

THE INFLUENCE OF SEXUAL VALUES ON PERCEIVED RISK OF INTERFAITH MARRIAGE AMONG UNMARRIED URBAN STUDENTS IN JAKARTA

Juneman*
Wahyu Rahardjo**

ABSTRAK

Fenomena pernikahan beda agama selama ini dianalisis dengan pendekatan teologi, sosiologi, hukum, politik, dan kebijakan publik. Kontribusi penelitian ini adalah upaya dan tujuannya untuk mendekati fenomena ini dengan perspektif psikologis. Penelitian ini menggunakan tingkat identifikasi seseorang terhadap nilai-nilai seksual sebagai prediktor bagi persepsi risiko tentang pernikahan beda agama yang tidak dapat dilepaskan dari kultur metropolitan. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian kuantitatif dengan desain korelasional prediktif. Sampel penelitian ini adalah 271 mahasiswa (99 laki-laki, 172 perempuan; $M_{usia} = 20.59$ tahun, $SD_{usia} = 1.67$ tahun) dari lima kampus di Jakarta dan sekitarnya. Hasil analisis terhadap data penelitian dengan regresi linear berganda menunjukkan bahwa terdapat interaksi antara jenis kelamin dan nilai seksual dalam memengaruhi persepsi resiko. Pada laki-laki, nilai seksual tidak mampu meramalkan persepsi resiko pernikahan beda agama. Pada perempuan muslim, dua nilai seksual yakni absolutisme dan hedonisme, mampu meramalkannya. Hasil penelitian ini memberikan wawasan baru mengenai relasi antara seksualitas dengan agama dan pernikahan, khususnya di wilayah urban di Indonesia.

Kata Kunci: lintas agama, nilai, pemuda, pernikahan, psikologi, seks, urban

ABSTRACT

The phenomenon of interfaith marriage has been approached from the perspectives of theology, sociology, law, politics, and public policy. The original contribution of this study is its effort and aim to approach this phenomenon from a psychological perspective. This study considers the level of one's identification towards sexual values as a predictor for his/her perceived risk of interfaith marriage, of which the values cannot be separated from metropolitan culture. This research is a quantitative research by employing predictive correlational design. The samples were 271 students (99 men, 172 women; $M_{age} = 20.59$ years, $SD_{age} = 1.67$ years) from five campuses in and around Jakarta. Research data analyses, by using multiple linear regression, show results which indicate that there is interaction between gender and sexual values in influencing the risk perception. There are differences between men and women in terms of correlation between the two variables. In men, sexual values cannot predict the perceived risk. In the Moslem women, two sexual values, i.e. absolutism and hedonism, can predict it. The results provide new insights regarding the relationship between sexuality and religion and marriage, particularly in urban areas in Indonesia.

Keywords: interfaith, marriage, psychology, sex, urban, values, youth

* Faculty of Humanities, Department of Psychology, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta

** Faculty of Psychology, Gunadarma University, Depok, West Java

INTRODUCTION

Interfaith marriage is a complex phenomenon and embodies controversy to present time. In the literature, other terms synonymous to it are interreligious marriage, religious intermarriage, and religious heterogamous marriage. These terms refer to marriage between partners professing different religions or faiths (Joanides, 2012). Cavan (1970:312) provides a more precise definition, namely “marriage of members of two religions whose values are sufficiently different that one or both religions perceives its values to be threatened”. For example, marriage between a Christian and a Moslem, who have faith, religious orientations, and religious practices that are different from each other. Marriage between a Protestant and a Catholic or between a Sunni and a Shi’ah is not called interfaith marriage, but intrafaith union, the marriage of different denominations within a religion (Chapman, 2011).

Interfaith marriage is “the inevitable price of living in an open and hospitable society” (Krasner, 2012:4). According to Copen (2008), the rise of interfaith marriages shows that religion, as an ascribed characteristic, is taking a “backseat” to other status signifiers, such as education, in selecting a partner. In scientific studies, interfaith marriage should be accepted as a type of minor but normal marriage, a part of the total social patterns of marriage (Chavan, 1970). Sociological studies about the causes of interfaith marriage can be read from the works of Kalmijn (1998).

