HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
California School

in cooperation with

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
School of Social Work

JEWISH INTERMARRIAGE: THE EFFECT OF CONVERSION ON INTERFAITH MARRIAGE

A Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for the double degrees

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

and

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

by

Amy E. Finkle and Marcia S. Ortega

June 1977

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
California School

in cooperation with

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
School of Social Work

JEWISH INTERMARRIAGE: THE EFFECT OF CONVERSION ON INTERFAITH MARRIAGE

Thesis approved by

Rosa F. Kaplan

Marilyn A. Biggerstaff

Samson H. Levey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> The question of intermarriage, to be sure, is not one that the Jewish community alone confronts, it is a concern shared by all minorities in the United States--at least all those who care about group survival. For such groups, intermarriage is a palpable threat, that is felt on a collective as well as an individual basis. On a group level, it poses the obvious dangers of physical attrition; in the individual aspect, it threatens the continuity of generations within the family, the ability of family members to identify with one another, their satisfaction with family roles.[1]

The first comprehensive national study of the Jewish population in the United States, the National Jewish Population Study, found that as of 1972, of all Jewish persons now married, 9.2% are intermarried. Intermarriage in this study was defined as "a marriage in which one or the other partner describes himself or herself as having identified with a non-Jewish cultural viewpoint at the time that he or she met his or her future spouse."[2] Therefore, intermarriage here includes the non-Jewish spouse that has retained his or her non-Jewish religion as well as the non-Jewish spouse that has converted to Judaism. As intermarriage was examined over the century,

the intermarriage rates increased as follows:

> Of all Jews marrying between 1900-1920, 2% married a non-Jewish spouse;
>
> of all Jews marrying between 1956-1960, 5.9% married a non-Jewish spouse;
>
> of all Jews marrying between 1961-1965, 17.4% married a non-Jewish spouse;
>
> of all Jews marrying between 1966-1972, 31.7% married a non-Jewish spouse.[3]

From these rising figures, it appears that Jewish intermarriage has become a fact of life and that the Jewish community must examine the consequences of intermarriage. This study was aimed at isolating problem areas in intermarriage so that they may be recognized and dealt with in order to strengthen Jewish life in those situations where intermarriage has occurred. Another focus of the study was to examine conversion of the non-Jewish partner and its function in strengthening Jewish family life as we believe that family ties and stability are strengthened when both members of the marital pair are of the same religion. Therefore, studying familial and marital relationships in both intermarriage in which no conversion occurred and intermarriage in which the non-Jewish spouse converted to Judaism was a purpose of the study.

We would like to thank both Dr. Rosa F. Kaplan and Dr. Marilyn Biggerstaff, our thesis advisors, for their patience, understanding and assistance in the

preparation and writing of this thesis.

We would like to thank Dr. Samson Levey for reviewing the manuscript.

We are very grateful to our parents, Molly and Dan Finkle and Marion and Russell Weis for their encouragement and support in the attainment of our career goals.

We owe a special debt to Russell Weis and Morton Cousens for the printing that they so kindly provided us at no cost.

We would like to thank Gerald B. Bubis, for introducing us to the Jewish knowledge base which had led us to our great interest with the Jewish community.

We are indebted to those couples who so willingly participated in our study and were so hospitable to us. We also would like to acknowledge those individuals who helped us obtain our sample.

A special thank you goes to Paul Ortega and Richard Lipeles for their patience, understanding and love.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

[1]Marshall Sklare, "Intermarriage and Jewish Survival," Commentary 49 (March, 1970), 53.

[2]Jerry Hochbaum, Ph.D., "Toward the Development of a Planned Communal Response to Jewish Intermarriage," Journal of Jewish Communal Service 51 (Winter, 1974): 132.

[3]Ibid., p. 132.

CHAPTER II

FACTORS AFFECTING JEWISH INTERMARRIAGE

The Importance of the Family in Judaism

As social workers and Jewish communal workers, we are concerned with the survival and preservation of the American Jewish community. The family is traditionally the core of Jewish life and the vehicle for its survival. In the Jewish tradition to marry and establish a family is a *mitzvah*.[1] Performing a *mitzvah* is an act of goodness designed to increase happiness in the world. All Jews are obligated by Jewish tradition to fulfill this *mitzvah*.

In a study titled "Family Religion as a Matrix of of Personal Growth," Samuel Glasner found that in the traditional Jewish religious culture, "the home is regarded as the basic religious institution, in which an individual is taught that he can find completion of his personality, growth and highest personal fulfillment only in marriage and the continuation of the larger family."[2] In Judaism the central institution has always been the home. There are many ceremonies such as traditional observances of the

Sabbath, and Passover and rites of passage such as circumcision, Bar Mitzvah and marriage which bring the extended family together frequently, thus strengthening its influence. "Such religious family gatherings . . . " Glasner states, "become a highly meaningful and cherished part of the individual family member's psyche."[3]

The modern Jewish family in suburbia has continued to stay close in this traditional Jewish model of the extended family. In a study of Jews in Suburbia, Albert Gordon found that 61% of his suburban respondents and their children visit their parents and other relatives as frequently as before they moved away from the central city area. A majority of the remaining 39% who reported that their visits were less frequent attribute this decrease to the increased distance between their homes and the homes of their relatives. However, nearly all respondents visit their parents on traditional Jewish festival days.[4] Thus, the Jewish emphasis on the family continues, as is evidenced by the maintenance of extended family ties in suburban Jewish families.

In Eastern Europe, marriages were usually arranged by the family with the assistance of the shadchan.[5] Shadchanut is based on the presumption that marriage is both a religious obligation and rational decision. Marriage was seen as an alliance between families as well as

an alliance between two individuals. Marrying for romantic love was not the norm for Jewish culture.[6]

Jewish parents may experience a sense of loss over the lack of machotonim as a result of the intermarriage of their child.[7] "A mixed marriage will not unite the families of the bride and groom into one larger family according to the enduring tradition of the Jewish community."[8] These words were written in an 1877 pamphlet and still express the sentiments of many Jewish parents today. A very important part of Jewish family life is the unity of families through marriage.

> In the context of the shtetl heritage, it would seem that the Jews' negative feelings about intermarriage stem more directly from a value system according to which marriage is by no means a private affair--marriage is a partnership between two members of a community, and it is also an alliance between their extended families, who look upon their offspring as a unique and precious opportunity to enhance family prestige, enrich family life and strengthen the bonds of community solidarity.[9]

Kinship feelings of machotonoshaft, mishpoche, congregation, community and peoplehood lie at the heart of Judaism, and intermarriage with or without conversion, can be viewed through the eyes of the Jewish community as threatening group solidarity.[10]

For traditional societies in general, marriage was closely regulated by the elders. The couples' feelings were relatively unimportant. Marriage did not involve a

complete separation of the individual from the family of orientation. In modern society, on the other hand, parental authority has taken on a new definition and extended kinship ties have lost some importance as young people have gained the freedom of choosing their own mates. Separation from the family of orientation is seen as a positive step toward independence. Hareven states,

> Different ethnic and socioeconomic groups adapted differently [to modernization]. Distance of migration, recency of migration, whether one was first- or second-generation immigrant, the religious organization of an ethnic group, all had a significant impact on individual and familial patterns of modernization.[11]

American Jews are caught in the struggle between choosing a mate through the notion of romantic love which often takes precedence over considerations of race, creed, cultural origins, social class or religion, or being concerned with the notion of group survival which is intertwined with parental and extended kinship ties.

In a 1960 sociological study, Jerold Heiss addressed the question of what characteristics of family and religious experience break down the barriers toward intermarriage. He found that for Jews, loyalty to the extended family was critical for maintenance of the Jewish identity.[12] Studies also show that the effectiveness of pressure to marry within one's group is directly related to the value the extended family places on group survival.

American Jews seem more prone to intermarriage when traditional extended family ties break down.

Jewish Identity

"Jewish continuity in an open society is largely based on the ingredient of Jewish identity."[13] Identity, particularly Jewish identity, is not easily defined. According to Halachah, a person is Jewish if he or she is born of a Jewish mother or if he or she has converted to Judaism according to the specifications of Jewish law.[14] But, Jewish identity has many more components, and individuals differ in the amount of their identification with these components. Identity can be defined as the many selves which make up a person. For example, the researchers identify themselves as Jews, as social workers, as women, among others. Identification is the pattern the person acts out in light of his or her identity.

In an open society, as exists in the United States, one is free to choose whether or not to identify Jewishly. One is also free to choose the nature of Jewish identification. Components of Jewish identity include: Jewish community involvement, feelings of Zionism, performing Jewish religious rituals and practice, feelings of Jewish ethnicity, feelings of connection with Jewish history, belief in God, belief in the philosophy, ethics and values

of Judaism, and investment in the future of the Jewish people.

There are historical precedents that lead the researchers to believe that there may be a connection between Jewish identity and intermarriage--and ultimately Jewish survival. Arthur Hertzberg, a noted historian, states, "No Jewish community in Europe which lived four generations in freedom survived." Professor Moshe Davis found that in early twentieth century England, the original Jewish families of Spanish and Portugese descent intermarried to the point of almost complete incorporation into the English society at large. In tracing the descendents of early twentieth century American Jewish leaders, historians have found a lessening of Jewish identity.[15] Therefore, the researchers feel that it is important to explore the relationship of Jewish identity to intermarriage and conversion.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

[1]Marshall Sklare, America's Jews (New York: Random House, 1971), p. 71. Mitzvah may be defined as a divine commandment, a good, merit.

[2]Samuel Glasner, "Family Religion as a Matrix of a Personal Growth," Marriage and Family Living 22 (August, 1961): 291.

[3]Ibid., pp. 292-293.

[4]Albert I. Gordon, Jews in Suburbia (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 57-59.

[5]A shadchan is a marriage broker utilized by European and Russian Jews of the past. An example of this is Yente, a character from the book and play Fiddler on the Roof.

[6]Sklare, America's Jews, p. 76.

[7]Machotonim is the Yiddish word for the individuals in the extended family.

[8]Louis A. Berman, Jews and Intermarriage (New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1968), p. 249.

[9]Ibid., pp. 306-307. A shtetl is a small town, village, townlet.

[10]Ibid., pp. 308-309. Machotonoshaft is the relationship between the individuals in the extended family. Mishpoche is the Yiddish word for family.

[11]Tamara K. Hareven, "Modernization and Family History: Perspectives on Social Change," Signs 3 (Autumn, 1976): 203.

[12]Jerold Heiss, "Premarital Characteristics of Religiously Intermarried," American Sociological Review 25 (February, 1960): 47-55.

[13]John Slawson, "Jewish Identity in the United States," Journal of Jewish Communal Service 48 (Fall, 1971): p. 42.

[14]Halachah is the legal part of the Talmud.

[15]Slawson, "Jewish Identity in the United States," pp. 42-43.

CHAPTER III

JEWISH INTERMARRIAGE THROUGH THE AGES

History of Intermarriage

Interfaith marriages are comparatively recent in our society. The Roman Emperor Constantine prohibited intermarriage between Jews and Christians in 339 C.E. and by 388 C.E. these marriages were declared adulterous.[1] Opposition continued throughout the centuries reaching the point where marriages between denominations of Protestantism were not even allowed.

With the separation of Church and State in Europe in the eighteenth century, religious intermarriage was first permitted. However, problems developed despite this legislation. In 1825, the government of Prussia declared that all children of interfaith marriages should be raised in either the religion of the father or the one chosen by the father. Priests were forbidden to exact any promises from interfaith married couples regarding religious affiliation of their children.

The Austrians passed a similar law in 1868. In Czarist Russia, intermarriages between Christians and Jews

were not permitted to take place until the Jew had been baptized. Poland controlled Jewish and Christian intermarriage until 1940. With regard to Catholic-Protestant marriages, male children of these unions were to follow the religion of their fathers, while female children were to follow their mother's religion. Lithuania and Yugoslavia totally prohibited intermarriage until World War II.[2]

Jewish religion and practice have tended to perpetuate ingroup marriage through halachic barriers. When medieval Jewry was ghettoized, the number of Jews who married out of the community was very small. The Enlightenment in 1500 C.E. brought political emancipation for Jews and the right to live where they desired, but the intermarriage rate was still low. In the early nineteenth century some Jewish secularist intelligentsia celebrated their freedom by intermarrying or converting to Christianity. Still the Jewish bourgeoisie and peasants seldom intermarried. In the large Eastern and Western European Jewish communities, the minority who left the community and intermarried were looked upon with scorn. In countries with smaller Jewish populations the intermarriage rate was higher.[3]

This condition continued until the beginning of the twentieth century. The Jewish Encylopedia of 1901

states that the overall European intermarriage rate was then about 9.3%. This figure was considered too high because the study only surveyed "chief communities in which intermarriages occur."[4]

Laws of Conversion

The law regarding conversion is quite explicitly stated in the Talmud, and reaffirmed in the sixteenth century law code known as the Shulhan Arukh.[5] There are three requirements of conversion according to the Talmud: (1) Kabbalat al mitzvot, (2) Milah, and (3) T'vilah.[6] All these requirements are carried out under the supervision of a legal court of three learned Jews. Within the three traditions of Judaism (Orthodox, Conservative and Reform) there are great differences in the observance and interpretation of Halachah.[7]

In order to prepare for conversion, all potential converts go through an educational process. Most rabbis today still assert an antiproselytizing posture and attempt to disuade the potential convert. They address the following questions to the convert: "What motivates you? Do you know that in these days Jews are subject to persecution and discrimination, that they are hounded and troubled?" If the convert replies "I know this and yet I regard myself as unworthy of being joined to them," he is accepted immediately.[8]

Orthodox Judaism requires complete acceptance and observation of Halachah by the potential convert and strict halachic procedure for conversion. Because of the nature of Orthodox Judaism and its small number of converts, their conversion instruction is conducted on a one-to-one basis. Strict halachic observance accounts for conversion in all circumstances. If a pregnant woman converted, the child born subsequently requires no immersion. If his father gives consent, a minor is allowed to convert. However, if he does not have a father and comes by himself, or is brought by his mother, a Jewish court may convert him. The logic behind this is that becoming Jewish is beneficial and it is permitted to bestow a benefit upon a minor without his consent. Anyone converted in this manner may renounce his conversion upon reaching maturity. Non-Jews, who are observed living as faithful Jews and keeping all commandments, are regarded as converts although they did not formally convert. Should such a person want to marry a Jew, he or she must bring positive proof of conversion or undergo t'vilah for the purpose of conversion.

