations that distinguish safety, rights fulfillment, and legal outcomes may classify service performance differently from evaluations based only on reconciliation. These propositions identify comparisons that future research could test. No directional effect size or causal relationship is asserted by the present study.

A first stage of validation could involve judges, mediators, counselors, legal aid providers, relevant protection services, and people with experience of family conflict, including survivors. Their review should examine unclear indicators, harmful assumptions, and feasible referral arrangements. A subsequent pilot could assess acceptability, completion of referrals, and adverse events before attempting an effectiveness study. A comparative evaluation would need a defined sampling strategy, appropriate outcome measures, sufficient follow – up, and an ethical basis for the

comparison. These steps are research recommendations; no stakeholder consultation or pilot is reported here.

The study recommends developing and evaluating a normative decision framework that connects *maqasid al-sharia*, Indonesian family law, and family resilience with practical criteria for selecting appropriate interventions. Conceptually, the framework should distinguish conflicts suitable for reconciliation from situations requiring protection and lawful separation, while ensuring that family welfare is not measured solely by marital continuity. Methodologically, future research should test the clarity, consistency, and practical applicability of the proposed assessment matrix through expert consultation, practitioner feedback, and case-based evaluation. Empirical studies should also examine how religious courts, the Office of Religious Affairs (KUA), and relevant family counseling institutions implement reconciliation procedures and domestic violence protection measures. From a policy perspective, institutional guidelines should prioritize safety (Arrasyid et al., 2024), voluntary participation, access to legal remedies, and appropriate referrals for professional assistance. Pilot implementation should assess staffing requirements, financial costs, rural accessibility, disability accommodation, and differences in institutional capacity. The framework should be refined before wider adoption and must not replace professional violence assessments, judicial fact-finding, or clinical judgment. These recommendations provide a basis for responsible institutional development while acknowledging that the proposed framework requires further empirical validation.

CONCLUSION

This study develops a normative framework for managing Muslim family conflicts in Indonesia by connecting the five essential *maqasid* with legal obligations, threatened interests, intervention choices, and evaluable outcomes. Dignity operates across all five protections. Reconciliation remains appropriate when parties can participate safely and meaningfully, whereas threats to essential interests require protective support and access to competent legal remedies. The classification of needs provides a reasoned basis for assessment but does not constitute a validated risk assessment instrument. The statutory analysis distinguishes marital reconciliation from the settlement of related legal claims. Reconciliation obligations must be interpreted alongside safeguards against domestic violence, settlement requirements, and continuing responsibilities toward children. Existing institutions, including KUA, BP4, counseling services, legal assistance providers, and religious courts, offer potential foundations for coordinated referrals within their respective mandates. Effective conflict management therefore requires differentiated responses that prioritize safety, protect legal rights, and recognize reconciliation as a conditional objective rather than a universal requirement in every family dispute.

The study contributes a structured normative decision framework integrating *maqasid al-shari'ah*, Indonesian family law, and family resilience. Conceptually, it connects Islamic legal objectives with practical criteria for identifying threatened interests and selecting appropriate interventions. Methodologically, it combines textual, systematic, and purposive interpretation to distinguish existing legal obligations from proposed institutional arrangements. The framework clarifies that coordination among existing institutions should strengthen access to services without creating a parallel adjudicative body or imposing additional conditions on access to divorce. Communication, understanding of rights and obligations, and Islamic values may support conflict resolution when applied consistently with safety, dignity, and informed choice. This approach broadens family conflict management beyond preserving marriage at all costs. Instead, it

recognizes protection, justice, child welfare, and meaningful participation as essential considerations. By connecting normative principles with institutional responsibilities, the framework offers a foundation for developing referral procedures and evaluating interventions. However, its proposed criteria remain analytical recommendations rather than established standards of practice, and their practical effectiveness cannot be assumed without further investigation.

This study has several limitations that should guide future research. First, its normative legal design relies on documentary analysis rather than interviews, observations, or direct assessments of family conflict management. Second, the proposed decision criteria have not undergone empirical validation, stakeholder consultation, or institutional feasibility testing. Third, the framework does not establish that its application reduces divorce, improves family resilience, or produces better outcomes for children. Future studies should employ qualitative fieldwork, case studies, and carefully designed pilot evaluations involving religious courts, KUA, BP4, legal assistance providers, counselors, and affected families. Researchers should examine whether referral procedures are accessible, whether participants understand their rights, and whether interventions adequately address power imbalances and potential violence. Evaluation should measure safety, rights fulfillment, child welfare, family functioning, and access to justice independently rather than relying solely on reconciliation rates. Comparative studies across Indonesian regions may also identify contextual differences in institutional capacity and community practices. These investigations would help determine whether the framework is practical, ethically appropriate, and beneficial before broader implementation is recommended.

