

Jews on the Move: Implications for National and Local Communities in the United States

Sidney Goldstein

The high mobility levels of the Jewish population and their increasing dispersion throughout the United States present new challenges to the national Jewish community, as well as to local Jewish communities and to individual Jews¹. Internal migration has most likely become the major dynamic responsible for the growth or decline of many Jewish communities and for the redistribution of the Jewish American population across the United States in a pattern quite different from that characterizing American Jewry earlier in the century. Indeed, internal migration and generational change probably constitute the two most important ongoing processes that help explain many of the other demographic, social, and economic changes that affect the ties of the individual Jew to the larger Jewish community.

The high level of education of American Jews and the kinds of occupations which they are now able to enter often result in movement away from family and place of origin; this often also means movement out of centers of Jewish population concentration. Moreover, many high level positions require repeated transfers, which may make it more difficult for individuals and families to plant deep roots in any single Jewish community. Such geographic mobility may weaken individual ties by reducing the opportunities to become fully integrated into a particular local community (cf., Zimmer, 1955; Roof, 1976; Wuthnow and Christiano, 1979) and by increasing opportunities for greater interaction with non-Jews, with resulting higher rates of intermarriage and assimilation.

Cohen (1988) offers three possible reasons why the mobile segments of the population may be less affiliated than the stable elements:

- 1) Compared to non-movers, those who move may have been less affiliated in their communities of origin;
- 2) The act of movement itself may be disruptive of formal and informal ties to family, friends, and local institutions; the process of reconstitution of such links, if they occur at all, may take years;
- 3) The new area of residence may have a "contextual impact" (a process demographers refer to as adaptation).

Contextual factors affecting affiliation, according to Cohen, include the socio-economic 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 density may

therefore reflect constraints of economic factors and housing markets but not necessarily a desire to assimilate.

On a more positive note, migration may help to renew the vitality of smaller communities or of formerly declining ones, by contributing to the greater density needed to develop basic institutions or to maintain existing ones. It may also do so, as Lebowitz (1975) has suggested, by bridging the traditional age and affiliation cleavages, thereby providing the 'social cement' needed to hold the community together.

Concurrently, mobility may contribute to the development of a national Jewish society, characterized both by greater population dispersion and by greater population exchange among various localities (cf. Goldstein, 1987). Both processes require more effective networking among locations in order to insure continuing opportunities and stimuli for mobile individuals to maintain their Jewish identity and their ties 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 means to ensure that such communities are better able through their own facilities or through links to other, larger communities to service the individual social, psychological, economic, health, and religious needs of both their migrant and non-migrant populations.

Data Sources: National and Local

To assess fully the extent of migration and its effect on the American-Jewish community requires national data with information covering both in- and out-migration involving different types of communities. Reliance on individual community surveys provides a one-sided picture; they usually encompass only those living in the community at the time of the survey and therefore provide no information on who and how many have left, where they have gone, or whether they are likely to return. Some insights on out-migration can be gained by asking respondents in a local survey about individual members of the household who have moved away, but this provides only partial coverage of total out-migration since entire households that have moved are not encompassed by the survey. These limitations of local surveys constitute one of the important arguments in favor of launching a national survey of the Jewish population which, especially when complemented by community surveys, will provide insights on both the national patterns and the ways in which these vary by community type.

Recognizing the need for a national overview, the Council of Jewish Federations in 1970-71 undertook the National Jewish Population Study (NJPS). This was an ambitious, important attempt to conduct a nationwide survey that would be fully representative of the United States Jewish population, including marginal and unaffiliated Jews as well as those closely identified with the organized Jewish community. The wide range of topics encompassed in this survey of over 7,000 households included questions on mobility. These data, together with background information on household members, provided the basis for evaluating the patterns of

population movement and redistribution among American Jews in 1970-71 (Goldstein, 1982).

The high rates of mobility shown by the NJPS data on lifetime and recent migration as well as local residential mobility strongly supported the thesis that Jews were participating in the major currents of population redistribution characterizing Americans as a whole. Observed patterns of redistribution pointed to fewer Jews in the Northeast and North Central regions and more in the South and West; wider dispersion throughout metropolitan areas, associated with substantial decreases in the concentrations in central cities; and greater movement to non-metropolitan areas, to smaller urban places, and to rural locations.

That the trends suggested by these data were likely to be accentuated in ensuing decades was indicated by the socioeconomic differentials observed: a) education tended to be positively correlated with rate of migration and with distance of move; and b) white collar employment was positively associated with levels and distance of mobility. Rising age at marriage, a decline in the propensity to marry, increases in marital disruption, and continuing low fertility were also seen as conducive to higher levels of mobility and long-distance mobility in the years ahead.

Overall, the patterns observed in the analysis of the NJPS statistics suggested that Jewish population mobility had to be considered a key variable in any assessment of the dynamics of demographic change in the American Jewish community. Changes of residence had clear, significant implications for the communities of origin and destination as well as for the migrating individual and family. Moreover, as population mobility comes to extend over a growing web of metropolitan areas, states, and regions, such movements acquire much broader significance at the national level.

Unfortunately, no national study of the Jewish population has taken place since 1970-71. One is planned for 1990. Migration will be one of the important components of that survey. Until then, the absence of new national statistics forces us to rely on the insights provided by community surveys. Since 1980, at least 45 such studies have been initiated (Goldstein, 1988). As a result, about three-quarters of the total Jewish American population has been surveyed. Nevertheless, our knowledge of the dynamics of population change and particularly migration on the Jewish American scene is incomplete for several reasons.

Attention given to migration in local surveys is often minimal and sometimes non-existent. We have not yet fully developed or adopted standardized procedures for asking questions and for tabulating and analyzing the survey data. Lack of standardization extends particularly to the types of questions asked about population mobility and the ways in which the data collected on movement have been tabulated and analyzed. This makes it particularly difficult to utilize in a comparative analysis the information on mobility from the various surveys conducted in recent years. The sampling designs used vary considerably. In many communities, reliance on Federation lists for sampling means that the coverage may be biased in favor of those migrants who are more readily identified as Jews, more involved in the community, and less likely to be repeat migrants (Phillips, 1986). Moreover, because larger communities are more likely to undertake population

surveys, gaps still exist in our knowledge of the situation in medium and small sized communities and of the effect of regional location (Friedman and Zober, 1989).

For these reasons, an in-depth analysis of the data from a particular community rather than a superficial comparative assessment of data sets from various communities seems the best approach for gaining insight into the levels and patterns of movement characterizing the Jewish population in the 1980s. The survey of the Jewish population of Rhode Island (Goldscheider and Goldstein, 1988) provides such an opportunity. It encompassed both affiliated and unaffiliated Jews and included a considerable range of questions on the geographic mobility of members of the households surveyed and of former household members who had moved away. In addition, information is available on key socio-demographic background characteristics and on indicators of integration into the Jewish community. Together, these data form the basis of the analysis which follows.