The present study was done because, scientifically, the literature which discusses interfaith marriage is still scarce. In addition, within the few references on such a topic, most of them literature are still in the format of master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation compared to those which are published in peer-reviewed academic journals. Also, in Indonesia, many scholars have written on this particular topic based on logical speculation, and there was no empirical test of the speculation. This research was conducted, first of all, to fill the existing literature gap on interfaith marriage.

Risks and Advantages of Interfaith Marriage : The Sociopsychological Dynamics.

In general perception, interfaith marriage has several risks, either directly or indirectly, in short or long term, such as being an apostate (having religious conversion), confusion and conflict within child(ren), disharmony among extended families, excision/excommunication from community, removal of caste, and so on. However, analyses elaborated in the following paragraphs provide insights that despite negative aspects (risk, hazard, pessimism), which are often assumed from interfaith marriage, there are also positive aspects (benefits, optimism, creativity) of the marriage. The explanations are aimed to show that the outcome of interfaith marriage is not only determined by the difference of religion itself. The difference interacts with other variables (culture, communication style, loyalty, etc).

LaDuca (1993) describes the dynamics of interfaith couples with contextual theory that emphasizes the concept of loyalty in intergenerational perspective. Loyalty has been defined as the attempt by an individual to fulfill the spoken or unspoken but assumed expectations of a parent. He found that an individual who marries someone who professes different religion than his/hers---which usually his/her religion is the same as his/her parents---is seen by parents as an act of rebellion or opposition. The “rebellion” may actually be (though not all) due to the perceived unjust treatment and mistrust felt by the interfaith partners (as the child) in the relational bond with one’s parents. However, loyalty to parents could still be realized by those partners by restoring the “imbalance” created by their interfaith marriage. It is called “invisible loyalty”. For example, related to the celebration of marriage, there are two ways to accommodate it. First, by replicating patterns of family of origin in religious ceremony. For example, Christian-Muslim partners perform Christian and Muslim weddings. This is to meet parental expectations. Disagreements between partners in this case can be a source of conflict. Second, by elopement. Elopement is seen as an attempt not to hurt the parents and the partners,

by negating marriage ceremony which will be considered as shameful or embarrassing to parents. Furthermore, in interfaith marriage, birth of child during the first or second year of marriage may also represent partners' loyalty towards parents. The partners contribute to their families of origin by producing next generation. The birth(s) "push(es)" family of origin to "come around" and accept the new loyalty system. In LaDuca's research, parents who disagree with the interfaith marriage prior to the birth of the child indicate acceptance after the birth of the first child. Interfaith couples can provide religious training, or do not provide religious training, for their children, taking into account the mandate of their parents.

In numerous research results, there has been no finding which states that interfaith marriage is riskier or more harmful than same faith marriage. In their research, McDavit-Aron (2009) found no correlation between religious homogeneous marriages with marital satisfaction. It means that common belief which states that interfaith marriages is less happy than religious homogeneous marriage is not supported by empirical data. They also found no correlation between the strength of faith of the partners with marital satisfaction on heterogamous marriage; meaning that common belief that states that high marital satisfaction only occurs when the strength of faith of the couple is low is not supported by data. Coffin (2008) found that on interfaith partners, children do not perceive religion as a major source of conflict in their parents. Even, McCarthy (2007) in his qualitative study, revealed that interfaith parents and their children attributed their religious background diversities as parts of favorable or valuable sequences of multicultural proficiency.

Other factors, beyond religion, which contribute more in determining satisfaction in marriage are, among others, nationality, level of income, and communication style. Kalmijn, de Graaf, and Tanssen (2005) found that the rate of divorce in partners with religious heterogamy is lower than partners with national heterogamy. Fishman (2010) found that there is an interaction

effect between levels of income with interfaith marriage in predicting dyadic adjustment (marital satisfaction). Women of Catholic-Jewish partners with lower incomes have higher levels of dyadic consensus, despite their religious differences. Reiter (2008) found that on interfaith couples, discussing religion/faith between the partners, communicating it in ways that are healthy and in positive style, are related to greater relationship satisfaction. However, Reiter also found that negative communication style (avoiding the problematic topic, failing to express feelings) is also associated with greater relationship satisfaction between interfaith partners. Reiter also explains that the negative communication style is a strategy used by interfaith partners to safely manage and navigate difficult discourse, to gradually develop skills required to communicate effectively about faith. He also explains that the avoidance of a topic (topic avoidance) is also part of the pro-relationship mechanism, in which individuals avoid topics that are potentially harmful or detrimental to the relationship in order to protect the relationship and self (Caughlin & Afifi, in Reiter, 2008).