Conservative rabbis require t'vilah and milah as prerequisites for conversion. The average length of preparation is 4.1 months. The course of educational study is an "Introduction to Judaism" course formulated by the

Rabbinical Assembly of America, the policy-making body of the Conservative movement. The course includes a survey of Jewish history; a mastery of Hebrew reading; the study of Jewish holy days and ceremonies; the difference between Christianity and Judaism, and the reading of various books on Jewish subjects. In the western United States, the course of study is conducted by the University of Judaism. Several courses are offered simultaneously at various Conservative synagogues in most American cities. This allows for uniformity in conversion classes and more time allotted for the students' study. There is an emphasis on tradition in the structure of this course which is expressed through discussion of halachic matters.

Reform rabbis do not adhere to the laws of the Shulhan Arukh. Their movement's official position is,

> Reform does not possess such a surety about Jewish law. Reform acknowledges that some of these observances, rituals, customs and traditions have helped preserve the Jewish religion and the Jewish people in past periods of our history. But it is by no means clear in our time which, if any, of these observances have the power of preservation for the Jews and Judaism.[9]

Therefore, the Reform movement does not require circumcision or immersion. The educational process in the Reform movement lasts about 3.7 months. The study course consists of Jewish history, theology, ethics, customs and ceremonies, and is conducted by the Union of American

Hebrew Congregations, the national Reform Jewish organization. Courses are conducted at several locations in each city. The Reform handbook describes its curriculum as a "progressive interpretation of the Jewish tradition." In other words, instead of an halachic approach, their course uses a more historical/sociological approach to Jewish tradition.

Both the Reform and Conservative courses are entitled "Introduction to Judaism" and are acceptable to either denomination for full or at least partial credit of the educational requirements of conversion. Although the majority of students in these courses are potential converts, neither course is designed specifically for converts. Their concern is to educate non-Jews in the basic tenets of Judaism, its history, ideologies and ceremonies although many Jews also find this education useful. After the courses are completed, the rabbi in charge of the students' conversion determines when the candidate is spiritually and educationally ready for the formal conversion. The rabbi makes that decision in terms of his own standards and philosophy. The conversion ceremony is usually held in the rabbi's study with the immediate family present.

Statistics of Intermarriage and Conversion

Until recently, studies of intermarriage in the United States have shown that Jews have been successful in comparison with other groups in retaining their religious endogamy. This pattern seems to be changing. The 1957 Narional Current Population Study conducted by the Bureau of Census found 7.2% of existing intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews, 9.0% intermarriage rate for Protestants and 21% for Catholics. The study included those Jews whose spouses had converted to Judaism as intermarriages, which may have caused an undercounting of the actual incidence of intermarriage. Local areas showed Jewish intermarriage rates as high as 17.2% for San Francisco and 53.6% for Iowa. This could either be attributable to the limited Jewish population in these areas or a foreshadowing of the national rate.[10]

A report by Fred Massarik studying the intermarriage rate among Jews from 1900-1972 was recently published. A "basic mixed marriage," according to the Massarik study, is defined as any marriage in which only one partner describes him or herself as having identified with a non-Jewish cultural viewpoint at the time that he or she met his or her future spouse. The findings of the study were: 1900-1920 = 2.0% intermarriage rate; 1921-1930 = 3.2%; 1931-1940 = 3.0%; 1941-1950 = 6.7%; 1951-1955 - 6.4%;

1956-1960 = 5.9%; 1961-1965 = 17.4%; 1966-1972 = 31.7%. Massarik found that Jewish males intermarry twice as often as Jewish females. Among inmarried Jews, four out of ten indicated that they never dated a non-Jew. Parental opposition to interdating was associated with intermarriage. He also found that 30% of the non-Jews who marry Jews formally convert but that 45% consider themselves an integral part of the Jewish community. About one-fourth of all intermarrying non-Jewish females convert, in contrast to the small number of non-Jewish males who convert. A third finding was that if both parents are Jews, 99.2% of the children are raised as Jews; if the mother is Jewish but the father is not, 98.4% of the children are raised as Jews; if the father is Jewish and the mother is not, 63.3% of the children are raised as Jews.[11]

It should be noted that the statistics on the intermarriage of Jewish women may be misleading. In the past, marrying a non-Jew was such a disgrace to both the girl and her family that she may have decided to drop out of Jewish life entirely. Because of this factor and because women usually take their husband's name, there may be many Jewish women who are married to non-Jews and have escaped even sophisticated sampling methods.[12]

In a 1967 study of the Jewish community in Providence, Rhode Island, out of a sample of 5,140 married

couples, 232 (4.5%) had intermarried. Of the intermarried couples, 4.4% involved a Jewish male marrying a non-Jewish female and 0.1% involved a Jewish female marrying a non-Jewish male. Of the 232 intermarried couples, 42% of the non-Jewish spouses had converted to Judaism. Those sixty years and older had the lowest rate of intermarriage, 1.3%; 40-59 had a rate of 7.9%; 30-39 had a rate of 1.7% and under 30 had a rate of 9.0%. While the younger group showed more intermarriage, they also had a higher percentage of conversion. In the over-sixty group, there was no conversion to Judaism; in the 40-59 age group, four out of ten non-Jewish spouses converted; in the under-40 group, seven out of ten converted. A Detroit study also found that the younger the person, the greater the possibility that with intermarriage the non-Jewish partner will convert to Judaism.[13]

Two studies described in an article by Allen S. Maller on "Mixed Marriage and Reform Rabbis" demonstrate that conversion, or at least adherence to one religious ideology by the couple, helps to reduce marital strife. The first study conducted in 1949 by J.T. Landis involved Protestant-Catholic mixed marriages and demonstrated that the above-average divorce rate was reduced by 25% when one spouse converted to the religion of the other.[14] Another study conducted in 1962 by A. J. Prince found that

in the absence of conversion, a clear agreement before marriage regarding religion helps reduce some of the likelihood of marital strife. His research indicates the basic reason for marital strife in mixed marriage is fighting over the religious identity and education of the children.[15]

In 1960, Zimmerman and Cervantes published a study called Successful American Marriages. They used divorce and desertion rates as indicators of marital success or failure and found that interfaith marriages were generally unsuccessful in comparison to infaith marriages. In Boston, the rate of divorce and desertion when both spouses were Jewish was 4.7%. In cases where only the husband was Jewish this rate rose to 25.4%. In New Orleans, the rate varied from 33.4% in an all-Jewish marriage to 57.4% in a mixed marriage, although this city's rates are both unusually high.[16]

In nine hundred mixed marriage cases studied, Zimmerman and Cervantes found some startling results. Couples with different religious affiliations have fewer children than couples of one faith. The divorce ratio is higher for those who intermarry than those who marry within their own faith. When only one of the parties in an intermarriage is Jewish, the divorce rate is five to six times higher than when both parties in an intermarriage

are Jewish. The teenage arrest rate is higher for children of mixed marriages. Children of Jewish fathers and Gentile mothers in the cities of Boston, St. Louis, Denver and Omaha are involved in four to ten times as many arrests as children of all-Jewish marriages in the same cities. It was also found that if a person without any religious affiliation marries a person with a religious affiliation, the chances of divorce, desertion or delinquency are generally twice as high as marriages in which both partners are religiously affiliated.[17]

Allen Maller mentions a similar study in Indiana that found that of all marriages that took place in 1960 and subsequently resulted in divorce within five years, Jews had a divorce rate of 69% below the state's average divorce rate. Jews who intermarried experienced a rate six times as high as inmarried Jews.[18]

The study of J. T. Landis called "Religiousness, Family Relationships and Family Values in Protestant, Catholic and Jewish Families" showed a positive relationship between religiousness and marital success. Jews rated the highest of the four groups, which included Protestants, Catholics, Jews and "no religious preference." Eighty per cent of the Jews reported their parents to be happy or very happy in terms of their marriage. Jews also had the lowest divorce rate at 3.3%. The Jews were

the closest of the four groups to their parents, had the highest marital satisfaction, and were the least willing to marry out of their group. The Jewish group stood out in this study in that they rated low in "religiousness" but high in "marital happiness" when compared with other faiths. Landis does not specify by what criteria he assesses the degree of religiousness. Judaism is not merely a religion, as ethnicity is an integral part of Judaism. Therefore, many of his findings relating religious devoutness to marital success may not hold true for Jews.[19]

In a 1967 study of the Chicago area, part of the National Jewish Population Study, Lazerwitz found that 34.7% of non-Jewish males identify themselves as Jewish despite a lack of formal conversion. He also found the partners in mitzvah marriages above average in emphasizing the importance of Jewish education for their children while mixed married couples are below average.[20] In terms of commitment to Zionism, converts and their spouses ranked the highest.[21]

Why People Intermarry

There are a variety of reasons why people intermarry. It is fairly well substantiated that interfaith marriages in one generation tend to lead to interfaith marriages among the children of those families.[22] Most

Jews no longer "ghettoize" themselves; they come into frequent close contact with non-Jews through business, professions, athletics, and social activities. Despite this, Jews intermarry less than would be the case if there was a total random choice of mates. There appear to be certain factors involved in intermarriage and conversion. These fall into the broad categories of personal factors and demographic factors.

Demographic factors include residential patterns, occupation, education, social class, age, generation status, and religious education. Residential patterns in Jewish communities include Jewish population density, ethnic mix in cities and neighborhoods, and the numbers in the marriage pool in a given area. In 1942, a study of intermarriage in Europe found that the smaller the Jewish community and the less intense the loyalty, the higher the rate of intermarriage.[23] This seems also to be the case in the United States. It is estimated that American Jews live in the ten largest metropolitan centers. Within these metropolitan areas there are heavy concentrations of the Jewish population in specific neighborhoods at a given time, partly because of a desire for group cohesion.[24] A study of Jews in Providence, Rhode Island, found that the lowest rate of intermarriage, less than 1%, was among people living in the older sections of

the central cities. The highest rate of intermarriage, 7.7%, was among those living in the suburbs. There was a 3.8% intermarriage rate among those living in the better economic sections of the central cities. This difference was not just due to the age of the residents in the different sections. Ties to Judaism, reflected in affiliation with Jewish organizations, synagogue membership and attendance, adherence to ritual practices, and ties to the Jewish family unit, were weaker in the suburbs than in the central city. The rates for conversion were parallel to those of intermarriage. Conversion to Judaism occurred in one-half of all intermarriages in the suburbs while one-third converted in the central cities. Most intermarriage as well as conversion occurred in the newer sections.[25] In larger cities, the primary purpose of voluntary concentration of Jews is to strengthen barriers against intermarriage in the face of acculturation which threatens survival. In Chicago, voluntary segregation in higher status areas, along with Jewish education, were thought to be devices which would forestall large-scale assimilation through intermarriage. There are few statistics about how effective this fostering of inmarriage is.[26]

Intermarriage in small Jewish communities involves different dynamics than in the large community.

