

Family Interaction, Coping Strategies and Family Resilience in Husbands Undergoing Long-Distance Marriage

Mochammad Fikri Noor Hidayat, IPB University, Indonesia

Diah Krisnatuti, IPB University, Indonesia

Defina, IPB University, Indonesia

Risda Rizkillah, IPB University, Indonesia

Salsa Bela Frisilia Agustin, IPB University, Indonesia

Sosteness Jerome Nakamo, Institute of Rural Development Planning, Tanzania

The Asian Conference on the Social Sciences 2026
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Family resilience in long-distance marriages (LDM) requires strong family interactions and effective coping strategies to manage the stress caused by separation. This study aims to analyze the influence of family interaction and coping strategies on family resilience among husbands undergoing long-distance marriages. A cross-sectional study design was employed, involving 60 husbands who had been in a long-distance marriage for at least six months and had children. The sample consisted of 30 working husbands (who left their families for work) and 30 stay-at-home husbands (whose wives worked away from home), selected through purposive sampling. The results showed that most both working and stay-at-home husbands had moderate to high levels of family interaction, coping strategies, and family resilience. Comparative tests revealed that the dimensions of spousal communication, coping strategies, and family belief systems were significantly higher in working husbands compared to stay-at-home husbands. Regression analysis showed that family interaction and household income had a significant positive effect on family resilience, while coping strategies did not show a significant effect.

Keywords: coping strategies, family resilience, family interaction, long-distance marriage

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Family resilience is dynamic and may change along with social, economic, and cultural developments. These changes present various challenges that affect family stability and well-being. One factor driving these changes is the increasing job mobility in an increasingly connected and dynamic world (Hughes & Silver, 2019). Although such mobility creates new opportunities, it also brings challenges, such as reduced established social support and the potential imbalance of roles within the household. In line with this, Hermawati (2018) showed that industrial development has brought significant changes to family dynamics, including shifts in the roles of husbands and wives, changes in family structure, decision-making patterns, and the socialization process among family members. Mobility, whether domestic or international, has consequences for family life, particularly in maintaining harmony and stability in relationships among family members.

Family resilience among couples experiencing long-distance marriage (LDM) is influenced by several factors. One of the main factors is family interaction. Family interaction is part of the socialization process carried out by parents toward their children (Puspitawati, 2017). The dimensions that shape family interaction include open communication, attachment, conflict, and acceptance (Rachman et al., 2020). Interactions between husband and wife that demonstrate empathy and openness, including open social and emotional communication, contribute to happiness and marital satisfaction (Tavakol et al., 2020). Meanwhile, parent-child interactions involving coaching, modeling, and emotional support are essential in helping children develop adaptive coping strategies. Parents who encourage children to express emotions and think critically about stressful situations play an important role in developing resilience and healthy emotional regulation in children (Abaied & Rudolph, 2010). In this regard, research conducted by Masarik et al. (2016) showed that well-established family interactions, through increasing quality leisure time together, giving attention to one another, and creating a sense of security among family members, can strengthen family resilience.

Family resilience in long-distance marriages requires synergy between effective family interactions and the implementation of appropriate coping strategies. High-quality family interactions can create a supportive environment, while adaptive coping strategies help couples manage the emotional and psychological pressures caused by separation. Another significant influencing factor is coping strategy. In long-distance marriages, the limited opportunities for husbands and wives to meet often become a source of conflict that may hurt one another emotionally and psychologically (Peterson, 2014). This condition may create stress for both the family and the couple, making coping strategies necessary (Maryam, 2017). Coping strategies refer to the efforts made by individuals or couples to deal with pressures arising from long-distance relationships. Effective coping strategies include measures such as arranging scheduled meetings, sharing feelings, and utilizing technology to maintain communication. Research by Wardhani and Wideasavitri (2020) revealed that coping strategies involving stress management and emotional support play an important role in strengthening family resilience.

