

An Analytical Approach for Ideal Spouse Selection Criteria Using AHP Method

Nur Azulia Kamarudin^{1*}, Mohd Aamir Adeeb Abdul Rahim², Norhayati Yusof³, Ayu Abdul Rahman⁴ and Mohamad Faizal Abd Matalib⁵

^{1,2,3,4}School of Quantitative Sciences, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia

^{1,2}Institute of Strategic Industrial Decision Modelling, School of Quantitative Sciences, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia

⁵School of Language, Civilisation and Philosophy, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 UUM Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia

* Corresponding author: nurazulia@uum.edu.my

Received: 23 October 2025

Revised: 10 March 2026

Accepted: 22 May 2026

ABSTRACT

Selecting an ideal spouse is crucial for long-term relationship satisfaction and stability, as mismatches in core values, emotional compatibility, or priorities can lead to marital conflicts and decreased quality of life. This study presents an Ideal Spouse Selection Framework using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) to identify and prioritize key criteria in partner selection. Essential factors identified from the literature include religion, affection, personal values, mental health, financial stability, communication, and shared interests. These criteria reflect qualities vital for relationship harmony, including aligned values, emotional support, and financial compatibility, which contribute to a resilient partnership. Using AHP, respondents ranked these criteria to reflect their perceived importance in a life partner. Religion emerged as the most critical factor, highlighting the importance of shared spiritual beliefs and cultural alignment. Affection, personal values, and mental health and emotional stability follow closely, emphasizing the role of emotional stability and ethical alignment. Financial stability, dynamic relationships, no negative traits are also valued but are secondary to these core traits. Meanwhile, physical appearance, communication, interests/hobbies and career and family are considered less critical, indicating that respondents prioritize enduring compatibility factors over initial attraction or leisure activities. This framework offers a structured method for assessing potential partners, helping individuals make decisions based on alignment with deeper, enduring qualities rather than transient traits. Not selecting a compatible spouse can increase the risk of conflicts, dissatisfaction, and emotional distress, impacting both personal well-being and family stability. Future research could explore the integration of fuzzy AHP to capture subjective preferences more accurately and examine the model across different cultural groups to understand regional variations in spouse selection.

Keywords: Spouse Selection, Spouse Criteria, Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)

1 INTRODUCTION

Implementing an ideal spouse selection framework can greatly enhance the process of finding a compatible life partner, so it is advisable not to choose life partners hastily. The criteria for choosing a spouse should be properly observed and the individuals themselves have a clear knowledge and definition of the criteria. [1] presented a framework that consists of many criteria like communication, personal values and culture, affection and support, financial status, career and family requirements, dynamic relationship, mental and wellbeing attributes, absence of negative traits, and appearance and interests. Features like attractiveness, resemblance, initial interaction, mutual choice, and positive attitude towards each other, have been found to have impacts on partner selection and the development of chemistry between the involved partners. To assess potential partners in these areas, one can evaluate their physical attributes, the extent to which their values align, the level of satisfaction that they get from their conversations and the mutual nature of those communications, as well as the warmth and positivity shown by the individual [2].

Critical factors in choosing an ideal spouse include similarities, expressiveness of emotions, acceptance, range of personality, and other pertinent variables [3]. The consideration of these factors is essential in order to boost the chances of a long-term relationship that yields maximum happiness and fulfilment. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the criteria that individuals regard as important when evaluating their compatibility in a relationship.

Ideal selection framework can significantly enhance the selection of life partners, which is why people should not rush or pressure themselves into choosing their spouse. Spouse selection for marriage is usually based on selecting a good candidate that meets certain expected criteria, depending on priority, preference and ranking [4,5,6]. [1] have shared several criteria such as communication, personal values and culture, affection and support, finance, career and family aspirations, dynamic relations, personality temper, absence of negative traits, and physical appearance interests. Some of these criteria include physical appearance, similarity, initial interactant communication, mutual choice, and warm affect. When appraising people in these areas, one could consider how his or her physical appearance is compared to that of the potential partner, how much both share the same values, how much satisfaction is derived from talking to the other party and whether the communication is reciprocal or not as well as the degree of warmth displayed by the person [2].

