

How to Cite

Sumardika, A. A. N. R., & Dewi, N. W. M. S. (2026). Gendered marital duties and the double burden of working women in Indonesia: Reconstructing articles 31 and 34 of the marriage law. *International Journal of Humanities, Literature and Arts*, 9(1), 36-44. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijhla.v9n1.2515>

Gendered Marital Duties and the Double Burden of Working Women in Indonesia: Reconstructing Articles 31 and 34 of the Marriage Law

Anak Agung Ngurah Roy Sumardika

Department of Civil Engineering, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Badung, Indonesia

Corresponding author email: ngurahroyka@gmail.com

Ni Wayan Merda Surya Dewi

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Badung, Indonesia

Abstract---This article examines whether gender-specific marital duties in Indonesia's Law No. 1 of 1974 on Marriage remain compatible with constitutional equality, Indonesia's obligations under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and contemporary dual-earner family life. The study employs doctrinal normative legal research using statute and conceptual approaches. It analyzes Articles 31 and 34 of the Marriage Law in relation to Articles 27(1), 28D(1), and 28I(2) of the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 7 of 1984 ratifying CEDAW, CEDAW Articles 5(a) and 16, relevant General Recommendations, and Constitutional Court Decision No. 22/PUU-XV/2017. Recent socio-legal and labor-market scholarship is used for contextual, not causal, interpretation. The analysis identifies an internal normative tension: Article 31(1) affirms balanced rights and status between spouses, while Article 31(3) and Article 34 assign the husband the roles of family head, protector, and provider and the wife the role of household manager. These provisions cannot by themselves establish the empirical cause of women's double burden; however, their sex-specific allocation of responsibilities can legitimize and reinforce male-breadwinner/female-caregiver norms that are difficult to reconcile with substantive equality and anti-stereotyping principles. The article proposes gender-neutral reform based on equal partnership, joint family maintenance, shared care, reciprocity, and mutual consent. Its contribution is an integrated doctrinal framework connecting internal statutory coherence, constitutional equality, CEDAW, contemporary care-economy evidence, and concrete legislative reconstruction.

Keywords---Marriage Law, gender equality, double burden, unpaid care work, substantive equality, Indonesia.

Introduction

The relationship between paid employment and unpaid care has become a central issue in gender equality because participation in the labor market does not automatically redistribute domestic labor. Across societies, women continue to perform a disproportionate share of unpaid care and domestic work, and this time burden constrains employment continuity, income, career progression, rest, and participation in public life (Addati et al., 2018; UN Women, 2023). Indonesia reflects this broader tension. The latest national labor-force publication continues to disaggregate participation by sex, underscoring the policy relevance of gender differences in labor-market access, while the national gender inequality index treats labor-market participation as a core dimension of gender inequality (BPS-Statistics Indonesia, 2025, 2026). Women's labor-force participation has expanded and diversified, but it remains shaped by marriage, motherhood, household responsibilities, commuting, sectoral opportunities, and social expectations about care (Cameron et al., 2019; Fajardo-Gonzalez et al., 2024; Rimkute & Sugiharti, 2023; Setyonaluri & Utomo, 2024). Recent Indonesian scholarship further shows that care responsibilities can reduce women's labor-market participation and household welfare, while the gendered organization of domestic labor

remains resilient even where men increasingly participate in housework or childcare (Kiram, 2026; Nur Asrofi et al., 2026).

These patterns make family law relevant to the care economy. Marriage law does more than regulate entry into and dissolution of marriage; it also expresses state-recognized expectations about spousal status, authority, maintenance, and family responsibilities. In Indonesia, Law No. 1 of 1974 on Marriage contains two normative messages that sit uneasily together. Article 31(1) states that the rights and position of the wife are balanced with those of the husband in household life and social relations. Yet Article 31(3) designates the husband as head of the family and the wife as homemaker. Article 34 then gives the husband a duty to protect his wife and provide household necessities according to his ability, while requiring the wife to manage household affairs to the best of her ability (Republic of Indonesia, 1974). The statutory architecture therefore recognizes equality at a general level but allocates core family roles by sex at a more specific level.

