

FACTORS RELATED TO POLYGAMY FAMILY IN PIDIE DISTRICT

Finaul Asyura¹, Marthoenis², Maidar³

^{1,2,3}Magister Kesehatan Masyarakat, Universitas Muhammadiyah Aceh, Indonesia

Abstract

Polygamy is a marriage that has been carried out by many people from various circles. During 2001, there were 234 cases of violence against wives. Data on victims reveals 5.1% of polygamy in secret, 2.5% of official polygamy, 36.3% of victims of cheating, 2.5% left by their husbands, 4.2% divorced, 0.4% as a second wife, and Another 0.4% as a dating park. Types of violence reported include economic violence as much as 29.4%; physical violence 18.9%; sexual violence 5.6%; and 46.1% psychological violence. There are still cases of polygamous families in Pidie Regency which can cause rifts in the household and can even cause feelings of sadness, jealousy, prolonged stress, and hatred because they feel they have been betrayed by their husbands. This study aims to determine the factors associated with polygamous families in Pidie District. The design of this research is case control. The research location is in Pidie Regency,. The sample in this study were 30 polygamous families, both first, second, third and fourth wives and as many as 60 families who were not polygamous. The results of the study that the most dominant variable on the incidence of polygamous families was a history of 12 times the disease. Expecting women to maintain attraction to their husbands so that husbands do not have a tendency to approach other women.

Keywords: Family, Polygamy.

Abstrak

Poligami menjadi suatu pernikahan yang sudah banyak dilakukan oleh masyarakat dari berbagai kalangan. Selama tahun 2001 mencatat sebanyak 234 kasus kekerasan terhadap istri. Data-data mengenai korban mengungkapkan 5,1% poligami secara rahasia, 2,5% dipoligami resmi, 36,3% korban selingkuh, 2,5% ditinggal suami, 4,2% dicerai, 0,4% sebagai istri kedua, dan 0,4% lainnya sebagai taman kencana. Jenis kekerasan yang dilaporkan meliputi kekerasan ekonomi sebanyak 29,4%; kekerasan fisik 18,9%; kekerasan seksual 5,6%; dan kekerasan psikis 46,1%. Masih adanya kasus keluarga poligami di Kabupaten Pidie yang bisa menyebabkan keretakan dalam rumah tangga bahkan bisa saja menyebabkan perasaan sedih, cemburu, iri, stress berkepanjangan, serta benci karena merasa sudah dikhianati oleh suaminya. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui faktor-faktor yang berhubungan dengan keluarga poligami di kabupaten pidie. Desain penelitian ini adalah *case control*. Lokasi penelitian di Kabupaten Pidie,. Sampel dalam penelitian ini adalah sebanyak 30 orang keluarga yang berpoligami baik istri pertama, kedua, ketiga maupun yang keempat dan sebanyak 60 orang keluarga yang tidak berpoligami.. Hasil penelitian variabel yang paling dominan terhadap kejadian keluarga poligami adalah riwayat penyakit sebesar 12 kali. Diharapkan kepada perempuan menjaga daya tarik pada suami agar suami tidak memiliki kecenderungan untuk mendekati perempuan lain.

Kata Kunci: Keluarga, Poligamy.

Author correspondence

Email: finaulasyurabintimuslim@gmail.com

Available Online at <http://jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/riwayat/>



INTRODUCTION

Marriage is a sunnatullah which is relevant with the desire of individuals to build a formal connection under the marriage bond to produce offsprings (1). In general, women have an expectation that her existence will be the only partner in someone's life, being the only wife who loves and is loved by her husband. In other words, husband will not marry another woman (2). Polygamy is defined as the marriage of a man with more than one woman at the same time. This type of marriage is mostly practiced by scholars who understand sharia or Islamic laws governing the implementation of polygamy (3).

Data from (Religion, 2017) showed that there was a decrease in the number of polygamy from 995 to 691 in 2012 to 2013, continuously to 689 in 2014, and 643 in 2016. However, the data only showed registered polygamy while unregistered polygamy is still commonly found in the society (4). Most of the perpetrators of polygamy came from among the aristocrats, civil servants, Bumiputra, students, and wholesalers (juragan). The wives of nobles who are very numerous were asked to live in the keputren.

Islam basically adheres to a monogamous marriage system, where a husband only has one wife. It is only possible for a man to have polygamous marriage under certain conditions. Not every man is able to carry out polygamy, given the numerous conditions that must be met. Polygamy is only allowed for men who are able to fulfill the terms and conditions for the implementation of polygamy (5).