The first comprehensive assessment of the Rhode Island Jewish community was completed in 1963 (Goldstein, 1964; Goldstein and Goldscheider, 1968). That survey encompassed the Greater Providence area and was based on a sample drawn from updated lists of the Jewish households maintained by the local federation. Recognizing the inadequacy of 1963 data for planning for the 1990s, the Jewish Federation of Rhode Island undertook a second survey of the State's Jewish population in 1987 (Goldscheider and Goldstein, 1988).

The 1987 survey of Rhode Island Jewry encompasses the entire State of Rhode Island. It is based on a combination of two sampling procedures. Approximately three quarters of the households were selected through a random sample chosen from the lists of the Jewish Federation of Rhode Island, which, after updating, contained approximately 6,600 households. The balance came from a sample, generated by random digit dialing (RDD), of all households with telephones in Rhode Island. Since fewer than 2 percent of the household units in Rhode Island were estimated to be Jewish, 18,000 households had to be contacted to identify the several hundred households containing Jewish members to supplement the sample from the Federation list. The RDD sample served to ensure coverage of Jewish households not on the Federation roster.

In each household, one person age 21 or older (age 18-20 if no one age 21 or over was a member of the household) was randomly selected to be the respondent. Each respondent was asked questions about all members of the household and other questions, including attitudinal ones, that related only to the respondent himself/herself. A total of 1,455 households were contacted for interviews. From among these, interviews were obtained from 1,129, representing a response rate of 78 percent. These data were weighted to approximate the total Jewish population of Rhode Island. The weighted data will be used in this analysis and all numbers cited in the following discussion will be the weighted statistics, covering 7,224 households encompassing 17,024 persons.

The 1987 survey obtained standard information on country—or if in the U.S.—state of birth, as well as residence 5 years before the survey. In addition, a series of questions was asked about all household members 18 years of age and over with respect to year of the most recent move to Rhode Island, the country or state of origin for those who were migrants, year of move to present city or town and the

origin of that move, and year and origin of the move to current residence. For respondents only, information was collected on whether or not a move was anticipated within the next three years, and, if so, to what destination. Supplementary information was also collected on residences and on migration from Rhode Island of the parents of the respondent and of the children of the respondent and his/her spouse, and whether those who were living out of the State planned to move to Rhode Island at some future date.

Beyond these questions directed specifically at migration, a host of additional questions obtained information on background characteristics, on religious behavior and attitudes, and on social and economic involvement in the life of the community. The analysis which follows will be restricted to assessment of migration into the State of Rhode Island, the smallest state in the Union, covering only about 1,200 square miles. Because of its small size, the State's Jewish population is organized as a single community under the Jewish Federation of Rhode Island. The paper begins with an overall description of the migration patterns of the population, set against some background information on migration to Rhode Island generally. Following this, attention will focus on how the migrants to the State, classified by duration of residence, differ from non-migrants with respect to socioeconomic characteristics. Finally, migrants and non-migrants will be compared on selected behavioral indicators designed to measure integration into the religious and social life of the community.

Migration Patterns: Volume and Direction

The size and composition of Rhode Island's Jewish population, like the general population, have changed as a combined result of the differences between the number of births and deaths and the balance of in-migrants compared to out-migrants. Between 1970 and 1987, the population of the State as a whole experienced losses through migration. While the pattern of gain or loss has varied from year to year over this period, it has been estimated that the number of out-migrants from the State exceeded the number of in-migrants by 38,000 persons. Had it not been for the excess of births over deaths in this interval, Rhode Island's 1987 estimated population of 986,000 would have been considerably smaller. In fact, between 1970 and 1980, a small decline (2,600 persons) did occur because natural increase was not sufficiently large to offset the population loss resulting from net out-migration. Recent estimates suggest that, reflecting improved economic conditions, population growth has resumed since 1980, with small gains from migration supplementing the additions from natural increase.

In Providence, where many of Rhode Island's Jews have lived, the exodus among the total population has been so heavy over the last several decades that natural increase could only partly compensate for migration losses. The city's population declined from a high of 253,504 in 1940 to 207,498 in 1960 and to 156,804 in 1980; only in 1987, when the population was estimated at 158,700 was there an indication that this long-term decline may have halted. Much of Providence's loss resulted in gains for suburban communities, but beginning in the 1970s, the inner suburbs grew

more slowly because of lower rates of migration from Providence and from outside the State.

There is every reason to believe that migration among Jews has paralleled the migration trend of Rhode Island's total population. The great value that Jews place on higher education has meant that a large percentage of Jews have been entering the professions. Many young people leave to go to college elsewhere in the United States, and a substantial proportion do not return because of the limited employment opportunities in Rhode Island. The attractiveness of the State to potential immigrants may be changing, however, as a result of improved economic conditions in the 1980s. In the 1960-80 decades, the poor economic situation probably attracted fewer Jews, just as fewer persons in general moved into the State.

The overall level of out-migration may be exacerbated by the tendency of older persons to move to warmer climates upon retirement. Together with the low and possibly negative natural increase that characterizes Rhode Island Jewry, the substantial out-migration of Jews helps to explain the total decline in the size of the Jewish population over the past quarter century from 20,000 in 1963 to 17,000 in 1987.

To the extent that the 1987 survey focused heavily on the population living in the State at the time of the survey, it is not possible to evaluate fully the net impact of out-migration on Rhode Island's Jewish population. Of necessity, therefore, the analysis must be restricted largely to the migration patterns of those resident in the State in 1987. These data can, however, be augmented by the limited insights into out-migration provided by the information collected about children and parents not living in the respondent's household.

State of Birth

Over the years, Rhode Island's Jewish population has grown not only through the immigration of persons from overseas (8 percent of Rhode Island's Jews were foreign-born in 1987) but also by the movement to the State of native-born Jews from other parts of the country. Of the American-born Jews living in Rhode Island in 1987, 45 percent were born in other parts of the United States (Table 1), compared to only 25 percent of the total American-born population living in Rhode Island in

TABLE 1. STATE OF BIRTH OF U.S.-BORN JEWISH RESIDENTS OF RHODE ISLAND, BY AGE, 1987, AND TOTAL ONLY, 1963

Age	Total percent	Total number	Rhode Island*	Mass.	Other New England	New York	New Jersey Penna.	Other	Unknown
Under 15	100.0	2,321	77.6	7.5	3.7	2.2	2.2	6.4	0.3
15-24	100.0	1,652	57.5	10.9	5.5	9.2	2.1	14.3	0.5
25-44	100.0	4,229	46.3	10.5	4.8	19.7	7.3	10.9	0.6
45-64	100.0	4,036	49.7	16.5	3.7	18.6	5.1	6.4	-
65 and over	100.0	3,059	57.9	15.3	3.3	14.3	3.5	5.7	-
All ages, 1987	100.0	15,297	55.4	12.7	4.1	14.5	4.6	8.4	0.4
All ages, 1963	100.0	15,708	72.1	11.7	2.5	8.8	2.1	2.8	-

a. In following tables: RI.

