
Some Aspects of Intermarriage in the Jewish Community of São Paulo, Brazil

Rosa R. Krausz

Introduction

Intermarriage has been part of the Jewish experience throughout history and in fact is a common phenomenon whenever a minority lives in constant contact with a majority group in an open society. Studies of intermarriage usually focus on tendencies related to demographic data, such as age, sex, education, nationality, and religion, and rarely explore how factors like identity, prejudice, values, commitment, and alienation influence the patterns of intermarriage. In contrast, the research project described in this paper was specifically designed to determine the extent to which the educational process and individual experiences, values, and concepts affect the rate of intermarriage. It also sought to determine the consequences of intermarriage for the survival of Jewish communities in the diaspora.

Research Methodology

Intermarriage defined. Intermarriage is the formal union through marriage of an individual who was born Jewish with one who was not born Jewish and was not raised as such. Based on this broad definition, it is possible to distinguish three categories of intermarriage: (1) Jewish conversionary intermarriage, in which the non-Jewish partner converts to Judaism; (2) Christian conversionary intermarriage, in which the Jewish partner abandons Judaism through formal conversion; and (3) mixed marriage, in which neither partner converts.¹

The respondents. Originally the research project was designed to reach forty randomly selected Jewish-born partners in each of the three intermarriage categories. A fourth group, consisting of endoga-

mous Jewish couples, was added as a control to determine whether the members of the various intermarriage categories differed in any significant way from a similarly selected group of persons who had chosen Jewish marriage partners. Unfortunately, it proved difficult to find and interview Jews who had converted to Christianity (category 2 above). Of the ten converts identified in the São Paulo Jewish community, six refused to be interviewed. Although the data for the remaining four are presented, the number of respondents was too small to permit comparative analysis. Because of the difficulty in finding converts, the research universe of the study was reduced from 160 respondents to 124.

Research procedure. The data presented in this study were collected through a questionnaire and an interview with specific items for each category of intermarriage. Both the questionnaire and the interview were answered by the Jewish partner in each of the intermarriage categories.

Characteristics of the Population

Age and sex. The age and sex characteristics of the respondents are shown in Table 1. The group that participated in the study was made up of men and women between the ages of twenty-one and seventy-four. Twenty-nine of the respondents (8 percent), the largest single group, were from the thirty to thirty-nine age bracket, and seven (3 percent), the smallest group, were from the sixty to seventy-four bracket. In the intermarriage categories, most of the respondents were between twenty and thirty-nine years old (60.6 percent), while in the endogamous category the highest concentration was found in the forty to fifty-nine age bracket (55.0 percent). The majority of the respondents in the intermarriage categories were male (66.5 percent). In the endogamous category the distribution was more balanced: 55.0 percent male and 45.0 percent female.

Place of birth. Table 2A shows that the respondents were predominantly first-generation Brazilians born in São Paulo City. Of the sixty-eight first-generation Brazilians, the majority (66.2 percent) were intermarried. This proportion grew even higher among the thirty-three second-generation Brazilians (84.9 percent). The lowest incidence of intermarriage was found among the foreign-born (47.9 percent). Thus the population studied showed a clear tendency to in-

termarriage as we pass from immigrants to second-generation Brazilians (see Table 2B).

Education. The educational characteristics of the respondents are shown in Table 3A. Most of them had a university education, although fewer females than males had attained this level of education (61.7 percent and 79.2 percent respectively). The second-generation Brazilians included the highest proportion of university graduates (87.9 percent) as compared to the first-generation Brazilians and the foreign-born (75.5 percent and 43.4 percent respectively). The data in Table 3B make it evident that the Jewish conversionary group had the greatest number of respondents with a university education, and that the endogamous group registered the lowest.

The Jewish partner. Table 4 shows the sex of the Jewish partners in the various groups. There was a clear predominance of male Jewish partners in the Jewish conversionary category. This can be explained by two facts: (1) conversion to Judaism is easier for women than for men, and (2) in a male-oriented society like Brazil, women tend to submit more easily than men to their spouses' way of life. The sexual distribution of the Jewish partners was more balanced in the mixed and endogamous categories.