Not limited to Islam alone, polygamy is also practiced in other religions. Mursalin & Zubaedi (1) explained that the Christian basically does not prohibit the practice of polygamy, because there is no clear explanation in the Bible about the basis of monogamous marriage or the basis for prohibiting polygamy. Meanwhile, according to Al-Fatih Suryadilaga (6) in Hinduism, polygamy has been practiced since the maritime era. As done by other nations, polygamy that applies in Hinduism does not recognize certain limits regarding the number of women that can be married.

Polygamy is a topic that is widely discussed in society, because the existence of polygamy is not always approved due to several pros and cons (7). Conflicts could arise in women of polygamous family, including internal family conflicts between wives, between wives and stepchildren, as well as between children with different mothers. The conflict that occurs between wives is very complex in which stronger wife tends to beat weaker wife (7). This phenomenon can also pose problems in children, especially their mental development. According to Mulia (7), polygamous marriages are known to pose heavy psychological burden for children.

An agency focusing on violence against women explained that during 2001 there were 234 cases of violence against wives. Data of the victims revealed that 5.1% of polygamy happened in secret, 2.5% were official, 36.3% were victims of cheating, 2.5% were left by their husbands, 4.2% were divorced, 74% were divorced, 0.4% were as a second wife, and the other 0.4% were due to dating. Types of violence reported include economic violence

(29.4%); physical violence (18.9%); sexual violence (5.6%); and psychological violence (46.1%) (8).

Psychologically, every wife feels uncomfortable when seeing their husbands remarry with other women. A number of studies explained that majority of women will feel sad, jealous, envious, prolonged stress, and hate due to the sense of betrayal. In addition, internal conflict in the family also causes psychological problems for women (7). Another impact experienced by the wife is the economic impact. Ramadhani & Rahmandani (9) explained that although there are fair men in providing a living, husbands tend to be more concerned with the life of young wives than their former wives.

The impact of polygamous marriages makes women feel worse. Nevertheless, the first wife in a polygamous marriage would keep in the marriage despite the impacts occurred due to polygamy (7). Results of initial survey conducted in June 2020 showed that there were 30 respondents from polygamous families in Pidie District. This phenomenon attracted researchers' attention to conduct the study. The researcher considers that the information and answers about the impact of the implementation of polygamy for

women is crucial, which will be focused on the psychological impact.

The purpose of this study was to determine factors associated with polygamous families in Pidie District.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This is an analytical research with case control study design, namely an observational analytic epidemiological study. This study examined the relationship between certain effects (can be diseases or health conditions) and certain risk factors. (Sastroasmoro & Ishmael, 2011). The research was conducted in Pidie Regency.

The population in this study were all polygamous families in Pidie Regency. There were 30 polygamous families with one, two, three or four wives and 60 wives from monogamous families. Samples were selected using snowball sampling technique, which is a method to identify, select and take samples in a network or continuous chain of relationships. Data was collected using direct interviews with the wives of polygamous families and monogamous families based on the research questions.

RESULTS

The results of the study were as follows:

Table 1 Frequency Distribution of Research Respondents in Pidie District

Research variable	Category	Status				Total	
		Polygamy		No Polygamy			
		N	%	n	%	N	%
Age	Productive	24	80,0	35	58,3	59	65,6
	Not productive	6	20,0	25	41,7	31	34,4
Education	High	18	60,0	30	50,0	48	53,3
	Intermediate	10	33,3	26	43,3	36	40,0
	Low	2	6,67	4	6,67	6	6,67
Tribe	Aceh	27	90,0	52	86,6	79	87,7
	Others	3	10,0	8	13,3	11	12,2

Research variable	Category	Status				Total	
		Polygamy		No Polygamy			
		N	%	n	%	N	%
Number of children	Less	16	53,3	16	26,6	32	35,5
	More	14	46,6	44	73,3	58	64,4
Income	>Minimum standard	13	43,3	7	11,6	20	22,2
	<Minimum standard	17	56,6	53	88,3	70	77,7
Profession	Does not work	8	26,6	33	55,0	41	45,5
	Work	22	73,3	27	45,0	49	54,4
Psychological wife	No impact	9	30,0	32	53,3	41	45,5
	impact	21	70,0	28	46,6	49	54,4
Household problem	Yes	10	33,3	36	60,0	46	51,1
	No	20	66,6	24	40,0	44	48,8
Destination Married	Happy	13	43,3	39	65,0	52	57,7
	Unappy	17	56,6	21	35,0	38	42,2
Cooking Ability	Yes	12	40,0	40	66,6	52	57,7
	No	18	60,0	20	33,3	38	42,2
Illness History	Yes	9	30,0	43	71,6	52	57,7
	No	21	70,0	17	28,3	38	42,2