1980. This large difference represents a substantial change from 1963 when Jews resembled the general American-born persons in Rhode Island, with about one-fourth having been born outside the State.

A considerable increase has thus occurred since 1963 in the proportion of Rhode Island's Jewish residents who migrated to Rhode Island from outside the State, even while no change took place in the level of such in-migration for the non-Jewish population. In part, this shifting pattern may stem from the out-migration of a considerable number of Jews born in Rhode Island, thereby resulting in a lower percentage of natives and a higher percentage of in-migrants among those living in the State in 1987. It is likely, however, that Jews have, in fact, recently experienced a higher in-migration rate than the general population, reflecting differentials in the particular types of economic opportunities available. The increase of about 20 points in the percentage of American-born Jews in Rhode Island who were not natives of the State has significant implications for the community, if the degree of identification with the community and involvement in its activities varies between those born there and those moving into the State.

Most of those American-born who had moved to Rhode Island by 1987 came from nearby states, although the distance of move has clearly increased during the last quarter century (Table 1). The 17 percent born in other New England states is similar to the 1963 level of 14 percent. But relatively more of the 1987 residents came from New York and the other Middle Atlantic states than did so in 1963 (19 percent compared to only 11 percent). All the other states contributed only eight percent to Rhode Island's U.S.-born Jewish population, but even this was three times as high as in 1963. The rise in out-of-staters characterized all age groups under 65 years, as did the upsurge in those coming from areas farther from Rhode Island. The higher mobility and the wider geographic range of state-of-origin is consistent with the greater population mobility that seems to have become a feature of the American Jewish community and which has led to an increasing redistribution of the population across the country (see Ritterband, 1986).

Recent Migration and Duration of Residence

A major concern with the impact of migration on the community and on individual identification is the extent to which migrants integrate into the community in which they are settling, in this case the Rhode Island Jewish community. Duration of residence has been suggested as an important variable affecting such integration (Jaret, 1978). To assess the impact of duration of residence, a finer subdivision of the migrant population is therefore desirable. For such purposes, a distinction is drawn between those who moved into the State during the five years (1983-87) preceding the survey (recent migrants), those who did so 5-10 years (1978-82) before the survey (intermediate migrants), and finally those who have lived in the State for longer than 10 years, subdivided into those who moved to the State before 1978 (long-term migrants) and those who have always lived in Rhode Island (non-migrants). In the analysis which follows, attention is given to the characteristics of these various migrant groups. Thereafter, the paper assesses their integration into the community as judged by membership in Jewish organizations and in synagogues and temples.

TABLE 2. YEAR OF MOVE TO RHODE ISLAND, BY AGE AND SEX

Age and year moved to Rhode Island	Total	Males	Females
All adults			
1983-1987	7.4	6.8	7.9
1978-1982	8.1	9.1	7.1
Before 1978	49.4	46.5	52.1
Always in RI	35.1	37.6	32.9
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number ^a	13,088	6,170	6,918
Under 45 years			
1983-1987	15.1	13.4	16.8
1978-1982	14.7	16.4	13.1
Before 1978	38.0	38.7	37.2
Always in RI	32.2	31.4	32.9
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number	5,285	2,591	2,694
45-64 years			
1983-1987	2.4	2.7	2.2
1978-1982	4.0	5.1	3.1
Before 1978	59.1	53.3	64.2
Always in RI	34.5	39.0	30.5
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number	4,174	1,949	2,225
65 years and over			
1983-1987	1.6	0.9	2.1
1978-1982	2.9	1.9	3.8
Before 1978	55.3	50.5	59.4
Always in RI	40.2	46.7	34.6
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number	3,410	1,570	1,840

a. Includes small number of unknown age.

The data in all instances refer to the adult population, 18 years of age and over, and in the case of membership are restricted to those adults who were respondents in the survey.

As the data in Table 2 indicate, a vast majority of the adult population are migrants to Rhode Island.² Only one third were born in the State and have always lived there, so that a minority of the current adult Jewish population have lifetime roots in the area. Since virtually half of the adult population moved to the State before 1978, however, approximately 85 percent of all Jewish adults either always lived in the State or did so for more than ten years. The data indicate minimal differences between men and women, although somewhat more men than women have always lived in Rhode Island. This may reflect the greater tendency of women who marry to join their husbands. Of the total adult population, 7 percent were recent migrants, having moved to Rhode Island within five years of the survey, and another 8 percent did so between five and ten years earlier.

The percentage of migrants in the population varied by age group, being loosely associated with labor market conditions and stages of the life cycle. The percentages are higher for younger persons and lowest for those 65 and over, especially males. Among the oldest age group, almost half of the men but only 35 percent of the women had always lived in Rhode Island, and by far the greatest number of migrants had moved here before 1978. A very small percentage were either recent in-migrants or had moved in during 1978-82. By contrast, almost 70 percent of those under age 45 were in-migrants to Rhode Island and 15 percent were recent migrants; an additional 15 percent were intermediate migrants. These percentages are similar for men and women. The 45-64 age group closely resembles the younger group in the percentage who had always lived in Rhode Island but has a considerably lower proportion of recent and intermediate migrants to the State. In fact, this age group has the highest percentage who were long term migrants. The proportion of recent and intermediate migrants is thus inversely related to age, understandably so since older persons have had longer opportunity to prolong their residence in the State.

Out-migration

As stressed earlier, growth and redistribution are concurrently affected by movement of Jews away from Rhode Island. Information on the children of adult respondents who were living away from their parental home indicates that about six out of ten were living outside the State; a great majority (about 90 percent) of these had at one time lived in Rhode Island. The available data on age at out-migration indicate that such movement is closely correlated with those points in the life cycle—obtaining higher education, entering the labor force, and marrying—which usually occur between ages 18 and 34. That such out-migration is likely to be permanent is strongly suggested by the fact that 90 percent of all children living outside the State, including 70 percent of those under age 25, are not expected to return to Rhode Island. While these out-migrants are replaced to some degree by in-migrants, to the extent that opportunities are greater elsewhere, the net impact on the State's Jewish community has probably been negative.

Similarly, considerable out-migration has occurred among older persons. The number of older persons enumerated in 1987 was substantially below that projected for 1987 on the basis of the 1963 survey results (Goldstein, 1964), taking estimated mortality into account. The differential indicates that many persons who would have been 65 and over in 1987 had left the State by then. This conclusion is confirmed by data on residence and out-migration of living parents of the adult respondents. Just over half (51 percent) were living outside Rhode Island at the time of the survey. Of these, almost one fifth had formerly lived in the State; this percentage reached one fourth for those aged 65-74, the recently retired cohort. Few of the elderly out-migrants were expected to return.