Identification with Judaism

Identification with Judaism is a multifarious and complex process. Herman says that "Jewish identity deals with: (a) The nature of the individual's relationship to the Jewish group as a membership group; and (b) The individual's perception of the attributes of the Jewish group, his feelings about them, and the extent to which its norms are adopted by him as a source of reference."²

For the purposes of the research described in this paper, we considered Jewish identification as the outcome of the educational process to which the individual was submitted, also including the individual's personal experiences and the values cherished and transmitted by his family. In order to measure the respondents' degree of identification with Judaism, we used the following indicators: attendance at a Jewish school; membership in Jewish youth groups; observance of Jewish traditional holidays in the parental home; Bar or Bat Mitzvah; observance of Kashrut in the parental home.

Table 1: Sex and Age of Respondents

Age	Inter-marriage				Endogamous				Grand Total	
	Female	Male	Total	%	Female	Male	Total	%		
20-29	6	12	18	21.4%	6	4	10	25.0%	28	22.6%
30-39	12	21	33	39.2%	2	2	4	10.0%	37	29.8%
40-49	2	13	15	17.8%	7	6	13	32.5%	28	22.6%
50-59	5	8	13	15.4%	1	8	9	22.5%	22	17.7%
60+	4	1	5	5.9%	8	2	4	10.0%	9	7.3%
Total	29	55	84	100.0%	18	22	40	100.0%	124	100.0%

Table 2A: Place of Birth of Respondents

Place of Birth	Inter-marriage		Endogamous		Total	
Brazil (1st generation)	45	66.2%	23	33.8%	68	100.0%
Brazil (2nd generation)	28	84.9%	5	15.1%	33	100.0%
Foreign	11	47.9%	12	52.1%	23	100.0%
Total	84		40		124	

Table 2B: Place of Birth and Inter-marriage Category

Place of Birth	Jewish Conversionary		Christian Conversionary		Mixed		Total	
Brazil (1st generation)	23	57.5%	3	75.0%	19	47.5%	45	
Brazil (2nd generation)	13	32.5%	—	—	15	37.5%	28	
Foreign	4	10.0%	1	25.0%	6	15.0%	11	
Total	40	100.0%	4	100.0%	40	100.0%	84	

Table 3A: Education and Place of Birth

Educational Level	1st Generation Brazilian		2nd Generation Brazilian		Foreign-Born		Total	
	Grammar school	1	1.4%	—	—	1	4.4%	2
High School	16	23.6%	4	12.1%	12	52.2%	32	25.8%
University	51	75.0%	29	87.9%	10	43.4%	90	72.6%
Total	68	100.0%	33	100.0%	23	100.0%	124	100.0%

Table 3B: Education and Marriage Category

Educational Level	Jewish Conversionary		Christian Conversionary		Mixed		Endogamous		Total
	Grammar School	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	
High School	4	10.0%	1	25.0%	7	17.5%	20	50.0%	32
University	36	90.0%	3	75.0%	33	82.5%	18	45.0%	90
Total	40	100.0%	4	100.0%	40	100.0%	40	100.0%	124

Jewish school attendance. As shown in Table 5, approximately one-third (37.4 percent) of the respondents attended Jewish day schools. Of the thirty-six respondents who went to Jewish grammar schools (four years), 36.1 percent married Jewish partners, 33.3 percent married gentiles who converted to Judaism, and 30.6 percent married nonconverted gentiles. Of the eleven respondents who attended Jewish day schools for a period of eight or more years, 54.5 percent married Jewish partners, 36.4 percent married gentiles who converted to Judaism, and 9.1 percent married nonconverted gentiles. Thus, in the population studied, attending a Jewish day school diminished the rate of intermarriage and increased the rate of endogamous marriage only when a Jewish school was attended beyond the grammar-school level.