The process of choosing a life partner is intricate and influenced by a multitude of elements, such as personal preferences, cultural norms, and society ideals. Recent research has identified some significant criteria that influence the selection of a life partner for both men and women. According to [1], the "ideal standards model" developed by [7] proposes that individuals establish ideal standards, which can be categorised into warmth-trustworthiness, vitality-attractiveness, and status-resources. They then evaluate possible mates using this set of criteria. This particular methodology addresses the cognitive dimension involved in the selection of a life partner. Furthermore, establishing standards for a prospective life partner entails the creation of lists encompassing both desirable and undesirable traits, as well as a compilation of shared values that the prospective spouse should share. This component facilitates introspection related to the concept of an ideal spouse and enables individuals to discuss this matter. Spouse selection cues expose inherent gender disparities, as males and females exhibit distinct preferences for specific cues

influenced by financial resources and physical beauty. Availability of resources directly influences the level of preference for specific selection cues [3].

While the process of selecting a spouse is common worldwide, many studies concentrate on the individual decision-making process towards choosing a mate in Western cultures. Conversely, in Islamic culture, Kufw is believed to be comparable in terms of its important significance, particularly in the way the process is managed. As Islam gives great importance to spouse selection, it is very necessary to take this decision of marital bond with due care. This is because when this marital relationship takes place, the lives of the spouses are totally changed and it becomes the subject of two families, not only two people [8]. For a marriage to be joyful and prosperous, the couples must exhibit compatibility in various aspects, including religious beliefs, social status, and moral principles. Marriage is a momentous choice that requires meticulous evaluation of several aspects, and selecting the appropriate marital partner in Islam is particularly crucial. As emphasized by the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) when he advised a man seeking counsel, "It is binding upon you to have a religious spouse," the main focus is on the religiosity and piety of the potential partner [9,10].

Furthermore, the Quran underscores the need of marrying individuals who are morally upright, as stated in Surah An-Nur, verse 32: "And marry the unmarried among you and the righteous among your male slaves and female slaves." In the event of poverty, Allah will bestow upon them His abundance, as Allah is all-encompassing and omniscient (Quran 24:32).

Islam has laid a lot of importance on the need of having faith and religion in one's life and also the importance of having a partner who is good character and moral nurtured. Imam Reza has also echoed the same opinion of [9] that whoever wants to marry one's daughter should be one with good characteristics and should have the feeling of religious responsibility. [9,10,11] confirmed the findings that the religious beliefs regarding selection of a spouse, religious commitment and good character, compatibility couples and a role of family also determine the success and happiness in married life. Thus, it is vital for a person to choose an ideal spouse in order to maintain a strong relationship, carry on the descent, and improve the well-being of society through family institutions [6].

Choosing a partner is essential not only for forming partnerships, but also for determining the impact of such relationships on their quality and health. The literature on partner selection research has some methodological limitations particularly concerning the analysis of the multi-perspective and methodological flexibility [1]. However, as is exemplified in the aforementioned example, the process of selection of a partner in marriage is a multifaceted one which depends on other aspects like availability, culture and preference. Thus, examining these factors can help try to gain a proper grasp of the choice of a life partner and its effects on the stability and health of the relationship.

The Ideal Spouse Selection Framework is based on the factors that have been found by many research studies to be the building blocks of a happy and fulfilling marriage. The criteria include communication, personal values, shared spiritual compatibility, relational attachments (such as emotional security), financial security, spousal dynamics (such as work/life balance), adaptability which promotes well-being (e.g. absence of negative traits), physical appearance, and common activities/past-times. The integration of these categories is essential for establishing a

comprehensive framework for selecting a life partner. Effective communication is the fundamental factor in enhancing marital pleasure [12]. Communication followed by tolerance and responsibility for family well-being has been the most powerful ingredient in partnerships [6]. From an Islamic perspective, religious compatibility plays a crucial role in enhancing the bond between spouses. For instance, they establish a closer bond and reciprocate emotional support because they share the same religious beliefs [13]. Hence, Islam not only regulates the interpersonal relationships among individuals, but also establishes a framework that ensures the harmonious functioning of both the family and society. Schwartz's theory of core values suggests that shared personal values have a significant impact on both life actions and respectful behaviour [14].