This role allocation is increasingly difficult to treat as a neutral description of family life. Indonesian families include dual-earner households, women who are primary or substantial earners, couples who share caregiving, and households whose economic survival depends on more than a single male income. Research on women's employment decisions in Greater Jakarta, for example, shows that paid work is negotiated together with care, mobility, and family expectations rather than being a simple individual choice (Setyonaluri & Utomo, 2024). Studies of Indonesian household labor likewise find persistent gender asymmetry in domestic work (Kiram, 2026; Simulja et al., 2014). During the COVID-19 period, gendered responsibilities within households became particularly visible and affected women's economic roles and vulnerabilities (Miranti et al., 2022). These empirical findings are not used here to prove that statutory language causes unequal household behavior; instead, they provide the socio-legal context for asking whether state law still endorses a family-role model that can normalize such inequality.

The constitutional framework strengthens the need for that inquiry. The 1945 Constitution guarantees equality before the law, fair legal certainty and equal treatment, and freedom from discriminatory treatment (Republic of Indonesia, 1945). Indonesia has also ratified CEDAW through Law No. 7 of 1984 (Republic of Indonesia, 1984). CEDAW requires States Parties to address prejudices and stereotyped roles based on sex and to eliminate discrimination in marriage and family relations (United Nations General Assembly, 1979). The CEDAW Committee has emphasized equality in marriage, shared responsibilities, and the economic consequences of gendered family arrangements (Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, 1994, 2013). Accordingly, the interpretive question is no longer limited to whether Article 34 reflects a traditional division of labor. The more important question is whether gender-specific marital duties remain normatively coherent with Indonesia's superior constitutional and international commitments to equality.

Indonesian legal scholarship has already criticized the persistence of patriarchal or sex-specific marital roles. Nur et al. (2024) identify inconsistencies between gender equality and the allocation of spouses' economic roles in Indonesian positive law, while Wahyudani et al. (2023) argue for dismantling patriarchal assumptions in marriage law. Broader scholarship on Indonesian family law shows that marriage regulation is shaped by interactions among state law, Islam, social norms, and gender politics, including contexts in which statutory obligations are negotiated with religious concerns (Ansori & Juliansyahzen, 2022; Grijns & Horii, 2018; Nisa, 2018; Platt, 2017). Studies of gender and law also demonstrate that formally neutral or historically normalized rules can reproduce unequal status when they are embedded in patriarchal structures (Afrianty, 2020; Pattiruhu, 2020).

A prior Indonesian-language study by Dewi (2025) focused on Article 34 and argued that gender bias in the Marriage Law is associated with the double burden experienced by working women. The present article does not reproduce that article or simply translate its claims. It extends the analysis in four material respects. First, it examines the internal relationship among Articles 31(1), 31(3), 34(1), and 34(2), rather than treating Article 34 in isolation. Second, it subjects the provisions to constitutional equality and non-discrimination analysis. Third, it integrates CEDAW Articles 5(a) and 16 and General Recommendations Nos. 21 and 29. Fourth, it uses the trajectory of Constitutional Court Decision No. 22/PUU-XV/2017 and the 2019 amendment to demonstrate that sex-differentiated rules in the Marriage Law are capable of constitutional reassessment and legislative reconstruction (Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2018; Miichi, 2025; Republic of Indonesia, 2019).

Against that background, this study addresses two research questions: (1) To what extent do Articles 31(3) and 34(1)-(2) create an internal normative tension with Article 31(1) and with Indonesia's constitutional and international commitments to gender equality? and (2) How should those provisions be reformulated to better reflect substantive equality, shared care, and contemporary dual-earner households? The article's central proposition is deliberately narrower than an empirical causation claim. It argues that gender-specific statutory duties can provide normative validation for the male-breadwinner/female-caregiver model and may reinforce an unequal distribution of paid and unpaid work. For a doctrinal study, this is the analytically appropriate level of claim (McGavock, 2021).

