CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Internal migration has become a major dynamic responsible for the growth or decline of many Jewish communities and for the redistribution of the Jewish population across the American landscape in a pattern quite different from that characterizing American Jewry earlier in the century. Indeed, internal migration together with generational change are closely interrelated with many of the other demographic, social, and economic changes that affect the ties of individuals to the larger Jewish community; and in many instances, migration helps to explain these changes.

For many years, the Jewish American press and, indeed, leaders of the Jewish American community have believed that the major *demographic* challenges facing American Jewry were the effects of high intermarriage rates and very low fertility. While these concerns persist, high levels of geographic mobility and major shifts in residential distribution are now recognized as also having significant relevance for the vitality of the Jewish community, both locally and nationally. America's Jews are highly mobile. They are increasingly dispersed across the major regions of the United States, across a growing number of metropolitan areas, and away from center cities to suburbs and exurban areas as well as to smaller cities and towns. Their redistribution presents new challenges to the national Jewish community and to individual Jews (cf. DellaPergola, 1991; Cohen, 1988).

That such mobility has raised concerns is clearly evident in newspaper headlines such as "Population Shifts Create New Problems for Jewish Federations"; "South Dakota's Lone Rabbi Travels Far and Wide to Sell Judaism to All"; "Jewish Outposts in Dixie"; "A Growing Trend: Jewish Population Moving from Northeast to Sun Belt"; "Being Jewish Where There Is No Jewish Community." High levels of population mobility and greater geographic dispersion are thus compounding the challenges to the demographic and socioeconomic vitality of the Jewish community raised by high intermarriage rates and low fertility.

Copyrighted Material

The problems caused by mobility extend not just to the community, but affect individual Jews as well (cf. Moore, 1994). The sense of isolation or disconnectedness that movement may engender is captured very well in an essay by Jay Neugeboren (1994:95). "[W]e often prized the distance . . . we created between our world and the world of our parents. . . . I had, obviously, made use of my American freedoms—my freedom of choice and freedom from discrimination—to gain education and amenities denied my parents. . . . And yet, it seemed, my very freedoms had led me to a time and place in which I felt, to my surprise, small connection."

The freedoms identified by Neugeboren are an integral part of the factors resulting in high levels of mobility. The high educational level of Jewish Americans and the kinds of careers they can now pursue, coupled with broad freedom of choice about where to live, have increasingly resulted in movement away from parental family and place of origin; this often also means movement out of centers of Jewish concentration (S. Goldstein, 1990). The primacy of considerations other than ties to place and kin when career decisions are made is caught in an exchange reported by journalist Mark Patinkin (1980):

> Occasionally, students will call me to talk about [my profession]. . . .
>
> "You looking anywhere specific?" I'll ask.
>
> "If there's a job, I'll go," they'll say.
>
> When I graduated, I pretty much felt the same way. . . .
>
> The call we hear is for the best job, not the closest ties. It doesn't mean we're growing colder, just more mobile.

Such geographic mobility may weaken ties to a particular Jewish community by reducing the opportunites for local integration while increasing opportunities for greater interaction with non-Jews. Moreover, the migration effects of both changing education and occupational patterns may be compounded by changes in marital and fertility behavior. If Jews marry at later ages, if more Jews choose not to marry at all, if marital disruption increases, and if fertility remains low, conditions conducive to locational stability may continue to weaken so that even higher levels of longer-distance movement may result.

While geographic mobility has been a striking feature of Jewish history from the very inception of the Jewish people in biblical times, population movement is certainly not unique to Jews. It

Copyrighted Material

accounts for the settlement and current population configuration of the North American continent. The migration of Jewish Americans must therefore be seen within the generally high mobility rates that characterize American society: about one in five Americans change their residence annually.

Such mobility for Americans as a whole has been attributed (Gober, 1993) to a number of factors: a longstanding tradition of immigration that fosters, once initial ties are severed, a "culture of migration" in which attitudes, values, and institutions are conducive to further movement; a high premium placed on personal freedom, which includes the freedom to move; and having housing markets and public policies that facilitate mobility. Such cultural features stimulating mobility are reinforced by wide opportunities for higher education, the character of employment and labor turnover and transfers in industrial and commercial enterprises, and such life cycle features as late marriage, living independent of parental households, low fertility, high divorce rates, and retirement.

Other factors affecting mobility in the 1990s have been identified by Peter Drucker (1994:72–73) as related to the rise of the "knowledge society." Old communities, like the family and village, have ceased to perform the social tasks delegated to them in the past, and have been replaced by organizations. But organizations do not generate the loyalties of their members in the way that the old communities did. "By definition, a knowledge society is a society of mobility. . . . People no longer have roots." To the extent that Jews participate heavily in the knowledge society, they may also be disproportionally affected by its rootlessness.