DECLARATIONS

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Miftakur Rohman: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, and Writing – Original Draft; Ach. Syarifuddin Abdulloh: Comparative Legal Analysis, Literature Review, and Writing – Original Draft; Samir Salman: Comparative Legal Analysis, Literature Review, and Writing – Review & Editing; Muhammad Machbub: Data Verification, Citation Management, and Writing – Review & Editing; Muhammad Naufal 'Adani: Data Verification, Citation Management, and Final Editing. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to be accountable for the work.

FUNDING STATEMENT

This research received no external funding. The study was conducted independently without financial support from any governmental, institutional, or private organization.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

No primary empirical data were generated or analyzed in this study. This research is based exclusively on publicly available legal documents, court decisions, statutory regulations, and published academic literature. All sources cited are accessible through official repositories, academic databases (Scopus, Google Scholar, Dimensions), and institutional libraries.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS STATEMENT

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper. There are no conflicts of interest to disclose.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to miftah.care86@gmail.com

ORCID

Miftakur Rohman  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2293-861x>

Ach. Syarifuddin Abdulloh  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6283-753X>

Muhammad Machbub  <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0774-3110>

Muhammad Naufal 'Adani  <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4236-2273>

Samir Salman  <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-3272-6067>

REFERENCES

- Akram, A., Nugroho, A. D., Putri, R., & Johanes. (2023). Gender mainstreaming through guarantees of legal protection and access to justice for women and children in religious court. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 12(2), 267 – 292. <https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.12.2.2023.267-292>
- Al – Ghazali. (n.d.). Al – Mustasfa. Islamweb. <https://www.islamweb.com/ar/library/content/33/1/المستصفي>
- Al – Shatibi. (n.d.). Al – Muwafaqat. Islamweb. <https://www.islamweb.net/ar/library/content/99/1/الموافقات>
- Arrasyid, F., Pagar, P., & Tanjung, D. (2024). Islamic family law reform in Indonesia through Supreme Court circulars: A maqasid sharia perspective. *Ulul Albab: Jurnal Studi dan Penelitian Hukum Islam*, 6(2), 208. <https://doi.org/10.30659/jua.v6i2.29236>
- Auda, J. (2008). Maqasid al – shariah as philosophy of Islamic law: A systems approach. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Badan Penasihat dan Pelestarian Perkawinan. (n.d.). Tentang BP4. <https://www.bp4-pusat.or.id/tentang-bp4/>
- Departemen Agama Republik Indonesia. (2015). Kompilasi hukum Islam di Indonesia. Rajawali Press.
- Djawas, M., Nurdin, A., Zainuddin, M., Idham, & Idami, Z. (2024). Harmonization of state, custom, and Islamic law in Aceh: Perspective of legal pluralism. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 10(1), 64 – 82. <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v10i1.4824>
- Fadhilah, N., Musonnif, A., & Hadisiswati, I. (2025). Regulating arbitrary divorce in Islamic family law: A maqasid al – sharia – based comparative analysis of Muslim – majority legal systems. *Al – Hukama': The Indonesian Journal of Islamic Family Law*, 15(2), 149 – 175. <https://doi.org/10.15642/alhukama.2025.15.2.149-175>
- I, J. I. (2011). Teori dan metodologi penelitian hukum normatif. Bayu Media Publishing.
- Indonesia, M. A. R. (2016). Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 1 Tahun 2016 tentang Prosedur Mediasi di Pengadilan. Mahkamah Agung RI.
- Instruksi Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 1991 tentang Penyebarluasan Kompilasi Hukum Islam. (1991).

<https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/293351/inpres-no-1-tahun-1991>