Data from Table 1 showed that productive aged respondents in non-polygamous status (58.3%) were less than those with polygamy (80%). While the proportion of higher education in polygamous status (60%) is fewer than polygamous (50%). Respondents from Aceh ethnic group in non-polygamous status (86.6%) were less than polygamous (90%). The proportion of elder children in polygamous status (46.6%) were less than those without polygamy (73.3%). The proportion of income less than the minimum salary standard in polygamous status (56.6%) were less than those without polygamy (88.3%). The proportion of working wives in polygamous status (73.3%) were higher than those without polygamy (45%). The proportion of wives with psychological impact in polygamous

status (70%) were higher than those without polygamy (46.6%). Respondents who did not have household problems in non-polygamous status (60%) were higher than those with polygamy (33.3%). The proportion of unhappy marriage in polygamous status (56.6%) were higher compared to those who are not polygamous (35%). Respondents who were able to cook in non-polygamous status (66.6%) were greater than those with polygamy (40%). While respondents who have no history of disease in non-polygamous status (71.6%) were greater than polygamy (30%).

Table 2 Age Relationship with Polygamous Families in Pidie District

No	Umur	Status				Total		OR (95% CI)	P Value
		Polygamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
1.	Productive	24	80,0	35	58,3	59	65,6		
2.	Not Productive	6	20,0	25	41,7	31	34,4	0,36 (0.12-1.03)	0,057
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

Data from Table 2 showed that the proportion of unproductive aged respondents in polygamous status (20%) were less than non-polygamy (41.7%). Meanwhile, respondents of productive aged respondents who are not polygamous (58.3%) were less than those of polygamy (80%). The statistical test results obtained an odd ratio of 0.36 (95%CI: 0.12-1.03),

meaning that the probability of not being polygamous in respondents of unproductive aged respondents was 65% greater than that of productive age. This finding showed that there was no relationship between age and polygamous families. (P = 0.057).

Table 3 Relationship of Education with Polygamous Families in the District

No	Education	Status				Total		OR (95% CI)	P value
		Polygamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	n	%	N	%		
1.	High	18	60,0	30	50,0	48	53,3		
2.	Intermediate	10	33,3	26	43,3	36	40,0	0,61(0,22-1.64)	0,328
3.	Low	2	6,67	4	6,67	6	6,67	0,80 (0.14-4.57)	0,807
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

The results showed that the proportion of education has no differences in the status of polygamy and non-polygamy (6.67%). Meanwhile, the proportion of secondary education in polygamous status (33.3%) was less than those without polygamy (43.3%). The statistical test results showed that the odds ratio of low education was 0.80 (95%CI: 0.14-4.57), meaning that the probability of not being

polygamous in respondents with low education was 20% greater than that of high secondary education and statistically unrelated (P=0.807) and odd the secondary education ratio is 0.61 (95%CI: 0.22-1.64). This finding stated that the probability of not being polygamous in secondary education respondents is 39% greater than that of higher education and statistically unrelated (P=0.328).

Table 4 Ethnic Relations with Polygamous Families in Pidie District

No	Tribe	Status				Total		OR (95%CI)	P Value
		Poligamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	n	%	N	%		
1.	Aceh	27	90,0	52	86,6	79	87,7		
2.	Others	3	10,0	8	13,3	11	12,2	0,75 (0.19-2.82)	0,671
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

Data of Table 4 showed that the proportion of other ethnic groups in polygamous status (10%) were less than those without polygamy (13.3%). Respondents who are ethnically based from Aceh in non-polygamy status (86.6%) were found to be less than those with polygamy (90%). The statistical test

results obtained an odd ratio of 0.75 (95%CI: 0.19-2.82), meaning that the probability of not being polygamous in other ethnic respondents was 25% greater than that of the Acehnese and statistically there was no relationship between ethnicity and polygamous families ($P = 0.671$).

Table 5 Relationship between Number of Children and Polygamous Families in Pidie District

No	Number of Children	Status				Total		OR (95%CI)	P value
		Poligamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	N	%	n	%		
1.	Less	16	53,3	16	26,6	32	35,5		
2.	More	14	46,6	44	73,3	58	64,4	0,35 (0.14-0.86)	0,023
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

The results from Table 5 above showed that the proportion of large children in polygamous status (46.6%) were less than those without polygamy (73.3%). Meanwhile, the number of children who are not polygamous (26.6%) were less than that of polygamous (53.3%). The results of statistical tests obtained that the odds ratio

of the number of children was 0.35 (95%CI: 0.14-0.86) meaning that the probability of not being polygamous in large respondents was 65% greater than the number of children and statistically there was a relationship between the number of children and polygamous families ($P = 0.023$).