Acculturation in a small Jewish community is usually accompanied by social disintegration of the marriage market. A study of a southern community found that, although Jewish religious life was successfully sustained, there were difficulties in organizing the marriage market. College and the army took away men who would date younger women. Jewish parents permitted their sons to date non-Jewish women, while their daughters were expected to date only Jewish men. In addition, non-Jewish women competed with the Jewish women for attention of Jewish men because of their economic status. Jewish women often have to make sacrifices or go to a college selected by their parents with a relatively large Jewish population of students. A comparative study of two small Jewish communities in two small Louisiana towns suggests that the survival of the small Jewish community is dependent on the community's desire for group survival and the consequent organization of religious and social activities. There is very little likelihood that two members of the same small Jewish community will marry. Barron attributes this to a repulsion against marriage with members of the ingroup with whom contact has been intimate and prolonged. Shosteck found the same phenomenon and attributes it to the fact that children who are brought up together see each other more as brothers and sisters than as future spouses.[27]

One study that interviewed Jewish intermarried men and women in depth concluded that intermarriage is the product of a general process of assimilation, weakening of Jewish identity and development of desegregating orientation. Studies have shown that despite modern communication and increased mobility, approximately 25% of all marriages are contracted by people living within five blocks of each other and 50% are contracted by people living within twenty blocks of each other. Jewish ghettos are found within all large American cities, but are no longer exclusively Jewish. Practically all Jewish districts have a large percentage of non-Jews living in them, particularly in the suburbs.[28]

Occupation affects intermarriage in a variety of ways. Occupational homogeneity strengthens the social fabric of a group by minimizing class differences and socioeconomic aspirations. It also brings about similarity in leisure time pursuits which lead to friendship, courtship and marriage within the same group. Studies in Washington and Iowa show that the Jewish men who work in traditional occupations such as managers, officials and proprietors, are less likely to intermarry than those Jewish men in nontraditional Jewish occupations, such as the salaried professions.[29] With the changing economic structure, new occupations opened for Jews. Government

employment became available to Jews on a large scale during the New Deal administration. Academia opened up for Jews in the post-World War II period. These salaried professions brought the Jews into the world of the Gentile. The dilemma of the young Jew is demonstrated in this quote from an article by Israel Ellman:

> The general tendency of the young generation to leave the traditional Jewish occupations with their strong Jewish family and Jewish social associations and the shift to the salaried professions combine to make the changing occupational structure one of the most potent causes of Jewish intermarriage.[30]

Education is another important demographic factor in intermarriage. Three points must be considered: the effectiveness of voluntary residential segregation upon group cohesion in college years; the dislocation of the marriage market when students move from local communities to college campuses, and courtship at college. Two-thirds of all Jewish high school students enroll at an institution of higher learning.[31] The number and percentage of young people attending colleges and universities are rapidly increasing, with a concommitant increase in similarity of background, and reduction in differences along ethnic, educational, economic, and national lines. Religious differences and distinctions in the school setting are minimized in importance. A study among the native-born Jews of both foreign and native parentage found that

Jewish men who had only attended or had been graduated from college had a higher intermarriage rate than those with graduate training. Of native-born men with foreign parentage, 15.6% of the men who had gone to college intermarried, while 11.4% of those with graduate education did. Thirty-seven per cent of third-generation men who attended college intermarried, as compared with 14.9% of those with graduate education. It was also found that the traditional Jewish identification of Jewish men in graduate school rose.[32]

In 1964, Rabbi Henry Cohen found that 20% of the Jewish male faculty members at the University of Illinois were married to non-Jewish women. This school is a conservative university with a large group of Jewish students whose parents send them to the University of Illinois to avoid intermarriage. Cohen postulates that marital behavior of the faculty has much influence on the young Jewish student as it accords intermarriage a degree of respectability, due to the role models set by faculty members. This undercuts the Jewish parents' desire to send their children to a school where the possibility and respectability of intermarriage is low.[33]

Intermarriage is at times used as a vehicle for upward mobility. Levinson and Levinson found that their intermarrying subjects married "either the same or often

somewhat higher social class."[34] Society tends to sanction female hypergamy--marriage to a male who is slightly superior in age, education and social status. The tendency for Jewish men to intermarry more frequently than Jewish women may be explained by the accepted patterns of class hypergamy on the part of Gentile women.

A fifth factor in intermarriage is age at marriage. In the study of Jews in Providence, Rhode Island, those 60 years of age and older had the lowest rate of intermarriage (1.3%). Those 40-49 had an intermarriage rate of 7%, those 30-39 a rate of 1.7% and those under 30 a rate of 9%. While younger individuals have a higher rate of intermarriage, they also have a higher percentage of conversion. Those over 60 had no conversion of the non-Jewish spouse in an intermarriage. In the 40-59 group, the non-Jew converted in four out of ten cases, and within the under-40 group, seven out of ten non-Jewish spouses converted.[35] A Detroit study also found that the younger the person, the greater the probability that one spouse in a mixed marriage will convert. According to Heiss, in all religious groups, those persons who were the youngest in the family have the highest intermarriage rate. There is some evidence that both early and late marriages are likely to be out-group marriages.[36]

A sixth factor in intermarriage is the generation status of the person since immigration. Studies in Washington and Providence show a progressive increase in intermarriage for Jewish men over the generations. In the Washington study the level of intermarriage was 1.4% in the first generation (foreign-born); 10.2% in the second generation (native-born parentage), and 17.9% in the third and subsequent generation (native-born of native parentage). Jewish women had an intermarriage rate of 0.1% for the first generation; 6.9% for the second generation; and 2.9% for the third generation. The rate of conversion varies directly with the rate of intermarriage. One-fourth of intermarriages of first-generation Jews involved conversion while over one-half of intermarriage of third-generation Jews involved a conversion.[37]

A final demographic factor in intermarriage is that of religious education. There is a widespread belief that Jewish education, including a Bar Mitzvah, helps to keep young men and women from marrying outside the Jewish group.[38] The Washington study found that third-generation Jews who had religious education had a 16.4% intermarriage rate while those without religious education had a rate of 30.3%.[39]

The second broad category involves four personal factors in intermarriage and conversion: psychological

reasons, lack of religious convictions, rational considerations and neurotic reasons. Some individuals go out of their way, for psychological reasons, to find a non-Jewish partner. They may try to lose their own Jewish identity and/or reject their parents. They may express their feelings of inferiority as Jews, and the perceived superiority of the non-Jews. Others may feel that non-Jews are inferior. They do not feel secure about themselves and therefore go outside the group to feel more comfortable in their own sense of inferiority.

A second group involves some individuals to whom religious beliefs and differences are of no concern. They marry because of physical attraction or intellectual compatibility. They may convert solely to marry the other person.[40]

A third group of individuals may intermarry and convert for rational considerations. They come to their new religion out of the conviction that it is superior to their previously held faith. They may be looking toward theological promises of life, health, and prosperity or may be disillusioned with the beliefs, practices and institutions of their earlier religion. Some non-Jews are attracted to Judaism as a direct result of their revolt against the rigidity of Christian religious orthodoxy.

They may actively seek to marry someone of the Jewish faith.[41]

A fourth area includes neurotic reasons for intermarriage and conversion. Conversion may serve as retaliation and revenge calculated to hurt the parents as much as possible. There may be a masochistic desire for self-degradation, punishment or rejection, or a tendency toward escapism from the unpleasant realities of the world.[42] The category of neurotic reasons for intermarriage also includes sexual inhibitions and taboos. For some, marriage with a non-Jew is more exotic and erotic as a "forbidden fruit." Other Jews may choose a Gentile spouse to avoid symbolic incest because a Jewish person may remind them of their parent of the opposite sex. To an adolescent who has overgeneralized the incest taboo, sex with someone of the same religion and resembling a family member is forbidden. He or she may tend to avoid contact with men or women of his or her own group because of this taboo. Levinson's concept of "contrast choice" suggests that feelings of ambivalence toward sexual expression can be overcome by finding a partner whose characteristics are sufficiently novel so as not to arouse one's acquired inhibitions. There may also be conditions of upbringing which inhibit the male or female's enjoyment of the sexual potential of an in-group partner, so that he or she goes

outside of his or her group to seek normal sexual gratification.[43]

In summary, it appears that intermarriage is increasingly becoming a threat to Judaism. While intermarriage is on the rise, so is marital strife and divorce. We have identified many factors that contribute to intermarriage. It is now necessary to look at intermarriage and see how it affects marriage and family relations and whether conversion to Judaism has any positive effects on family and marital relations.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1]Judaism does not recognize the usage of A.D., but uses C.E. which refers to the common era.

[2]Albert I. Gordon, Intermarriage (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), pp. 89-90.

[3]David Max Eichorn, ed., Conversion to Judaism, A History and Analysis (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1965), p. 53.

[4]Ibid., pp. 54-55.

[5]The Talmud is the basic body of Jewish oral law consisting of the interpretation of laws contained in the Torah. The Torah is the first five books of the Old Testament.

[6]Kabbalat al mitzvot is acceptance of the Torah's commandments; Milah is circumcision, for males only, and T'vilah refers to the ritual immersion of both males and females.

[7]There are three traditions of Judaism; Orthodox, Conservative and Reform. The basic difference between the three lies in their observance of Halachah and ranges from strict observance of Halachah in Orthodox Judaism to the Reform position which does not acknowledge that all Jewish law is necessary for the preservation of the Jewish religion and people.

[8]Lisa Von Valtier, "Conversion American Style," Davka 5 (Winter, 1975): 11.

[9]Ibid., p. 12.

[10]David Max Eichorn, Jewish Intermarriages: Fact and Fiction (Florida: Satellite Books, 1974), p. 55.

[11]Ibid., p. 56.

[12]Norman Mirsky, "Chapter III: Ill Wind or High Tide?" Third chapter is a work soon to be published.

[13]Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldscheider, Jewish Americans, Three Generations in a Jewish Community (New Jersey: Princeton-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 161.

[14]Judson T. Landis, "Marriage of Mixed and Non-Mixed Religious Faith," American Sociological Review 14 cited in "Mixed Marriage and Reform Rabbis," Judaism: A Quarterly Journal of Life and Thought 24 (Winter, 1975): 40.

[15]A. J. Prince, "194 Cross Religion Marriages," Family Life Coordinator cited in "Mixed Marriage and Reform Rabbis," Judaism: A Quarterly Journal of Life and Thought 24 (Winter, 1975): 40.

[16]Gordon, Intermarriage, p. 95.

[17]Ibid., p. 96.

[18]Benjamin Schlesinger, ed., The Jewish Family (Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1971), p. 47.

[19]Judson T. Landis, "Religiousness, Family Relationships and Family Values in Protestant, Catholic and Jewish Families," Marriage and Family 22 (November, 1960): 341-347.

[20]Bernard Lazerwitz, "Intermarriage and Conversion: A Guide for Future Research," The Jewish Journal of Sociology 13 (June, 1971): 41. We used Allen Maller's definition to define mitzvah marriage as a marriage where the Gentile spouse converts to Judaism, thus unifying the family and doing a mitzvah. We define a mixed marriage as one in which one of the parties to the marriage has not formally converted to the faith of the other.

[21]Zionism is defined as a worldwide Jewish movement for the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jews; an identification with the Jewish country, Israel and its people.

[22]Paul H. Besanceney, Interfaith Marriages Who and Why (Connecticut: College and University Press, 1970), p. 161.

[23]Eichhorn, Conversion to Judaism, A History and Analysis, p. 54.

[24]Erich Rosenthal, "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States," American Jewish Yearbook 64 (1963),9.

[25]Goldstein and Goldscheider, Jewish Americans, Three Generations in a Jewish Community, p. 161.

[26]Rosenthal, "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States," p. 9.

[27]Ibid., pp. 50-51.

[28]Schlesinger, The Jewish Family, p. 49.

[29]Rosenthal, "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States," pp. 11-14.

[30]Schlesinger, The Jewish Family, pp. 50-51.

[31]Rosenthal, "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States," p. 91

[32]Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[33]Schlesinger, The Jewish Family, pp. 50-51.

[34]Berman, Jews and Intermarriage, pp. 58-59.

[35]Goldstein and Goldscheider, Jewish Americans, Three Generations in a Jewish Community, p. 157.

[36]Berman, Jews and Intermarriage, p. 83.

[37]Goldstein and Goldscheider, Jewish Americans, Three Generations in a Jewish Community, p. 159.

[38]A Bar Mitzvah is a ritual which introduces a boy into manhood and his responsibilities as a Jew at age thirteen.

[39]Rosenthal, "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States," p. 29.

[40]Jack Zurofsky, ed., "The Psychological Implications of Intermarriage," Proceedings of a Conference (New York: Commission on Synagogue Relations, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, 1964), p. 80.

[41]Eichhorn, Conversion to Judaism, A History and Analysis, pp. 203-204.

[42]Ibid., p. 204.

[43]Berman, Jews and Intermarriage, pp. 486-500.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY FOR EXPLORING JEWISH INTERMARRIAGE

Study Focus

This exploratory study focused on the postmarital effects of conversion on Jewish intermarriage. The review of the literature points to personal and demographic factors which have been found to influence intermarriage among Jewish men and women. Although research has related personal and demographic characteristics to the rate of intermarriage, there is a paucity of research on the factors affecting the quality of these marriages. An exploratory design was chosen because little empirical research has been done on the postmarital period of the intermarriage. It was hoped that some of the issues could be clarified so others could follow with further research.

In this study, intermarried couples in which the non-Jewish partner converted to Judaism were compared with couples who had intermarried without conversion. The study concerned itself with the effect of conversion on the marital success in intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews.

The assumption was that the conversion of the non-Jewish spouse to Judaism would have a positive effect on the marital relationship.

Specific research questions which were the basis of the study design are the following:

1. What is the effect of conversion to Judaism on postmarital relationships in terms of marital satisfaction?

2. What demographic factors, as they relate to the spouses as well as the families of origin, play a role in the marital satisfaction of an intermarriage?