For the individual and the community, frequent and widespread mobility can have both positive and negative effects. These are effectively summarized by Gober (1993:4), who points out that one school of thought sees the freedom associated with migration as leading to greater innovation as a result of the synergism of people from a variety of backgrounds sharing ideas and expertise. Others argue that high mobility can be disruptive by leading to social isolation, a breakdown in family life, the loss of a sense of community, and the development of, to use Vance Packard's (1972) term, a "nation of strangers." Most geographic mobility combines both features, depending on particular circumstances.

Copyrighted Material

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Wade Clark Roof (1976), in his critical assessment of traditional religion in contemporary society, argued that in the absence of a religiously based moral order, structural-functional interpretations of commitment in terms of role and status positions appear to be less than satisfactory in explaining traditional religion in modern, industrial society. Instead, he proposed that social sectors in modern life, in which traditional symbols and rituals are meaningful, provide an alternative approach for explaining the social basis of religion in a secular order. In doing so, he turned to the local community as a sphere in modern society that still persists "as a complex system of friendship and kinship networks, formal and informal associations, as well as symbolic attachments, very much rooted in family life and ongoing socialization processes" (197). Roof stressed the importance of locality attachments and participation by citing Luckmann (1967) to the effect that the locality is a micro-universe around which experiences may be structured and interpreted in the modern world: "The local community in modern mass society offers an individual opportunities for nurturing and maintaining the 'private' life, set aside and somewhat distinct from the public sectors of society" (Roof, 1976:206).

Complicating the formulation of the role of community as the context for religious expression are the changes that have occurred in attitudes and behavior among the generation born during the "baby boom" years. Roof (1993) has shown how their experiences have led to a transformation of the role of religion that in the 1990s includes a reemergence of spirituality, religious pluralism, and beliefs and practices that draw on a variety of sources. These changes have created a new desire for networks and community within which to realize religious expressions. This emerging set of religious affiliations and practices has great relevance to any assessment of the impact of migration; relocation from one community to another may break the connections that tie the individual to the local religious community.

The relation among migration and levels of community involvement and extent of Jewish identity may be affected by three processes that generally affect differences between migrants and nonmigrants at origin or destination, regardless of the particular attitudinal or behavioral traits being assessed (cf. S. Goldstein and

Copyrighted Material

A. Goldstein, 1983): *selectivity, adaptation,* and *disruption.* The selectivity perspective views the differentials as having existed before migration occurred. The adaptation response is seen as manifesting itself after migration in response to the conditions of the host population and to facilities in the place of destination. The third perspective (disruption) argues that the migration process itself largely accounts for whatever differentials exist, and these differentials are therefore likely to dissipate with increased duration in place of destination.

In the case of Jewish migration, the *selectivity* model assumes that, compared to nonmovers at origin, migrants are less affiliated in their community of origin and generally less identified with Judaism; they may therefore be less reluctant or even more motivated to move elsewhere. This perspective suggests that, even after all other key variables (such as education and occupation) affecting mobility are controlled, such persons would be more mobile because of their weaker ties to the Jewish community. Moreover, the character of the selection process may change with time, as the strength and nature of individual ties to the community change with the meaning of identity in individual lives. Over time, and especially as migration becomes more common, the migrants may become more typical of the population as a whole so that the differentials associated with the selection process may become less distinct.

The *adaptation* model assumes that Jewish migrants differ minimally from the Jewish population at origin and bring with them to their new destination those attitudes and behavioral traits characteristic of Jews at origin. However, once exposed to the new opportunities and facilities at destination, and after sufficient interaction with the population living there, the migrants are likely to adopt the attitudes and behavior of the "host" population. The major variable here, of course, is who constitutes the host population. If the motives for migrating include the desire to discard one's original identity, then the move may include a concerted effort to "disappear" into the larger community and to avoid contact with the Jewish community. If, on the other hand, there is a desire to maintain or even strengthen Jewish identity and participation, then a concerted effort may be made to search out other Jews, to join Jewish groups, and to live in Jewish neighborhoods. The success of such efforts will depend both on the strength of the motivation and on the degree to which the host

Copyrighted Material

community extends a facilitating hand. The combination of circumstances will determine whether, in fact, the incoming individuals and families differ from or come to resemble the nonmigrant Jewish population in their Jewish characteristics.