Future Mobility

The important role of out-migration in affecting the Jewish community is further evidenced by answers to a question on expected mobility in the three years following

the survey. One fourth of all respondents reported that it was very likely or somewhat likely that they would move in the near future, and this percentage was especially high for those under age 45, for whom it reached 42 percent (Table 3). The probable destination for those who reported a move to be very or somewhat likely confirms earlier observations about population mobility. Almost one third expected to move to another state, again suggesting a relatively high rate of population turnover. More of the aged who expected to move mentioned an out-of-state destination (37 percent) but as many as 31 percent of those under age 45 did so, too.

TABLE 3. LIKELIHOOD OF MOVING WITHIN THREE YEARS AND PROBABLE DESTINATION OF MOVE, BY AGE

	Total	Under 45	45-64	65 and over
Likelihood of move				
Very likely	12.1	23.6	8.6	4.0
Somewhat likely	12.9	18.8	12.5	7.5
Not at all likely	66.9	53.6	71.9	75.6
Unknown	8.1	4.0	7.0	12.9
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number	7,219	2,390	2,363	2,339
Probable destination ^a				
Rhode Island	58.1	58.4	62.1	47.7
Other state	30.7	30.6	28.0	37.2
Overseas	2.4	3.5	1.6	-
Unknown	8.8	7.6	8.3	15.0
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number	1,803	1,014	499	269

a. Based on those indicating very likely or somewhat likely to move.

Cross-tabulation of previous migration experience with mobility intentions allows evaluation of whether duration of residence affects prospective mobility. Indirectly such an assessment allows testing of the thesis that recent migrants are more likely than long term residents to make repeat moves. Moreover, it is hypothesized that the greater the likelihood that a repeat move (out-migration) will be made, the less integrated into the community the individual is likely to be. At this point, only the first hypothesis is tested. Indirect evidence for the latter will be assessed later through analysis of synagogue/temple membership patterns of migrants by duration of residence and plans to move.

The data strongly support the first thesis (Table 4). For adults who had always lived in Rhode Island, only 7 percent expected to move out of the State in the three years following the survey. Only 4 percent of those who moved in before 1978 and have lived there ever since expected to become out-migrants. By contrast, this percentage rises to 15 percent of those who moved in between 1978 and 1982 and to a high of 35 percent of the recent in-migrants (1983-87). Approximately the same pattern of differentials by earlier migration experience characterized those who said they planned to move but did not know the specific destination.

TABLE 4. EXPECTED MOBILITY 1987-1990, BY AGE AND PREVIOUS MIGRATION STATUS

Age and year moved to Rhode Island	Total percent	Total number	No move	Move within RI	Move out of RI	Move, destination not certain	Don't know
All adults							
1983-1987	100.0	509	32.6	22.9	35.1	7.1	2.3
1978-1982	100.0	604	55.8	22.7	15.0	5.5	1.1
Before 1978	100.0	3,618	72.3	11.7	4.4	1.6	10.0
Always in RI	100.0	2,363	69.2	15.0	7.1	1.0	7.7
Total	100.0	7,094	67.0	14.5	8.4	2.1	7.9
Under 45							
1983-1987	100.0	416	25.9	21.5	42.2	8.7	1.8
1978-1982	100.0	442	49.2	28.1	15.2	6.1	1.4
Before 1978	100.0	878	69.7	17.2	6.0	1.1	6.0
Always in RI	100.0	617	54.1	35.0	8.1	0.8	2.1
Total	100.0	2,353	54.0	24.7	14.7	3.3	3.4
45-64 years							
1983-1987	100.0	57	74.5	25.5	-	-	-
1978-1982	100.0	90	59.2	14.4	19.3	7.1	-
Before 1978	100.0	1,382	73.1	13.6	4.1	2.1	7.1
Always in RI	100.0	790	71.0	11.1	9.4	0.8	7.7
Total	100.0	2,319	71.9	13.1	6.4	1.8	6.8
65 years and over							
1983-1987	100.0	33	48.4	38.2	-	-	13.4
1978-1982	100.0	72	91.6	-	8.4	-	-
Before 1978	100.0	1,274	72.6	6.3	4.0	1.5	15.7
Always in RI	100.0	911	79.2	3.9	4.8	1.4	10.7
Total	100.0	2,290	75.5	5.6	4.4	1.4	13.2

The tendency of recent in-migrants to expect to move out of the State is especially strong among those under age 45. In contrast to none of the recent movers among those age 45 and over, and well under 10 percent of those under age 45 who had lived in Rhode Island since before 1978, just over four out of every ten recent migrants in the under 45 age group expected to leave the State before 1990; an additional nine percent expected to move, but were not sure of their destination. Clearly, the possibility of repeat migration over relatively short intervals is a major feature of the life style of a considerable portion of families and individuals in those stages of the life cycle associated with family formation, completion of higher education, and establishment of careers.

That over one-third of all recent migrants and 42 percent of those under age 45 anticipated an out-of-state move within 1-8 years of having settled in Rhode Island lends strong weight to the conclusion that recent migrants have unstable residence patterns. The lower percentage anticipating future moves among those who moved in during 1978-82 and the even lower one among long-term migrants suggest that many of those who moved to Rhode Island during these earlier periods have already moved away. Given these differentials, recent migration seems likely to be associated with lower levels of community integration—both because of the more limited length of

settlement in the community and because of the greater expectation on the part of recent migrants that an early move out of the State will occur.

Socioeconomic Differentials

Occupation

How do the recent migrants differ from the intermediate and long term migrants and from the natives with respect to socioeconomic characteristics? Attention turns first to occupational composition. With some exceptions for specific age groups, recent male migrants (Table 5a) consist disproportionately of professionals, in contrast to earlier migrant groups and to those who have always lived in Rhode Island. Among all adult men, over half of those moving into the State in 1983-87 were professionals; this percentage declines consistently and sharply to only 25 percent of those who have always lived in the State. The proportion who occupy managerial

TABLE 5A. OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH MALES, BY AGE AND MIGRATION STATUS

Age and year moved to Rhode Island	Total percent	Total number	Professionals	Managers	Clerical and sales	Service and manual
All adults						
1983-1987	100.0	402	55.1	16.1	26.5	2.2
1978-1982	100.0	527	40.2	17.5	28.0	14.2
Before 1978	100.0	2,629	33.7	18.2	35.8	12.3
Always in RI	100.0	2,223	24.5	18.3	41.9	15.3
Total	100.0	5,781	32.2	18.0	36.7	13.0
Under 45						
1983-1987	100.0	330	53.2	18.6	25.4	2.7
1978-1982	100.0	403	44.4	17.8	21.8	16.0
Before 1978	100.0	952	32.9	17.7	32.1	17.3
Always in RI	100.0	771	22.8	17.6	33.5	26.1
Total	100.0	2,456	34.3	17.8	29.9	17.9
45-64 years						
1983-1987	100.0	52	55.9	6.6	37.5	-
1978-1982	100.0	93	16.8	15.3	58.0	10.0
Before 1978	100.0	984	38.7	17.5	34.8	9.1
Always in RI	100.0	726	28.8	20.0	41.5	9.7
Total	100.0	1,855	34.2	18.1	38.6	9.1
65 years and over						
1983-1987	-	a	-	-	-	-
1978-1982	100.0	23	41.5	27.8	26.4	4.4
Before 1978	100.0	670	27.1	18.9	43.4	10.5
Always in RI	100.0	713	21.4	17.7	51.2	9.7
Total	100.0	1,420	25.2	18.3	46.7	9.9

a. Fewer than 20 cases.

positions varies minimally by migration status for all age groups combined, only between 16 and 18 percent. By contrast, only 26 percent of the recent migrants to Rhode Island were engaged in clerical and sales work compared to 42 percent of those who always lived there. The least regular pattern characterizes the blue collar male workers. Nonetheless, the percentage is especially low among recent migrants (less than 3 percent) and considerably higher for those always in Rhode Island (15 percent for the total and 26 percent for those under age 45).