Jewish youth groups. Table 6 shows the pattern of participation in Jewish youth groups. The majority of the respondents had belonged to groups of this kind. Although the length of their participation does not seem to be relevant, the very fact of participation shows a slight influence on marriage behavior. Of the seventy individuals who were involved in Jewish youth-group activities in some way, 40 percent married Jewish spouses, 31.4 percent married gentiles who converted to Judaism, and 25.7 percent married nonconverted gentiles. In contrast, of the fifty respondents who did not participate in Jewish youth activities, 36 percent married gentiles who converted to Judaism, another 36 percent had nonconverted gentile spouses, and only 24 percent married Jews.

Jewish observances in the parental home. As shown in Table 7, the holiday most frequently observed by the parents of the respondents was Yom Kippur, followed by Pesach (Passover) and Rosh Hashana. All of the respondents in the endogamous group reported that their parents had observed Yom Kippur, as did 75 percent of the respondents in the intermarriage categories. A similar pattern was found for Passover and Rosh Hashana. Although Sabbath observance was not as widespread, the pattern of observance showed the same ordering of frequency among the groups: 50 percent of the parents in the endogamous category, 27.5 percent of the parents in the Jewish conversionary category, and only 15 percent of the parents in the mixed-marriage category. Thus it appears that there is a connection between a high degree of Jewish holiday observance and a tendency toward endogamous marriage.

Table 4: Sex of Jewish Partner

Marriage Category	Sex of Jewish Partner		Total
	Female	Male	
Jewish Conversionary	7 17.5%	33 82.5%	40 100.0%
Christian Conversionary	1 25.0%	3 75.0%	4 100.0%
Mixed	21 52.5%	19 47.5%	40 100.0%
Endogamous	18 45.0%	22 55.0%	40 100.0%
Total	47 37.9%	77 62.1%	124 100.0%

Table 5: Level of Jewish Schooling

Jewish School Attended	Sex of Jewish Partner				Total
	Jewish Conversionary	Christian Conversionary	Mixed	Endogamous	
Grammar school	12 33.3%	— —	11 30.6%	13 36.1%	36 100.0%
High school	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
Both	4 36.4%	— —	1 9.1%	6 54.5%	11 100.0%
Total	16 34.1%	— —	12 25.5%	19 40.4%	47 100.0%

Table 6: Participation in Jewish Youth Groups

Level of Participation	Sex of Jewish Partner				Total
	Jewish Conversionary	Christian Conversionary	Mixed	Endogamous	
Participated	22 31.4%	2 2.9%	18 25.7%	28 40.0%	70 100.0%
Didn't Participate	18 36.0%	2 4.0%	18 36.0%	12 24.0%	50 100.0%
No answer	— —	— —	4 100.0%	— —	4 100.0%
Total	40	4	40	40	124

Table 7: Jewish Holiday Observance in Parental Home

Holiday Observance	Sex of Jewish Partner			
	Jewish Conversionary	Christian Conversionary	Mixed	Endogamous
Passover	30 75.0%	2 50.0%	29 72.5%	40 100.0%
Rosh Hashana	30 75.0%	2 50.0%	28 70.0%	38 95.0%
Yom Kippur	30 75.0%	3 75.0%	30 75.0%	40 100.0%
Shabbat	11 27.5%	1 25.0%	6 15.0%	20 50.0%
Hanukah	8 20.0%	— —	6 15.0%	17 42.5%

Table 8: Bar Mitzvah

Had Bar Mitzvah	Sex of Jewish Partner			
	Jewish Conversionary	Christian Conversionary	Mixed	Endogamous
Yes	28 84.8%	3 100.0%	14 73.6%	20 90.9%
No	5 15.2%	— —	5 26.4%	2 9.1%
Total	33 100.0%	3 100.0%	19 100.0%	22 100.0%

Bar and Bat Mitzvah. The Bar/Bat Mitzvah is an important event in the strengthening of Jewish identity. It is a milestone of a youth's experience as well as a solemn entrance into the adult life of the Jewish community. As the data in Table 8 show, 84.4 percent of the male respondents had been Bar Mitzvah, while only 4.2 percent of the female respondents had experienced a Bat Mitzvah ceremony. The highest incidence of Bar Mitzvah was found in the endogamous category (90.9 percent), followed by the Jewish conversionary group (84.8 percent). It should be noted that all the male respondents in the Christian conversionary category had been Bar Mitzvah.