We would not expect a uniform pattern among all in-migrants since substantial variation is likely in the motives for moving and in the priorities given to maintaining Jewish identity. For example, in Washington, D.C., Ressler (1993) found that expression of Jewish identity was initially greater among migrants to the capital, but diminished with time spent in Washington. Evidently, the identificational norms of the host community, which involved low levels of affiliation, were conveyed to and adopted by the new residents. The eventual lower levels of involvement of the in-migrants may, on the other hand, be in response to creation of informal networks with other Jews; once created, the formal structure would no longer be as important.

Moreover, duration of residence in itself constitutes a major variable as do the size of the Jewish community, the nature of its facilities, and the extent of difference between sending and receiving communities. As Cohen (1983) points out, a new area of residence may have a "contextual impact," including the effect of such factors as the socioeconomic composition of the area's population, the maturity of the area's institutions, the density of Jewish population, and the proximity to major Jewish communities and central institutions. Some, like Goldscheider (1986), have argued that weakened ties to the formal Jewish community are replaced by other sources of ethnic and identificational cohesion; movement into areas of lower Jewish density may reflect constraints of economic factors and housing markets, but not necessarily a desire to assimilate. Nonetheless, the nature of the adaptation made and the extent to which assimilation does occur will undoubtedly be influenced by contextual factors.

A variation of the adaptation model is the *socialization* model. It also assumes that adaptation to the patterns characterizing the host community will occur, but only after considerable length of residence at destination, often involving one or more generations. Duration of residence in any given location may be limited, however, with extensive repeated movement; the opportunity for integration and adaptation may therefore be seriously restricted.

These two perspectives point to conditions at places of origin or destination as the key variables affecting migrant attitudes and

Copyrighted Material

behavior in comparison to those of nonmigrants. The *disruption* model, by contrast, holds that the migration process itself may be responsible for observed differentials. The differentials would therefore be sharpest immediately following the move and lessen with longer duration of residence, since the disruptive effects of migration are likely to dissipate over time.

Several factors may help to explain the disruptive character of the migration process for Jews. To the extent that community ties within the Jewish population are expressed through membership in temples/synagogues, enrollment of children in educational programs, participation in local organizations, and contributions to local philanthropic activities, a high degree of population movement, especially when it is repeated with some frequency, may disrupt existing patterns of participation or weaken the loyalties they generate.

Reflecting breaks in social ties, in neighborhood cohesion, in school and occupational connections, and in affiliations, the move itself may be sufficiently stressful from a sociopsychological perspective as to interfere with integration into the new setting. Lack of familiarity with resources of the Jewish community and lack of a sense of loyalty to the new location and community may also retard the adaptation process. Sociological research has suggested, for example, that recent migrants to a community are much less active in its formal organizational structure than are long-term residents (Zimmer, 1955; Goldscheider, 1986). In a study of Greater Orlando, Florida, for example, Sheskin (1993) found that membership in a synagogue increased from 21 percent of those who had lived in the area less than five years to at least 38 percent for those with longer residence.

Although participation eventually increases, the adjustment may take from three to five years, and sometimes migrants never reach the same level of participation as persons who grew up in the community. Moreover, if a significant proportion of inmigrants anticipate that they are likely to remain in the community only a few years, the financial and sociopsychological costs involved in becoming members of organized groups and in developing new linkages may discourage efforts to participate and affiliate, thereby exacerbating the disruptive effects of the move. Such costs as initiation fees and required contributions to building funds may serve as barriers to affiliation for newcomers who expect to remain in the community only a few years.

Copyrighted Material

Observances within the home may be less affected by the move than those involving interaction with the larger community, but even the former may depend on the ease with which access is gained in the new setting to Jewish facilities and to the personal contacts and organizations that often facilitate such access. With the passage of time, the migrant may either resume earlier patterns of behavior or adapt to the new contextual conditions and opportunities. Depending on the degree and nature of initial disruption, the development of linkages with both the Jewish community and the larger community may be difficult and prolonged, and the disruptive effects could have a permanent impact.

The problem may be especially acute in smaller communities, where newcomers are often seen as potentially invigorating the local Jewish community. Yet, as Barry Marks (1975) observed, if the newcomers anticipate moving out again in a few years, they contribute little to their current community: "Many of our newcomers . . . still identified primarily with their former communities and spend one or more weekends a month out of town. . . . I've seen a good deal of mobility in the past year—families barely established in [the community] on the move once again" (212).