3. Does the degree of Jewish identification of the Jewish-born partner affect whether the marital relationship of the intermarried couple will be successful?

4. Does the degree of Jewish identification of the Jewish-born partner affect whether or not the non-Jewish partner converts to Judaism?

5. Does the degree of Jewish identification on the part of the converted spouse affect the success of the intermarital relationship?

6. What are the differences in familial relationships between mixed marriages and mitzvah marriages?

7. What is the effect of conversion on the convert personally and on his or her spouse?

8. What is the relationship between the atmosphere in the home of the family of origin and the present marital satisfaction of the intermarried couple?

9. What is the effect of the present parent-child relationship for each spouse on the marital satisfaction of the intermarried couple?

10. Does the degree of congruence of Jewish identity between the Jewish spouse and the converted Jew have an effect on the marital satisfaction for the couple?

11. Does the degree of religious identity of the non-Jewish spouse and the degree of Jewish identity of the Jewish spouse affect the marital satisfaction of the couple?

Six areas were identified for focus in this study. The first, demographic information, included: religion, level of education, occupation, geographical location, type of marriage ceremony, size of the Jewish community, and age at marriage. The second, Jewish identity, was loosely defined as the individual's feelings of belongingness to his or her group. This was explored in terms of the level of religious education, religious behavior such as synagogue attendance, childhood religious memories, religious practices, Jewish organizational activity, and ethnic identity. The third factor is the non-Jewish spouse's religious identity which was measured utilizing the same variables as those employed for measuring Jewish identity. The fourth factor is marital satisfaction which was defined as the level of fulfillment and enjoyment each spouse receives from the marital relationship. In order to examine marital satisfaction, the following variables were utilized: empathy within the marriage involving communication and understanding, marital roles and legitimation of roles, primary relations within marriage including

sexual relations, and companionship in leisure time. Another major focus is the nature of, reasons for, and consequences of conversion to Judaism. Conversion to Judaism was defined as the formal adoption of Judaism requiring fulfillment of specific structured requirements. Other variables examined in the study included: expectations of Judaism, familial reactions to conversion, and satisfaction with conversion and the formal process of conversion. The final factor included relationship to families of origin, including each partner's relationship to his or her own family as well as his or her in-laws, and the relationship between parents and family of the couple to each other. The variables examined included: feelings toward both sets of parents, how often parents are visited, early socialization, and how often both sets of parents get together with each other.

Research Instrument

The instrument constructed to explore the research questions consisted of open-ended questions followed by more specific close-ended questions in the same area. This section was administered orally and responses were recorded on the questionnaire form. This section dealt with the individual's attachment to parents; happiness as a child and adolescent; the subject's parents' marital

happiness; the respondent's manner of selection of a mate, and parents' and friends' reactions to the marriage as perceived by the subject. These questions were based on previous studies and a doctoral dissertation by Iris Tan Mink titled "An Investigation of Intermarriage: A Comparison of Intermarried and Inmarried Jewish Men."[1] Other questions in this section were adapted from the study "Sex Roles, Economic Factors and Marital Solidarity in Black and White Marriages."[2] The questions on religious identification in this section were based on the variables presented by Bernard Lazerwitz in "Intermarriage and Conversion: A Guide for Future Research."[3]

Questions regarding the convert's reaction to his or her conversion were extracted from the review of the literature. After several interviews the researchers realized that they left an important area unexplored. At this point, the researchers introduced questions to the spouse of the convert concerning his or her reaction to the conversion and his or her perception of the spouse's acceptance as a Jew.

After several interviews the researchers decided to eliminate one question from the study as they felt it was meaningless. The question read, "Is your income sufficient to meet your needs and desires?" Overall, the responses to this question were similar. "Yes, our income

is sufficient to meet our needs but not sufficient to meet our desires. You can always have more." The intention was to look for a relationship between income and marital satisfaction. However, this question did not solicit the information and was therefore dropped from the interview schedule.

Following this section, the respondents were asked to respond to a Marital Adjustment Scale modeled after one utilized by Iris Tan Mink in her study of intermarriage. This scale was based on the test developed by Burgess, Locke and Thomes.[4] In completing the Marital Adjustment Scale, respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with eighteen statements dealing with their marital relationship. The respondents were asked to rate their responses on a five-point scale. The five measures on the scale were: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree and strongly disagree. The eighteen statements in the scale can be broken down into the factors of companionship, consensus, affectional intimacy, sexual behavior, and satisfaction with the marriage. There are several components that make up the factor of companionship. These include: joint participation in common interests and activities, confiding and talking things over as a couple, and understanding each other's ideas and feelings. Consensus can be defined as the amount of agreement or disagreement a couple has

regarding primary values or objectives in their marriage.

The respondents were also asked to respond to a religious identity scale. The Jewish Identity Scale was a modified version of the scale developed by Lawrence Marks.[5] The Jewish Identity Scale required respondents to indicate agreement or disagreement with nineteen statements, on a five-point scale as in the marital adjustment scale. The Jewish-born and converted respondents were asked to complete this scale. The components of Jewish identity measured were: orientation toward traditionalism, psychological valence of being Jewish, pietism, historical time perspective, orientation toward community affiliation, ethnocentrism, psychological salience of being Jewish, and orientation toward family.

The researchers adapted the Jewish Identity Scale for the non-Jewish partner's religious identity. The Non-Jewish Spouse's Religious Identity Scale included the same components as the Jewish Identity Scale, adapted for the religion of the non-Jewish spouse. Respondents were asked to rate their agreement or disagreement on a five-point scale on twelve items as in the Marital Adjustment Scale.

Sampling Plan

Twenty-eight intermarried couples from the Los Angeles area were interviewed. Of these, thirteen were intermarried with conversion (from this point forward to

be referred to as mitzvah marriages) and fifteen were mixed marriages. The sample included only marriages which had taken place between 1970 and 1977. Originally, the sampling plan called for interviewing forty couples, twenty of whom intermarried without conversion and twenty of whom intermarried with conversion to Judaism. The researchers had hoped to obtain a sample of mitzvah marriages from the conversion class records of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations but were denied use of the conversion class records of both the Reform (at the Union of American Hebrew Congregations) and Conservative (at the University of Judaism) movements because studies are either presently or soon to be conducted by these agencies.

The alternative sampling plan utilized an accidental sample of mitzvah marriages attempting to make this as widely diversified a sample as possible. The sample was obtained from several sources. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations allowed the researchers to use records of student who attended the Introduction of Judaism class but who had not formally notified the Union of American Hebrew Congregations of their conversion. Therefore, there was no way to know whether the students had married, had intermarried with conversion, or had intermarried without conversion. Using this list, letters were mailed to seventy people in the Los Angeles area who had attended the classes since 1970. The letter explained the study and requested their participation. A stamped, self-addressed

envelope was enclosed to assure the return of the release of information form, indication of willingness to participate in the study and an indication of whether or not they had converted. Five positive responses and one negative response were received. Ten letters were returned with incorrect addresses. Of the five positive respondents, four couples had intermarried without conversion to Judaism, and one couple intermarried with conversion to Judaism.

Six couples included in the study were contacted through three Reform rabbis in the Los Angeles community. The couples were first contacted by the respective rabbis who explained the study to them. After they agreed to participate in the study, they were contacted by telephone to set up the interviews. Only four of these couples were included in the sample due to scheduling problems.

The researchers placed an advertisement in the University of Southern California daily newspaper asking for volunteers to participate in the study. The ad ran for one week and two responses were received, of which one couple was willing to participate. Two of the couples in the sample were known to the researchers personally and were quite willing to be participants.

Three of the couples were contacted through friends of the researchers. The remaining two couples in the sample were names given to the researchers by other participants in the study.

The sample of mixed married couples was also accidental. There are no records of such mixed marriages in Los Angeles. A list of twenty-one possible participants was obtained. Ten of the couples were known to the researchers personally. However, the researchers were unable to schedule an interview with two of these ten couples because of time conflicts. Two couples were recommended to the researchers by other participants in the study. Neither couple was able to participate because of conflict with schoolwork and moving to a new home.

Four couples were contacted through mutual friends. All four couples were contacted by telephone and were willing to be participants in the study. The remaining four couples were those contacted through the Union of American Hebrew Congregations' lists. Of these four couples, only three were able to participate. The fourth, although willing, was in the process of moving and a mutually convenient time could not be arranged. In total, fifteen couples who intermarried without conversion were interviewed.

All interviews were conducted in the participants' homes. Before beginning the interview, the researchers explained the study and answered any questions. Each participant was then asked to sign a release of information form. The researchers each interviewed one member of the couple in separate rooms simultaneously, interviewing

spouses separately to allow each a maximum amount of freedom in answering questions. The subjects seemed more comfortable answering questions and were much more open and honest in their answers when their spouses were not present. On several occasions when a spouse entered the room while an interview was being conducted, the person being interviewed would stop until his or her spouse left the room. It was also the researchers' intention to avoid marital arguments by interviewing each spouse separately.

To reduce interview bias, the researchers alternated interviewing the male and female subjects. The interviews lasted approximately forty-five minutes for mixed married couples and one hour for couples in which one of the partners converted to Judaism. This additional time was due to added questions for the convert and his or her spouse which dealt specifically with the area of conversion.

Although the original sampling plan included forty couples, it was difficult to locate and to schedule this number within the time limitations of the research project. The couples interviewed were eager to participate and were quite friendly. They all offered the researchers refreshments and made them feel welcome. They were anxious to help in any way, even by providing names of possible participants. The subjects appeared quite honest and open in their responses. All the subjects were interested in receiving a copy of the findings of the study.

Analysis of the Data

The researchers tabulated the questions and used descriptive statistics to analyze the findings. Descriptive material was then cross-tabulated by mixed and mitzvah marriages. Analysis of variance was utilized with the Marital Satisfaction Scale and Religious Identity Scale between mixed and mitzvah marriages. All computations were done at the University of Southern California Computer Center utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Limitations of the Study

The small and accidental nature of the sample limited the study. By using the method of interviewing rather than mailed questionnaires, the sample size was limited because of the time constraints involved. Although the use of close-ended questions allowed the researchers to better categorize responses, they did not appear to always reflect the true feelings of the respondents as did open-ended questions. The results of the findings cannot be generalized to the total population as the researchers were unable to match the two groups, mixed and mitzvah, on any variables other than period of time married and geographical location.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV

[1]Iris Tan Mink, "An Investigation of Intermarriage: A Comparison of Intermarried and Inmarried Jewish Men" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1971), pp. 212-222.

[2]John Scanzoni, "Sex Roles, Economic Factors and Marital Solidarity in Black and White Marriages," Journal of Marriage and Family (February, 1975): pp. 130-144.

[3]Bernard Lazerwitz, "Intermarriage and Conversion: A Guide for Future Research," The Jewish Journal of Sociology 13 (June, 1971): pp. 41-63.

[4]Mink, "An Investigation of Intermarriage: A Comparison of Intermarried and Inmarried Jewish Men," pp. 235-237.

[5]Lawrence E. Marks, "An Application of the Jordan-Guttman Facet Analysis Model of Attitude Structure to the Assessment of Jewish Identity in the United States" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1976), pp. 62-110.

CHAPTER V

THE INTERMARRIED COUPLES SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

Description of the Sample

Of the fifty-six people in the sample, forty-one of the subjects identified themselves as Jews. Of these, thirteen of the subjects converted to Judaism. Of the non-Jews, four identified themselves as Catholics, one person as Protestant, one as Mormon, one as Christian, one as Buddhist, one person identified as atheist, two persons identified themselves as agnostics, and two persons were not identified with any religion. The subjects who identified themselves as Jews can be further distinguished as fifteen Conservative, seventeen Reform, one Reconstructionist and eight with no specific affiliation. Of the Jewish-born subjects in the study, fifteen are male and thirteen female. Of the fifteen Jewish-born males, six are married to non-Jews and nine to converted Jews. Of the thirteen Jewish-born females, nine are married to non-Jewish men and four are married to men who converted to Judaism. All of the conversions to Judaism were carried out through the Reform or Conservative movements.

The researchers asked the subjects questions concerning their courtship period. Twenty-seven per cent of the subjects met their spouse in college, 4% met while in high school, 23% met at work, 14% met through friends, 7% met while on vacation, 4% met at a dance, 4% met at a bar, 4% met at a party, 9% met on blind dates and 5% met in their apartment building.

The mean age at marriage was twenty-five, with a range from eighteen to thirty-five. Thirty-one per cent of the sample were married one year or less, 13% were married for two years, 30% were married for three years, 13% for four years, and 14% were married from five to seven years.

The majority of the subjects (71%) were married by a rabbi. Ministers performed the marriage ceremony for 18% of the subjects. Four per cent of the subjects were married by a priest and another 4% were married by a judge. A final 4% were married by other officials authorized to perform marriage ceremonies.

Most of the subjects (82%) had both parents still living at the time of our study. Of these forty-six, fourteen subjects had parents who were divorced. Fifty-six per cent of the subjects had at least one relative outside of the immediate family, primarily grandmothers (62%), live with them while they were growing up. The period of time

that this relative lived with the subject's family ranged from less than one year to twenty-three years.