Furthermore, of greater significance is the aspect of financial compatibility. Financial issues may worsen arguments in a relationship, therefore there is a need to monitor financial status with detail. Indeed, research has demonstrated that financial collaboration is an effective solution for marital difficulties [15]. Financial management among Muslims typically involves fulfilling the necessary responsibilities outlined in Islamic teachings, which consequently contributes to a greater level of stability in marriages [13]. Both affection and emotional support contribute to the foundation of positive relationship satisfaction and overall well-being [16].

While physical attractiveness can be decisive in attraction in the first instance, it plays a secondary role in the long term. However, having common interests and preferences could have a positive effect on the quality of relationships and emotional closeness between individuals [17]. They get the opportunity to regularly spend quality time with one another thus strengthening their bond. Hence, based on these considerations, an individual can also plan on how to select an appropriate partner for a lifetime, hence encouraging positive marital relationships.

2 METHODS

One of the most common methods applied in decision making with multiple criteria is the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP). AHP is a technique that represents a decision-making problem in the form of a hierarchy of factors, subfactors and criteria. AHP has been applied extensively to measure the relative importance or weights of the factors that are related to priorities. Thus, AHP can provide a methodical way to be used for the assessment of critical ideal life partner factors. The technique is utilized to determine and compare the significance of such parameters as communication, personal values, financial standing, and emotional state. Through the use of AHP, an individual can be able to rank all the criteria depending on their importance and provide a weight for each criterion to aid in decision making.

The ideal spouse selection framework in this research is developed with the use of the AHP. In light of the benefits and strengths of AHP, this study pursues to develop a well-organized framework that could guide individuals in deciding on their partner selection, hence making better relationship choices. The following sections will explain the methods used in this research, including steps taken when using AHP to rank ideal life partner factors. The first stage of the AHP process is to establish a clear statement of the decision problem. The first step in this regard involves defining the main goal and getting to know other sub goals which have to be achieved as a result of the decision-making process. Defining the problem is essential especially since it is the first step in any problem-solving

process, and this means that all other steps that are to be taken should be geared towards achieving the defined problem.

After the problem and objectives have been identified, the next step is to divide the decision problem into a hierarchical form. This hierarchy typically consists of three levels: the target at the top, with the criteria and sub-criteria for the decision and the options available for consideration. The goal is the more specific and ultimate result of the decision-making process. Criteria are the variables or characteristics that influence the decision, while sub-criteria are the factors within the criteria, alternatives refer to the choices that are available in the decision-making process to achieve the set goal. Organizing the hierarchy in this way makes it easier to analyze each component of the decision problem because it is divided into sub-problems that can be more easily analyzed.

Once the hierarchy of criteria, sub-criteria, and alternatives is established, pairwise comparisons are made to assess the relative mean weightage of the criteria and sub-criteria and the relative importance of the alternatives. This step involves the comparison of each of the elements with the others in reaching the element that is above it in the hierarchy. The comparisons are made by means of a number scale with values ranging between 1 to 9 where 1 stands for both elements being of the same importance and 9 for one element clearly dominating the other one. These comparisons are then incorporated to form pairwise comparison matrices. For instance, if there are n criteria, a matrix A of size $n \times n$ is constructed, where the element a_{ij} represents the relative importance of criterion i over j . The matrix is reciprocal, meaning $a_{ij} = \frac{1}{a_{ji}}$, and the diagonal elements are always 1, as each criterion is compared with itself. Therefore, the matrix becomes:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & a_{12} & a_{13} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ \frac{1}{a_{12}} & 1 & a_{23} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \frac{1}{a_{13}} & \frac{1}{a_{23}} & 1 & \cdots & a_{3n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{a_{1n}} & \frac{1}{a_{2n}} & \frac{1}{a_{3n}} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

Next, the priority vector, or eigenvector, is then calculated from the pairwise comparison matrices. This vector represents the relative weights or importance of each criterion or alternative. To compute the priority vector, the sum of each column in the matrix is calculated, and each element of the matrix is divided by its corresponding column sum, resulting in a normalized matrix. The priority vector is obtained by averaging the rows of the normalized matrix. If A' is the normalized matrix, the priority vector w is given by:

$$w_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n a'_{ij} \quad (2)$$

This step ensures that the relative importance of each criterion or alternative is quantified, facilitating a clear comparison. Another important aspect of AHP is the consistency of pairwise comparisons. Consistency ensures that the judgments made during the comparison process are logically sound. To assess consistency, the Consistency Index (CI) is calculated using the formula:

$$CI = \frac{\lambda_{max} - n}{n - 1} \quad (3)$$

where λ_{max} is the maximum eigenvalue of the pairwise comparison matrix, and n is the number of criteria.