Kashrut observance. Parental observance of the dietary laws is tabulated in Table 9. Few of the respondents had parents who observed the dietary laws. The highest percentage was found in the endogamous group (42.5 percent), followed by the mixed-marriage category (7.5 percent).

Jewish Education Influence Degree (JEID). The global analysis of the five factors described above and selected as relevant to the development of an identification bond with Judaism was made through a compound index called the Jewish Education Influence Degree (see Appendix A). The analysis of these related factors sheds some light on the rather complex process of Jewish identification. Table 10 shows that the majority of the respondents in the endogamous category (52.5 percent) had a JEID of 3 or more. The percentage of respondents with 3 or more on the JEID decreased in the Jewish conversionary group (27.5 percent) and more so in the mixed-marriage category (12.5 percent). While the number of respondents in the Christian conversionary group was too small to permit comparisons, it is worth noting that all of them had a JEID of less than 3. The data assembled in the study indicate that there is a clear association between a high JEID and endogamous marriage, and also that a lower JEID indicates a higher probability of an intermarriage that will draw the Jewish spouse away from Judaism.

Participation in Jewish Community Life

The maintenance of an organized Jewish communal life is essential for the survival of Judaism in the diaspora. Two indicators were selected for assessing the participation of respondents in the life of the São

Paulo Jewish community: (1) affiliation with Jewish communal organizations, and (2) enrollment of their children in Jewish schools.

Affiliation with Jewish communal organizations. As the data in Table 11A demonstrate, the number of affiliated respondents was relatively high. Organizational affiliation was 87.5 percent in the endogamous group, 80 percent in the Jewish conversionary group, and 60 percent among mixed-marriage respondents. The data in Table 11B reveal that there was a close relationship between organizational affiliation and a high JEID.

Enrollment of children in Jewish schools. As was also true of the degree of communal affiliation, both marriage category and JEID clearly influence the continuity or discontinuity of the process of commitment to Judaism. The data in Table 12 show that the highest incidence of enrollment in Jewish day schools was found among the children of endogamous couples, and the highest incidence of enrollment in secular schools was seen among the offspring of mixed marriages. Although some of the mixed-marriage respondents were ambivalent about providing their children with a Jewish education, only one couple, from the Christian conversionary group, decided to raise their children as Christians.

The Concept of "Jew"

How one answers the question "Who is a Jew?" has a considerable amount of relevance in regard to the subject of intermarriage, since it determines one's approach to Judaism, to the Jewish community, to the larger society, and, perhaps most important, toward oneself. The answers the respondents provided to this question revealed that they entertained a wide range of views on what being a Jew means. In the endogamous category, the main points underlined under the heading *Jew* were "tradition" and "religion." The respondents from the Jewish conversionary group emphasized "tradition," "education," and "feelings." The mixed-marriage respondents mentioned "tradition" and "education" but also referred to other frames of reference, such as "race," "descent," "culture," "people," and "specific values." While respondents from the endogamous group limited their choices to just a few concept options, there was a progressive increase in the number of options selected by the respondents in the other categories, perhaps as a means of preventing cognitive dissonance. This is an extremely im-

portant point that warrants further exploration in an in-depth research study.

Intermarriage

Parental attitude toward intermarriage. Social scientists have generally recognized that the family group influences the child's view of the world and of himself. The family exerts strong pressures on its children to shape their behavior to fit into the patterns sanctioned by the group. By asking the respondents to provide information about whether and to what extent their parents regarded endogamous marriage as a traditional Jewish value to be maintained and encouraged, we were able to form some insights into the degree of influence that parental values have on the younger generation in an open society like that of Brazil.