The subject's families of origin got together more often with their mother's relatives than with their father's relatives. Twenty-nine per cent of the subjects got together with their mother's relatives at least once a week, 26% at least once a month, 37% several times a year, and 9% never got together with their mother's relatives. With their father's relatives, 22% got together at least once a week, 18% at least once a month, 49% several times a year and 11% never.

The researchers questioned the subjects as to whether any of their relatives had intermarried and found a much higher rate of relatives who intermarried among Jews than among non-Jews. Seventy-nine per cent of the Jewish subjects had relatives who had intermarried with non-Jews. A high percentage (37%) of these intermarried relatives were brothers and sisters of the Jewish subjects. Another 32% were aunts and uncles, with the remaining 23% cousins and 9% mothers. Thirty per cent of the non-Jewish subjects had relatives who had intermarried with Jews. Thirty per cent of these were fathers, 50% aunts and uncles and 13% cousins.

The three major states where the subjects were born are California (38%), New York (18%) and Illinois

(16%). The remaining 28% of birth places were scattered throughout the United States and Europe.

The researchers also questioned the subjects on their generational status in the United States. Fifty-four per cent of the subjects are second-generation Americans on their father's side and 57% are second-generation Americans on their mother's side; 4% of the subjects are immigrants to this country; 12% of the subjects are first-generation Americans on their father's side, while 10% are first-generation Americans on their mother's side. Twelve per cent of the subjects are third-generation Americans on their father's side and 16% are third generation on their mother's side. Nineteen per cent of the subjects are fourth generation or more on their father's side, while 14% were fourth generation or more on their mother's side. A large proportion of this last group of subjects believe that their ancestors came over to the United States on the Mayflower.

The majority (67%) of the subjects were either first- or last-born. Thirty-six per cent were first-born and 31% were the youngest child.

It appears from the study that young married couples seldom affiliate with religious organizations or places of worship. Only 25% of the subjects belonged to Jewish organizations and none of the subjects belonged to organizations affiliated with other religious groups.

Twenty-five per cent of the subjects affiliated with religious institutions. Of these fourteen subjects, ten belonged to Reform Jewish synagogues, two to churches, and two to other religious institutions.

Only 25% of the subjects had children. This included three mixed and four mitzvah marriages. Of these seven couples, one had two children and the rest had only one child each. The children ranged in age from six months to four years. Of couples with no children, three expected to never have children because one or both members of the couple do not want to give up their present life style. Eighty per cent of the subjects are raising or plan to raise their children in a religious tradition. Ninety-four per cent of these subjects plan to raise their children in the Jewish tradition, 3% plan to raise their children as Catholics and 3% in another religious tradition. When indicating the reasons for their choice of how they would raise their child religiously, 17% of the subjects want their children to be exposed to all religions and make their own choice, 37% of the subjects believe it is important for a child to have one religious identification, 66% feel that imparting the Jewish culture and ideology to children is important, 10% will leave the choice of religious tradition up to their spouse, 4% do not believe in religion, 4% want to raise their children with God in the

house and 12% have other reasons for their choice. Ninety-one per cent of the respondents had discussed with their spouse the subject of the religious tradition of their children and 9% had not.

Research Findings

In comparing the results from the Jewish Identity Scale and the Non-Jewish Spouse's Religious Identity Scale, it appears that the Jewish subjects in general identify more strongly with Judaism than do the non-Jewish spouses with their respective religions. On the Non-Jewish Spouse's Religious Identity Scale, there were seven significant Likert-type items to which the non-Jewish subjects responded. The possible responses ranged from a score of seven (strongest possible religious identification) to a score of forty-nine (lowest possible religious identification). The actual responses range from seven to thirty-one, with a mean score of twenty-two ($\bar{X} = 22$).

On the Jewish Identity Scale, there was a possible range from eleven (strongest level of Jewish identity) to 121 (lowest level of Jewish identity) on eleven significant Likert-type items. The actual scores ranged from twelve to thirty-nine with a mean score of twenty-four ($\bar{X} = 24$).

All respondents scored fairly high on the Marital Satisfaction Scale. There were fourteen significant

Likert-type items and a possible range of scores from fourteen (highest level of marital satisfaction) to 196 (lowest level of marital satisfaction). The actual scores range from fifteen to forty-three with a mean score of 25.982. Mixed marriages and mitzvah marriages were compared in terms of the Marital Satisfaction Scale utilizing an analysis of variance. The F ratio indicated no significant difference between mixed and mitzvah marriages in terms of marital satisfaction ($F = 1.1033$).

The researchers also compared the non-Jewish spouses involved in mixed marriages with the converted spouses involved in mitzvah marriages in terms of the Marital Satisfaction Scale in order to see if conversion to Judaism has any effect on marital satisfaction. There was no statistically significant difference in the F ratio between the two groups ($F = 0.9539$). The mean scores of the two groups were also compared and mixed marriages showed a higher level of marital satisfaction ($\bar{X} = 25.33$) than did mitzvah marriages ($\bar{X} = 28.23$).

In the oral section of the interview the participants did not report their marriages to be as satisfactory as the scale indicates. Either, the scale does not measure what it purports to measure, or participants were not as honest in completing the scale as they were in the interview.

The interview consisted of both close-ended Likert-type questions and open-ended questions. The responses to the close-ended question did not reveal a significant difference between mitzvah and mixed marriages. The majority of the responses indicated satisfaction with the marriage. However, the open-ended questions revealed comments that were contradictory to this overall satisfactory response. Almost half of the respondents indicated problem areas with regards to marital satisfaction. Many of our subjects are in graduate school or are just beginning their professional careers. This appeared to put a strain on overall marital satisfaction. Some typical comments reflecting this include:

> "Leisure time, what's that?"
>
> "Companionship is great when we're not in school?"
>
> "Communication has been difficult since my wife started school. It is difficult in terms of time, being tired and studying."
>
> "He is more concerned with his life and work. My concerns are less important."

The researchers also found a pattern among men with regards to communication. The couples felt that the men were less open in expressing their feelings than were the women. Comments from both wives and husbands include:

> "Not a fair question. He does not tell me 95%. He does not tell me his problems."
>
> "Communication is going generally well but I keep things in. I'm too quiet."

> "I can tell him everything. He keeps things inside. It takes me a long time to get things out of him."

Many subjects were not satisfied in their physical love and sexual relations. This dissatisfaction seemed to stem from two basic areas: religious or moral beliefs and the proper physical and emotional climate for sexual relations. Some examples include:

> "I feel we don't have enough sex. She is always too tired. She needs to feel good and relaxed. I don't."

> "Her Catholic upbringing has put some barriers that have created problems. She has lots of guilt."

> "She does not find comfort in sex as I do. Her life situation has to be comfortable. We have a lot of stress so she does not want sex."

In response to the question, "Would you raise your child in particular religion or religious tradition?" all respondents involved in mitzvah marriages answered Yes (N = 22), while fifteen out of twenty-four respondents involved in mixed marriages answered Yes (N = 15). All those in mitzvah marriages plan on raising their children in the Jewish tradition (N = 22). Of those in mixed marriages, twelve plan to raise their children in the Jewish tradition, two plan to raise their children as Catholics and one plans to raise his or her children in another religion. It appears that when a couple is involved in a conversion to Judaism, they have a stronger commitment to

raising their children in the Jewish tradition than if the non-Jewish spouse does not convert. There also seems to be a trend among mixed married couples who are committed to raising their children in one religious tradition, to raise their children in the Jewish tradition. Nine respondents involved in mixed marriages did not choose to raise their children in one particular religion or religious tradition. All of these individuals indicate that they would expose their children to many religious traditions and allow their children to make their own choices.

A significant difference ($< .0001$) was found between mitzvah and mixed marriages in terms of the reasons for their choices in how they will raise their children religiously. The greatest proportion of those in mitzvah marriages ($N = 16$) feel that a child needs one religious identity. Of the remaining respondents involved in mitzvah marriages, two people feel that the importance of the Jewish culture is the reason for their choice, two people will leave the decision up to their spouse, and two people have other reasons for raising their children in one religion or religious tradition. Respondents in mixed marriages had a wider range of responses for their choice. Nine people feel that the child should be exposed to all religions and should make his or her own choice. Three people feel the need for their child to have one religious

identity. Six people have the desire to transmit the Jewish culture to their children. Three participants will leave the decision up to their spouses. And the remaining nine respondents indicated that they have other reasons for their choice.

Two questions were posed to ascertain the closeness between the subjects and their respective parents. The researchers defined closeness as the amount of contact, whether physical or by other means such as the telephone or through correspondence, between the respondents and their respective parents. There seems to be a trend toward a greater closeness with parents for those in mitzvah marriages than for those in mixed marriages. Of those respondents who live in the same general vicinity as their mother, the researchers found that eight mixed married subjects live within fifteen miles of their mother and ten mixed married subjects live twenty-five miles away from their mother. Of those subjects in mitzvah marriages, eleven live within fifteen miles of their mother while only five live twenty-five miles away. It appears that subjects in mitzvah marriages tend to live closer to their mothers than do those in mixed marriages.

This trend does not reflect itself as clearly with regard to living in the same general vicinity as the respondents' fathers. Of the sixteen mixed married

respondents who live in the same general vicinity as their fathers, ten live within fifteen miles of their fathers and six live twenty-five miles away. For the fifteen subjects involved in mitzvah marriages, eleven live within fifteen miles of their fathers and four live twenty-five miles away.

With regards to visitation, there appears to be a large difference between mixed and mitzvah marriages in terms of frequency of visits to parents. In response to the question, "How often do you visit your father?", nine respondents involved in mitzvah marriages saw their father at least once a week as opposed to only three respondents from mixed marriages. When this category is combined with the category of visitation at least once a month, this difference is made even clearer. Eleven subjects from mixed marriages visit their respective fathers at least once a month and eleven subjects visit their fathers only several times a year. Whereas in the mitzvah marriage group, the majority of respondents (N = 15) visit their father at least once a month while seven respondents visit their fathers only several times a year.

This trend is less apparent for visitation to the respondents' respective mothers. Of those involved in mixed marriage, seventeen subjects see their mothers at least once a month and eleven subjects see their mothers

several times a year. Of the subjects involved in mitzvah marriages, fifteen see their mothers at least once a month while only seven see their mothers several times a year.

The researchers also found a trend towards more frequent telephone calls to parents among respondents from mitzvah marriages. The majority of respondents from mitzvah marriages spoke to their parents at least once a week (N = 16) while five respondents spoke to their parents only once a month. The respondents from mixed marriages were almost equally divided between speaking to their parents at least once a week (N = 13) and speaking to their parents once a month (N = 10).

Two questions were asked to ascertain the closeness that existed between the respondents and their respective parents in the year prior to their present marriages. The same trends of closeness that exist at present were also in existence for these respondents prior to marriage. In the year preceding their present marriage, sixteen subjects involved in mitzvah marriages lived in the same general vicinity as their mothers and their fathers. All but one lived within fifteen miles of their mother and one lived twenty-five miles away. All sixteen of the respondents lived within fifteen miles of their father.

Of those involved in mixed marriages, twenty subjects reported living in the same general vicinity as their

mother and eighteen reported living in the same general vicinity as their father. Twelve of these respondents reported living within fifteen miles of their mother and eight reported living twenty-five miles away. With regards to their father, thirteen lived within fifteen miles of him and five lived twenty-five miles away.

There seemed to be no difference between mitzvah and mixed marriages as far as visitation to their parents prior to marriage. A contributing factor to this may be that six respondents involved in mitzvah marriages lived at home in the year preceding their marriage. No individuals involved in mixed marriages lived at home in the year preceding their marriage.

There seems to be little difference between mixed and mitzvah marriages in terms of their relationship to their respective parents both before and after marriage. Most of the respondents' parents both of mixed (N = 28 for mothers; N = 21 for fathers) and mitzvah marriages (N = 24 for mothers; N = 21 for fathers) expressed a favorable attitude toward their new son and daughter-in-laws. There appears to be slightly more indifference on the part of parents of respondents involved in mixed marriages to their son and daughter-in-laws although it is not significant.

The relationship with in-laws in both mixed and mitzvah marriages generally appears to be favorable,

according to the responses on the close-ended question with little difference between mixed marriages (N = 28 for mother-in-laws; N = 24 for father-in-laws) and mitzvah marriages (N = 26 for mother-in-laws; N = 23 for father-in-laws).

Open-ended responses to these same questions indicated that relationships with in-laws are perhaps not as favorable as the respondents had previously indicated. Some of the comments made by the respondents included:

> "They accept him. They're not crazy about him and I don't know exactly what the problem is." (Speaking of parents' relationship with spouse.)
>
> "Mother-in-law very dominant. She feels that she owns people and she tells you what to do. I totally resent her and ignore her." (Speaking of own relationship with mother-in-law.)
>
> "We get along O.K. We see too much of them. They are all right people. They think they are big shots and try to impress me. They are very different from me and I feel they are phony. (Speaking of own in-laws.)