The Consistency Ratio (CR) is then computed by:

$$CR = \frac{CI}{RI} \quad (4)$$

where Random Index (RI), a predefined constant based on the number of criteria. A CR value of 0.1 or less is considered acceptable, indicating that the comparisons are consistent. If the CR exceeds this threshold, the comparisons may need to be revised to improve consistency.

Once the priority vectors are calculated, these vectors are aggregated to determine the overall priority of each alternative. This involves multiplying the priority vector of the criteria by the priority vectors of the alternatives, yielding the final ranking of the alternatives. The final decision is made based on the aggregated priority scores. The alternative with the highest score is selected as best meets the criteria and objectives defined at the beginning of the process

In conclusion, the AHP methodology provides a systematic approach to decision-making by breaking down complex problems into a structured hierarchy, conducting pairwise comparisons, and ensuring consistency. This method allows decision-makers to objectively evaluate alternatives based on multiple criteria, leading to informed and rational decisions.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

When establishing an Ideal Spouse Selection Framework based on AHP, a key starting point is demographic profiling of the target audience. It can be ascertained that the demographic characteristics of respondents have important influences on the criteria and weights concerning spouses' selection in the AHP model.

The demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Tables 1-4. The sample consists of 35 individuals, with 60% being men and 40% being women (Table 1). The majority of the respondents (74.29%) have an income of RM2,500 or below, while the remaining respondents are distributed across higher income brackets (Table 2).

Table 1: Gender of respondents

Gender	No. of respondents	%
Men	21	60
Women	14	40

Table 2: Income of respondents

Income	No. of respondents	%
RM2,500 and below	26	74.29
RM2,501 - RM 3,169	3	8.57
RM3,170 - RM3,969	1	2.86
RM3,970 – RM4,849	1	2.86
RM4,850 - RM5,879	1	2.86
RM7,110 – RM8,699	1	2.86
RM8,700 – RM10,959	2	5.71%

In terms of employment status, 48.57% of the respondents are self-employed, followed by those working in the private sector (20%), government (17.14%), and other sectors (14.29%) (Table 3). The educational background of the respondents varies, with 48.57% holding a diploma or certificate, 34.29% having secondary education, 11.43% with a bachelor's degree, and a small percentage (2.86%) having primary education or a doctoral degree (Table 4).

Table 3: Status of respondents

Status	No. of respondents	%
Self-Employed	17	48.57%
Government	6	17.14%
Others	5	14.29%
Private Sector	7	20.00%

Table 4: Education Level of respondents

Education Level	No.	%
Primary Education	1	2.86
Secondary Education	12	34.29
Diploma or Certificate	17	48.57
Bachelor's Degree	4	11.43
Doctoral Degree (PhD) or equivalent	1	2.86

The demographic data not only informs the selection of criteria and subcriteria within the AHP model but also guides the weighting and prioritization of these factors based on the characteristics of the respondents. For instance, income levels may influence the importance placed on financial stability or career aspirations in partner selection, while educational background could impact preferences for intellectual compatibility or shared values. The respondent is then asked to score using 9-scale [18] based on the following criteria (C): *communication* (C1), *personal values* (C2), *religion* (C3), *affection* (C4), *financial* (C5), *career and family* (C6), *dynamic relationships* (C7), *mental health and emotional stability* (C8), *no negative traits* (C9), *physical appearance* (C10) and *interests / hobbies* (C11). Table 5 shows the scores obtained from the respondents.