- Iqbal, R., Syahrin, M. A., & Ismail, H. (2025). Maqashid syariah dalam mediasi keluarga: Telaah Al-Quran terhadap prinsip kesetaraan dan kemaslahatan. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 3(3), 2027–2038. <https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v3i3.1680>
- Johnson, L., Chen, Y., Stylianou, A., & Arnold, A. (2022). Examining the impact of economic abuse on survivors of intimate partner violence: A scoping review. *BMC Public Health*, 22, Article 1014. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13297-4>
- Jones, B., & Aftab, A. (2023). Inside Indonesia's religious courts: An argument for domestic and family violence screening and exemption from compulsory mediation. *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion*, 12(2), 217–231. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojlr/rwad015>
- Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia. (2026). Sistem informasi manajemen nikah (SIMKAH). <https://simkah4.kemenag.go.id/>
- Latifa, R., Nihayah, Z., Rokhim, M., Nurhasan, N., Murniasih, F., & Rismawati, R. (2024). Contributing factors of family resilience in Moslem population. *Jurnal Indo-Islamika*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.15408/jii.v14i2.42507>
- Lohmann, S., Cowlshaw, S., Ney, L., O'Donnell, M., & Felmingham, K. (2024). The trauma and mental health impacts of coercive control: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 25(1), 630–647. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380231162972>
- Maula, B. S., & Ariyanti, V. (2022). Justice negotiations for women: Divorce cases due to domestic violence in religious courts. *Jurnal Hukum Islam*, 20(1), 155–180. <https://doi.org/10.28918/jhi.v20i1.6024>
- Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 3 Tahun 2017 tentang Pedoman Mengadili Perkara Perempuan Berhadapan dengan Hukum. (2017).
- Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia Nomor 3 Tahun 2022 tentang Mediasi di Pengadilan secara Elektronik. (2022). <https://pabontang.go.id/images/pdf/perma/perma-2022-3.pdf>
- Peraturan Menteri Agama Republik Indonesia Nomor 30 Tahun 2024 tentang Pencatatan Pernikahan. (2024). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/321787/peraturan-menag-no-30-tahun-2024>
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 9 Tahun 1975 tentang Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 1974 tentang Perkawinan. (1975). <https://bphn.go.id/data/documents/75pp009.pdf>
- Peter Mahmud Marzuki. (2014). Metodologi penelitian hukum. Kencana.
- Republik Indonesia. (1974). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 1974 tentang Perkawinan. Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia.
- Rohman, M. (2024). Family conflict in the context of economic change: Resilience and adaptation. *Sakina: Journal of Family Studies*, 8(4), 518–532.
- Sharifnia, A. M., Bulut, H., Ali, P., & Rogers, M. (2025). Muslim women's experiences of domestic violence and abuse: A meta-ethnography of global

- evidence. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 26(4), 694 – 711.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380241286836>
- Sriyono, S., Zulkarnain, H., Proboningsih, J., & Kurnia, K. A. (2024). COVID – 19 slightly reduced family resilience, coping, and disaster preparedness in ISTIFAR's Lombok study. Jamba: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies, 16(1), Article a1696. <https://doi.org/10.4102/jamba.v16i1.1696>
- Surat Al – Baqarah ayat 231: Arab, Latin, terjemah dan tafsir lengkap | Quran NU Online. (n.d.). <https://quran.nu.or.id/al-baqarah/231>
- Surat An – Nisa ayat 19: Arab, Latin, terjemah dan tafsir lengkap | Quran NU Online. (n.d.). <https://quran.nu.or.id/an-nisa/19>
- Surat An – Nisa ayat 35: Arab, Latin, terjemah dan tafsir lengkap | Quran NU Online. (n.d.). <https://quran.nu.or.id/an-nisa/35>
- Trianto, E. (2023). KUA Tegalrejo lokasi piloting layanan Pusaka Sakinah. Kantor Kementerian Agama Kota Yogyakarta. <https://yogyakartakota.kemenag.go.id/kua-tegalrejo-lokasi-piloting-layanan-pusaka-sakinah/>
- Undang – Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 16 Tahun 2019 tentang Perubahan atas Undang – Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 1974 tentang Perkawinan. (2019). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/122740/uu-no-16-tahun-2019>
- Undang – Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 23 Tahun 2004 tentang Penghapusan Kekerasan dalam Rumah Tangga. (2004). <https://peraturan.go.id/id/uu-no-23-tahun-2004>
- Undang – Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 50 Tahun 2009 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang – Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 1989 tentang Peradilan Agama. (2009). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/38795/uu-no-50-tahun-2009>
- Undang – Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 52 Tahun 2009 tentang Perkembangan Kependudukan dan Pembangunan Keluarga. (2009). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/38852/uu-no-52-tahun-2009>
- UU No. 1 Tahun 1974 (Vol. s2 – IX, No. 215). (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/s2-ix.215.112a>
- van Eldik, W. M., de Haan, A. D., Parry, L. Q., Davies, P. T., Luijk, M. P. C. M., Arends, L. R., & Prinzie, P. (2020). The interparental relationship: Meta – analytic associations with children's maladjustment and responses to interparental conflict. Psychological Bulletin, 146(7), 553 – 594. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000233>
- Walsh, F. (2016). Strengthening family resilience (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Yusoff, S. H. M., Yusoff, Z. J. M., Saefudin, W., & Sriwiyanti. (2025). Influence of cultural communication style on marital satisfaction among Muslim couples on Malaysia's East Coast. Eksplorium, 46(1), 438 – 455. <https://doi.org/10.28918/eksplorium.v46i1.51>
- Zainuri, M. I., Pajarianto, H., Anuar, A. B., & Suarja, S. (2025). Marital interaction value – based counseling as a strategy to build Muslim family resilience. Jurnal Konseling dan Pendidikan, 13(2), 379 – 390. <https://doi.org/10.29210/1157000>

Zaprulkhan. (2018). Maqasid al–shariah in the contemporary Islamic legal discourse: Perspective of Jasser Auda. Walisongo: Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Keagamaan, 26(2), 445 – 472. <https://doi.org/10.21580/ws.26.2.3231>