Materials and Methods

This study uses doctrinal normative legal research. Its object is the content, hierarchy, coherence, and normative implications of legal rules governing the status and responsibilities of spouses. A statute approach is used to examine the Marriage Law, its amendment, the 1945 Constitution, and Law No. 7 of 1984 ratifying CEDAW. A conceptual approach is used to interpret formal equality, substantive equality, sex-role stereotyping, shared care, and the double burden. The method follows the basic logic of Indonesian normative legal research, in which legal materials are analyzed as authoritative norms and systematically related to higher-order principles (Ibrahim, 2006).

The primary legal materials are: the 1945 Constitution, particularly Articles 27(1), 28D(1), and 28I(2); Law No. 1 of 1974 on Marriage, particularly Articles 31 and 34; Law No. 16 of 2019 amending the Marriage Law; Law No. 7 of 1984 ratifying CEDAW; CEDAW, particularly Articles 5(a) and 16; CEDAW General Recommendation No. 21 on equality in marriage and family relations; CEDAW General Recommendation No. 29 on the economic consequences of marriage, family relations, and dissolution; and Constitutional Court Decision No. 22/PUU-XV/2017. Secondary legal and socio-legal literature was selected purposively for direct relevance to Indonesian family law, women's employment, household labor, care work, gender norms, and legal reform.

The analysis proceeded in four stages. First, an internal-coherence analysis compared the Marriage Law's general equality clause in Article 31(1) with its role-specific provisions in Articles 31(3) and 34. Second, a vertical-harmony analysis assessed whether sex-specific allocation of marital roles is consistent with constitutional equality, equal treatment, and non-discrimination. Third, an international-consistency analysis compared the provisions with Indonesia's CEDAW commitments, especially the obligation to address stereotyped family roles and ensure equal rights and responsibilities in marriage. Fourth, a reform-oriented analysis considered whether gender-neutral drafting could preserve legitimate family-law objectives - support, protection, maintenance, and household management - without assigning those functions permanently by sex.

Empirical studies and statistical publications are used only for contextual triangulation. They show why the legal categories matter in contemporary Indonesian life, but they are not treated as evidence that Articles 31 or 34 directly cause women's double burden. The study does not include interviews, household time-use observations, judicial case coding, or causal econometric analysis. Consequently, its findings concern legal coherence, normative compatibility, and plausible socio-legal implications rather than measured behavioral effects. This limitation is intentional and prevents the doctrinal method from being stretched beyond what its evidence can support (Bayeh, 2016).

Table 1
Doctrinal matrix of the principal marital-role provisions

Provision	Normative function	Equality concern	Reform direction
Art. 31(1)	Balanced rights and position of wife and husband.	General equality principle.	Retain as the governing principle.
Art. 31(3)	Husband as family head; wife as homemaker.	Sex-based hierarchy and role stereotyping.	Replace with equal partnership and shared family leadership.
Art. 34(1)	Husband protects wife and provides household necessities.	Male-provider presumption; wife's economic contribution is not recognized as a joint legal responsibility.	Joint protection and family maintenance according to capacity and agreement.
Art. 34(2)	Wife manages household affairs.	Feminization of unpaid domestic and care responsibility.	Shared domestic and caregiving responsibility based on equality and reciprocity.

Note. English descriptions are authors' working translations and analytical paraphrases of the Indonesian provisions.

Results and Discussion

Internal normative tension: equality in status, hierarchy in roles

Article 31 of the Marriage Law contains the starting point for an equality-based reading. Article 31(1) affirms balanced rights and positions between wife and husband in household life and social interaction, while Article 31(2) recognizes each spouse's capacity to perform legal acts. Taken together, these clauses can be read as an explicit rejection of civil incapacity based on marital status or sex. However, Article 31(3) immediately reintroduces a sex-specific hierarchy by naming the husband as head of the family and the wife as homemaker (Republic of Indonesia, 1974). The structure therefore places a general principle of equality alongside a specific allocation of authority and domestic identity.

Article 34 deepens the tension. The husband's duties are framed in terms of protection and material provision, while the wife's duty is framed in terms of household management. In doctrinal terms, these are not merely descriptive examples. They are legal duties attached to sex-defined marital statuses. The husband is normatively associated with public-economic responsibility and leadership; the wife is normatively associated with domestic organization. The resulting pattern corresponds to the male-breadwinner/female-caregiver model criticized in Indonesian gender and family-law scholarship (Nur et al., 2024; Wahyudani et al., 2023).