URGENCY FOR STUDY

There is scarcity of research which studies the psychological aspects of interfaith marriage, especially in Indonesia. In most studies, the emphasis lies more on theological aspect. The book edited by Baso and Nurcholis (2010), entitled *Pernikahan Beda Agama: Kesaksian, Argumen Keagamaan, dan Analisis Kebijakan (Interfaith Marriage: Testimony, Theological Argument, and Policy Analysis)* is one of the recent and most comprehensive empirical research literature in Indonesia, yet it does not cover many psychological aspects. Perhaps one of the earliest comprehensive articles about the psychological aspects of the interfaith marriage is a work of Chiles (1971), yet this is not an empirical study. In his article, he discusses the psychological factors as follows: (a) concession and resentment,

(b) intrusion and animosity, (c) crisis and conflict, (d) the mystery and estrangement, (e) maturity, (f) experience, (g) commitment, and (h) understanding.

This study offers a new approach in analysing interfaith marriage, namely empirical-psychological approach. This study makes psychological identification with sexual values as predictors of risk perception on interfaith marriage. Its basic premise is, generally, marriage is preceded by sexual attraction. In fact, Gülsün, Ak, and Bozkurt (2009) state that, based on their study of previous researches, sexuality is the most decisive factor in happiness between partners, and recent researches continue to elaborate on interaction between sexuality with marriage. Yabiku and Gager (2009) also confirm that, in accordance with the prediction of social exchange theory, lower sexual frequency and satisfaction were associated with higher rate of divorce. Nevertheless, it appears that studies linking sexuality with interfaith marriage have not been done, if not rare. This study contributes to that particular matter.

SEXUAL VALUES AND PERCEIVED RISK OF INTERFAITH MARRIAGE : THE HYPOTHETICAL GROUNDS

Sexuality is closely associated with sexual values. Studies on the concept of value cannot be separated from culture because the building of the concept of value must be based on culture (Yuan & Dong, 2006). Sexual values are “moral guidelines for making choices in non-marital, marital, heterosexual, and homosexual relationships” (Knox & Schacht, 2012:249). There are three types of sexual values (Knox & Schacht, 2012), namely: (1) absolutism (traditional, abstinence until marriage), which is based on the value system of authority and absolute power of religion, law and tradition; (2) relativism (relational), the sexual value system whereby decisions are made in the context of the situation and the relationship; and (3) hedonism (recreational), which confirms that the main value and human motivation to do something is to get pleasure and avoid pain (“if it feels good, do it”).

Richey, Knox, and Zusman (2009) and Knox and Schacht (2012) explain that hedonism is a value that emphasizes pursuit of pleasure and self gratification of the sexual relationship. Based on their findings, indications of people who embrace hedonism are: having sexual intercourse without romanticism and without emotional involvement, having more permissive lifestyle and having fun to explore, and they tend to do infidelity in the future. Meanwhile, relativism is a value which states sexual intercourse may be performed under conditions of mutual affectionate feeling or any other special contexts which can be used as basis of justification (such as the degree of love, commitment, and relationship involvement). So, there is no permanent moral standard. Indication of relativism can be explained by the theory of symbolic interactionism. People who commit sexual intercourse give meaning to sexuality which is depended on their definition of the undergoing interactional situation. In people who embrace absolutism, the line between what is right/wrong and good/bad about sexuality is very firm. The indications are as follows: sexual intercourse is primarily for procreation, not recreation; virginity should be preserved and is a testament to true love, and sexual pleasure is positioned at a much lower level of spirituality that occupies a high level.