The selection, adaptation, and disruption processes are not mutually exclusive. Thus, the patterns of affiliation, observance, and other Jewish activities of migrants at the time of a given survey can, in fact, reflect the cumulative effects of all three processes. To isolate any one requires a very rich set of longitudinal data as well as detailed information on the contextual features of the various areas from which and to which the migrants have moved; this is well beyond the possibilities of the data from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey that form the basis of this assessment. While the possible roles of the respective processes in explaining differentials between migrants and nonmigrants and among migrants belonging to subcategories of the Jewish population will be suggested and explored as far as the data allow, definitive answers are not likely.

Migration may also have a positive impact on the individual and the community. It could help enhance the Jewish identity of individuals by bringing them to communities with more extensive facilities and fuller opportunities for interaction with other Jews. Those Jews wishing to have easy access to other Jews and to Jewish facilities—like synagogues/temples, schools, and kosher butchers—may opt to shift residence from areas of weak Jewish life to

Copyrighted Material

areas that are more Jewish. This may be especially true of Orthodox and, to a lesser degree, of Conservative Jews. Some of the movement from smaller towns to larger cities and from states and regions more heavily secular to those containing higher proportions of observant Jews may reflect such concerns.

At the same time, by bringing additional population to smaller communities or to declining ones, migration can also provide the kind of "demographic transfusion" and minimum population density needed to help maintain or to develop basic institutions and facilities essential for a vital Jewish community. This would be especially true if the in-migrating Jews have a strong Jewish identity and can assume leadership roles and provide models for the less committed. Migration may also have a positive effect by bridging the traditional age and affiliation cleavages that characterize some communities, thereby providing the social cement needed to hold the community together and to enhance Jewish continuity across the generations (Lebowitz, 1975). Whether mobility varies among the denominational subsegments of the Jewish community and between these groups and those identifying as secular Jews also has significance for ties to the larger community and for individual identity.

Jaret (1978), using data from Chicago, found that geographic mobility has different impications for Reform/nonaffiliated and for Orthodox/Conservative Jews. For the former, mobility was linked to reduced ethnic identification and participation. Among the latter, mobility apparently did not necessarily mean ethnic detachment, and even promoted ethnic participation. If these differentials can be generalized, any substantial change in the degree to which Jews identify with, and are committed to, their ethnic community could well be associated with both higher levels of residential mobility and lower levels of social participation. Cause and effect remain to be determined.

In interviews conducted in Iowa, New Jersey, and Oregon in 1972 on the relation between geographic mobility, social integration, and church attendance, Welch and Baltzell (1984) found that geographic mobility inhibits attendance indirectly through disrupting an individual's network of social ties and bonds of community attachment. The authors suggest that a reference group perspective may be useful in interpreting the observed patterns. Migrants may experience resocialization pressures as they encounter community norms that might deemphasize formal

Copyrighted Material

church attendance. Adoption of these norms, rather than disruption per se, may therefore be responsible for the change in behavior. Exposure to a variety of norms in the new social setting may encourage a relativistic perspective that allows individuals to evaluate new norms more critically and to choose new styles of behavior (cf. de Vaus, 1982). As the authors stress, full evaluation of the process requires data that allow attention to localism, multiple measures of past and present attendance, community religious norms, and propensity for norm violation.

Concurrently, mobility may contribute to the development of a national Jewish society, characterized by greater population dispersion and by greater population exchange among various localities (Goldstein, 1991). Both processes require more effective networking among locations in order to insure continuing opportunities and stimuli for mobile individuals and families to maintain their Jewish identity and their links to the Jewish community, regardless of where they live or how often they move from place to place. Greater dispersion, especially to smaller communities and to more isolated ones, also requires development of methods to insure that such communities are better able through their own facilities or through links to other, larger communities to service the social, psychological, economic, health, and religious needs of both their migrant and nonmigrant populations (Goldstein, 1990).

EVIDENCE FROM PAST STUDIES

Community Studies in the 1960s

Despite migration's importance for understanding the dynamics of population change both nationally and in individual communities, little attention was given to Jewish population movement in most studies undertaken before the 1970s (Goldstein, 1971:34–52). Some insights were provided by studies of individual Jewish communities, but to the extent that each community is unique in some respects, the possibility of generalizing to the total Jewish American population was limited. National data first became available from the results of the 1970/71 National Jewish Population Study (NJPS-1970/71). These findings reinforced those from earlier community studies which suggested that, judged either by the pro-

Copyrighted Material

portion of population born outside the community of residence or by the length of time individuals had resided in the area of enumeration, high levels of mobility characterized American Jewry.