The problem is not that every couple must divide all tasks identically. Substantive equality is compatible with negotiated specialization, differences in income, temporary caregiving arrangements, disability, pregnancy, or other family circumstances. The problem is that the statute pre-allocates responsibility by sex rather than by capacity, agreement, need, or changing circumstances. A husband who performs most caregiving and a wife who provides most income are legally possible in everyday life, yet the statutory labels continue to identify household leadership and domestic management with different sexes. This can produce what may be described as normative lag: social and economic arrangements diversify faster than the legal categories used to describe them.

The internal contradiction is clearer when Article 31(1) is treated as a governing principle rather than ceremonial language. If rights and position are balanced, specific spousal duties should normally be interpreted or drafted in a manner consistent with that balance. A hierarchy in which one spouse is formally identified as family head and the other as homemaker requires a justification that goes beyond historical convention. Modern family law can regulate mutual support, maintenance, child welfare, and household administration without fixing those functions to male and female status. The inconsistency therefore lies not in the existence of family duties, but in their sex-based allocation.

Constitutional equality and non-discrimination

The constitutional analysis begins with the principle that all citizens are equal before the law and government under Article 27(1), reinforced by Article 28D(1)'s guarantee of fair legal certainty and equal treatment and Article 28I(2)'s protection against discriminatory treatment (Republic of Indonesia, 1945). These provisions do not require every legal distinction to disappear. They do, however, require sex-based classifications to be assessed in light of equality, dignity, and the rights affected. Where a distinction rests on generalized assumptions about men's and women's proper social roles, the risk of substantive discrimination is particularly strong.

Articles 31(3) and 34 can be defended historically as a framework for reciprocal family responsibilities: the husband bears economic and protective duties while the wife bears domestic-management duties. Reciprocity, however, does not automatically establish equality. A division can be reciprocal and still be hierarchical if one role is associated with authority, public economic identity, and decision-making while the other is associated with unpaid care and domestic responsibility. Moreover, the practical burdens of the roles are not necessarily symmetrical in dual-earner households. If a wife works for pay but remains normatively assigned household management, the legal architecture does not recognize that paid employment may require a corresponding redistribution of unpaid work.

Constitutional Court Decision No. 22/PUU-XV/2017 is analytically relevant even though it addressed a different provision: the former sex-differentiated minimum marriage age. The Court's decision marked a constitutional turning point by treating differentiated treatment of men and women within the Marriage Law as susceptible to equality and non-discrimination review and by requiring legislative correction within a specified period (Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2018). The subsequent enactment of Law No. 16 of 2019 equalized the minimum marriage age for men and women (Republic of Indonesia, 2019). Scholarship on the reform emphasizes the role of constitutional litigation, feminist advocacy, and changing understandings of gender justice in producing that amendment (Miichi, 2025).

The significance for Articles 31 and 34 is not that Decision No. 22 automatically invalidates them. No such conclusion is claimed here. The significance is doctrinal: the Marriage Law is not insulated from constitutional

development simply because its provisions are longstanding or embedded in family tradition. The 2019 amendment demonstrates that sex-differentiated marital norms may be reconsidered when they conflict with contemporary constitutional standards. That reasoning supports a legislative review of role provisions whose classifications are also expressly based on sex.

CEDAW, anti-stereotyping, and equal family responsibility

Indonesia's ratification of CEDAW through Law No. 7 of 1984 makes the Convention a central interpretive reference for state commitments on sex discrimination (Republic of Indonesia, 1984). Two provisions are particularly relevant. Article 5(a) requires action to modify social and cultural patterns based on stereotyped roles for men and women, while Article 16 requires elimination of discrimination in marriage and family relations and equality between spouses in relevant rights and responsibilities (United Nations General Assembly, 1979). The CEDAW framework therefore reaches beyond formal access to marriage and divorce; it also addresses the normative assumptions through which family responsibilities are organized.