For men, recent in-migration is thus characterized by high proportions of professionals. Compared to other duration categories, fewer of the recent migrants were in the lower white collar and blue collar occupations. This strongly suggests that the growing professional character of the Jewish male labor force in Rhode Island is disproportionately a function of the attraction to the State of migrants from elsewhere rather than the professionalization of the native-born population. If anything, the native-born males are disproportionately concentrated in the lower white collar and the blue collar occupations.

TABLE 5B. OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH FEMALES, BY AGE AND MIGRATION STATUS

Age and year moved to Rhode Island	Total percent	Total number	Professionals	Managers	Clerical and sales	Service and manual
All adults						
1983-1987	100.0	457	42.3	17.8	37.0	3.0
1978-1982	100.0	476	50.1	5.0	33.7	11.2
Before 1978	100.0	3,235	36.4	13.2	42.1	8.3
Always in RI	100.0	2,020	23.7	10.5	56.5	9.3
Total	100.0	6,188	33.7	12.0	45.8	8.4
Under 45						
1983-1987	100.0	377	42.3	16.8	39.0	2.0
1978-1982	100.0	349	54.2	5.0	29.5	11.3
Before 1978	100.0	1,005	46.5	14.0	28.1	11.4
Always in RI	100.0	807	28.8	11.9	46.6	12.7
Total	100.0	2,538	41.3	12.5	35.8	10.4
45-64 years						
1983-1987	100.0	49	41.2	36.8	16.3	5.7
1978-1982	100.0	75	30.0	8.0	43.2	18.8
Before 1978	100.0	1,326	36.6	12.6	44.8	6.1
Always in RI	100.0	609	19.3	9.0	64.3	7.4
Total	100.0	2,059	31.3	11.9	49.8	7.0
65 years and over						
1983-1987	100.0	25	42.9	-	57.1	-
1978-1982	100.0	52	51.6	-	48.4	-
Before 1978	100.0	858	25.2	13.1	53.3	8.3
Always in RI	100.0	550	22.2	9.5	60.9	7.4
Total	100.0	1,485	25.3	11.1	56.1	7.6

Occupational patterns for females are not as clear as those characterizing males (Table 5b). For adult women as a whole, the percentage of professionals is highest (50 percent) for the intermediate category of migrants and declines with longer duration of residence in the State to a low of 24 percent among natives. Although also lower among the recent migrants (42 percent), the percentage of professionals among recent migrants is above that of long term migrants and especially the natives. Large variation characterizes the three age groups but for two of the three, the same pattern with respect to proportion of professionals exists and in the third (ages 45-64), it is the recent migrants who have the highest concentration of professionals.

A considerably higher percentage of managers is found among women who were recent migrants than among the other migration status groups, but for clerical/sales workers the highest proportions characterize the long-term residents of the State, that is, those migrating before 1978 and those who always lived there. These greater variations for women may reflect the fact that many have moved in conjunction with

TABLE 6. PERCENT WITH COMPLETED COLLEGE AND GRADUATE STUDIES, BY AGE, SEX AND MIGRATION STATUS^a

Age and year moved to Rhode Island	Total		Males		Females	
	Completed college only	Graduate school	Completed college only	Graduate school	Completed college only	Graduate school
All adults						
1983-1987	27.9	54.5	22.6	61.6	32.6	48.1
1978-1982	32.1	43.3	32.9	46.8	31.2	39.4
Before 1978	23.6	34.1	23.2	44.4	23.9	26.5
Always in RI	24.2	23.5	28.4	30.2	19.9	16.7
Total	24.8	32.5	26.1	40.4	23.7	25.7
Under 45						
1983-1987	25.1	58.7	18.1	63.8	31.7	53.9
1978-1982	36.8	44.7	37.1	48.6	36.5	40.0
Before 1978	24.8	52.2	24.4	61.1	25.1	44.7
Always in RI	35.4	29.4	40.1	32.1	31.3	27.0
Total	30.1	45.1	30.5	50.6	29.7	40.0
45-64 years						
1983-1987	33.6	52.4	37.5	55.9	29.4	48.6
1978-1982	28.5	43.4	28.6	44.4	28.5	41.9
Before 1978	26.7	34.1	25.0	43.8	27.8	27.2
Always in RI	27.3	23.8	32.4	33.6	21.5	12.8
Total	27.1	31.3	28.5	40.1	25.9	23.7
65 years and over						
1983-1987	49.5	8.5	^b	^b	43.7	0.0
1978-1982	4.7	28.2	0.0	16.2	6.8	33.5
Before 1978	18.4	18.0	19.6	28.8	17.6	10.4
Always in RI	11.8	18.8	14.4	25.1	8.9	12.0
Total	15.7	18.5	17.1	26.8	14.5	11.6

a. Number of cases on which percents are based similar to numbers in Tables 5a and 5b.

b. Fewer than 20 cases.

marriage or the migration of their husbands; in such cases, the move was more closely related to the employment opportunities for the husband than for the wife.

Education

The high level of education characterizing the Jewish population is evidenced by the fact that 57 percent of all adult Jews in Rhode Island had completed at least a college education, and more than half of these had had some graduate studies. That migration status is related to education is also clearly indicated (Table 6). Of the recent migrants, 82 percent had completed a college education, and 54 percent had some graduate studies. These percentages declined with longer duration in the State; among those who had always lived in Rhode Island, just under half had completed a college education and just under one fourth had graduate studies. Quite consistently, males in every migration status group had more education than females. But for both men and women, those who most recently moved into the State had the highest percentage with completed college education and with some graduate studies while those who had always lived in Rhode Island were characterized by the lowest levels.

While the patterns showed greater variation within age groups, partly reflecting smaller numbers in some cells, the recent migrants consistently had the highest proportion of college graduates as well as the highest percentage with some graduate studies. The high educational achievements of the recent migrants to the State contribute to the unusually high educational level of the Rhode Island Jewish population as a whole. Together with the differentials on occupation, these differentials by education strongly support the thesis that higher socioeconomic achievement is associated with considerably higher mobility rates among Jews.