Table 5: Scores from respondents on criterion

Respondent	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11
1	9	9	9	9	1	1	7	7	1	5	5
2	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	9	3
3	9	1	8	7	8	6	2	5	9	1	2
4	9	8	9	7	3	4	7	8	8	7	5
5	9	8	9	9	9	8	9	7	9	9	9
6	7	7	9	9	5	6	6	6	7	8	1
7	9	9	9	8	7	7	9	6	9	5	9
8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
9	9	4	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	1	1
10	9	7	8	8	6	5	7	7	7	7	6
11	9	9	6	7	7	7	6	6	6	7	6
12	1	2	4	1	3	9	8	5	8	1	2
13	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
14	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
15	2	1	6	6	9	7	3	8	5	3	5
16	8	7	7	7	2	5	8	8	8	7	2
17	7	5	7	6	4	4	7	8	6	4	4
18	9	9	9	9	5	5	8	8	9	6	4
19	8	8	9	9	5	5	8	8	5	7	5
20	9	5	9	9	3	4	8	8	9	4	5
21	9	6	9	9	9	8	8	5	5	3	1
22	4	5	6	9	4	3	7	8	2	3	4
23	8	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	4
24	7	6	9	9	8	7	6	7	1	6	4
25	9	7	9	9	8	9	7	9	8	6	5
26	9	8	9	9	3	9	9	9	2	1	3

27	7	6	9	8	8	9	7	7	9	6	4
28	6	4	7	6	7	6	9	9	9	8	4
29	8	2	4	2	5	4	3	8	4	2	1
30	7	8	9	9	6	7	8	8	7	7	6
31	8	7	9	9	8	8	8	9	7	6	5
32	9	7	7	8	8	8	8	7	1	6	8
33	9	5	9	9	7	7	9	9	6	7	5
34	8	8	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
35	2	1	3	5	6	4	7	3	5	8	9

It is essential to understand the importance of the weights in the context of spouse selection before proceeding to calculate the weighted averages for each criterion based on the respondent's data using the 9-scale [18]. The weights given to the various criteria as nominated by the respondents are a mirror of their personal perception, belief and concern towards potential partners in marriage. This will help in identifying the criteria that are most crucial to the decision-making process, thus making it easier to understand the order of preference. The weight data given by the respondents regarding various factors that influence spouse selection is useful in determining the level of importance placed on each factor when selecting a spouse.

The most important criteria which the majority of respondents considered when choosing the partner were *communication* (C1), *personal values* (C2), and *mental health and emotional stability* (C8), which received the highest weights. This implies that people have an understanding that communication, respect and mutual values and emotional health are crucial ingredients for a healthy relationship. And many respondents also considered *affection* (C4) and the *no negative traits* (C9) as essential factors, which also supports the significance of emotional closeness, empathy, and the lack of toxic behaviors in a relationship. *Religion* (C3), and *career and family* (C6) also got different weights from the respondents suggesting that it may be relative to the subject's preference or culture. The two factors; *financial* (C5) and *physical appearance* (C10) had a higher level of variability in terms of the weights assigned by the respondents, with some attaching lower weights and others higher weights. This means that although these factors can be important in partner selection for some people, they are not necessarily as important as communication, values and emotional state of the potential partner for everyone. The themes of *dynamic relationships* (C7) and shared *interests and hobbies* (C11) had moderate weights which showed that there was confusion on the role or value that flexibility, growth and leisure activities have in relationships. These criteria may be more personal and may depend on the preferences that the individual has as well as their goals in a relationship.

The evaluation of the weight data can give an idea about the aspects that are given priority while choosing the best partner for marriage. Hence, by comparing the degrees of their importance and priorities for essential criteria, including communication, self- and partner's values, emotional stability, and absence of negative features, people and couples can deliberate more effectively regarding their relationship aspirations and expectations, and thus create stronger and more satisfying relationships.

Using the weights and the priority vectors obtained, aggregated scores were then calculated to determine the final ranking. For each participant j , the final score S_j , is calculated by multiplying the priority vector w_j , by the weight, W_j :

$$S_j = w_j \times W_j \quad (5)$$

The calculation for the aggregated scores in Table 6 follows these steps, by taking personal value (C2) as an example:

Step 1: Calculate the Final Score of Personal Value(C2) for Each Participant

For each participant j , the final score S_j , is calculated by multiplying the priority vector w_j , by the weight, W_j :

$$S_{j,C2} = w_{j,C2} \times W_{j,C2} \quad (6)$$

Let's assume the priority vector and weight values for *personal values* (C2) across a few participants:

Participant 1:

$$w_{1,C2} = 0.2148$$

$$W_{1,C2} = 9$$

$$S_{1,C2} = 0.2148 \times 9 = 1.9332$$

Participant 2:

$$w_{2,C2} = 0.3235$$

$$W_{2,C2} = 9$$

$$S_{2,C2} = 0.3235 \times 9 = 2.9115$$

This process is repeated for all 35 participants, calculating S_j , for each one based on their respective priority vector and weight.