The 1963 Detroit study (Mayer, 1966a), which ascertained the place of birth of the resident population, found that only one-third of the total Jewish population of Detroit was born in the city; 28 percent were foreign-born; and 36 percent had moved to Detroit from other places in the United States, with over half of these coming from other cities and towns in Michigan. A similar finding emerged from the 1964 Camden, New Jersey, study (Westoff, 1964): only one-third were born in the Camden area, and almost 60 percent had moved there from elsewhere in the United States. The small balance of foreign-born reflected the area's more recent growth as a place of Jewish residence, partly as a suburb of Philadelphia.

The 1963 Greater Providence study (Goldstein, 1964), which encompassed almost all of Rhode Island's Jewish population, found that 60 percent of all Jews living in the area were born in the state. Of the 40 percent who were born elswhere, 16 percent were foreign-born and 24 percent originated in other states. Virtually identical patterns emerged for Springfield, Massachusetts (Goldstein, 1968).

Mobility can also be measured by length of residence in the area. The 1964–65 Milwaukee study (Mayer, 1966b), for example, found that 60 percent of the city's Jews had been living in their current residence for less than ten years and 40 percent for less than five years. These data suggest a high degree of residential mobility, although they did not specify whether it took the form of intraurban mobility or migration across larger distances. The 1965 Boston study (Axelrod, Fowler, and Gurin, 1967) also suggested a high degree of mobility. Half the population had lived at their present address for less than ten years, and almost one-third for five years or less. The age statistics confirmed that, like the general American population, the highest mobility characterized those in their twenties; 70 percent of Boston's Jews age 20–29 had lived at their surveyed address less than five years compared, for example, to 10 percent of those age 60–69. Further reflecting the high mobility of Boston's Jews, 34 percent intended to move in the near future. Part of the high mobility in the Boston area reflects the high concentration there of college/university students.

Copyrighted Material

The 1969 Columbus, Ohio, study (Mayer, 1970) was among the first to document that levels of mobility varied between the older, more concentrated areas of settlement and the newer, less densely Jewish areas. The former were inhabited more by persons who were born in the community, and who were also characterized by lower educational levels, were more likely businessmen than professionals, and were inclined toward more traditional religious beliefs and practices. The results suggested that the importance of religion as a basis for selecting areas of residence was diminishing in favor of socioeconomic criteria. This in turn suggested a greater dispersion of the Jewish population in the future, as the traditional forces that had led to settlement in areas of high Jewish density weakened and as the motivations for mobility that characterized the American population as a whole also came to characterize the Jewish population.

A few studies also suggested that the rising educational level of Jews and changes in their occupational profiles could contribute to an increasing rate of population movement. For example, statistics from Toledo, Ohio (Rosen, 1970), indicated that national operations had brought to Toledo a surprisingly large number of Jewish men in managerial positions, and that the local university had had a substantial increase in the number of Jewish faculty. At the same time, 45 percent to 60 percent of young Jews raised in Toledo had moved to distant cities after college graduation to begin employment.

Based on the experience of the general American population, the pattern identified by the Toledo study seemed likely to become more typical of the Jewish population, resulting in increasing migration levels and increasingly higher rates of repeated movement by the same persons. General migration studies of the American population had already documented higher than average mobility of professionals and other highly educated persons because of the unequal regional demands for their talents and their greater responsiveness to opportunities around the country. Moreover, as the Toledo report on the national corporations suggested, many national firms had adopted company policies of relocating staff, especially executives and professionals, as the needs of the firm's various branches changed and as a way of upgrading ranks. As the proportion of Jews holding such positions increased, the rate of Jewish population mobility was likely to increase, too.

Copyrighted Material

This possibility had been recognized by Glazer and Moynihan (1963:150) as early as 1963: "The son wants the business to be bigger and better and perhaps he would rather be a cog in a great corporation than the manager in a small one. He may not enjoy the tight Jewish community with its limited horizons and its special satisfactions—he is not that much of a Jew any more." Status may thus be the drawing force of third-generation Americans, just as financial success was the major consideration of second-generation Americans. The decline in discriminatory practices and the greater availability of executive and professional positions formerly closed to Jews were also expected to stimulate the greater geographic dispersal of those Jews willing to develop occupational careers outside the communities where they were raised.

That this was already happening in the 1960s was strongly suggested not only by the Toledo data but also by evidence from the 1963 study of Greater Providence (Goldstein, 1964). Among the surveyed families, only one-third of the sons age 40 and over were living outside Rhode Island, compared to half of the sons age 20–39 and almost two-thirds of those under age 20. Although fewer daughters lived away from their parental community, the basic age differentials paralleled those characterizing the sons.