This study has several objectives: (a) to analyze differences in family characteristics, family interaction, coping strategies, and family resilience in long-distance marriages based on the perceptions of husbands who leave home for work and husbands whose wives work away from home; (b) to analyze the relationships among family characteristics, family interaction, coping strategies, and family resilience in long-distance marriages; and (c) to analyze the

effects of family characteristics, family interaction, and coping strategies on family resilience in long-distance marriages.

Method

This study employed a quantitative approach with a cross-sectional design, conducted online through a self-administered survey using Google Forms. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling with the following criteria: husbands or wives experiencing a long-distance marriage for at least six months, having children, and still legally married. The total number of respondents was 60 husbands, consisting of 30 husbands working outside the city/country and 30 husbands whose wives worked outside the city/country. Data collection was conducted from April to June 2025. The instruments used covered three main variables: family interaction (adapted from Puspitawati and Setyoningsih, 2011; $\alpha = 0.798$), coping strategies (economic coping from Caplan & Schooler, 2007; $\alpha = 0.699$ and social psychological coping from Folkman et al., 1986; $\alpha = 0.619$), and family resilience (using the Walsh Family Resilience Questionnaire developed by Walsh, 2012; $\alpha = 0.806$). Data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS 25.0. Descriptive analysis was conducted to examine the distribution of the data, while independent T-test were used to examine differences based on the husband's living/working status. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to examine the effects of family interaction and coping strategies on family resilience. Score categorization followed the cut-off criteria from Puspitawati et al. (2021): low (< 60), moderate (60–80), and high (> 80).

Results

Respondent Characteristics

Most husbands were in early adulthood, with an average age of 40.13 years among husbands who worked away from home and 34.43 years among husbands who stayed at home, showing a significant difference between the groups ($p = 0.013$). Husbands' educational level and type of occupation also showed significant differences; husbands who worked away from home were more likely to hold diplomas or higher education degrees (D1–S3) (40%) and work in the formal sector (63.3%), compared to husbands who stayed at home, the majority of whom had only completed senior high school or equivalent education (66.7%) and worked in the informal sector (70%).

The wives' age and educational level also differed significantly, with wives in the group of husbands working away from home tending to be older and more highly educated, although the majority were housewives (80%). In contrast, all wives of husbands who stayed at home had permanent jobs outside the home, either domestically or abroad ($p = 0.000$).

Meanwhile, most of the family income in both groups was below IDR 5,000,000 and did not show a significant difference ($p = 0.098$), indicating that variations in long-distance marriages were not directly associated with differences in family income levels.

Table 1
Individual and Family Characteristics

Characteristics	Husband Working Away		Husband Staying at Home	
	n	%	n	%
Individual Characteristics				
Husband's Age (years)				
Early adulthood	19	63.3	27	90.0
Middle adulthood	9	30.0	3	10.0
Late adulthood	2	6.7	0	0.0
P-value	0.013			
Mean	40.13		34.43	
Min–max	25–64		27–50	
Highest Educational Attainment				
Did not complete elementary school	0	0.0	0	0.0
Elementary school/equivalent	0	0.0	2	6.7
Junior high school/equivalent	2	6.7	6	20.0
Senior high school/equivalent	16	53.3	20	66.7
Diploma/Bachelor's/Master's/Doctoral degree (D1–S3)	12	40.0	2	6.7
P-value			0.000	
Husband's Occupation				
Formal sector	19	63.3	9	30.0
Informal sector	11	36.7	21	70.0
P-value			0.009	
Duration of Long-Distance Marriage (years)				
6 months	3	10.0	3	10.0
6 months–1 year	17	56.7	13	43.3
> 1 year	10	33.3	14	46.7
P-value			1.000	
Family Characteristics				
Wife's Age (years)				
Early adulthood	21	70.0	28	93.3
Middle adulthood	9	30.0	2	6.7
Late adulthood	0	0.0	0	0.0
P-value			0.006	
Highest Educational Attainment				
Did not complete elementary school	0	0.0	0	0.0
Elementary school/equivalent	0	0.0	2	6.7
Junior high school/equivalent	2	6.7	6	20.0
Senior high school/equivalent	16	53.3	20	66.7
Diploma/Bachelor's/Master's/Doctoral degree (D1–S3)	12	40.0	2	6.7