Step 2: Sum the Final Scores Across All Participants for 'Personal Value'

After calculating $S_{j,C2}$, for each participant j , sum these scores:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{35} S_{j,C2} = 32.9292$$

Step 3: Calculate the Average Score for 'Personal Value'

To find the overall aggregated score, divide the sum of scores by the number of participants P :

$$S_j = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{35} S_{j,C2}}{P} = \frac{32.9292}{35} = 0.9408$$

The aggregated average score for 'personal value' across all participants is 0.9408. This result represents the relative importance of 'personal value' based on the collective input of all participants. The ranking of 'personal value' can then be determined in comparison to the average scores for the other criteria.

Later, the AHP was employed to rank various criteria in order of importance, providing insights into decision-making priorities, which is summarized in Table 6:

Table 6: Aggregated Score Rank from respondents on criteria

Rank	Criterion	Aggregated Score
1	C3: Religion	1.5875
2	C4: Affection	1.4272
3	C2: Personal Values	0.9408
4	C8: Mental Health and Emotional Stability	0.7840
5	C5: Financial	0.7192
6	C7: Dynamic Relationships	0.5253
7	C9: No Negative Traits	0.4682
8	C10: Physical Appearance	0.2293
9	C1: Communication	0.2265
10	C11: Interests and Hobbies	0.1257
11	C6: Career and Family	0.0965

The AHP assessment of factors that affect decision making outcomes identifies a clear order of preference of the factors. The findings also reveal that *religion* (C3) is the most important variable with a score of 1.5875. This is in accordance with the aspects of religion and faith in participants' choice, which underlines the significance of spiritual compatibility and religious compatibility. After religion, the next most important factor is *affection* (C4) and the rating given to it is 1.4272. This implies that appreciation and concern of the other person is a very important factor. Next was the *personal values* (C2) with a score of 0.9408, while *mental health and emotional stability* (C8) with a score of 0.7840. This is in accordance with the earlier mentioned, which shows how emotional health and stability is valued. These factors indicate that participants' decisions are guided more by the

emotional aspect of the relationship rather than any other factor. These results point towards the fact that decision making is based on personal ethics, faith and feelings. It suggests that there is a need to have similar creeds and values as a way of maintaining the relationship in the long run. Even though the financial factors are important they are not as significant as the individual and interpersonal aspects. Analysis of the results show that *financial* (C5) considerations are ranked fifth with a score of 0.7192. This can be evidenced where it is vivid that while financial factors are taken into consideration, they are not the main priority but rather the personal and emotional factors. This is a moderate stance since the concrete considerations are taken into consideration yet other concerns are not subordinate to them.

Intermediate level of criteria provides the following information. *Dynamic relationships* (C7) and *no negative traits* (C9) are ranked sixth and seventh and they have scores of 0.5253 and 0.4682, respectively. This indicates that although the quality of interactions and the lack of undesirable characteristics speak more of religious fit, emotional attraction, and similar values are the most important. It is also possible that participants will be more inclined to discuss the relationships or will overlook certain negative characteristics if there is a high agreement in other areas of ranking.

Some aspects of the relationship such as physical appearance and communication that were once deemed very essential are less important in this study. *Physical appearance* (C10) is ranked eighth having a score of 0.2293. The next factor is *communication* (C1), and it is ranked ninth with a score of 0.2265. These lower rankings imply that these factors are considered as less important than the basic ones related to compatibility. It can also mean that these factors are considered as more adjustable or as results of compatibility in the higher-ranked areas.

The lowest-ranked criteria, interests and hobbies (C11) and career and family (C6) with scores of 0.1257 and 0.0965, suggest that shared interests are less central to the decision-making process. This may indicate that these aspects are considered less critical, with strong compatibility in more fundamental areas of religion, values, and emotional connection being more significant.