General Recommendation No. 21 emphasizes equality in marriage and family relations and warns against legal or customary arrangements that place women in an inferior position within the family (Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, 1994). General Recommendation No. 29 further addresses the economic consequences of marriage and family relations, drawing attention to the ways gendered divisions of labor and economic dependency can generate unequal outcomes during and after marriage (Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, 2013). These principles make the language of Articles 31(3) and 34 important not only because of who performs a task but because the state assigns a social role in advance on the basis of sex.

From an anti-stereotyping perspective, the phraseology of 'husband as head' and 'wife as homemaker' is problematic because it turns a contingent family arrangement into a legal identity. It suggests that leadership is presumptively male and domestic management presumptively female. Likewise, separating material provision from household management can imply that earning income is the husband's primary contribution even when the wife also earns income, and that unpaid care remains the wife's primary obligation even when she works full time. Such categorization sits uneasily with CEDAW's expectation that law should help dismantle, rather than formally preserve, stereotyped roles.

A CEDAW-consistent reconstruction would not prohibit couples from choosing a traditional arrangement. Equality includes autonomy. Instead, the law should establish a neutral baseline from which spouses may organize family life by mutual agreement. The legal default should be equal partnership and shared responsibility, with practical distribution determined by capacity, care needs, employment, health, preferences, and the best interests of children. This approach protects plural family choices while removing a state-imposed sex hierarchy.

The double burden as a socio-legal implication, not a doctrinally proven cause

The concept of the double burden describes the accumulation of paid work and disproportionate unpaid domestic or care work. It is analytically useful because it connects labor-market participation with the organization of household reproduction. International evidence shows that women perform substantially more unpaid care and domestic work than men, generating time poverty and limiting equal participation in paid work and public life (Addati et al., 2018; UN Women, 2023). The persistence of this imbalance is relevant to legal analysis because family law can either challenge or normalize the social expectations through which unpaid work is distributed.

In Indonesia, the employment-care relationship is well documented. Cameron et al. (2019) show that female labor-force participation has remained constrained by structural and life-course factors. Rimkute & Sugiharti (2023) connect married women's labor-force participation with occupation and household technology, demonstrating the importance of domestic constraints. Setyonaluri & Utomo (2024) show that married women's employment decisions in Greater Jakarta are negotiated through the simultaneous demands of work, family, and mobility. Fajardo-Gonzalez et al. (2024), identify a gendered parenthood penalty in Indonesian labor markets, reinforcing the importance of family responsibilities for women's economic trajectories.

Recent work strengthens the care dimension. Nur Asrofi et al. (2026), find that double care burdens are associated with women's participation and household welfare in Indonesia. Kiram (2026) documents a highly gendered division of housework and childcare among Indonesian Muslim families, even as men's participation varies by context and time. Simulja et al. (2014), likewise identify gender inequality in household labor among working married couples in Indonesia and Japan. Miranti et al. (2022), show how the pandemic exposed and intensified

gendered economic and household vulnerabilities. These findings are consistent with the broader observation that women's economic participation does not necessarily produce an equivalent redistribution of unpaid work.

Family and cultural context also matters. Indonesian marital relations are mediated by religion, community norms, economic strategies, and legal pluralism (Nisa, 2018; Platt, 2017). The public piety and family-law environment can shape gender expectations in complex ways rather than through a single linear patriarchal mechanism (Afrianty, 2020). Studies of familial relations similarly show the importance of negotiation and adaptation within Indonesian families (Mas'udah, 2022). For this reason, it would be methodologically excessive to state that Article 34 directly 'causes' the double burden. Household behavior has multiple determinants. The more defensible socio-legal conclusion is that sex-specific statutory roles can operate as authoritative cultural signals that legitimize an already familiar division of labor and make redistribution appear optional rather than normatively expected.

This distinction is important for publication-quality legal scholarship. A causal claim would require empirical research capable of isolating the effect of legal language from income, education, childcare availability, religious interpretation, workplace organization, household bargaining, and local norms. The present study does not provide such evidence. Its contribution is instead to demonstrate a mechanism of normative reinforcement: when state law labels the husband as head/provider and the wife as homemaker/household manager, it can validate the social script under which a working wife remains principally accountable for domestic work (Hanandita & Tampubolon, 2015).