Characteristics	Husband Working Away		Husband Staying at Home	
P-value	0.001			
Wife's Occupation				
Housewife	24	80.0	0	0.0
Working wife	6	20.0	30	100.0
P-value	0.000			
Family Income				
< IDR 5,000,000	22	73.3	27	90.0
> IDR 5,000,000	8	26.7	3	10.0
P-value	0.098			

Family Interaction

For the family interaction variable, working husbands had an average index score of 68.50, slightly higher than husbands who stayed at home, with an average score of 65.83. The results of the independent sample t-test showed that the difference between the two groups was not significant ($p = 0.452$). A significant difference was found only in the husband-wife communication dimension ($p = 0.002$). Working husbands had an average index score of 78.33, whereas husbands who stayed at home had an average index score of 65.33. Other dimensions, such as father-child communication, husband-wife bonding, father-child bonding, and overall family interaction, did not show significant differences.

Table 2

Distribution of Respondents' Answers Based on Minimum and Maximum Values, Average, and Standard Deviation for Family Interaction Variables

Variable	Working Husbands (Min-Max)	Stay-at-Home Husbands (Min-Max)	p-value	Working Husbands (Mean $\pm$ SD)	Stay-at-Home Husbands (Mean $\pm$ SD)
Father-Child Communication	30-100	20-100	0.273	60.00 $\pm$ 19.11	65.00 $\pm$ 15.70
Father-Child Bonding	40-100	20-90	0.559	66.00 $\pm$ 15.66	68.33 $\pm$ 15.10
Father-Child Interaction	35-100	20-85	0.318	63.00 $\pm$ 14.89	66.66 $\pm$ 13.28
Husband-Wife Communication	50-100	30-90	0.002	78.33 $\pm$ 14.40	65.33 $\pm$ 16.34
Husband-Wife Bonding	20-100	30-100	0.311	69.67 $\pm$ 20.59	64.67 $\pm$ 17.16
Husband-Wife Interaction	35-100	30-95	0.028	74.00 $\pm$ 15.33	65.00 $\pm$ 15.59
Family Interaction	35-97	25-87	0.452	68.50 $\pm$ 14.54	65.83 $\pm$ 12.70

Coping Strategies

There was a significant difference in overall coping strategies between migrant husbands and stay-at-home husbands. The average coping strategy score among migrant husbands was 73.94, whereas among stay-at-home husbands it was 62.77. As many as 83.3 percent of migrant husbands were categorized in the moderate category, while around three-quarters (76.7%) of stay-at-home husbands were also classified in the moderate category.

In the dimension of emotion-focused financial coping, 56.7 percent of migrant husbands and 55 percent of stay-at-home husbands were in the moderate category. This indicates that both groups tended to use emotional approaches in dealing with financial problems.

Table 3

Distribution of Respondents' Answers Based on Category, Minimum and Maximum Values, Average, and Standard Deviation for the Coping Strategy Variable

Dimension	Working Husbands (Min–Max)	Stay-at-Home Husbands (Min–Max)	P-value	Mean ± SD Working Husbands	Mean ± SD Stay-at-Home Husbands
Emotion-Focused Financial Coping	46–93	33–80	0.000	75.55 ± 10.83	59.33 ± 11.25
Problem-Focused Financial Coping	53–93	26–73	0.000	74.22 ± 10.75	58.44 ± 11.83
Economic Coping Strategy	63–90	43–73	0.000	74.88 ± 8.24	58.88 ± 8.68
Emotion-Focused Coping	66–100	26–86	0.000	82.00 ± 10.95	67.77 ± 13.34
Problem-Focused Coping	40–86	33–80	0.807	64.00 ± 12.57	63.55 ± 12.22
Psychological Coping Strategy	56–93	30–80	0.007	73.00 ± 9.31	65.66 ± 10.97
Total Coping Strategy	61–88	36–75	0.000	73.94 ± 7.02	62.77 ± 8.27

Family Resilience

For the family resilience variable, working husbands had an average index score of 70.29, which was higher than stay-at-home husbands, who had an average score of 64.59. However, the independent sample t-test showed that this difference was not significant ($p = 0.076$).