4 CONCLUSION

This study, based on AHP analysis, reveals a decision-making framework that prioritizes cultural, religious, and emotional factors over more practical or superficial considerations. The findings suggest a holistic approach to decision-making, particularly in the context of relationships or cultural integration where compatibility in values, beliefs, and emotional capacities in marriage is seen as paramount.

Future research might benefit from incorporating fuzzy scales into the AHP framework in this context. Specifically, the fuzzy AHP may address some of the inconsistencies observed among respondents by capturing the uncertainty in human decision-making. Therefore, allowing better assessment in ranking the criteria and subsequently, leading to a more consistent result. Additionally, fuzzy AHP may handle imprecise and vague information.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express utmost gratitude and appreciation to Universiti Utara Malaysia for the financial support (Grant S/O code: 21416). We also appreciate the helpful recommendations provided by the anonymous reviewers.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. J. Rockinson-Szpakiw, L. S. Spaulding, and A. Knight, "Protecting the marriage relationship during the doctoral journey," *The Family Journal*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 141–146, 2015, doi: 10.1177/1066480714565106.
- [2] P. M. Markey and C. N. Markey, "Romantic ideals, romantic obtainment, and relationship experiences: The complementarity of interpersonal traits among romantic partners," *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 517–533, 2007, doi: 10.1177/0265407507079241.
- [3] S. G. White and C. Hatcher, "Couple complementarity and similarity: A review of the literature," *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 15–25, 1984, doi: 10.1080/01926188408250155.
- [4] D. Destinasari, D. Gustian, and S. Saepudin, "Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Pada Rekomendasi Pasangan Hidup Dengan Simple Additive Weighthing," *JTKSI*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 26–31, 2020.
- [5] K. Y. Palilingan, "Multi Criteria Decision Making Using TOPSIS Method For Choosing Mate," *Jurnal Teknik Informatika*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 283–290, 2020.
- [6] N. M. Noor, A. M. Mahdzir, A. M. Nor, and R. Abdullah, "Marital wellbeing indicators amongst Malay Muslim couple in Malaysia: A preliminary study," *Malaysian Journal of Medicine and Health Sciences*, vol. 15, pp. 114–119, Apr. 2019.
- [7] G. J. O. Fletcher, J. A. Simpson, G. Thomas, and L. Giles, "Ideals in intimate relationships," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 76, no. 1, pp. 72–89, 1999, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.76.1.72.
- [8] S. Haroon and S. Pakeeza, "Compatibility for Marriage in Islam (Kuf'ū) and Societal Perspectives," *Jihat-Ul-Islam*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2022.
- [9] S. A. A. Shirazi, *Spouse Selection Workbook*, Hadi Foundation, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://www.duas.org/pdfs/spouse-selection-workbook.pdf>
- [10] S. A. H. S. H. Rizvi, *Islamic Marriage Handbook*, Al-Islam.org, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.al-islam.org/islamic-marriage-handbook-sayyid-athar-husayn-sh-rizvi/selection-spouse>
- [11] L. A. Asamarai, K. B. Solberg, and P. C. Solon, "The role of religiosity in Muslim spouse selection and its influence on marital satisfaction," *Journal of Muslim Mental Health*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 37–

52, 2008, doi: 10.1080/15564900802006459.

- [12] J. M. Gottman, *The marriage clinic: A scientifically based marital therapy*. New York, NY, USA: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999.
- [13] Z. Alghafli, T. G. Hatch, A. H. Rose, and L. D. Marks, "Religion and relationships in Muslim families: A qualitative examination of devout married Muslim couples," *Religions*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 814–833, 2014, doi: 10.3390/rel5030814.
- [14] S. H. Schwartz, "An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values," *Online readings in Psychology and Culture*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2012.
- [15] J. Dew, "Debt change and marital satisfaction change in recently married couples," *Family Relations*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 60–71, 2008.
- [16] H. T. Reis and P. Shaver, "Intimacy as an interpersonal process," *Handbook of personal relationships*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 367–389, 1988.
- [17] A. Aron, C. C. Norman, E. N. Aron, C. McKenna, and R. E. Heyman, "Couples' shared participation in novel and arousing activities and experienced relationship quality," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 78, no. 2, p. 273, 2000.
- [18] T. L. Saaty, *The Analytic Hierarchy Process: Planning, Priority Setting, Resource Allocation*. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill, 1980.