Responses from open-ended questions revealed an overall feeling of improvement in relationships with parents since marriage for both groups. Comments included:

> "It's very good. I don't let her dominate me. She treats me like an adult."
>
> "I'm closer with them since the birth of our child and since I've grown up more as an adult."
>
> "Good. It improved because they get along beautifully with my wife."

There appears to be little difference between the mitzvah marriages and mixed marriages in terms of contact between respective sets of parents and in-laws. The majority of respondents in both groups find that there is minimal contact between parents and in-laws (N = 26 for mitzvah marriages and N = 29 for mixed marriages). The couples indicated that most of this contact occurred during special occasions and always with the couples present.

Most respondents received some religious education (N = 20) and there was no difference between groups on whether or not they had received religious education. Participants involved in mitzvah and mixed marriages appeared to have similar types of religious education. Religious education included: Jewish education, eleven of those in mixed marriages and eleven of those in mitzvah marriages; Christian education, eleven of those in mixed marriages and eight of those in mitzvah marriages; parochial school, three of those in mixed marriages and three of those in mitzvah marriages and one of those in mixed marriages with other religious education and one in mitzvah marriages with other religious education. The attendance at religious education ranged in years from one to eighteen. Those individuals in mitzvah marriages attended somewhat longer than those in mixed marriages. The researchers also found that those individuals involved in the mitzvah

marriages had Bar or Bat Mitzvah ceremonies more often than those involved in mixed marriages. Although it appears that the type of religious education does not have an effect on whether or not the non-Jewish spouse converts to Judaism in an interfaith marriage, perhaps the length of time spent in religious education does have an effect on conversion.

Individuals with religious affiliation other than Judaism and individuals with no religious affiliation were looked at on the basis of the Non-Jewish Spouse's Religious Identity Scale. The intent was to see if the religious identity of those who had affiliated with a religion other than Judaism was different from the religious identity of those who had no particular religious affiliation. The results of the analysis of variance were not significant.

The researchers looked at the results of the Marital Satisfaction Scale in terms of the religious identification of the participants. Religious identification was broken down into Jewish, Jewish convert, other religion and no religious affiliation. There was no significant difference using the F ratio between the groups in terms of marital satisfaction.

The Jewish subjects in mixed marriages and the Jewish subjects in mitzvah marriages, both those born as Jews and those who converted to Judaism, were compared in

terms of their Jewish identification using the Jewish Identity Scale. There was a statistically significant difference (<.001) between the Jewish identity of the two groups (F = 19.7495).

The researchers also compared the Jewish identity, using the Jewish Identity Scale, of individuals who were born Jewish in both mixed and mitzvah marriages. There was a statistically significant difference (<.001) in the Jewish identity of the two groups (F = 15.0696). The mean scores showed those in mitzvah marriages with a much higher Jewish identity ($\overline{X}$ = 20.769) while those in mixed marriages showed a lower Jewish identity ($\overline{X}$ = 29.067).

This may have important implications for the Jewish community as those individuals with higher Jewish identification seem to be more likely to encourage their spouse to convert than those individuals with a lower Jewish identification.

When comparing those individuals born as Jews and those individuals converted to Judaism in terms of their Jewish identification using the Jewish Identity Scale, no significant difference was found (F = 2.5442).

The researchers questioned the participants as to those religious practices, both Jewish and non-Jewish that they considered important as well as those they regularly observe. The intent was to ascertain the differences

between those individuals in mixed marriages and those individuals in mitzvah marriages in terms of amount and importance of religious practices.

Twenty-seven individuals involved in mixed marriages reported observing at least one Jewish practice regularly and twenty-six individuals involved in mitzvah marriages reported observing at least one Jewish practice regularly. A statistically significant difference was found between the two groups ($t = 7.48$, $< .0001$) in terms of observance of Jewish practices, using the student t-test with a two-tailed probability. The mean number of Jewish practices observed regularly by individuals in mixed marriages is 2.2593 and the mean number for individuals in mitzvah marriages is 6.6538.

Fifteen individuals involved in mixed marriages reported that at least one Jewish practice was important to them. Twenty-six individuals involved in mitzvah marriages reported that at least one Jewish practice was important to them. Using the t ratio with a two-tailed probability, a statistically significant difference was found between the two groups ($t = 5.18$, $< .0001$). Those individuals in mitzvah marriages reported a greater number of Jewish practices ($\bar{X} = 7.1154$) as being important to them than those individuals in mixed marriages ($\bar{X} = 3.00$).

Twenty-eight of the individuals involved in mixed marriages reported regularly observing at least one Christian practice and only eight individuals involved in mitzvah marriages reported regularly observing at least one Christian practice. The mean score for those individuals in mixed marriages was 1.8214 and the mean score for those in mitzvah marriages was 1.3750. There was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of the amount of regularly observed Christian practices.

Sixteen of the participants in mixed marriages reported that at least one Christian practice was important to them. Six of the participants in mitzvah marriages reported that at least one Christian practice was important to them. Using the t ratio with a two-tailed probability, there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups ($t = 2.67$, $< .0001$). Those individuals in mixed marriages reported a greater number of Christian practices ($\overline{X} = 2.3750$) as being important to them than those individuals in mitzvah marriages ($\overline{X} = 1.3333$).

It appears from these findings, that individuals in mitzvah marriages observe Jewish practices much more frequently than do those individuals in mixed marriages. It seems that although most individuals in mixed marriages observe at least one Jewish practice regularly ($N = 27$), only half that number feel that any Jewish practices are

important to them (N = 15). It also appears that individuals in mixed marriages observe more Jewish practices on a regular basis ($\bar{X}$ = 2.2593) than they do Christian practices on a regular basis ($\bar{X}$ = 1.8214). The mean scores indicate that more Jewish practices are observed regularly by both groups than Christian practices.

From the open-ended questions, it appeared to the researchers that there may be a connection between family background and present marital relationship. Therefore, the researchers compared the Likert-type items dealing with marital satisfaction with the items dealing with family background. The components of family background include: attitude toward mother and father as growing up; parents' marital happiness; childhood in terms of happiness; parents' occupations; parents' levels of education; proportion of neighborhood that was Jewish as a child; proportion of Jewish friends as a child, teenager, two years preceding marriage and at present, and the number of Jewish dating partners prior to present marriage.

In order to test the level of significance, utilizing the chi-square test between family background and marital satisfaction, the researchers cross-tabulated the components of these factors broken down by mixed and mitzvah marriages. The intent was to see if there was any difference between the two groups. Using the close-ended

data, the researchers found no statistically significant relationship between family background and marital satisfaction for both those individuals in mixed marriages and those individuals in mitzvah marriages.

Utilizing the Likert-type close-ended questions on marital satisfaction, the researchers found two interesting trends. It appears that individuals in both mixed marriages and mitzvah marriages responded similarly with regard to the quality of communication with their spouse and with regards to how their spouse understands their problems and feelings. Both groups reported overall satisfaction with these two categories. There seems to be a difference between those individuals in mixed and mitzvah marriages with regard to satisfaction with their physical love and sexual relations. Those individuals in mixed marriages appear to have more satisfactory sexual relationships. Twenty-seven individuals in this group reported satisfaction, one individual reported neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction, and two individuals reported dissatisfaction with their sexual relationship. Of those in mitzvah marriages, eighteen reported satisfaction with their sexual relationship, three reported neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction and five reported dissatisfaction with their sexual relationship. There also seemed to be a difference between those individuals in mixed and

mitzvah marriages in terms of satisfaction with the companionship with their spouse. Those individuals in mitzvah marriages appeared to be slightly more satisfied with their companionship than those individuals in mixed marriages. Thirteen of those in mixed marriages were highly satisfied with their companionship, eleven were satisfied, four were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and two were dissatisfied. Ten of those in mitzvah marriages were highly satisfied with their companionship, fourteen were satisfied, and two were dissatisfied.

Although the close-ended questions indicated no relationship between family background and marital satisfaction, the responses to the open-ended questions revealed some correlation between the two factors. The following remarks demonstrate these findings:

> "We have problems with communication because of different value perspectives. We have different backgrounds." (Mixed marriage)
>
> "My wife probably understands my problems and feelings. Toward religion, she understands but doesn't care. She wants her way. As long as she wins in a religious argument, everything is O.K. I feel like one against all Jews so I can't argue." (This respondent grew up with no Jewish friends -- mixed marriage)
>
> "Under the circumstances she does very well. She is very understanding about my monetary goals. I'm a hustler, she's not. She can't understand how high my goals are. I look at Judaism as a philosophy, not a religion. Jewish people are more aware of life and are more intelligent. They don't float through life. They are hustlers." (Mixed marriage)

"We have a lot of differences in attitudes. He's ambitious, I'm not." (Mixed marriage)

"Our problem is that we come from different socioeconomic backgrounds. Society's stereotypes of Jews and Latins are not inaccurate. We have different value systems. We clash on issues around this which causes a lot of fighting." (Mitzvah marriage)

"There was almost no physical or emotional affection seen or felt in my family. I feel this scarred me for life. My wife and I are very different emotionally. She grew up in a warm, loving environment, I did not." (Mitzvah marriage)

Converts were questioned on their conversion process; reasons behind their conversion; how their family feels about their conversion; how their in-laws feel about their conversion; the greatest influence leading toward their conversion; how they feel about their conversion and if they feel accepted as a Jew and by whom. In response to the open-ended question concerning reasons behind conversion, 50% of the converts reported that the main reason behind their conversion was their marriage. Twenty-five per cent reported converting to Judaism because they wanted to raise their children in one religion, and 25% reported converting to Judaism because they feel a connection with Judaism.

Those participants who had converted to Judaism were asked about their families' reaction to their conversion. In response to the close-ended question, "How does your family feel about your conversion?", 27% of the

respondents reported a favorable reaction from their family. Sixty-four per cent of the respondents reported a neutral reaction from their family, and 9% reported an unfavorable response from their family.

Although only one person reported an unfavorable response to this close-ended question, open-ended responses reflected a less favorable attitude among family members. Some of these reponses include:

> "My father has never spoken about my conversion but I feel he prays for me every day in Church."
>
> "Initially very upset and didn't understand it. Now my mother accepts it but she will always think that I was wrong [because of Jesus Christ]."
>
> "There was no problem with my family except my nineteen-year-old sister. She's a born-again Christian and she cried when I converted."
>
> "They never talk about it. I think they feel rejected. They were invited to the conversion ceremony but they didn't go."

These participants were also questioned about their in-laws' reaction to their conversion. In response to the Likert-type close-ended question, "How do your in-laws feel about your conversion?", the response was overwhelmingly favorable. Sixty-seven per cent of the subjects reported a highly favorable reponse from their in-laws, 17% reported a favorable response, and 17% reported a neutral response. The neutral responses came from in-laws who did not consider themselves religious. Almost all of the converts (N = 11) felt that the greatest influence on

them leading toward their conversion was another person, primarily their spouse. The remaining two converts reported the teachings of Judaism as the greatest influence leading toward their conversion.

Most of the converts had a positive feeling about their conversion to Judaism, but several still feel self-conscious about being Jewish. All of the converts feel accepted as Jews by their friends. The majority do not know how the total Jewish community sees them.

It appears that the converts have found a favorable reaction to their conversion from both family and friends. But it seems that it may take some time for them to feel totally comfortable with their Judaism.

All of the subjects married to converts have a positive feeling about their spouses' conversion. The majority also see their converted spouse as being accepted by the Jewish community. The researchers sensed that subjects married to converts feel a greater acceptance of their spouses by the Jewish community than did the converts themselves.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

In reviewing the results, several findings stand out as significant. It appears from the religious identity scales that the Jewish subjects in general identify more strongly with Judaism than do non-Jewish respondents with their respective religions. Also there appears to be no significant difference in terms of religious identity between those non-Jews who are affiliated with a religion and those unaffiliated non-Jews.

When all Jews, both those born Jewish and converts, were compared using the Jewish Identity Scale, those Jews in mitzvah marriages had a significantly stronger Jewish identity than those Jews in mixed marriages. The researchers also compared all those in mixed and mitzvah marriages who were born Jewish using the Jewish Identity Scale. Those individuals born as Jews and in mitzvah marriages had a higher Jewish identity.

Individuals involved in mitzvah marriages observe more Jewish practices regularly than those individuals involved in mixed marriages. However, individuals in mixed

marriages observe more Jewish practices on a regular basis than they do Christian practices on a regular basis. The mean scores of practices observed regularly show that more Jewish practices are observed on a regular basis than Christian practices by both individuals in mixed and mitzvah marriages.

From the Marital Satisfaction Scale, there appeared to be no significant difference between mixed and mitzvah marriages in terms of marital satisfaction. The non-Jewish spouses involved in mixed marriages were compared with the converted spouses involved in mitzvah marriages in terms of the Marital Satisfaction Scale in order to see if conversion to Judaism has an effect on marital satisfaction. No significant differences emerged.