When analyzed by dimension, a significant difference was found in the family belief system dimension ($p = 0.009$). Working husbands had a higher average index score (75.77) compared to stay-at-home husbands (66.22). Meanwhile, no significant differences were found in the organizational pattern dimension ($p = 0.619$) or the communication and problem-solving dimension ($p = 0.137$). The average index scores for the organizational pattern dimension were 64.22 (working husbands) and 62.00 (stay-at-home husbands), while for the communication and problem-solving dimensions the scores were 70.88 (working husbands) and 66.55 (stay-at-home husbands).

Table 4

Distribution of Respondents' Answers Based on Categories, Minimum and Maximum Values, Mean, and Standard Deviation for The Family Resilience Variable

Dimension	Working Husbands (Min–Max)	Stay-at-Home Husbands (Min–Max)	P-value	Working Husbands (Mean ± SD)	Stay-at-Home Husbands (Mean ± SD)
Family Belief System	53–100	20–86	0.009	75.77 ± 11.13	66.22 ± 15.94
Organizational Pattern	26–100	26–80	0.619	64.22 ± 18.65	62.00 ± 15.67
Communication and Problem Solving	53–93	20–86	0.137	70.88 ± 11.93	65.55 ± 15.27
Family Resilience	51–95	26–82	0.076	70.29 ± 11.72	64.59 ± 12.70

Relationship Between Individual and Family Characteristics With Family Interaction, Coping Strategies, and Family Resilience

Based on Table 5, the wife's years of education and family income had a significant positive relationship with family interaction. This means that the higher the wife's education and the greater the family income, the better the quality of family interaction tended to be.

Several characteristics, namely husband's status, husband's years of education, wife's years of education, husband's occupation type, wife's occupation type, and family income, showed significant positive relationships with coping strategies. Meanwhile, family resilience had significant positive relationships with both family interaction and coping strategies.

Table 5

Relationship Between Individual and Family Characteristics With Family Interaction, Coping Strategies, and Family Resilience

Characteristics	Family Interaction	Coping Strategies	Family Resilience
Husband's Age (years)	-0.099	-0.004	-0.195
Wife's Age (years)	-0.043	0.020	-0.206
Husband's Status (0 = working, 1 = stay-at-home)	-0.231	-0.612**	-0.099
Husband's Years of Education	0.228	0.531**	0.087
Wife's Years of Education	0.258*	0.283*	0.090
Length of LDM (years)	-0.089	0.031	-0.121
Husband's Occupation Type (0 = informal, 1 = formal)	0.097	0.302*	0.184
Wife's Occupation Type (0 = housewife, 1 = working wife)	-0.193	-0.435**	0.011
Family Income (in units of IDR 100,000)	0.370**	0.258*	0.121
Family Interaction	1	0.500**	0.605**
Coping Strategies		1	0.408**
Family Resilience			1

The Influence of Individual Characteristics, Family Characteristics, Family Interaction, and Coping Strategies on Family Resilience in Long-Distance Marriages

The multiple linear regression test on family resilience showed an Adjusted R Square value of 0.522 and $p = 0.000$, indicating that the model was able to explain 52.2% of the variation in family resilience, while the remaining variation was influenced by other factors outside the model. The model significance value of 0.000 indicates that, overall, the regression model was significant.

The analysis identified two variables that had a significant effect on family resilience. First, family income ($B = 0.000$; $p = 0.033$) had a significant positive effect, indicating that every increase of IDR 100,000 in family income would increase the family resilience score. Second, family interaction ($B = 0.548$; $p = 0.000$) also showed a significant positive effect on family resilience. This means that every one-point increase in the family interaction index would increase family resilience by 0.548 points.