In linking interfaith marriage with sexual values, we consider the work of Leeming (2003). He states that religion and sexuality are two inseparable things, and, when separated, it becomes a tragedy for mankind. Sexual and religious experiences have similar characteristics, which can be expressed with words such as: desire, mystery, ritual, passion, ecstasy, and union. For example, according to Leeming, “Ideally we go to religious services and ‘to bed’ because we desire something beyond ourselves” (p.102). His summarized opinion is as follows (Leeming, 2003:101):

“From the beginning of human history religion and sexuality have shared certain characteristics. But what existed in early history as a natural linguistic and liturgical marriage between two activities with certain shared emotional,

psychological, and even physical goals, ended in most of the ‘great religions’ centuries ago in divorces fueled by patriarchal fear and prejudice. The split between sexuality and religion is especially evident in the repression of women and the criminalization of sexuality characteristic of our Abrahamic religions, all factors that have led to tragic and too often perverted parodies of the old natural marriage.“

The three sexual values (absolutism, relativism, hedonism) described previously are interesting and important to investigate in relation to interfaith marriage because we suspect that sexual values have impact on phenomenology of sexual experience. In fact, as explained by Leeming, the phenomenology of sexual experience has analogous structure to phenomenology of religious experience. The phenomenology of religious experience is considered to be strongly embedded in perception and decision making of having interfaith marriage (or sexual bond) especially in Indonesia. However, such an assumption has no definitive truth, and therefore needs a test to validate this assumption.

The present study is aimed to investigate the effect of sexual values towards perceived risk of interfaith marriage. As already mentioned above, in the literature, interfaith marriage has a variety of risks, from small to large. In one of the earliest literature on risk perception, Slovic, Fischhoff, and Lichtenstein (1981) have stated that this perception is influenced by psychological factors. Horne (2004) has shown that human values can be explained psychologically by evolutionary psychology. Thus, this study hypothesize that there is a relationship between sexual values and perceived risk of interfaith marriage.

This is a quantitative research, with predictive correlational design. Statistical analysis technique used is multiple linear regression analysis, and the predictors are sexual values and the dependent variable is the perceived risk of interfaith marriage. Data processing was performed by using *SPSS 20 for Windows*. The samples were 271 students (99 men, 172 women; $M_{age} = 20.59$ years, $SD_{age} = 1.67$ years), administered by using the convenience incidental sampling technique from

five campuses in Jakarta and surrounding areas, and the majority (70.1%) were students from the Faculty of Psychology. In Indonesia, the Faculty of Psychology is the faculty which is dominated by female students. Students were selected for the study because courtship (*pacaran*) before marriage is typically experienced by them. Thus, understanding relation between the values they have and their perceptions of the risk of interfaith marriage are important to be investigated. The majority of the students was Islam (85.6%), Protestant (7.4%), and Catholic (4.8%). The majority of the students were from Javanese ethnic group (44.6%), Sundanese (16.6%), Betawi (9.2%), Melayu (6.3%), and the Bataknese (5.2%).

The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire consisting of two scales. First, the perceived risk of interfaith marriage was measured by a scale containing the following questions:

Within the range of 1 to 10, how risky do you think is interfaith marriage? (Circle one number)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Note: 1 = “Not at all risky”, 5 = “Moderately risky”, 10 = “Extremely risky”

Second, sexual values scales in this study were developed from the categorization of sexual values, i.e. absolutism, relativism, and hedonism. The scales were presented with six response choices, ranging from “Strongly Disagree” (scored 1) to “Strongly Agree” (scored 6). Examples of absolutism items are “Husband or wife must not have sex with someone else other than their committed partner”, “Sexual relations before marriage is permissive to do” (unfavorable items), and “Homosexual relations is not something that is forbidden in the world “(unfavorable items). Based on test data from the instrument trial outside of Participants 72 students, the instrument of this dimension is reliable (Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.64), by aborting 2 items, and corrected item-total correlations range from 0.31 to 0.49. Examples of relativism items are “Sexual intercourse with unsteady partner is feasible as long as promoting safe sexual behavior,” “Though not married,

sexual intercourse is feasible if there is a strong commitment between the two”, and “As long as it is not committed during initial meetings, sexual intercourse in dating relationships may be done”. Instrument of this dimension is reliable (Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.7), by aborting 2 items, and corrected item-total correlations range from 0,33 to 0.63. Hedonism examples of items are “Dating is one of the simple ways to satisfy sexual needs”, “There is nothing wrong if one views sex as a source of worldly pleasures”, and “It is legitimate if someone has sex for fun”. Instrument of this dimension is reliable (Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.92), by aborting one item, and corrected item-total correlations range from 0.71 to 0.84.