The responses to the close-ended Likert-type questions dealing with marital satisfaction did not reveal a significant difference between mixed and mitzvah marriages. The majority of the responses indicate a satisfaction with the marriage although two trends appeared. Those in mixed marriages reported greater satisfaction with their sexual lives than those in mitzvah marriages. Those individuals in mitzvah marriages appeared to be slightly more satisfied with their companionship than those individuals in mixed marriages. The open-ended questions revealed that the subjects were not as satisfied with their marriages as the close-ended questions indicated.

The findings indicate that all those in mitzvah marriages plan to raise their children in the Jewish tradition, while only half of those in mixed marriages plan to raise their children in the Jewish tradition.

In looking at the familial relations, the researchers discovered that there is a trend toward greater closeness with parents, both before and after marriage, for those in mitzvah marriages than for those in mixed marriages.

Both individuals in mixed and mitzvah marriages reported favorable relationships with their in-laws when responding to the close-ended Likert-type questions. However, their responses to the open-ended questions indicated that relationships with their in-laws were not as favorable as they previously had stated.

There appears to be minimal contact between machotonim for both mixed and mitzvah marriages.

From the open-ended questions, there appeared to be a connection between family background and present marital relationship. This trend was not seen in the responses to the close-ended questions dealing with family background and marital satisfaction. There was no difference between mixed and mitzvah marriages in terms of the effect of family background on marital relationships.

Most of the converts as well as their spouses had a positive feeling about their conversion to Judaism. All of the converts feel accepted as a Jew by their friends while they still do not know how the total community views them.

CHAPTER VII

INTERMARRIAGE AND CONVERSION: WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD?

The Jewish community has become increasingly concerned about the threat to its survival posed by the increased frequency of intermarriage. Massarik's analysis of the Jewish Population Study shows a 2.0% intermarriage rate among Jews in the 1900-1920 time period. This increased slowly until 1956-1960 which had a 5.9% rate of Jewish intermarriage. For 1961-1965 the rate jumped to 17.4% and nearly doubled to 31.7% in 1966-1972.[1] In our open society, Jews intermarry for a variety of reasons. These include: residential patterns, occupation, education, social class, psychological reasons, lack of religious convictions, rational considerations and neurotic reasons.

The family is traditionally the core of Jewish life and the vehicle for its survival. The traditional Jewish family consists not only of the nuclear family but also includes the extended family, the machotonim. Intermarriage can weaken these family ties, especially if the

intermarried couple does not identify Jewishly.

The results from our study indicate that intermarriage does not necessarily mean that the couple is lost to Judaism. There is a tendency for intermarried couples to continue contact and relationships with families and a continuing association and identification with Judaism, especially in the instance of couples within mitzvah marriages. Although instilling high Jewish identity in Jewish individuals may not insure against intermarriage, it does appear to contribute to Jewish continuity.

The fact that those in mitzvah marriages identify more strongly with Judaism than do those in mixed marriages may have important implications for the continuity of the Jewish community. Individuals with a higher Jewish identification are not only less likely to intermarry, but if they do so, are more likely to encourage their non-Jewish spouse to convert. Therefore, in the interest of Jewish survival, the Jewish community must develop methods for building stronger Jewish identity.

It is the intention of all couples in mitzvah marriages in the sample to raise their children as Jews while only some of the children in mixed marriages will be raised as Jews. It would therefore appear that in the face of an increasing incidence of intermarriage the Jewish community must look toward conversion as a means of survival.

The researchers found the closer a Jew is with his or her family, the more likely it is that his or her future spouse will convert to Judaism in the event of an intermarriage.

The researchers also found that in this sample, there is no significant difference between mixed and mitzvah marriages with regard to marital satisfaction.

It appears, however, that a potential area of conflict for individuals in mixed marriage relates to the question of the religious tradition in which to raise their children. In the sample there does not appear to be a relationship between religious identity and marital satisfaction. Marital satisfaction appears to be affected to a greater extent by family background and values than by religious identification. Response to the open-ended questions also suggested that there may be a correlation between family background and marital satisfaction. However, values and background may very well be a function of one's religion. Therefore, one cannot discount the effect of religious identity on marital satisfaction.

Due to the small and accidental nature of the sample, the study is limited in its scope. By using the method of interviewing rather than mailed questionnaires, the researchers were limited in the number of possible subjects because of the amount of time involved. On the

other hand, questionnaires would have resulted in other limitations. Although answers to close-ended questions were easier to categorize, they did not always reflect the respondent's true feelings as demonstrated by responses to open-ended questions. Because many of the subjects were located through individuals involved in the Jewish community, there may be a tendency toward greater Jewish involvement among the subjects.

No conclusions from the findings can be generalized to the total population as the researchers were unable to match the two groups, mixed and mitzvah on any variables other than period of time married and geographical location. The conclusions drawn may lead, however, to specifying questions for further, more rigorous and extensive study.

The researchers recommend that further study be carried out in this area as they were limited by the small and accidental nature of their sample. They also would suggest a methodology should be developed that allows for more probing and cross-checking on responses. Open-ended questions allowing the participants more freedom in their responses may be used as an initial step in the development of a more extensive interview schedule.

On the basis of this study, it would appear that conversion to Judaism is important for the preservation of

Jewish identity and the survival of the Jewish people. In this time of high intermarriage, conversion to Judaism appears to be an important solution. It also appears that in order to bring about conversion to Judaism in the event of intermarriage, stronger Jewish identity needs to be developed in Jewish young people.

Converts to Judaism appear to find some difficulty in being accepted by the Jewish community. With the increase of converts to Judaism there needs to be a greater awareness and acceptance of the converts by the Jewish community as a whole. The researchers would like to recommend several ways of facilitating the acceptance of converts. These include educational methods such as lectures by rabbis on the subject, discussion groups led by social workers involving converts and their families, hospitality within synagogues and communities to make converts and their spouses feel more welcome, ongoing discussions between the convert, his or her spouse and the rabbi, and the inclusion of converts and their spouses in _havurot_.[2] Help should be given to couples with marital tensions that include a special sensitivity to issues of cultural or socioeconomic differences and the question of religion of children.

Despite the high rate of intermarriage, the strong Jewish identity among individuals in _mitzvah_ marriages

indicates a positive outlook for the survival and preservation of Jewish life and the Jewish family. For the sake of the Jewish community--if not for the sake of the prevention of intermarriage--programmatic means for strengthening Jewish identity must be developed and implemented in home, synagogue classrooms, Jewish centers, Jewish social agencies or any other place Jewish people may be.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VII

[1]David Max Eichhorn, Jewish Intermarriages: Fact and Fiction (Florida: Satellite Books, 1974), p. 55.

[2]Havurot are fellowships. There are two types of havurot. The first is the commune in which the individuals in the havura live together. The second is the community in which the individuals in the havura do not live together but share ideas, values and ideals together to the end that common goals are achieved. The second type of havura described here is the one used in this paper, referring to a Jewish havura.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barron, Milton, ed. The Blending American. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1972.

Berman, Louis A. Jews and Intermarriage. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1968.

Besanceney, Paul H. Interfaith Marriages Who and Why. Connecticut: College and University Press, 1970.

Bossard, James H. S. and Boll, Eleanor Stoker. One Marriage Two Faiths. New York: The Ronald Press Comp., 1957.

Bubis, Gerald B. "The Modern Jewish Family." The Journal of Jewish Communal Service 47 (Spring, 1971): 238-247.

Cahnman, Werner J., ed. Intermarriage and Jewish Life, A Symposium. New York: The Herzl Press, 1963.

Cohen, Leland. "Jewish Intermarriage, Analysis of the National Population Study." Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

Eichhorn, David Max. Conversion to Judaism - A History and Analysis. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1965.

_____. Jewish Intermarriages: Fact and Fiction. Florida: Satellite Books, 1974.

Encyclopedia Judaica, 1973 ed. "Proselytes."

_____, 1973 ed. "Mixed Marriage."

Eshleman, J. Ross. Perspectives in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

Freehof, Solomon B. "Conversion and Divorce." Jewish Digest 10 (August, 1965): 63-65.

Glasner, Samuel. "Family Religion as a Matrix of Personal Growth." Marriage and Family Living 23 (August, 1961): 291-293.

Goldstein, Sidney and Goldscheider, Calvin. Jewish Americans Three Generations in A Jewish Community. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Gordon, Albert I. Jews in Suburbia. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.

_____. Intermarriage. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

_____. The Nature of Conversion. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Hareven, Tamara K. "Modernization and Family History: Perspectives on Social Change." Signs 2 (Autumn, 1976): 190-206.

Heiss, Jerold. "Premarital Characteristics of Religiously Intermarried." American Sociological Review 25 (February, 1960): 47-55.

Hochbaum, Jerry, Ph.D. "Towards the Development of a Planned Communal Response to Jewish Intermarriage." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 51 (Winter, 1974): 131-138.

Intermarriage and the Future of the American Jew. Proceedings of a Conference. Sponsored by Commission on Synagogue Relations, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, New York, 1964.

Kirshenbaum, David. Mixed Marriage and the Jewish Future. New York: Block Publishing Comp., 1958.

Landis, Judson T. "Religiousness, Family Relationships and Family Values in Protestant, Catholic and Jewish Families." Marriage and Family 22 (November, 1960): 314-347.

Lazerwitz, Bernard. "Intermarriage and Conversion: A Guide for Future Research." The Jewish Journal of Sociology 13 (June, 1971): 41-63.

Levy, Richard N. "Conversion: A Matter of Time." Davka 5 (Winter, 1975): 5-8.

Linzer, Norman ed. Jewish Communal Services in the United States: 1960-1970, A Selected Bibliography. New York: Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, 1972.

Maller, Allen S. "In Search of New Jews." Davka 5 (Winter, 1975): 16-19.

_____. "Mixed Marriage and Reform Rabbis." Judaism: A Quarterly Journal of Jewish Life and Thought 24 (Winter, 1975): 39-48.

Marks, Lawrence E. "An Application of the Jordan-Guttman Facet Analysis Model of Attitude Structure to the Assessment of Jewish Identity in the United States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1976.

Mayer, John E. Jewish-Gentile Courtships. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

Mirsky, Norman. "Mixed Marriage and the Reform Rabbinate." Midstream 16 (January, 1970): 40-46.

_____. "Chapter III: Ill Wind or High Tide?" Third chapter in a work soon to be published.

Rosenthal, Erich. "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States." American Jewish Yearbook 64 (1963): 3-53.

Scanzoni, John. "Sex Roles, Economic Factors, and Marital Solidarity in Black and White Marriages." Journal of Marriage and Family 37 (February, 1975): 130-144.

Schlesinger, Benjamin, ed. The Jewish Family. Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Sklare, Marshall. "Intermarriage and Jewish Survival." Commentary 49 (March, 1970): 51-58.

_____. America's Jews. New York: Random House, 1971

Slawson, John. "Jewish Identity in the United States." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 48 (Fall, 1971): 42-48.

Stuart, Irving R. and Abt, Lawrence Edwin. Interracial Marriage: Expectation and Reality. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973.

Von Valtier, Lisa. "Conversion American Style." Davka 5 (Winter, 1975): 9-13.

Wright, Norman. "A Convert Speaks Out." Davka 5 (Winter, 1975): 14-15.

Zurofsky, Jack, ed. "The Psychological Implications of Intermarriage." Proceedings of a Conference. Sponsored by Commission on Synagogue Relations, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, New York, 1964.

APPENDICES

Letter Requesting Participation in Study Appendix A

January 12, 1977

Dear

A research project at the University of Southern California School of Social Work and Hebrew Union College School of Jewish Communal Service is exploring the effect of conversion to Judaism on the modern family. Little research has been done in this area. We are interested in finding ways to aid the convert and his/her family during and after the conversion process.

We obtained your name from the "Introduction to Judaism" course records at the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 13107 Ventura Blvd., North Hollywood. Since you and your spouse were involved in an intermarriage, we feel that you have valuable information to offer in this area.

We are conducting interviews with intermarried couples throughout Los Angeles, both couples in which the non-Jew converted and couples in which the non-Jew did not convert. The interview will last approximately twenty-five minutes and can be conducted in the respondent couples' home. We will interview both the husband and wife of the respondent couples separately. This interview and all information obtained will be kept completely confidential. No names will be used in our study. We will mail a synopsis of the results to all participants.

We would appreciate your cooperation in this study, as it will lead to a better understanding of the effects of intermarriage and conversion on the family.

Please return the enclosed letter to us by January 24, 1977, if you are willing to participate in our study. Once we have received the letters, we will call to arrange a mutually convenient time for the interview. If you have any questions, please feel free to call us at either phone number: Amy Finkle (839-7984) or Marci Ortega (836-2939) evenings or weekends.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Amy Finkle Marci Ortega

Name_____

Address_____

Phone_____ Time can be reached?_____

We are willing to participate in your study. yes_____

no_____

Did you or your spouse convert to Judaism? yes_____

no_____

I would like more information about the

study. yes_____

no_____

If yes, please contact_____at_____

- -

I am willing to participate in the study and realize that all information is confidential and I will not be identified in any way in the data analysis or final research report.

_____

Participant's Signature

_____

Participant's Signature

Appendix B

INTERMARRIAGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

Hello. My name is _____.
As we have already explained, we are conducting a research project exploring the effect of conversion to Judaism on the modern family. In order to study the effect of conversion, we need to interview both intermarried couples who have been married without conversion and couples who intermarried with conversion.