Table 6

Multiple Regression Analysis of Individual and Family Characteristics, Family Interaction, and Coping Strategies on Family Resilience

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient (B)	Standardized Coefficient (β)	Sig.
(Constant)	10.780		
Husband's Age (years)	-0.523	-0.376	0.181
Wife's Age (years)	0.488	0.299	0.241
Husband's Status (0 = working, 1 = stay-at-home)	5.396	0.218	0.406
Length of LDM (years)	0.307	0.007	0.952
Husband's Years of Education	0.230	0.054	0.745
Wife's Years of Education	0.436	0.087	0.526
Husband's Occupation Type (0 = informal; 1 = formal)	-3.285	-0.133	0.258
Wife's Occupation Type (0 = housewife, 1 = working wife)	-6.642	-0.263	0.177
Family Income (in units of IDR 100,000)	0.000	0.274	0.033*
Number of Children	1.071	0.077	0.577
Family Interaction (index)	0.548	0.598	0.000**
Coping Strategies (index)	0.047	0.036	0.829
F	4.273		
R Square	0.522		
Adjusted R Square	0.400		
Sig.	0.000**		

Note. * Significant at $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed), ** Significant at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed)

Discussion

The correlation analysis showed that family interaction was positively associated with overall family resilience. The more open the communication among family members and the stronger the emotional bonds established through mutual support and shared involvement, the greater the family's ability to adapt and remain resilient in the face of challenges. This finding is consistent with Sabah et al. (2023), who identified family communication as an important mediator in strengthening family resilience during times of crisis. Similarly, Zamralita et al. (2024) found that good communication quality enhances family resilience, particularly among younger generations in Indonesia. According to Walsh (2016), communication and problem-solving processes—including openness, healthy emotional expression, and collaborative problem-solving—are essential components of resilient families.

In the context of long-distance marriages (LDM), Priastuty et al. (2023) reported that couples can maintain family resilience despite physical separation through effective communication, openness, and strong emotional connections. These interactions contribute to emotional stability, role clarity, and the preservation of shared family values. Consistent with this finding, working husbands reported significantly higher husband–wife communication and interaction scores than stay-at-home husbands, although no significant difference was found in overall family resilience. One possible explanation is that husbands who migrate for work intentionally invest greater effort in maintaining communication to compensate for physical distance. Frequent communication through digital technologies may help sustain emotional intimacy, coordinate family responsibilities, and reinforce commitment to the marital relationship. In contrast, husbands whose wives work away from home may face greater adjustments in domestic and caregiving responsibilities, which may influence the quality of couple interaction.

Family income also emerged as an important factor related to family resilience. Riptanti et al. (2021) found that higher family income enables families to employ more diverse and effective coping strategies, particularly when facing economic pressure and uncertainty. Stable income provides families with greater flexibility in managing problems through financial planning, resource utilization, and access to external support. In addition, families with higher income are generally better able to finance regular visits, maintain communication technologies, support children's needs, and access services that facilitate family functioning. Consequently, economic stability strengthens a family's capacity to adapt to separation and uncertainty. This finding supports previous studies showing that financial resources serve as important protective factors for family resilience (Radetic & Cerne, 2019).

The regression analysis further demonstrated that family interaction had a significant positive effect on family resilience. This finding highlights the importance of relational processes in sustaining family functioning under conditions of geographical separation. In LDM families, communication serves not only as a means of exchanging information but also as a mechanism for maintaining emotional closeness, mutual understanding, and trust. Effective family interaction helps family members adapt to physical separation by strengthening emotional bonds and facilitating collaborative problem-solving. These findings are supported by Carr and Kellas (2017), who emphasized that family and couple communication plays a central role in building resilience by providing opportunities for emotional validation and reinterpretation of challenging experiences.