RESULTS

Multiple linear regression analysis showed the following results: $F(3.270) = 4.803, p = 0.003$ ($p < 0.05$), $R^2 = 0.051$. This means that the sexual values consisting of hedonism, absolutism and relativism can jointly predict the perceived risk of interfaith marriage. More specifically, the results are shown in Table 1:

Table 1 shows that hedonism is negatively correlated with risk perception of interfaith marriage ($\beta = -0.223, p < 0.05$). That is, the stronger someone’s value of hedonism, the more he/she perceives that interfaith marriage is not risky. Values of absolutism and relativism do not significantly predict the perceived risk of interfaith marriage ($p > 0.05$).

We subsequently conducted further analysis to analyze predictive correlations between variables of each gender. In men, it was found that sexual values cannot predict the perceived risk of interfaith marriage, with the following results: $F(3, 98) = 1.300, p = 0.279$ ($p > 0.05$), $R^2 = 0.039$. In women, it was found that the sexual values can predict the perceived risk of interfaith marriage, with the following results: $F(3, 171) = 6.304, p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.05$), $R^2 = 0.101$.

Table 2 shows that hedonism is negatively correlated with risk perception of interfaith marriage ($\beta = -0.284, p < 0.01$); absolutism is positively correlated with risk perception of interfaith marriage ($\beta = 0.219, p < 0.05$);

Table 1. Regression Analysis Results (n = 271)

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig. (p)	
	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)			
	(Constant)	7.976	1.516		5.261	.000
1	Absolutism	.018	.035	.038	.510	.611
	Relativism	.013	.044	.028	.294	.769
	Hedonism	-.082	.035	-.223	-2.313	.021

a. Dependent Variable: Risk_InterMarr

Table 2. Regression Analysis Results (n = 172, female students)

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig. (p)	
	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)			
	(Constant)	4.567	1.781		2.563	.011
1	Absolutism	.103	.041	.219	2.492	.014
	Relativism	.097	.048	.218	2.010	.046
	Hedonism	-.115	.043	-.284	-2.648	.009

a. Dependent Variable: Risk_InterMarr

Table 3. Regression Analysis Results (n = 152, female Moslem students)

Model	Coefficients ^a				t	Sig. (p)
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)			
(Constant)	3.718	1.943		1.914	.058	
1	Absolutism	.136	.046	.262	2.950	.004
	Relativism	.095	.051	.202	1.837	.068
	Hedonism	-.126	.046	-.300	-2.755	.007

a. Dependent Variable: Risk_InterMarr

relativism is positively correlated with risk perception of interfaith marriage ($\beta = 0.218$, $p < 0.05$). This means that the stronger the hedonism value of a woman, the more she perceives that interfaith marriage is not risky. Conversely, the stronger the value of absolutism and relativism of a woman, the more she perceives that interfaith marriage is risky.

Considering that more than 80% of the participants were Moslems, we further analyzed the predictive correlations between variables in female participants who were Moslems. The results are as follows: $F(3, 151) = 7.794$, $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.05$), $R^2 = 0.136$. Table 3 shows that hedonism is negatively correlated with risk perception of interfaith marriage ($\beta = -0.300$, $p < 0.01$); absolutism is positively correlated with risk perception of interfaith marriage ($\beta = 0.262$, $p < 0.01$); relativism does not correlate with the risk perception of interfaith marriage ($p > 0.05$).

DISCUSSION

This study is the first in Indonesia to investigate the effects of sexual values towards perceived risk of interfaith marriage, with young unmarried heterosexual students as research participants. It was found that sexual values interact with gender in predicting risk perception of interfaith marriage. In men, sexual values did not correlate with risk perception. Conversely, in women, sexual values (specifically absolutism and hedonism) correlated with risk perception.

These findings indicate that in perceiving risk of interfaith marriage, men are not affected by sexual values, but are influenced by other factors.