The attitudes toward intermarriage expressed by the parents of the respondents, as reported by the respondents, are shown in Table 13. The parents of the respondents in the endogamous group were the ones who most strongly maintained the value of endogamous marriage. Among the respondents in this group, 75 percent reported that their parents had strongly opposed intermarriage—the highest incidence of parents taking this stance—and in addition 17.5 percent reported that their parents had expressed some disapproval of intermarriage. In the Jewish conversionary group, the proportion of parents strongly opposed to intermarriage dropped to 45 percent, but another 27.5 percent had a somewhat unfavorable attitude toward intermarriage. In the mixed-marriage group, only 25 percent of the respondents reported that their parents had strong feelings against intermarriage, but another 27.5 percent reported that their parents were somewhat unfavorable toward it. These data lead to the conclusion that there is a correspondence between parental views on intermarriage and the likelihood that offspring will marry a non-Jewish mate.

Favorable and unfavorable aspects of intermarriage. Our analysis of perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of intermarriage among the various categories of respondents provided an overview of their marital expectations. As Table 14 shows, the majority of the endogamous category (57.5 percent) stated that “there are no favorable aspects” to intermarriage, but at least 25 percent mentioned favorable

Table 9: Kashrut Observance in Parental Home

Kashrut Observed	Jewish Conversionary		Christian Conversionary		Mixed		Endogamous	
Yes	2	5.0%	1	25.0%	3	7.5%	17	42.5%
No	38	95.0%	3	75.0%	37	92.5%	23	57.5%
Total	40	100.0%	4	100.0%	40	100.0%	40	100.0%

Table 10: Jewish Education Influence Degree

JEID	Jewish Conversionary		Christian Conversionary		Mixed		Endogamous		Total	
0-2.9	29	72.5%	4	100.0%	35	87.5%	19	47.5%	87	70.2%
3-6	11	27.5%	—	—	5	12.5%	21	52.5%	37	29.8%
Total	40	100.0%	4	100.0%	40	100.0%	40	100.0%	124	100.0%

Table 11A: Affiliation with Jewish Communal Organizations

Affiliated	Jewish Conversionary		Christian Conversionary		Mixed		Endogamous		Total	
Yes	32	80.0%	—	—	24	60.0%	35	87.5%	91	73.4%
No	8	20.0%	4	100.0%	16	40.0%	5	12.5%	33	26.6%
Total	40	100.0%	4	100.0%	40	100.0%	40	100.0%	124	100.0%

Table 11B: Jewish Communal Affiliation and JEID

JEID	Affiliated		Not Affiliated		Total	
0-2.9	60	68.9%	27	31.1%	87	100.0%
3-6	31	83.8%	6	16.2%	37	100.0%
Total	91	73.4%	33	26.6%	124	100.0%

Table 12: School Enrollment of Respondents' Children

Marriage Category	Jewish School		Christian School		Secular School		No Children		Total	
Jewish Conversionary	15	36.6%	—	—	15	28.3%	10	34.5%	40	
Christian Conversionary	—	—	1	100.0%	2	3.8%	1	3.4%	4	
Mixed	2	4.9%	—	—	27	50.9%	11	37.9%	40	
Endogamous	24	58.5%	—	—	9	17.0%	7	24.2%	40	
Total	41	100.0%	1	100.0%	53	100.0%	29	100.0%	124	

Table 13: Attitude of Respondents' Parents Toward Intermarriage

Parental Attitude	Jewish Conversionary		Christian Conversionary		Mixed		Endogamous		Total	
Freedom of choice	1	2.5%	—	—	7	17.5%	1	2.5%	9	7.2%
No comment	10	25.0%	1	25.0%	11	27.5%	3	7.5%	25	20.2%
Duty to maintain tradition	5	12.5%	2	50.0%	1	2.5%	2	5.0%	10	8.1%
Intermarriage is trouble	6	15.0%	—	—	11	27.5%	5	12.5%	22	17.8%
Against intermarriage	18	45.0%	1	25.0%	10	25.0%	29	72.5%	58	46.7%
Total	40	100.0%	4	100.0%	40	100.0%	40	100.0%	124	100.0%