Denominational Identification

In-migration can be selective not only with respect to traditional demographic variables, such as age, gender, occupation, and education; it may also be selective on variables related more directly to the specific socio-religious structure of the community. For the Jewish community, such features include denomination, religious practice, and levels of Jewish education. Within the limits of this paper, it is not possible to evaluate the relation between migration status and all of these relevant and potentially important characteristics. Attention will be restricted to denomination (Table 7).

In Rhode Island's adult Jewish population as a whole, slightly less than half (47 percent) identified themselves as Conservative, about one third as Reform (32 percent), and 7 percent as Orthodox. The balance, 14 percent, reported themselves as either "just Jewish," Reconstructionists, Secular, or Traditional, and a small number (2 percent) as Christian, some other religion, or no religion.

That migration status is related to denomination is suggested by the data. Interestingly, those who have always lived in Rhode Island have the lowest percentage of Orthodox and the highest percentage of Conservatives, as well as the lowest proportion who do not identify themselves with the three major denominations. The Reform show the least variation among the various migration

status groups but within this narrow range the native group have the highest percent. In contrast to those who in-migrated before 1978 or who were natives of the State, more of those who moved since 1978 were Orthodox and Other Jewish and fewer were Reform and Conservative. Overall, therefore, these data suggest that duration of residence is negatively correlated with being Orthodox, positively correlated with being Conservative and to a lesser extent with being Reform, and again negatively related to being non-denominational.

The higher proportion of Orthodox is particularly noteworthy among migrants under age 45 who moved into the State since 1978. They account for just over 10 percent of the recent and intermediate migrants, which is well above the 5-7 percent characterizing the long-term migrants and the natives in the same age cohort. Recent migration has therefore served to invigorate the Orthodox Jewish sub-community within Rhode Island, especially its younger segments (cf., Jaret, 1978).

TABLE 7. RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION, BY AGE AND MIGRATION STATUS (RESPONDENTS ONLY)

Age and year moved to Rhode Island	Total percent	Total number	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform	Other	Christian, no answer
All adults							
1983-1987	100.0	509	9.3	37.6	30.7	12.8	9.6
1978-1982	100.0	589	11.2	42.7	29.6	14.0	2.5
Before 1978	100.0	3,603	7.2	47.5	32.0	11.9	1.4
Always in RI	100.0	2,305	4.7	50.9	32.6	9.1	2.7
Total	100.0	7,007	6.9	47.5	31.9	11.2	2.5
Under 45							
1983-1987	100.0	416	11.4	38.3	28.6	10.8	10.9
1978-1982	100.0	434	10.2	39.4	31.3	15.7	3.4
Before 1978	100.0	877	5.2	46.2	33.9	11.7	3.1
Always in RI	100.0	600	7.1	42.3	35.4	9.5	5.8
Total	100.0	2,326	7.7	42.5	32.8	11.7	5.2
45-64 years							
1983-1987	100.0	57	-	34.6	41.0	24.4	-
1978-1982	100.0	90	17.5	47.5	27.9	7.1	-
Before 1978	100.0	1,369	2.5	48.3	35.7	12.6	0.9
Always in RI	100.0	762	2.6	50.0	35.7	9.2	2.6
Total	100.0	2,277	3.1	48.5	35.5	11.5	1.4
65 years and over							
1983-1987	100.0	33	-	37.6	43.3	19.1	-
1978-1982	100.0	66	9.2	57.8	20.8	12.2	-
Before 1978	100.0	1,274	14.0	46.1	26.7	12.2	1.0
Always in RI	100.0	899	5.3	57.0	28.6	8.2	0.9
Total	100.0	2,272	10.2	50.6	27.5	10.7	0.9
Percent in each denomination/age group who always lived in Rhode Island							
All adults			22.8	35.3	33.6	26.6	48.6
Under 45 years			23.6	25.6	27.8	20.8	40.2
45-64 years			28.4	34.5	33.7	26.7	60.1
65 years and over			20.4	44.6	41.1	30.4	-

Community Involvement

The high percentage of migrants among Rhode Island Jews and their distinctive characteristics make it particularly important to ascertain the extent to which they participate in the organized life of the community. Unfortunately, the omnibus character of the survey did not allow in-depth assessment of organization memberships. The questions were necessarily restricted to whether the respondent was a member of any Jewish or non-Jewish organization, agency, or club for social, cultural, political, or recreational activities. If so, the specific number of Jewish and non-Jewish organizations was ascertained. A separate question asked whether the respondent or any member of the household was currently a member of a synagogue or temple or any organized religious activity.

For purposes of measuring integration into the local community, information on synagogue and temple memberships is more useful than that on organization memberships. Affiliation with religious institutions tends to be at the local level, reflecting the motives for membership—attendance at religious services, education of children, participation in auxiliary groups such as men's and women's clubs, and identification with the Jewish community. By contrast, participation in Jewish and non-Jewish organizational life is not necessarily tied to the local area. Many persons may belong to national organizations largely through "paper membership" rather than active participation. To the extent that such membership is national or regional rather than local, it may not be affected by movement from one community to another.³ For example, a person who belongs to Hadassah or to Kiwanis in one locale probably continues membership even after moving, regardless of whether she or he is immediately active in the local chapter in the new community of residence. This may be even more true of membership in such national organizations as the American Jewish Committee or Sierra Club, which do not have local organizations in a number of smaller communities. Unless local organizations can be distinguished from national ones, a full assessment of the impact of migration on organization membership is not feasible. Information obtained on names of Jewish organizations is not adequate without assessment of the existence and vitality of local affiliates.

In the analysis which follows and within the limitations noted above, attention will be given first to membership in Jewish organizations; this will be followed by a somewhat fuller evaluation of membership in synagogues and temples.

Organization Membership

Data for all adult Jewish men (Table 8) show that the average number of organizations to which they belong is lowest (0.7 organizations per person) for the more recent migrants to the State (both those moving in between 1983 and 1987 and those settling in the State five years earlier) and highest (1.3 average) for those who have always lived in the State. These averages are consistent with the hypothesis that migration interferes with participation in the organized life of the community. However, without controls for age or other key variables, the conclusion that migrant men have lower levels of participation than non-migrants is not fully warranted.

TABLE 8. AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS IN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS, BY AGE, SEX AND MIGRATION STATUS

Age and year moved to Rhode Island	Males	Females
All adults		
1983-1987	0.7	0.6
1978-1982	0.7	1.5
Before 1978	0.9	2.0
Always in RI	1.3	1.6
Total	1.0	1.7
Under 45 years		
1983-1987	0.6	0.6
1978-1982	0.7	1.4
Before 1978	0.5	1.3
Always in RI	0.8	0.8
Total	0.7	1.0
45-64 years		
1983-1987	1.2	0.6
1978-1982	0.5	2.1
Before 1978	0.9	2.0
Always in RI	0.9	1.5
Total	0.9	1.8
65 years and over		
1983-1987	-	0.9
1978-1982	0.4	1.5
Before 1978	1.2	2.4
Always in RI	1.9	2.0
Total	1.5	2.2

Overall, adult Jewish women have much higher levels of participation in Jewish organizations than do men, 1.7 per woman compared to an average of 1.0 for men. For women the lowest level of participation characterizes the most recent migrants, only 0.6 organizations per woman. However, for those migrants with longer duration of residence and for those who have always lived in Rhode Island the relation between level of participation and duration of residence in the State is not as clear as for men. Nonetheless for women who have lived in Rhode Island for at least five years, the average levels of participation are well above those of the most recent migrants.