Legal reform trajectory and the case for legislative reconstruction

The 2019 amendment to the Marriage Law is evidence that the statute can be updated when constitutional development and social realities make existing distinctions untenable. Law No. 16 of 2019 responded to the Constitutional Court's decision by revising the minimum marriage age, but it left the spousal-role provisions in Articles 31 and 34 unchanged (Republic of Indonesia, 2019). The amendment therefore solved one equality problem without undertaking a comprehensive review of the law's broader gender architecture.

A legislative rather than purely interpretive solution is preferable for Articles 31(3) and 34. Courts and administrators can interpret 'protection,' 'provision,' and 'household management' flexibly, and spouses may in practice adopt egalitarian arrangements. Nevertheless, the text remains explicitly sex-specific. Interpretation cannot easily transform 'husband' and 'wife' into a neutral allocation without effectively rewriting the statute. Clear legislative amendment would provide better legal certainty and a stronger equality signal.

Reform should also avoid replacing one rigid model with another. The objective is not to mandate an identical 50/50 distribution of every task or income contribution. Families have different resources and needs. Instead, the statute should articulate governing principles: equal partnership, mutual respect, joint responsibility for family welfare, shared care, reciprocity, and distribution according to capacity and agreement. Such principles are compatible with substantive equality because they recognize differences in circumstance without presuming that sex determines competence, authority, or obligation.

The reform is also consistent with contemporary approaches to care. The ILO frames unpaid and paid care as fundamental to decent work and gender equality and emphasizes recognition, reduction, and redistribution of unpaid care responsibilities (Addati et al., 2018). UN Women similarly treats unequal unpaid care as a structural barrier to women's economic agency (UN Women, 2023). Although these frameworks are not sources of Indonesian family law, they illuminate why statutory family duties matter for labor and social policy. A marriage law based on shared responsibility would align the private-law framework with broader policy efforts to support women's equal participation in education, employment, and public life.

Proposed gender-neutral formulation

The following formulation is offered as a doctrinal proposal rather than an official translation or legislative draft. It preserves the legitimate purposes of the existing provisions - family organization, mutual support, protection, and maintenance - while removing sex as the determinant of leadership and domestic responsibility.

For Article 31(3), the principle should shift from a hierarchical role designation to equal partnership: 'Husband and wife are equal partners in the family and share responsibility for family leadership on the basis of mutual respect and agreement.' For Article 34(1), material and protective responsibilities should be joint rather than attached exclusively to the husband: 'Husband and wife are jointly responsible, according to their respective capacities and mutual agreement, for the protection, maintenance, and material needs of the family.' For Article 34(2), domestic and care responsibilities should likewise be shared: 'Husband and wife shall jointly manage domestic, caregiving, and family responsibilities on the basis of equality, reciprocity, and mutual consent.'

This drafting approach has several advantages. First, it resolves the internal tension with Article 31(1) by making the operative duties consistent with the equality principle. Second, it eliminates formal sex-role stereotyping while retaining enforceable mutual duties. Third, it accommodates breadwinner variation, including households in which the wife earns more or is the primary earner. Fourth, it recognizes unpaid care as a shared family responsibility rather than an inherent attribute of wifehood. Fifth, it leaves space for couples to negotiate practical arrangements without treating negotiated difference as legal inferiority.

The proposal also reflects the direction of Indonesian legal development. The Marriage Law's age provision was revised after constitutional review demonstrated that a sex-based distinction could no longer be justified consistently with equality (Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2018; Miichi, 2025). A similar legislative review of spousal roles would not import a foreign family model; it would operationalize equality principles already contained in Article 31(1), the 1945 Constitution, and Indonesia's CEDAW commitments.

Table 2
Illustrative gender-neutral reconstruction of Articles 31(3) and 34

Provision	Current normative orientation	Illustrative reformulation
Art. 31(3)	Husband = family head; wife = homemaker.	Husband and wife are equal partners in the family and share responsibility for family leadership on the basis of mutual respect and agreement.
Art. 34(1)	Protection and household maintenance are assigned to the husband.	Husband and wife are jointly responsible, according to their respective capacities and mutual agreement, for the protection, maintenance, and material needs of the family.
Art. 34(2)	Household management is assigned to the wife.	Husband and wife shall jointly manage domestic, caregiving, and family responsibilities on the basis of equality, reciprocity, and mutual consent.