Table 14: Perceptions of Favorable Aspects of Intermarriage

Favorable Aspects	Jewish Conversionary		Christian Conversionary		Mixed		Endogamous		Total	
None	13	32.5%	2	50.0%	11	27.5%	23	57.5%	49	39.5%
Doesn't know	—	—	—	—	2	5.0%	4	10.0%	6	4.8%
A marriage like any other	11	27.5%	—	—	5	12.5%	3	7.5%	19	15.3%
A new experience	8	20.0%	1	25.0%	12	30.0%	3	7.5%	24	19.3%
Spreads out Judaism	3	7.5%	—	—	1	2.5%	1	2.5%	5	4.0%
Adjusts to larger society	1	2.5%	—	—	2	5.0%	1	2.5%	4	3.2%
Brings the couple together	2	5.0%	—	—	6	15.0%	5	12.5%	13	10.6%
Other	2	5.0%	1	25.0%	1	2.5%	—	—	4	3.2%
Total	40	100.0%	4	100.0%	40	100.0%	40	100.0%	124	100.0%

Table 15: Perceptions of Unfavorable Aspects of Intermarriage

Unfavorable Aspects	Jewish Conversionary		Christian Conversionary		Mixed		Endogamous		Total	
None	14	35.0%	2	50.0%	18	45.0%	3	7.5%	37	29.9%
Children's education	8	20.0%	—	—	4	10.0%	17	42.5%	29	23.4%
Problems of family integration	4	10.0%	1	25.0%	—	—	3	7.5%	8	6.4%
Problems of couple's integra- tion	3	7.0%	—	—	1	2.5%	5	12.5%	9	7.2%
Loss of tradition	2	5.0%	—	—	3	7.5%	2	5.0%	7	5.6%
Family pressure	4	10.0%	—	—	3	7.5%	1	2.5%	8	6.4%
Different outlooks	2	5.0%	—	—	6	15.0%	8	20.0%	16	12.9%
Loss of community integration	1	2.5%	—	—	3	7.5%	—	—	4	3.2%
Other	2	5.0%	1	25.0%	2	5.0%	1	2.5%	6	4.9%
Total	40	100.0%	4	100.0%	40	100.0%	40	100.0%	124	100.0%

points. In the Jewish conversionary group, 32.5 percent denied that intermarriage had any positive aspects, while 40 percent indicated favorable points. It is especially noteworthy that while the majority of the mixed-marriage group (55 percent) mentioned favorable aspects of intermarriage, 27.5 percent said "there are none." On the other hand, as shown in Table 15, that intermarriage has unfavorable aspects was denied by 7.5 percent of the endogamous respondents, by 35 percent of the Jewish conversionary group, and by 45 percent of the mixed-marriage respondents. Even in the Christian conversionary group, 50 percent of the respondents mentioned unfavorable aspects. Overall, while the endogamous and Jewish conversionary groups included a higher percentage of respondents emphasizing the negative aspects of intermarriage, the respondents in the other two groups gave the same weight to negative and positive aspects.

The non-Jewish partner's option. An area of interest in the study of intermarriage is the question of why some gentiles who marry Jews convert to Judaism while others maintain their original religious affiliation. In order to elicit information on this subject, it was necessary to formulate somewhat different questions for each of the three groups, depending on how they were constituted.

The respondents in the Jewish conversionary group were asked to explain why their spouses had converted. The answers are shown in Table 16: 25 percent had converted of their own volition, 15 percent to facilitate family integration, 12.5 percent for the sake of the children, 20 percent because they were asked to by the Jewish spouse or his family, and 10 percent because they were of part-Jewish descent.

The respondents in the mixed-marriage category were asked why their spouses had not converted. The answers are shown in Table 17: 32.5 percent of the respondents said that they and their spouses had never even discussed the issue; another 32.5 percent declared that they did not identify with Judaism, and 22.5 percent reported that neither partner had desired conversion.