These data clearly suggested a weakening in the kinship ties of Jewish Americans, as measured by a greater tendency of children to live at some distance from parental family. They supported Gerhard Lenski's (1963) thesis that one of the best indicators of the changing importance attached to family and kin groups by modern Americans is their willingness to leave their native community and move elsewhere. Since most migration is motivated by economic and occupational considerations, he suggested, migration serves as an indicator of the strength of economic motives compared to kinship ties. In modern society the continual removal of economic rewards out of the hands of kin and extended family groups lessens the dominance of Jewish families over the socioeconomic placement of its young. The changing kinship relations, coupled with more fluid labor markets, contributed to higher mobility rates. To the extent these trends could be expected to persist, they pointed to increased mobility in future decades. The 1987 Rhode Island study (Goldscheider and Goldstein, 1988), for example, found that almost 60 percent of all respondents' sons and daughters age 25–64 lived outside the state, well above the 1963 level and with minimal differences by gender.

Copyrighted Material

While the data from these individual community studies provided valuable insights into the extent and character of Jewish population movement, they also documented clearly that mobility levels varied considerably among communities, depending on size, location, the age of the Jewish settlement, the age structure of the Jewish population, and the availability of Jewish facilities and resources. They also suggested that the pull of living in areas inhabited by other Jews and serviced by Jewish institutions remained strong even while the attraction of being part of more integrated areas and of taking advantage of the full range of residential, social, educational, and occcupational opportunities was gaining momentum. The latter forces might have become more important in influencing whether Jews moved and in their choice of destination. To the extent that new areas of residence had lower Jewish population and institutional density, increased mobility might have impinged seriously on the cohesiveness of the Jewish community and on the likelihood that migrating Jews would retain a strong Jewish identity. Indeed, it might be in part responsible for increasing rates of intermarriage and assimilation.

Yet, the community studies in themselves, while highly suggestive of the extent and impact of migration, could not adequately or fully document the process or its effects nationally. In addition to varying on a wide range of characteristics, individual communities differed significantly in the survey sampling methods used to identify the Jewish population, in the questions and definitions employed, and in the way the data were tabulated. This lack of standardization created serious difficulties in attributing differences in migration patterns among communities to the actual characteristics of the communities or to differences in research designs and analytic methods. Undoubtedly, both factors were operating in most cases.

Individual community studies were also of limited value because they usually encompassed only one side of the mobility picture. Relying on samples of the population resident in the community at the time of the survey, only in-migrants to the community were assured coverage. Persons who had moved away were not generally encompassed by the studies, except in surveys that asked about household members, especially children, who had out-migrated. However, even here the picture was incomplete; when entire households had moved away they were completely

Copyrighted Material

missed. For all these reasons, local studies made generalizations to the national scene difficult if not dangerous.

The 1970/71 National Jewish Population Survey

A national survey that covers both areas of out-migration and in-migration and that relies on the best possible sampling procedures, with appropriate definitions and questions, is able to overcome the limitations of community studies. The decision by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds to undertake a National Jewish Population Survey in 1970/71 provided an opportunity to realize these goals more effectively than had heretofore been possible (Massarik, 1992).

The study was designed to sample the entire Jewish population of the United States, including marginal and unaffiliated Jews as well as those closely identified with the organized Jewish community, in every geographic region of the country, and generally from every Jewish community with an initially estimated population of 30,000 or more (Massarik and Chenkin, 1973). Interviews were also conducted in appropriate proportions in medium-sized and small Jewish communities, and special efforts were made to contact Jewish households in a sample of counties which had until then been assumed to contain few Jewish households.

Two types of samples were used: (1) an "area probability sample," collected by contacting and screening many thousands of households on a door-to-door basis to identify those including a Jewish member; and (2) a "list sample" based on households known to have at least one Jewish member through inclusion of the household on lists either furnished by Jewish communities or developed specifically for the study. The two sample groups were combined through proper weighting to provide the needed balance between marginal Jews and those directly associated with their Jewish community. A total of 7,179 households were included in the national sample, encompassing a weighted sample size of 33,165 individuals.

The wide range of questions included in the omnibus survey included several on mobility. They provided the basis for obtaining information on lifetime migration (based on comparison of place of residence in 1970/71 and place of birth), mobility between 1965 and the time of the survey, and the last move. Information was also obtained on mobility expectations in the five

Copyrighted Material

years following the survey. Background data on the socioeconomic characteristics of the surveyed population allowed assessment of differentials between migrants and nonmigrants (Goldstein, 1981).