In contrast, coping strategies did not significantly predict overall family resilience. This may be explained by the nature of coping strategies, which tend to operate at the individual level and focus on managing personal stress. Vladislav et al. (2024) argued that coping strategies, particularly those aimed at emotional distress management, primarily help individuals maintain psychological balance rather than strengthen family cohesion or organizational processes. Likewise, Herawati et al. (2017) suggested that coping strategies contribute to emotional stability but have limited influence on the development of a comprehensive family resilience system when not accompanied by strong family interaction. Therefore, although coping strategies remain important as individual resources, they may not be sufficient to foster collective family resilience without effective communication, emotional engagement, and mutual support among family members.

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the relatively small sample size and the use of purposive sampling may restrict the generalizability of the findings to other long-distance marriage families with different socio-demographic characteristics. Second, all variables were measured using self-reported questionnaires, which may be subject to social desirability bias and respondents' subjective perception. Future research is encouraged to employ longitudinal designs, larger and more diverse samples, and multiple informants to better capture the dynamic nature of family resilience in long-distance marriage contexts.

Conclusions

The study involving 30 working husbands and 30 stay-at-home husbands showed significant differences in individual and family characteristics between the two groups. Stay-at-home husbands were more predominantly in early adulthood compared to working husbands, with a significant difference. Educational level also differed significantly, as working husbands were more likely to have at least a diploma-level education compared to stay-at-home husbands. Similar patterns were found in wives' educational levels, as well as wives' employment status, where all wives in the stay-at-home husband group were employed, while most wives of working husbands were housewives. The husbands' occupational types also showed significant differences, with working husbands more commonly employed in the formal sector, while stay-at-home husbands were more dominant in informal employment. The correlation results indicated that family characteristics were related to several main variables. The wife's educational level and family income were associated with family interaction, while the educational levels of both husbands and wives, as well as the husband's employment status, were correlated with coping strategies. No significant relationship was found between family characteristics and family resilience. The regression analysis results showed that family resilience was influenced by one family characteristic, namely income, and one main independent variable, namely family interaction.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

The author declares that ChatGPT, an AI-assisted writing software, was used in proofreading and refining the language used in the manuscript. The usage was limited to correcting grammatical and spelling errors and rephrasing statements for accuracy and clarity. The author further declares that, apart from ChatGPT, no other AI or AI-assisted technologies have been used to generate content in writing the manuscript. The ideas, design, procedures, findings, analyses, and discussion are originally written and derived from careful and systematic conduct of the research.

References

- Abaied, J. L., & Rudolph, K. D. (2010). Mothers as a resource in times of stress: interactive contributions of socialization of coping and stress to youth psychopathology. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 38(2), 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-009-9364-7>
- Caplan, L. J., & Schooler, C. (2007). Socioeconomic status and financial coping strategies: The mediating role of perceived control. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 70(1), 43–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250707000106>
- Carr, K., & Kellas, J. K. (2017). The role of family and marital communication in developing resilience to family-of-origin adversity. *J Family Communication*, 18(1), 68–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2017.1369415>
- Folkman, S., Lazarus, R. S., Dunkel-Schetter, C., DeLongis, A., & Gruen, R. J. (1986). Dynamics of a stressful encounter: Cognitive appraisal, coping, and encounter outcomes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(5), 992–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.50.5.992>
- Herawati, T., Tyas, F. P. S., & Trijayanti, L. (2017). Tekanan ekonomi, strategi koping, dan ketahanan keluarga yang menikah usia muda [Economic pressure, coping strategies, and resilience of families who marry at a young age]. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen* [Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences], 10(3), 181–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2017.10.3.181>
- Hermawati. (2018). Perubahan pola kehidupan keluarga di era industri [Changes in family life patterns in the industrial era]. *Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling Islam* [Journal of Islamic Guidance and Counseling], 1(1), 26–38. <https://doi.org/10.15548/jbki.v1i1.122>
- Hughes, K. D., & Silver, W. A. (2019). Beyond time-binds: Rethinking work–family dynamics for a mobile world. *Human Relations*, 73(7), 924–952. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719846264>
- Maryam, S. (2017). Strategi coping: Teori dan sumberdayanya [Coping strategies: Theories and resources]. *Jurnal Konseling Andi Matappa* [Andi Matappa's Counseling Journal], 1(2), 101–107. <https://doi.org/10.31100/jurkam.v1i2.12>
- Masarik, S., Martin, M. J., Ferrer, E., Lorenz, F. O., Conger, K. J., & Conger, R.D. (2016). Couple resilience to economic pressure over time and across generations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(2), 326–345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12284>
- Peterson, K. K. (2014). Distance makes the heart grow fonder: Do long distance relationships have an effect on levels of intimacy in romantic relationships? *Global Tides*, 8(1), 1–12. <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol8/iss1/8>
- Priastuty, B. A. D., Aulia, S. Z. N., Afifatunnisa, A., & Kaloeti, D. V. S. (2023). Long-distance, strong connection: Shaping family resilience in the face of long-distance marriage. *Proceedings of International Conference on Psychological Studies (ICPsyche)*, 4(1), 105–116. <https://doi.org/10.58959/icpsyche.v4i1.29>