Note. The wording is a scholarly reform proposal and not an official translation or an enacted amendment

Conclusion

Indonesia's Marriage Law contains a significant internal normative tension. Article 31(1) recognizes balanced rights and status between spouses, but Article 31(3) and Article 34 organize family leadership, provision, protection, and household management through sex-specific roles. In a legal system committed to constitutional equality and non-discrimination, and in a state that has ratified CEDAW, this architecture warrants renewed legislative scrutiny.

The doctrinal evidence does not justify the empirical claim that Articles 31 or 34 alone cause the double burden of working women. Women's paid and unpaid workloads are produced by multiple interacting factors, including labor-market structure, household bargaining, childcare availability, commuting, income, religion, and social norms. The stronger legal conclusion is that gender-specific statutory duties can legitimize and reinforce the male-breadwinner/female-caregiver model. In dual-earner households, that normative signal can sit uneasily with substantive equality because the wife's paid work does not automatically displace the law's assignment of domestic responsibility.

A gender-neutral reconstruction should therefore preserve mutual family obligations while removing sex as the default determinant of authority and work. Equal partnership, joint maintenance, shared care, reciprocity, and mutual consent provide a more coherent statutory basis. Reform along these lines would align Articles 31 and 34 with the Marriage Law's own equality clause, the 1945 Constitution, CEDAW's anti-stereotyping and family-equality principles, and the demonstrated trajectory of constitutional reform in Indonesian marriage law. Future empirical research should test how legal norms are understood by couples, judges, religious officials, employers, and community actors and whether gender-neutral legislative change affects the actual distribution of paid and unpaid work.

References

- Addati, L., Cattaneo, U., Esquivel, V., & Valarino, I. (2018). *Care work and care jobs for the future of decent work*. ILO.
- Afrianty, D. (2020). Rising public piety and the status of women in Indonesia two decades after reformasi. *TRaNS: Trans-Regional and-National Studies of Southeast Asia*, 8(1), 65-80.