The respondents in the endogamous category were asked why Jews marry gentiles. Their answers are shown in Table 18. Almost one-third said that "it just happens" and 22.6 percent attributed such marriages to "love," while only 13.2 percent mentioned "erroneous education." These answers revealed that the endogamous respondents held a rather open and romantic view of intermarriage and regarded

Jewish tradition and the survival of Judaism as of secondary importance when compared to the right to choose a marriage partner freely and without barriers. In other words, commitment to the values of an open society seemed to be stronger than the roots linking even the endogamous respondents to traditional Jewish values.

*Table 16: Why Non-Jewish Partner Converted to Judaism
(Jewish Conversionary Category Only)*

Reasons for Conversion	Number	Percentage
Personal choice	10	25.0
Partner's parents asked	3	7.5
To bring family together	6	15.0
Children's education	5	12.5
Partner asked	5	12.5
Of Jewish ancestry	4	10.0
To have religious marriage	3	10.0
Other	3	7.3
Total	40	100.0

*Table 17: Why Non-Jewish Partner Did Not Convert
(Mixed-Marriage Category Only)*

Reasons for Nonconversion	Number	Percentage
Issue never discussed	13	32.5
Couple did not wish conversion	9	22.5
Both partners agnostic	4	10.0
Never thought of religious marriage	3	7.5
Don't believe in Judaism	6	15.0
Against couple's principles	3	7.5
Other	2	5.0
Total	40	100.0

*Table 18: Perceptions of Why Jews Inter marry
(Endogamous Category Only)*

Reasons for Inter marriage	Number	Percentage
Lack of identification with Judaism	7	13.2
Erroneous education	7	13.2
Love	12	22.6
It just happens	16	30.2
Rebellion	6	11.3
Don't have money for dowry	2	3.8
Other	3	5.7
Total	53*	100.0%

*Multiple choice.

Conclusions

The data assembled in the study described in the preceding pages support the following conclusions:

1. Among Brazilian Jews, the frequency of intermarriage tends to be higher among native-born university graduates.
2. There is a demonstrable relationship between the Jewish Education Influence Degree and marital pattern; the higher the JEID, the greater the observed tendency toward endogamous marriage; the lower the JEID, the greater the observed tendency toward mixed marriage.
3. On the basis of the factors comprising the JEID, growing up in a home where Jewish traditions are observed is one of the most positive influences on the process of Jewish identification—leading to endogamous marriage or Jewish conversionary marriage.
4. The higher the JEID of the Jewish partner, the more likely that the couple, whatever the marriage category, will raise their children as Jews.
5. Affiliation with Jewish communal organizations was relatively high in the endogamous category but tended to decrease somewhat in the Jewish conversionary category and still more in the mixed-marriage category.
6. Respondents from the different marriage categories tended to define the concept of “Jew” in different ways. The definitions given by members of the endogamous group were the narrowest, those given by the Jewish conversionary respondents were somewhat broader, and those given by the mixed-marriage respondents were the broadest of all.
7. Respondents whose parents had strong views against intermarriage were less likely to intermarry.
8. Respondents from the endogamous and Jewish conversionary categories were more likely to underline the unfavorable aspects of intermarriage than were those from the mixed-marriage category.

Rosa R. Krausz was formerly Research Coordinator and Professor of Jewish Sociology at the Center for Jewish Studies of the University of São Paulo.

Appendix A: Jewish Education Influence Degree

The index is based on the quantification of the following items:

1. Jewish grammar school attendance:

Yes 1
No 0

2. Jewish youth-group membership:

Less than one year 0
One to two years 0.5
Three or more years 1

3. Bar/Bat Mitzvah:

Yes 1
No 0

4. Jewish holiday observances in parental home (Shabbat, Yom Kippur, Rosh Hashana, Passover, Hanuka):

One festival 0
Two to three 0.5
Four or more 1

5. Kashrut observance in parental home:

Yes 2
Partially 1
No 0

The Jewish Education Influence Degree results from adding together the weights assigned each item, with a range of 0 to 6.

Notes

The research project described in this article was conducted on a grant from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.

1. The intermarriage categories outlined here are broadly the same as those used by E. Mayer and C. Sheingold, *Intermarriage and the Jewish Future* (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1979).

2. Simon N. Herman, *Jewish Identity* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1977), p. 39.