Because the majority of the study participants are Moslems, the discussion will focus on Moslem men. Typical example of interfaith marriage in Indonesia is Jamal Mirdad (Moslem man) who married Lydia Kandou (Christian woman) in 1986. For Moslem men, the risk perception of interfaith marriage seems to be more determined by theological reasons, the Islamic Law. Qur'an allows a Moslem man to marry a woman who comes from the "People of the Book" (Christians and Jews), in addition to the man's requirement to make sure to raise his children as Moslems (Leeman, 2009). In addition, other reasons that may affect the perception of Indonesian Moslem men are sociological reasons and political reasons (Aini, 2008). According to Aini (p.684): "From this sociological point of view, the discouragement of Interreligious marriage is a protection for society from religious and social-cultural-ethnic differences that could destabilize marriages." A political-ideological reason that may be considered by Indonesian Moslem men is that in patriarchal cultures, such as in Indonesia, men generally have the power, control, and determination, and want to maintain superiority. Whilst, as a ruler, Moslem man wants Islam to widely spread so that the Moslem population increases. In perceiving the risk of interfaith marriage, the three reasons mentioned above, the theological, sociological, and political-ideological, seem much more important and dominate men, rather than psychological variables such as sexual values. However, there should be more studies on this matter.

In the Moslem women, perceived risk of interfaith marriage is contributed by sexual

values by 13.6% ($R^2 = 0.136$). In social sciences, especially psychology, the amount of such prediction provides an important contribution to science. These findings suggest that for young Moslem women in Jakarta, the high or low degrees of interfaith marriage risk perception is determined by affective field, namely values, in this case sexual values. Value is something really significant, worthy to be earned by hard struggle (Leahy, 2001). When we are attentive to the three reasons which are possibility factors that influence risk perception of interfaith marriage on men, as stated above (i.e, theological, sociological, and political-ideological) ---if all three were true--- it seems that the three put more emphasis on cognitive field (or, social cognition, see also: Fincham & Beach, 1999; Bainbridge, 2006) and has a "macro" scope. In the Moslem women, these three factors may also play a role, but based on this study, that affective factors and "micro", i.e, the identification of individual women towards specified sexual values, are proven to have contribution, and this distinguishes it from the men. Furthermore, the value is more about something good (*bonum*) and subjectivity, while cognition involves more on reality and objectivity (or trans-subjectivity) (Leahy, 2001).

Another explanation of the correlation between the variables mentioned above is that there are "third variables" contributing to these predictive correlations. Third variable affects the sexual values, and at the same time affecting the perceived risk of interfaith marriage; such as sexuality and marriage education, series of regular religious exposure derived from places of worship, religious tradition at home, philosophy or ideology adopted by parents, values presented by the mass media, etc (see also: Ambaw, 2008).

Findings that absolutism correlated positively and hedonism correlated negatively with perceived risk of interfaith marriage suggest that sexual values also have implication on women sexual script regarding to/with whom sexual relations may be committed, and how large the perceived risk may arise from these relations. The more absolutist a woman is, the more she perceives

that interfaith marriage is risky. She will not commit sexual intercourse until marriage, and she has tendency to dismiss any possibilities of doing it in an interfaith marriage. It contains coherence. Perhaps, for an absolutist, if someone has been struggling to maintain her virginity, the virginity should be "dedicated" to the very right person. For Indonesians, the easiest social category used and salient to determine whether someone is good or bad, morally worthy or not to be sexual partner is religion. In accordance with the teachings of Islam, one that is right for a Moslem woman is, first and foremost, a man with the same faith. In contrast with hedonist and relativist, for an absolutist these things can not be modified, but must be obeyed unconditionally. All these findings show that for Moslem females, in context of perception towards interfaith marriage, religion is approached by "heart", affection, not by theological "logic", cognition, as perceived by Moslem males.

The opposite occurs in the hedonist. The more hedonist someone is, the more she perceives that interfaith marriage is not risky. She can have sexual relations before marriage as long as giving her pleasure, and she opens up the possibility to do so in an interfaith marriage. From research on risk perception, there is a strong and negative correlation between the perceived risk and the risky behavior (Weber, Blais, & Betz, 2002). The more a thing is not considered risky, the more such risky thing will be done. Noteworthy is that symptoms of a hedonist can have sexual intercourse without any basis of love.