- Puspitawati, H. (2017). *Gender dan Keluarga: Konsep dan realita di Indonesia* [Gender and Family: Concepts and Realities in Indonesia]. IPB Press.
- Puspitawati, H., & Setyoningsih, S. S. (2011). Fungsi pengasuhan dan interaksi dalam keluarga terhadap kualitas perkawinan dan kondisi anak pada keluarga tenaga kerja wanita (TKW) [The function of care and interaction within the family on the quality of marriage and the condition of children in families of female migrant workers (TKW)]. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen* [Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences], 4(1), 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2011.4.1.11>
- Puspitawati, H., Herawati, T., & Rizkillah, R. (2021). *Asesmen Gender dan keluarga Jilid 2* [Gender and Family Assessment Volume 2]. IPB Press.
- Rachman, Y. A., Sunarti, E., & Herawati, T. (2020). Pengaruh interaksi suami-isteri, interaksi orangtua-anak, dan interaksi teman sebaya terhadap resiliensi remaja [The influence of husband-wife interaction, parent-child interaction, and peer interaction on adolescent resilience]. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen* [Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences], 13(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2020.13.1.1>
- Radetic, T., & Cerne, A. (2019). The influence of family income on students' family resilience in Croatia. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 33(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2019.1697332>
- Riptanti, E. W., Masyhuri, Irham, Suryantini, A., Irianto, H., & Widiyanti, E. (2021). Relationship of coping strategy with income by households of farmers cultivating dry land: A case study in food-insecure regency of East Sumba in East Nusa Tenggara. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 905(1), 012022. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/905/1/012022>
- Sabah, A., Aljaberi, M.A., Hajji, J., Fang, C.Y., Lai, Y.C., & Lin, C.Y. (2023). Family communication as a mediator between family resilience and family functioning under the quarantine and COVID-19 pandemic in Arabic countries. *Children (Basel)*, 10(11), 1742. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children10111742>
- Tavakol, Z., Yadollahi, P., Shirmohammadi, M., & Dehkordi, A. K. (2020). The effect of couples' interaction on their marital satisfaction: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(1), 6820–6826. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_386_20
- Vladislav, E. O., Marc, G., Paica, C. I., & Pop, O. A. (2024). Family resilience in a social-ecological context – Emotional difficulties and coping strategies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1421745. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1421745>
- Walsh, F. (2012). Family Resilience: Strengths Forged through Adversity. In F. Walsh (Ed.), *Normal Family Processes*. Guildford Press.
- Walsh, F. (2016). Family resilience: a developmental systems framework. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 13(3), 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2016.1154035>

Wardhani, N. D. W., & Wideasavitri, P. N. (2020). Coping strategies on wives in a long-distance marriage and live with in-laws. *Journal Psikodimensia*, 19(1), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.24167/psidim.v19i1.2309>

Zamralita, Z., Wilis, A. P. L., & Angelina, S. (2024). The role of family resilience on family functioning with family communication as mediator in Generation Z. *Jurnal Komunikasi [Journal of Communication]*, 16(2), 508–524. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jk.v16i2.3043>

Contact email: defina@apps.ipb.ac.id