The data by age are less patterned. The youngest group of men shows minimal variation in level of participation by migrant status, varying only between an average of 0.5 and 0.8 organizations and not being consistently related to duration of residence. For the youngest group of women, the average for the most recent migrants, 0.6, is not very different from the figure for those who always lived in Rhode Island, but both groups are well below the averages for the intermediary length migrants and for the long term migrants. For the middle aged groups, the

recent migrants display the highest average level of participation among men, but the women in this migration status group have the lowest average of all women. In the oldest group, which has the smallest relative number of migrants, duration of residence tends to be positively associated with level of organization membership.

At this simple level of analysis, the evidence with respect to the relation between migration status and organization membership is therefore mixed, although it points to lower levels of membership on the part of more recent migrants.

Multivariate analysis may indicate more clearly whether a relation exists after controls are introduced for key variables which might affect organizational participation. Such evaluation is undertaken through use of multiple classification analysis (Table 9). Education—as an indicator of socioeconomic status—and age are controlled as background variables; migration status is introduced as a covariate factor. The analysis is performed separately for men and women because of the differing interaction effects for migration status with gender.

TABLE 9. AVERAGE NUMBER OF JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS, BY MIGRATION STATUS AND SEX^a

Migration status	Males	Females
1983-1987	1.06	0.98
1978-1982	0.90	1.73
Before 1978	0.86	1.88
Always in RI	1.16	1.52
Unadjusted total	0.99	1.69

a. MCA analysis controlling for age and education.

Without any adjustment for background characteristics, men on average belonged to 1.0, and women to 1.7 Jewish organizations. This differential does not characterize every migration status group; the impact of duration of residence is quite different for men and women. Recent male migrants, with an average of 1.1 memberships, are surpassed only by the natives of the State (1.2) in average number of affiliations. The two other migrant groups have lower averages (0.9). Although the data presented here cannot provide definitive explanations for this somewhat unexpected pattern, several factors may account for it. Since a substantial percentage of recent male migrants are professionals, their career networks, their previous affiliations with nation-wide organizations, and their personal life-styles may all enhance their likelihood of joining several Jewish organizations. They may also be more visible to the organized community than men with different types of occupations and therefore more easily targeted for recruitment.

The relation between migration status and number of Jewish organizations for women is in the expected direction. Average number of memberships rises with duration of residence, from 1.0 for recent female migrants to 1.9 for long term migrants. Women who have always been in Rhode Island have a somewhat lower average (1.5) but it is still substantially above that of recent migrants.

Despite these varying patterns by sex, the data indicate that recent migrants have a lower average number of memberships than do men and women who have always lived in the State. Again it is important to recognize that the inability to distinguish between memberships in local and national organizations makes it impossible to clearly assess the impact of migration on integration into the local community. For such an analysis, a more refined data set needs to be collected and evaluated.

Since, as earlier analysis has shown, recent migrants are also more likely than longer term migrants to move again, the affiliation pattern observed suggests that those individuals who migrate with some repetition during the course of the life cycle are less likely to assume as active a role in the organized life of the community as those who develop more stable patterns of residence. This likelihood will be explored with the data on synagogue/temple membership.

Synagogue/Temple Membership

Fuller insights into the impact of migration on local membership may be provided by the survey information on affiliation with temples and synagogues. As noted earlier, to the extent that such membership is undertaken in order to participate in religious and educational activities, it is tied much more to the local scene than is membership in a social, cultural, or other type of organization. Synagogue/temple membership may, therefore, serve as a better indicator of the relation between migration status and integration into the local community. To the extent that such membership in itself reflects identification with Judaism and involves financial costs through membership dues and, often, building pledges, it also serves to index an individual's or family's commitment to integrating into the religious life of the community. If it is true that ties of migrants to Judaism may be weaker, that recency of settlement in the area deters membership, and that anticipated out-migration argues against large financial "investments" in local institutions, it can be hypothesized that synagogue/temple membership of migrants, and especially of recent migrants, will be lower than that of natives.

For the population as a whole, 70 percent of the respondents belonged to households that held memberships in a synagogue, temple, or some other form of organized religious activity (Table 10). High level of participation, however, did not characterize all migration status groups. The highest level was reported by those who always lived in Rhode Island, among whom 75 percent were temple/synagogue members. By contrast, only 46 percent of the most recent in-migrants held such membership. This percentage rose consistently with duration of residence, reaching 71 percent for those who had arrived before 1978. This clear and sharp pattern of differentials between recent migrants and longer term migrants and between migrants and non-migrants strongly suggests that migration has a very significant impact on membership in the organized religious life of the community.

Within each age group, membership also varied according to migration status. For example, among those respondents under age 45, 68 percent of those who had always lived in Rhode Island were temple/synagogue members as were 66 percent of those who had moved into the State before 1978. However, only 45 percent of those migrating to the State recently, and 58 percent of those who moved in between 1978

TABLE 10. PERCENT REPORTING SYNAGOGUE/TEMPLE MEMBERSHIP, BY AGE, MIGRATION STATUS, NUMBER OF CHILDREN AGE 6-17 AND EXPECTED MOBILITY, 1987-1990

Age and year moved to Rhode Island	Number of children, 6-17 years				Expected mobility status, 1987-1990		
	Total	0	1	2 or more	No move	Move within RI	Move out of RI
All adults							
1983-1987	46.2	37.9	43.7	100.0	54.0	48.9	27.8
1978-1982	58.9	53.2	64.1	92.9	63.3	57.2	64.7
Before 1978	70.8	68.4	72.5	86.3	72.2	68.0	50.2
Always in RI	75.3	73.8	96.5	80.6	77.1	65.7	74.0
Total	69.5	66.8	73.7	87.4	72.6	63.6	52.4
Under 45							
1983-1987	45.1	34.6	51.1	100.0	56.7	47.6	28.3
1978-1982	57.9	50.0	61.8	93.2	66.7	56.6	52.4
Before 1978	65.8	46.5	59.7	87.8	69.9	53.3	54.8
Always in RI	68.2	58.4	100.0	89.5	71.1	57.7	80.9
Total	61.2	48.3	67.9	90.0	68.6	54.8	44.6
45-64 years							
1983-1987	50.4	49.8	-	-	48.5	-	-
1978-1982	61.9	57.3	-	-	56.7	-	-
Before 1978	75.4	74.1	93.7	71.4	74.4	80.6	54.3
Always in RI	74.5	74.5	87.4	-	75.9	71.9	60.3
Total	73.9	73.1	87.6	70.1	73.7	76.1	62.7
65 years and over							
1983-1987	56.7	56.7	-	-	-	-	-
1978-1982	61.5	61.5	-	-	57.6	-	-
Before 1978	68.6	68.6	-	-	70.5	68.3	40.9
Always in RI	79.5	79.3	-	-	80.1	83.2	89.7
Total	72.6	72.5	-	-	73.9	70.7	65.7

and 1982 reported such memberships. The membership level is higher for each migration status group in the 45-64 year age category, but the pattern of differentials among migration groups persists, varying between a high of three-fourths of the natives and those who had migrated to the State before 1978 to only half of the recent migrants. This direct relation persists even for the aged.