Unfortunately, the data from NJPS-1970/71 were not as fully analyzed as the richness of its contents justified.[1] The limited evaluation did, however, document relatively high mobility rates: one quarter of the native-born Jewish population was living in a state other than that in which they were born, a level of interstate lifetime movement quite similar to that of the native-white population of the United States. Eight percent of the adult population had moved interstate within the 5–6 years immediately preceding the survey, and as many as one-third of the entire adult population were living in a town or city other than that in which they had resided in 1965. The observed patterns of redistribution indicated a migration loss of Jews for the Northeast, minimum net change in the Midwest, and migration gains for the South and the West, as well as substantial decreases in the concentrations in central cities and a more generally dispersed Jewish population (Goldstein, 1982).

The tendency for migration rates to be higher for those with more education and for education to be positively correlated with movement involving greater distance (see chapter 4) confirmed earlier suggestions that higher levels of enrollment in colleges and universities would be an important factor in Jewish mobility levels and patterns. Such a conclusion was reinforced by the observed occupational differentials, which pointed to a positive association between white-collar employment and levels and distance of migration.

The continuation of a high degree of movement in future years was also suggested by the answers to questions on anticipated moves. Of the total population, 16 percent indicated plans to move within at least five years, but as many as six out of every ten adults age 25–29 expected to do so. Such high rates are obviously related to the family formation and career stages of persons in this cohort. The rates declined with increasing age.

The evaluation of the NJPS-1970/71 data supported the thesis that Jewish population mobility had to be considered a key variable in any assessment of the future vitality the Jewish American community.

Copyrighted Material

Community Studies after NJPS-1970/71

Between NJPS-1970/71 and NJPS-1990, no other full-scale study of the national Jewish population was undertaken that allowed detailed attention to migration. As a result, insights about changes in this twenty-year interval again must be derived from community studies. They continued to document high levels of mobility. Since several communities that had given attention to migration in their first survey undertook second and, in the case of Boston, third surveys between 1970 and 1990, some assessment could be made of the persistence of earlier patterns.

Only selected evidence from these studies need be cited here. The 1972 Dallas survey (Maynard, 1974) found that only 35 percent of the population were born in Dallas, and a high percentage of these were children. Over half the Jewish population had moved to Dallas from other parts of the United States, and an additional 14 percent were foreign born. Consistent with the patterns of regional redistribution noted earlier, almost one-quarter of the U.S.-born migrants to Dallas originated in the Northeast, and just over one quarter in the Midwest. Similarly, the 1976 Greater Kansas City survey (*Jewish Population Study*, 1979) found that "not only are the majority of household heads not born in Kansas City, but there is little tendency for this proportion to increase among the younger people."

Evidence from northern New Jersey suggested that weakening kinship ties were associated with high levels of mobility (Verbit, 1971). Only about one-quarter of the sons and daughters among those children living outside their parental home remained in the same general area, and an additional quarter were living in other areas of the state. What is most important is that as many as 25 percent were residing in parts of the United States outside New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, pointing to the substantial dispersion of family members.

That the levels of migration were increasing for the Jewish population was strongly suggested by the 1987 Rhode Island survey (Goldscheider and Goldstein, 1988), a study similar to that conducted twenty-four years earlier for Greater Providence. The 1987 study found that only one-third of those surveyed had lived in Rhode Island all their lives, compared to about half of those surveyed in 1963. The highest migration rate characterized younger adults; seven out of every ten persons age 18–45 were in-

Copyrighted Material

migrants to Rhode Island. This compared to only 36 percent of this age range in 1963. Of the American-born Jews living in Rhode Island in 1987, 45 percent were born in other states, compared to only one-quarter in 1963. Moreover, more of the migrants living in the state in 1987, especially the younger population, came from more distant parts of the United States than in 1963: 28 percent from outside New England, compared to only 14 percent in 1963.

As in 1963, the redistribution patterns also affected movement of Jews away from Rhode Island. Six of every ten children living away from parental home were living outside the state. In contrast to 1963, by 1987 almost equal proportions of children in all age groups were living outside the state. That such separation was no longer exceptional for younger groups corroborates other evidence of increasing Jewish mobility levels over the past several decades. Similarly, considerable out-migration seems to have characterized middle-aged and older persons. Even after taking account of mortality, the number of older persons enumerated in 1987 was considerably below the number projected on the basis of the population surveyed in 1963. The substantially higher percentage of Rhode Island Jews who were in-migrants in the state by 1987 compared to 1963, the out-migration of others, and the greater dispersal of the population within the state, all represent an accentuation of patterns observed a quarter century earlier.