Relativistic sexual value cannot predict the risk of interfaith marriage. In people who embrace relativism, moral correctness of sex outside marriage depends on the particular situation. For example, a woman feels that sexual intercourse can be justified if she and her sexual partner is in a secure, mutual love relationship. In contrast, sexual intercourse is not acceptable when there is deception, pressure, coercion, or exploitation. The disadvantage of relativism as a sexual value is the difficulty in making sexual decisions, and implies uncertainty in many cases (Knox & Schacht,

2012). This can create directional uncertainty in correlation patterns between value and behavior. This explains why relativism is not related to the perceived risk of interfaith marriage.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This cultural psychological research concludes that certain sexual values (absolutism, hedonism) can predict perceived risk of interfaith marriage on unmarried urban Moslem women in Jakarta and its surrounding areas. Although the prediction is not synonymous with causation, this conclusion has an important implications for all stakeholders associated with education on sexuality, programs on sexuality, and interfaith marriage in urban areas. Interventions towards sexual values are found to be ineffective for unmarried urban Moslem men regarding his decision to marry or not to marry women who profess different religions. However, in women, the intervention has an effect.

Based on these results, the campaign containing sexual absolutism value (e.g. avoiding masturbation, avoiding oral sex, delaying sexual intercourse until marriage, etc.) effectively reinforces the perception of Moslem women that interfaith marriage is risky. The findings of this study essentially support Leeming's analysis (2003), that sexuality and religion actually have common characteristics, i.e., among others, embodying human desire to surpass themselves, embodying rituals that can lead to passion and ecstatic experience in a union that affects oneself physically, emotionally, and psychologically (in marriage, it is union with a partner, in religion, the main union is with God). Perhaps, for the absolutist Moslem women, they fear that these experiences can not be experienced when married to men professing different religions.

Collins (2001) makes an econometric analysis of rationalizations of virginity loss in terms of love. Based on his study of 2269 males and 1476 females, he concludes that, in economic terms,

for men, sex is more of a "a consumption good", while for women, it is "a capital good". His arguments support the results of this study which are related to the dynamics of the relationship between sex and religion (Collins, 2001: 194):

"In some strongly religious societies it may be observed that virginity loss is complementary to marriage ... For women, in such social institutional settings, virginity may be viewed as a pre-marital investment in human capital related marriage Females are significantly more romantic likely to offer reasoning for virginity loss The negative significance of the Moslem variable, however, suggests that romantic considerations are less likely to account for virginity loss amongst those within this religious denomination. Arguably this religion tends to discourage romantic notions and encourage bride wealth payments and other non-romantic objectives."

Subsequent research can include socio-demographic variables in research questionnaires, such as whether the research participants' parents are interfaith partners, whether the research participants' parents are divorced or not, whether research participants are currently dating anyone or not, and if so, whether dating someone from different religion or not, whether research participants have certain metaphors in relation to sexuality, and so on. These variables are useful to expand the explanation for the findings of this study.

REFERENCES

- Aini, Noryamin. (2008). Inter-Religious Marriage from Socio-Historical Islamic Perspectives. *Brigham Young University Law Review*, 3, 669-705.
- Ambaw, Fentie. (2008). Predictors of Sexual Value Systems Among Jimma University Students. *Ethiopian Journal of Health Sciences*, 18(3), 109-116.
- Bainbridge, William Sims. (2006). Social Cognition of Religion. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 29(5), 463-464.
- Cavan, Ruth Shonle. (1970). Concepts and Terminology in Interreligious Marriage. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 9(4), 311-320.