Table 6 Relationship of Income with Polygamous Families in Pidie District

No	Income	Status				Total		OR (95% CI)	P value
		Polygamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	N	%	n	%		
1	>Minimum standard	13	43,3	7	11,6	20	22,2		
2	<Minimum standard	17	56,6	53	88,3	70	77,7	0,14 (0.41-0.52)	0,003
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

Data from Table 6 above showed that the proportion of income less province minimal salary standard in polygamous status (56.6%) were less than those without polygamy (88.3%). Meanwhile, respondents whose income is above the the minimal salary standard in non-polygamy status (11.6%) were less than those with

polygamy (43.3%). The statistical test results obtained the odds ratio of 0.14 (95% CI: 0.41-0.52) meaning that the probability of not having polygamy in respondents with less income is 86% greater and statistically there is a relationship between income and polygamous families ($P = 0.003$).

Table 7 Employment Relationship with Polygamous Families in Pidie District

No	Profession	Status				Total		OR (95%CI)	P value
		Polygamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
1.	Jobless	8	26,6	33	55,0	41	45,5		
2.	Work	22	73,3	27	45,0	49	54,4	2 (1.18-7.32)	0,002
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

Data from Table 7 showed that the proportion of working respondents in polygamous status (73.3%) is higher than those who are not polygamous (45%). Meanwhile, respondents who were jobless in non-polygamous status (55%) were higher than those with polygamy

(26.6%). Statistical test obtained an odd ratio of 2 (95% CI: 1.18-7.32), meaning that working respondents were two times likely to do polygamy compared to those who do not work and there is a relationship between work and polygamous family ($P = 0.020$).

Table 8 Psychological Relationships of Wives with Polygamous Families in Pidie District

No	Psychological Wife	Status				Total		OR (95% CI)	P value
		Polygamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	N	%	n	%		
1.	No Impact	9	30,0	32	53,3	41	45,5		
2.	Impact	21	70,0	28	46,6	49	54,4	2 (1.00-6.93)	0,049
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

Data from Table 8 showed that the proportion of the wife's psychological impact on polygamous status (70%) is higher than that of non-polygamy (46.6%). Meanwhile, respondents who have no psychological impact on their wives on non-polygamous status (53.3%) are greater than those of polygamy (30%). The statistical test results obtained an odd ratio

of psychological impact 2 (95% CI: 1.00-6.93) meaning that respondents who had a psychological impact on their wives had 2 times chance of polygamy compared to those who did not have a psychological impact on their wives and there was a relationship between the psychology of their wives and their polygamous families ($P = 0.049$).

Table 9 Relationship of Household Problems with Polygamous Families in Pidie District

No	Household Problem	Status				Total		OR (95% CI)	P value
		Polygamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
1	No	10	33,3	36	60,0	46	51,1		
2	Yes	20	66,6	24	40,0	44	48,8	3 (1.19-8.43)	0,021
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

Data from Table 9 revealed that the proportion of problematic households in polygamous status (66.6%) is higher than those without polygamy (40%). Meanwhile, respondents who do not have household problems with non-polygamous status (60%) are greater than those with polygamy (33.3%). The statistical test

results obtained an odd ratio of household problems 3 (95% CI: 1.19-8.43) meaning that respondents with household problems had 3 times chance of polygamy compared to those without household problems and there was a relationship between household problems ($P = 0.021$).

Table 10 Relationship of Happiness in Marriage with Polygamous Families in Pidie District Kabupaten

No	Feeling	Status				Total		OR (95% CI)	P value
		Polygamy		Tidak Polygamy					
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
1.	Happy	13	43,3	39	65,0	52	57,7		
2.	Unappy	17	56,6	21	35,0	38	42,2	2 (0.93-5.16)	0,071
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

Data from Table 10 showed that the proportion of unhappy marriages in polygamous status (56.6%) is higher than those without polygamy (35%). Meanwhile, respondents who are happily married in non-polygamous status (65%) are greater than those with polygamy (43.3%). The statistical test results

obtained an odd ratio of 2 (95% CI: 0.93-5.16), meaning that respondents who are not happily married have 2 times the chance of polygamy compared to those who are happily married and there is no relationship between happiness in marriage and polygamous families ($P = 0.071$).