I will be asking you questions concerning your background, your family relationships and your marriage. I would like to tape record this interview because I would like to record all information that you make available to me. I will be taking some notes on what you are saying, but need the tape recorder to get all the information. As you know, all the information is confidential and no names will be used in our study. Do you have any objections or questions before we start? At the end of the oral section of the interview, there will be a short questionnaire to fill out.

We appreciate your cooperation in this study.

1. Regardless of whether or not you attend services regularly, do you have a religious preference? _____

   If Jewish, do you consider yourself:

   Orthodox Conservative Reform Reconstructionist

   (Circle one)

   Have you always been _____? Yes___ No___

   If no, what was your previous religious preference?

   _____

2. How did you meet your spouse, and when?

3. How long have you been married?

4. How old were you when you married?

5. Who performed the ceremony?

   Rabbi Priest Minister Judge Other _____

   (Circle one)

6. Are your parents still living? Yes___ No___

   If no, which parent is still alive?_____

   Were your parents ever widowed, separated or divorced? Yes___ No___

   If yes, circle which one.

   Also if yes, how old were you when this occurred?____

7. Once you decided to marry your present spouse, how did you inform your parents?

How did your parents respond?

Describe your father's attitude.

Describe your mother's attitude.

Which of these best describes your father's attitude?

Which of these best describes your mother's attitude?

Hand respondent Card No. 1 and record their response.

Father's attitude_____

Mother's attitude_____

8. What was your in-laws' reaction to your marriage?

Describe your father in-law's attitude.

Describe your mother in-law's attitude.

Hand respondent Card No. 1 and record their response.

Which of these best describes your father in-law's attitude?

Which of these best describes your mother in-law's attitude?

Father in-law's attitude_____

Mother in-law's attitude_____

9. In the year preceding your present marriage, did you live in the same general vicinity as your parents?

Yes___ No___

Same neighborhood five miles away fifteen miles away

neighboring city same county (circle one)

If no, where did you live?

10. How often did you visit your parents?_____

Could you answer this question according to these categories?

Hand respondent Card No. 2 and record their response above.

For what reasons did you visit your parents?

Hand respondent Card No. 2 to answer the following questions:

How often did you talk by telephone with your parents?_____

How often did you correspond by mail?_____

11. Did any relatives ever live with you when you were a child? Yes___ No___

If yes, who?_____ For how long?_____

12. How often did your parents get together with their relatives?

Hand respondent card No. 2.

With mother's relatives_____

With father's relatives_____

Was there any particular reason for your relatives getting together?

13. For Jews: Have any of your relatives married someone who was not Jewish? Yes___ No___

How many?_____ Who?_____

For Non-Jews: Have any of your relatives married someone who was Jewish? Yes___ No___

How many?_____ Who?_____

14. Which would you say most closely describes your attitude toward your father as you were growing up? Hand respondent Card No. 3, and record response. Describe what you mean by this.

15. How would you describe your parents' marital happiness?

Which of these best describes your parents' marital happiness?

Hand respondent Card No. 4 and record response.

16. How would you describe your childhood years in terms of happiness?

Which of these best describes your childhood years?

Hand respondent Card No. 4 and record response.

17. Where were you born?_____

18. What generation American are you?

Parents were immigrants. From where?_____

Grandparents were immigrants. From where?_____

Great grandparents were immigrants. From where?____

(Circle one)

19. What did your parents do while you were growing up?

Father's occupation and level of education. _____

Mother's occupation and level of education _____

20. Do you have any brothers or sisters? Yes___ No___

How many?_____ Their ages relative to yours?_____

21. Where did you spend your childhood? In what Cities?

22. What proportion of your neighborhood was Jewish as you were growing up?

Hand respondent Card No. 5 and ask them to answer the question using these categories. Record response below.

23. Hand respondent Card No. 5 and ask,

How many of your friends were Jewish

as a child?_____ as a teenager?_____ in the two years preceding your marriage?_____ at present?___

24. Hand respondent Card No. 5, and ask:

How many of your dating partners after age eighteen were Jewish?_____

25. What religious practices were observed in your childhood home?

For Non-Jews:	For Jews:
Celebrate Easter	Keep Kosher
Celebrate Christmas	No bacon or pork eaten
Go to Church every Sunday	Shabbat dinners special candles and Kiddush
Other_____	No work on Shabbat
	Seder celebrated
	No bread on Passover
	Fast on Yom Kippur
	Light Hanukkah candles
	Other_____

(Circle relevant items)

How did you observe these practices in your family?

How observant were you of these practices as an individual?

Did you participate in these observances as you were growing up? Yes___ No___

26. Did you receive any religious education while you were growing up? Yes___ No___

What type?_____ How long did you attend?_____

For Jews only: Were you bar or bat mitzvah?

Yes___ No___ Were you confirmed? Yes___ No___

27. How often did your family attend services in any one year as you were growing up?
Hand respondent Card No. 2 and record their response.

28. Are you presently affiliated with any religious institution? Yes___ No___
If yes, which one?_____

29. What religious practices do you consider important?

30. How often did you attend religious services during the past year?
Hand respondent Card No. 2 and record their response.
What type of religious services did you attend?

31. What religious practices do you observe more or less regularly in your home?
(See question No. 25)
Do you feel that these are different from the practices observed in your parents' home? Yes__No__
If yes, how do you feel about no longer following the religious practices of your parents and childhood?

32. Do you belong to any Jewish organizations? Yes__No__
With or without your spouse?_____
Do you belong to any organizations affiliated with other religious groups? Yes___ No___
With or without your spouse?_____

33. Do you have any children? Yes___No___

If yes, how many?_____

What are their ages?_____

If no, do you expect to have any children?

Yes___ No___ If no, why?_____

34. Are you raising or would you raise your children in any particular religion or religious tradition?

Yes___ No___

If yes, what religion or religious tradition?_____

What are your reasons for your choice?_____

Have you and your spouse discussed this? Yes__No__

35. Do you live in the same general vicinity as your close relatives (mother, father, brother, etc.)?

Yes___ No___

Same neighborhood five miles away fifteen miles away

neighboring city same county

(Circle one)

If no, where do your relatives live?

36. How often do you visit your close relatives?_____

Could you answer this question according to these categories?

Hand respondent Card No. 2 and record their response above.

For what reasons do you visit your close relatives and which ones?

Hand respondent Card No. 2 to answer the following questions:

How often do you talk by telephone with your close relatives and with whom?

How often do you correspond by mail and with whom?

37. Hand respondent Card No. 5 and ask the following question:

What portion of your social life is centered around your relatives?_____

And your spouse's relatives?_____

38. How has your marriage been working out so far?

39. How do you feel about the ways you and your spouse can confide in each other, talk things over, and discuss anything that comes up?

How satisfied are you with the communication between you and your spouse?

Hand respondent Card No. 6 and record their response.

40. How do you feel about the way your husband/wife understands your problems and feelings?

How satisfied are you with the understanding between you and your spouse?

Hand respondent Card No. 6 and record their response.

41. How do you feel about the physical love and sexual relations you experience with your wife/husband? Hand respondent Card No. 7 and ask which of these best describes your physical relationship? Record response below.

42. How do you feel about the companionship that you and your spouse have in doing things during leisure or non-work time?

How satisfied are you with this companionship?

Hand respondent Card No. 6 and record their response.

43. What type of things do you do together?

44. Is your income sufficient to meet your needs, desires? Yes___ No___

45. How would you describe your relationship to your parents since your marriage?

Which of these best describes your relationship to them?

Hand respondent Card No. 7 and record response below.

46. How does this compare to your relationship to them prior to your marriage?

47. How do you think your parents feel about your spouse?

Which of these best describes their feeling?

Hand respondent Card No. 1 and record response.

48. How would you describe your relationship with your in-laws?

Which of these best describes your relationship?

Hand respondent Card No. 1 and record response.

49. What is your biggest area of conflict with your parents?

50. Is there any contact between your in-laws and your parents? Yes___ No___

If yes, how often?

Hand respondent Card No. 2 and record response.

For what reason do they get together and do they get along?

For Converts Only

51. Could you describe your conversion process?

52. What were the reasons behind your conversion?

53. How does your family feel about your conversion?
Has it affected your relationship?
Describe how your family feels about your conversion.
Hand respondent Card No. 1 and record response below.

54. How do your in-laws feel about your conversion?
Has it affected your relationship?

Describe how your in-laws feel about your conversion.
Hand respondent Card No. 1 and record response below.

55. What was the greatest influence on you leading toward your conversion?

56. Now that you are converted, how do you feel about it?

Do you feel accepted as a Jew and by whom?

57. What kind of Jewish things are you doing?

JEWISH IDENTITY SCALE

#_____

Please circle the number that indicates the amount of agreement or disagreement you have with the following statements. The scale range is as follows:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

As a Jew, it is important for me to:

1. participate in Jewish rituals and ceremonies.

   1 2 3 4 5

2. want to be born again as a Jew if I have the opportunity.

   1 2 3 4 5

3. believe there is a God.

   1 2 3 4 5

4. feel a close personal connection with all Jews throughout history.

   1 2 3 4 5

5. play an active role in the Jewish community.

   1 2 3 4 5

6. be proud to be Jewish.

   1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

7. be totally committed to living my life as a Jew.

1	2	3	4	5

8. think of Jews when I think of my people.

1	2	3	4	5

9. feel that all Americans are similar with respect to customs and culture.

1	2	3	4	5

10. try to maintain my identity as a Jew.

1	2	3	4	5

11. insure that Jewish identity is more strongly transmitted through my family than through my friends and associates.

1	2	3	4	5

12. be more concerned with Jewish issues than with universal issues.

1	2	3	4	5

13. accept as Jews only those people who maintain beliefs about God expressed in Jewish tradition.

1	2	3	4	5

14. instill strong feelings of Jewishness in Jewish children.

1	2	3	4	5

15. If a person were handicapped in getting a job because he had a Jewish name, he would be justified in changing his name.

1	2	3	4	5

1	2	3	4	5
strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

16. I would have nothing to do with a person who was Jewish but denied it.

1	2	3	4	5

17. I prefer to have Jews as my friends.

1	2	3	4	5

18. On the whole, there are more drawbacks than advantages to being Jewish.

1	2	3	4	5

19. There are times when I have wished that I were not Jewish.

1	2	3	4	5

#_____

NON-JEWISH SPOUSES RELIGIOUS IDENTITY SCALE

Please indicate your religious preference in the blank. Circle the number that indicates the amount of agreement or disagreement you have with the following statements. The scale range is as follows:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

As a _____, it is important for me to:

1. participate in _____religious rituals and ceremonies.

   1 2 3 4 5

2. want to be born again as a _____if I have the opportunity.

   1 2 3 4 5

3. believe there is a God.

   1 2 3 4 5

4. feel a close personal connection with all _____ throughout history.

   1 2 3 4 5

5. play an active role in the _____community.

   1 2 3 4 5

6. be proud to be _____.

   1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

7. be totally committed to living my life as a _____

1 2 3 4 5

8. think of _____, when I think of "my people."

1 2 3 4 5

9. feel that all Americans are similar with respect to customs and culture.

1 2 3 4 5

10. try to maintain my identity as a _____.

1 2 3 4 5

11. insure that a _____identity is more strongly transmitted through my family than through my friends and associates.

1 2 3 4 5

12. be more concerned with _____issues than with universal issues.

1 2 3 4 5

#_____

MARITAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Please circle the number that indicates the amount of agreement or disagreement you have with the following statements. The scale range is as follows:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

1. In our marriage, disagreements are resolved by mutual give and take.

   1 2 3 4 5

2. I would say that my mate and I have a common core of mutual interest and activities.

   1 2 3 4 5

3. The way we spend our leisure time is a source of disagreement between my mate and myself.

   1 2 3 4 5

4. My mate and I agree on right, good and proper behavior.

   1 2 3 4 5

5. My mate and I agree on the amount of time we spend together.

   1 2 3 4 5

6. In general, my mate and I agree on aims, goals and things believed important in life.

   1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

7. Friends are a source of conflict between my mate and myself.

1 2 3 4 5

8. With regard to in-laws, my mate and I agree on ways of dealing with them.

1 2 3 4 5

9. The handling of family finances is a source of disagreement between my spouse and myself.

1 2 3 4 5

10. My mate and I agree on demonstrations of affection.

1 2 3 4 5

11. My mate and I get on each other's nerves.

1 2 3 4 5

12. My mate and I kiss each day.

1 2 3 4 5

13. I feel that there is a lack of cooperation in our marriage.

1 2 3 4 5

14. If I had my life to live over, I would marry the same person.

1 2 3 4 5

15. There are times when I wish that I had not married.

1 2 3 4 5

16. My marriage is a happy one.

1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree

17. My mate and I talk things over together.

1	2	3	4	5

18. Sexual relations with my mate are enjoyable.

1	2	3	4	5

Please answer the following questions:

1. What is your occupation?

2. What level of education have you completed?

3. What year were you born?

   19_____