- Chapman, Kyle. (2011). *Interfaith Marriage Counseling: Perspectives and Practices Among Christian Ministers*. (Unpublished MA in Sociology Thesis). Graduate Faculty of Texas Tech University, Texas.
- Chiles, Robert E. (1971). *Psychological Factors in Interfaith Marriage*. *Pastoral Psychology*, 22(1), 35-40.
- Coffin, Demetri Beau. (2008). *Young Adult Children of Interfaith Parents. Ego-Identity Development*. (Unpublished PsyD Dissertation.). California School of Professional Psychology, Alliant International University, San Diego.
- Collins, Alan. (2001). Surrender Value of Capital Assets: The Economics of Strategic Virginity Loss. *Journal of Bioeconomics*, 2, 193-201.
- Copen, Casey E. (2008). *Transmission and Transitions: Young Adults' Beliefs, Values and Life Course Transitions in Familial Context*. (Unpublished PhD in Sociology Dissertation). Faculty of the Graduate School, University of Southern California, California.
- Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (1999). Marriage in the New Millennium: Is there a Place for Social Cognition in Marital Research?. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16, 685-704.
- Fishman, P. A. (2010). *Interfaith Marriage, Religious Orientation, and Dyadic Adjustment*. (Unpublished MSc Thesis). Department of Family, Consumer, and Nutrition Sciences, Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois.
- Guiren, Y., & Dong, L. (2006). On Value and Culture. *Frontiers of Philosophy in China*, 1(2), 237-244.
- Gülsün, M., Ak, M., & Bozkurt, A. (2009). Marriage and Sexuality From a Psychiatric Point of View. *Current Approaches in Psychiatry*, 1, 68-79.
- Horne, Christine. (2004). Values and Evolutionary Psychology. *Sociological Theory*, 22(3), 477-503.
- Joanides, Charles. (2012). *Glossary of Key Terms*. Retrieved on 28th October 2012 from <http://www.goarch.org/archdio-cese/departments/marriage/interfaith/glossary>.
- Kalmijn, M., de Graaf, P. M., & Tanssen, J. P. G. (2005). Inter-marriage and the Risk of Divorce in the Netherlands: The Effects of Differences in Religion and in Nationality, 1974-94. *Population Studies*, 59(1), 71-85.
- Kalmijn, Matthijs. (1998). Inter-marriage and Homogamy: Causes, Patterns, Trends. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 395-421.
- Knox, D., & Schacht, C. (2012). *Choices in Relationships: An Introduction to Marriage and the Family*. Cengage Learning.
- Krasner, Jonathan. (2012). Focus on Young Adult Reform Jews. *The Chronicle*. Retrieved on 28th October 2012 from <http://huc.edu/chronicle/74/docs/Chronicle%20Fall%202012%20for%20web.pdf>.
- LaDuca, Susan Silverman. (1993). *Manifestation of Loyalty by Family Members of Interfaith Marriage*. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Temple University.
- Leahy, Louis. (2001). *Siapakah Manusia? Sintesis Filosofis tentang Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Leeman, Alex B. (2009). Interfaith Marriage in Islam: An Examination of the Legal Theory Behind the Traditional and Reformist Positions. *Indiana Law Journal*, 84(2), Article 9. Retrieved on 28th October 2012 from <http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj/vol84/iss2/9>.
- Leeming, David. (2003). Religion and Sexuality: The Perversion of a Natural Marriage. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 42(2), 101-109.
- McCarthy, Kate. (2007). Pluralist Family Values: Domestic Strategies for Living with Religious Difference. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 612, 188-208.
- McDavit-Aron, Janice. (2009). *Ingredients for a Happy Marriage: Religious Homogamy and Its Interaction with Strength of Faith*. (Unpublished PhD in Clinical Psychology Dissertation). Alliant International University, California School of Professional Psychology, California.
- Nurcholis, A., & Baso, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Pernikahan Beda Agama: Kesaksian, Argumen Keagamaan dan Analisis Kebijakan*. Jakarta: Komnas HAM dan ICRP.
- Reiter, M. J. (2008). *Communication and Satisfaction in Inter- and Intra-racial and Inter- and Intrafaith Romantic Relationships*. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Faculty of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, The George Washington University.

- Richey, E., Knox, D., & Zusman, M. (2009). Sexual Values of 783 Undergraduates. *College Student Journal*, 43(1), 175-180.
- Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., & Lichtenstein, S. (1981). Perceived Risk: Psychological Factors and Social Implications. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, Vol. 376, No. 1764, The Assessment and Perception of Risk (Apr. 30, 1981), 17-34.
- Weber, E. U., Blais, A., & Betz, N. E. (2002). A Domain-specific Risk-attitude Scale: Measuring Risk Perceptions and Risk Behaviors. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 15, 263–290
- Yabiku, S. T., & Gager, C. T. (2009). Sexual Frequency and the Stability of Marital and Cohabiting Unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(4), 983-1000.