Table 11 Relationships Can Cook with Polygamous Families in Pidie District

No	Cooking ability	Status				Total		OR (95% CI)	P value
		Polygamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
1.	Yes	12	40,0	40	66,6	52	57,7		
2.	No	18	60,0	20	33,3	38	42,2	2 (1.08-5.85)	0,031
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

Data from Table 11 showed that the proportion of wives who could not cook in polygamous status (60%) is higher than those without polygamy (33.3%). Meanwhile, respondents who can cook in non-polygamous status (66.6%) are greater than those with polygamy (40%). The results of the statistical test showed that the

odds ratio for being able to cook was 2 (95%CI: 1.08-5.85), meaning that respondents who could not cook had 2 times the chance of having polygamy compared to those who could cook and there was a relationship between being able to cook and having a polygamous family ($P = 0.031$).

Table 12 Relationship of Disease History with Polygamous Families in Pidie District

No	Illness History	Status				Total		OR (95%CI)	P Value
		Polygamy		No Polygamy					
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
1.	No	9	30,0	43	71,6	52	57,7		
2.	Yes	21	70,0	17	28,3	38	42,2	7 (2.22-26.6)	0,001
	Total	30	100	60	100	90	100		

Data from Table 12 showed that the proportion of patients with medical history in polygamous status (70%) is higher than those without polygamy (28.3%). Meanwhile, respondents who have no history of disease in non-polygamous status (71.6%) are greater than those with polygamy (30%). Statistical test results obtained an odds ratio of 7 (95%CI: 2.22-26.6), meaning that respondents with a history of disease had a 7 times chance of polygamy compared to those without a history of disease and there was a relationship between a history of disease and a polygamous family ($P = 0.001$).

Conclusion

Based on the analysis, factors related to the polygamous family are:

1. There is a relationship between the number of children (OR= 0.35; 95%CI: 0.14-0.86; $P = 0.023$), income (OR = 0.14; 95%CI: 0.41-0.52; $P = 0.003$), occupation (OR=2; 95%CI: 1.18-7.32; $P= 0.020$), wife's psychology (OR=2; 95%CI: 1.00-6.93; $P= 0.049$), household problems (OR=3; 95%CI: 1.19 -8.43; $P= 0.021$), able to cook (OR=2; 95%CI: 1.08-5.85; $P= 0.031$) and a history of disease (OR=7; 95%CI: 2.22-26.6; $P= 0.001$) with polygamous family.

2. There is no relationship between age (OR= 0.36; 95%CI: 0.12-1.03; $P = 0.057$), education (OR= 0.61; 95%CI: 0.22-1.64; $P=0.328$), ethnicity (OR= 0.75; 95%CI: 0.19-2.82; $P=0.671$) and happiness in marriage (OR=2; 95%CI: 0.93-5.16; $P= 0.071$) with polygamous families.

Recommendations

1. Women has to reject men who want to do polygamy because problems occur more in polygamous marriages.
2. Wives should be independent for the welfare of the family. It is adviced to not only rely on and depend on the provision of a living from their husbands.
3. Maintain attractiveness to the husband to prevent the tendency of finding alternative women.

Bibliography

- Mursalin S. & Zubaedi. Menolak poligami: studi tentang undang-undang perkawinan dan hukum Islam: Pustaka Pelajar; 2007.
- Yuliantini F., Abidin Z. & Setyaningsih R., Konflik Marital pada Perempuan Dalam Pernikahan Poligami yang

- Dilakukan Karena Alasan Agama,
Jurnal PsikoIogi, 2008;1(2).
- Tihami H. & Sharani S., Fikih Munakahat,
Kajian Fikih Nikah Lengkap,
Jakarta: PT, *Raja Grafindo
Persada*, 2009.
- Agama K., Kementerian Agama dalam
Angka 2017, *Jakarta (ID)*,
Kemenag, 2017.
- AlFatih Suryadilaga M., Sejarah Poligami
Dalam Islam, *Jurnal Studi Gender
Dan Islam Musawa*, 2002;1(1).
- Mulia M., Islam menggugat poligami:
Gramedia Pustaka Utama; 2004.
Mursalin S. & Poligami M., Studi
tentang Undang-Undang
Perkawinan dan Hukum Islam,
Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2007.
- Annisa R. & Murtini H., The Determinant
of Regional Financial Information
Transparency on the Official
Website of Local Government,
*Accounting Analysis
Journal*, 2018;7(1):43-51.
- Ramadhani A.F. & Rahmandani A.,
Pengalaman Pengasuhan Single
Mother yang Memiliki Anak
Disabilitas Intelektual:
UNDIP; 2018.