The 1987 Rhode Island data also showed that recent migrants had lower levels of Jewish organizational affiliation than did those who had always lived in the state. The relation between recency of migration and synagogue/temple membership was especially clear: for persons under age 65, migration was associated with lower levels of affiliation, especially in the period immediately following settlement in the new community.

Rhode Island is clearly not typical of the country as a whole, but in the past changes in the general population of the state have often preceded those in the nation as a whole. The changing patterns of Jewish mobility behavior may thus also anticipate changes that will come to characterize American Jewry as a whole, or at least reflect the ongoing processes in the older sections of the nation, including the Northeast and the Midwest.

Boston is unique in having undertaken surveys decennially since 1965. Moreover, the data from the 1965 and 1975 Boston studies have also been the subject of intensive analyses by Steven

Copyrighted Material

Cohen (1983) and Calvin Goldscheider (1986). Unfortunately, the treatment of migration in the three surveys was not uniform, making comparisons across time difficult.

The 1965 survey used length of residence in present home as its measure of mobility. It found that 31 percent of the Greater Boston population had lived in their present home for less than five years and half had done so for less than ten years. Although these data point to a high level of mobility, they do not distinguish between local and longer-distance movers. Indicative of future mobility, 34 percent of the total population reported definite or tentative plans to move within the next two years, but most of the intended movement was expected to occur within the Greater Boston area, especially to newer suburbs.

The results of the 1975 survey, as reanalyzed by Goldscheider (1986), pointed to considerably higher mobility among Jews than non-Jews in the area. Only one-fifth of the Jews but almost four out of every ten non-Jews had lived in their community for twenty years or more; moreover, higher mobility characterized every age group of the Jewish population. As many as four in ten Jews, but only one-quarter of the non-Jews, resided in their 1975 community less than three years. This rose to over three-fourths of the Jews age 18–29, compared to half of the non-Jews.

That Jews were highly mobile was corroborated by the data on their origins. Four in ten of the Jewish population were born in the United States but outside the Boston metropolitan area, compared to only 29 percent of non-Jews. This picture of substantial movement from outside the Greater Boston area persisted when the assessment was based on comparison of place of residence in 1975 compared to ten years earlier. Almost one-third of the Jews, but only 22 percent of the non-Jews, lived outside the metropolitan area.

The Boston data also pointed to substantial differences between migrants and nonmigrants in various indicators of Jewishness. For example, whereas 66 percent of those who had lived in Boston city ten years earlier reported that most of their friends were Jewish, only 33 percent of those migrating from outside the metropolitan area did so. Whereas 55 percent of the former valued living in a Jewish neighborhood, only one-third of the migrants did. Fifteen percent of the 10-year Boston residents were nondenominational, in contrast to 40 percent of the migrants

Copyrighted Material

from outside the metropolitan area. Synagogue attendance, however, showed minimal difference.

On the basis of his in-depth analysis, however, Goldscheider (1986:57) concluded that "while there appears to be a relationship between migration and disaffection from the Jewish community, that relationship is mainly because movers are younger and more educated. The net effects of migration per se are weak, except among those with the shortest durations of residence." Since, for many migrants to a community, residence does not extend to more than a few years, the opportunities to integrate more fully may be limited. The much lower levels of Jewishness characterizing such recent migrants may, in fact, be indicative of a longer term situation for those who experience frequent movement.

In this respect, Stephen Cohen's (1983:111) conclusions, also using the Boston data, but with different types of analyses, seem relevant:

> [H]igh residential mobility . . . is a crucial factor influencing communal affiliation. Movers are indeed less often affiliated than nonmovers. In part this is so because movers are initially different from—primarily younger than—the residentially stable. Indeed, this process of self-selection is the principal reason why recent movers contribute less often to philanthropic causes. However, joining a synagogue is a much more localistic activity than participating in Jewish charitable drives. As a result, synagogue membership is adversely affected by residential mobility as well as by the antecedents of mobility (especially age and life cycle).
>
> In particular, the residentially mobile disrupt their ties to family, friends, and formal institutions; and they take five or more years to reestablish those ties in their new residential locales. Moreover, they are likely to move to those areas where residential mobility is high and where, as a consequence, established informal networks and mature communal institutions are relatively rare.

The 1985 statistics on mobility for the Boston community pointed to continued high levels of mobility—quite similar, in fact, to those of 1975 (Israel, 1987). As in 1975, the highest rates of mobility characterized the younger segment of the population, partly reflecting the heavy concentration of students enrolled in educational institutions in the area. Moreover, four out of every

Copyrighted Material