- Ansori, A., & Juliansyahzen, M. I. (2022). The contestation of the family law discourse in the digital age: Islam, state, and gender. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga dan Hukum Islam*, 6(1), 244-272.
- Bayeh, E. (2016). The role of empowering women and achieving gender equality to the sustainable development of Ethiopia. *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 37-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psr.b.2016.09.013>
- BPS-Statistics Indonesia. (2025). Indeks ketimpangan gender 2024 [Gender inequality index 2024]. <https://www.bps.go.id/id/publication/2025/07/31/83ae68c36720895d3895ec58/indeks-ketimpangan-gender-2024.html>
- BPS-Statistics Indonesia. (2026). Labor force situation in Indonesia February 2026. <https://www.bps.go.id/en/publication/2026/06/26/96b31cf730df9e84f17bfe03/keadaan-angkatan-kerja-di-indonesia-februari-2026.html>
- Cameron, L., Contreras Suarez, D., & Rowell, W. (2019). Female labour force participation in Indonesia: Why has it stalled? *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 55(2), 157-192.
- Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. (1994). General recommendation No. 21: Equality in marriage and family relations. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. (2013). General recommendation No. 29 on article 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: Economic consequences of marriage, family relations and their dissolution (CEDAW/C/GC/29). United Nations.
- Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2018). Decision No. 22/PUU-XV/2017 concerning judicial review of Law No. 1 of 1974 on Marriage.
- Dewi, N. W. M. S. (2025). Beban ganda perempuan yang bekerja akibat bias gender dalam uu perkawinan. *Jurnal Hukum Saraswati (JHS)*, 7(02), 1000-1011.
- Fajardo-Gonzalez, J., Hasanbasri, A., & Rios-Avila, F. (2024). *Is There a Gendered Parenthood Penalty in Indonesian Labor Markets?*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Grijns, M., & Horii, H. (2018). Child marriage in a village in West Java (Indonesia): Compromises between legal obligations and religious concerns. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 5(2), 453-466.
- Hanandita, W., & Tampubolon, G. (2015). The double burden of malnutrition in Indonesia: Social determinants and geographical variations. *SSM-population health*, 1, 16-25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2015.10.002>
- Ibrahim, J. (2006). Teori dan metodologi penelitian hukum normatif [Theory and methodology of normative legal research]. Bayumedia Publishing.
- Kiram, M. Z. (2026). Gendered division of domestic labour: Indonesian Muslim Men's perceptions, participation and experiences in housework and childcare. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 35(1), 174-191.
- Mas'udah, S. (2022). Familial relationships and efforts in retention of marriage among atomistic families in Indonesia. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8(1), 2046313.
- McGavock, T. (2021). Here waits the bride? The effect of Ethiopia's child marriage law. *Journal of Development Economics*, 149, 102580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2020.102580>
- Miichi, K. (2025). Feminist strategies in a Muslim democracy: case study of the 2019 marriage law revision in Indonesia. *Contemporary Islam*, 19(3), 559-575.
- Miranti, R., Sulistyaningrum, E., & Mulyaningsih, T. (2022). Women's roles in the Indonesian economy during the COVID-19 pandemic: Understanding the challenges and opportunities. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 58(2), 109-139.
- Nisa, E. F. (2018). The bureaucratization of Muslim marriage in Indonesia. *Journal of Law and Religion*, 33(2), 291-309.
- Nur Asrofi, D. A., Pratomo, D. S., Pangestuty, F. W., Tasmilah, & Al Ayyubi, M. S. (2026). Double care burden, women's participation, and household welfare in Indonesia. *Development Studies Research*, 13(1), 2688100.
- NUR, H. A., SONNY, D. J., & NYULISTIOWATI, S. (2024). The Inconsistencies in Efforts to Realize Gender Equality Towards the Roles of Husband and Wife to Fulfill Economic Needs in Relation to Positive Law in Indonesia. *JOURNAL OF LAW, POLITIC AND HUMANITIES Учредители: Yayasan Dharma Indonesia Tercinta (Dinasti)*, 5(1), 554-567.
- Pattiruhu, F. J. (2020). Critical legal feminism pada kedudukan perempuan dalam hak waris pada sistem patriarki. *Culture & Society: Journal Of Anthropological Research*, 2(1), 24-30.
- Platt, M. (2017). *Marriage, gender and Islam in Indonesia: Women negotiating informal marriage, divorce and desire* (Vol. 51). Taylor & Francis.
- Republic of Indonesia. (1945). The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Republic of Indonesia. (1974). Law No. 1 of 1974 on Marriage.

- Republic of Indonesia. (1984). Law No. 7 of 1984 on the ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.
- Republic of Indonesia. (2019). Law No. 16 of 2019 on the amendment to Law No. 1 of 1974 on Marriage.
- Rimkute, A., & Sugiharti, L. (2023). The Link Between Occupations, Labor Force Participation of Married Women, and Household Technology in Indonesia. *Journal of Population & Social Studies*, 31, 20.
- Setyonaluri, D., & Utomo, A. (2024). Negotiating work, family, and traffic: Articulations of married women's employment decisions in Greater Jakarta. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 31(6), 2423-2445.
- Simulja, J., Wulandari, E. H., & Wulansari, S. A. (2014). Gender inequality and the division of household labor: A comparative study of middle-class, working married men and women in Japan and Indonesia. *Hubs-Asia*, 10(1), 109-126.
- UN Women. (2023). Forecasting time spent in unpaid care and domestic work. <https://data.unwomen.org/publications/forecasting-time-spent-unpaid-care-and-domestic-work>
- United Nations General Assembly. (1979). Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (United Nations Treaty Series, Vol. 1249, p. 13).
- Wahyudani, Z., Astiti, N. N. A., & Tarantang, J. (2023). Dismantling the patriarchal culture and optimizing gender equality in marriage law. *Jurnal Anifa: Studi Gender dan Anak*, 4(2), 16-29.