Membership in a synagogue/temple may also be related to the family life cycle, associated with the presence of children whom parents wish to enroll in a Jewish educational program. Such a relation is confirmed by the lower levels of synagogue/temple membership characteristic of both young households and those with fewer children of school age (6-17 years). Only 47 percent of respondents under age 35 reported affiliation with a synagogue/temple. Such a low level of affiliation in part reflects the small proportion (13 percent) of households with respondents in this age group that include children between ages 6 and 17. For those age 35-44 (59 percent of whose households included children of school age), the level of synagogue membership rose to 71 percent. In older age groups, despite fewer school age children, membership persisted at a level above 73 percent, suggesting that no

substantial cut-back occurred in membership after children ended their formal Jewish education.

That the number of school age children significantly affects synagogue/temple membership is evidenced when membership level is assessed by number of children age 6-17 years (Table 10, Cols. 2-4). For respondents as a whole, this level rises from 67 percent of those without school-age children to 87 percent of those with two or more such children. The differentials are even sharper for the younger households, rising from 48 percent of those with no school-age children in the under 45 age group to 90 percent of those with two or more.

For all migrant groups, the more school age children there are in the household, the higher is the level of synagogue/temple membership, but the differential is sharper for recent migrants. For them, for example, the level of affiliation rises from 38 percent of those with no school age children to 100 percent of those with two or more. For those who arrived before 1978, it rose from 68 percent to 87 percent. For natives, by contrast, the relation is less regular, rising from the zero to one-child group then declining for those with two or more. The same patterns characterize the under 45 age group.

These patterns suggest that school-age children in a household play a key role in affecting the affiliation of migrant households, and especially so among more recent migrant households with two or more children. Such households may feel considerable pressure to involve their children in Jewish education or youth activities sponsored by synagogues/temples as a way of enhancing contacts with other Jewish youth. With longer duration in the community, reliance on other formal and informal channels may reduce the need to turn to synagogues/temples, explaining the greater similarity among the longer-term residents in level of affiliation regardless of number of school age children.

A fuller evaluation of the impact of migration on synagogue/temple membership can be undertaken through use of logistic regression in which the effects of age, education, and number of children age 6-17 are controlled. Such an analysis points to a slight increase in membership rates with rising age and to virtually no effect of education. The impact of having school age children is considerable; the odds that a household will have synagogue/temple membership increase by a factor of 1.95 (i.e., $e^{.669}$) with each child age 6-17. Most important for our analysis, with gender, age, education, and presence of children controlled, the odds of belonging to a

TABLE 11. LOGISTIC REGRESSION ON PROBABILITY OF MEMBERSHIP IN SYNAGOGUE/TEMPLE

	Standardized coefficients
Age	0.023 ^a
Education	0.001
Year of migration ^a	
1978-1982	0.158
Before 1978	0.387
Always in RI	0.702 ^a
Children age 6-17	0.669 ^a

a. Reference group is year of migration 1983-1987.

b. $p < .01$

synagogue/temple rise consistently and sharply with longer duration of residence in the community. If those who are recent migrants are used as the standard of comparison, the results show that the odds of belonging to a synagogue/temple increase by a factor of 1.17 for those who moved into the State during the preceding five year period, 1978-82. For the long-term migrants they increase by a factor of 1.47, and for natives of Rhode Island by 2.02. Although only the difference for the natives is statistically significant, these data do suggest that duration of residence in the community has a substantial positive impact on participation in the organized life of the community, here indexed by synagogue/temple membership.

It was earlier hypothesized that the greater the likelihood that an individual expected to move out of the community, the less integrated that person was likely to be into the organized life of the community; this would be especially true of recent in-migrants. This relation can be explored by assessing whether respondents who expected to move out of the State had lower levels of membership in synagogues/temple than did those who had no such intention; moreover the latter group can be subdivided into those planning no move at all and those expecting to move only within the statewide community. Beyond this, comparisons of the synagogue/temple membership levels of intended movers and stayers by duration of residence in the State allows fuller evaluation of the combined effects of previous and potential mobility on level of community integration.

The data (Table 10, Cols. 5-7) confirm that both past and potential mobility have significant impacts on affiliation levels; in combination, the experience of recent immigration and anticipated out-migration is particularly conducive to low levels of integration. Among those respondents who had no intention at all to move in the succeeding three years, 73 percent held synagogue/temple memberships. This declined to 64 percent of those planning to move within the State, and to only 52 percent of those who expected to leave Rhode Island. Moreover, the differentials were even sharper for those who were recent migrants—a group which overall had the lowest level of synagogue/temple membership. Only 54 percent of those recent migrants who had no plans to move were synagogue/temple members. This declined to 49 percent of those intending to change residence within the State, and to only 28 percent of those expressing intent to move out of Rhode Island before 1990. Clearly the lowest level of membership characterized those displaying the least tendency to be residentially stable—those who had recently moved and who expected to move again in the near future.

This pattern is repeated in the under 45 age group, which is the most mobile segment of the population but also the one that includes most of those at a stage of the life cycle when synagogue/temple membership might be particularly motivated by the need to enroll children ages 8-13 in religious education schools prior to Bar/Bat Mitzvah. While 68 percent of the under 45 year group who had no plans to move belong to synagogues/temple, only 45 percent of those who expected to leave the State do. Again, these proportions are even lower for the recent in-migrants, with 57 percent of those planning to stay at least three years reporting membership, but only half as many—28 percent—of the projected out-migrants doing so.

Overall, therefore, these data on synagogue and temple membership support the hypothesis that migration is associated with lower levels of affiliation with the

organized life of the community, especially in the period immediately after first settlement. Moreover, the data on affiliation in relation to expected future movement indicate that anticipated mobility is also associated with lower synagogue/temple membership rates, especially for those who recently moved into the community. To the extent that synagogue and temple memberships serve as better indicators of the effect of migration on affiliation with the organized local community, the absence of sharper patterns in the earlier analysis of memberships in organizations other than synagogues/temples may be interpreted as reflecting the diverse character of those organizations, with some being purely local and others national in their orientation. The findings for synagogue/temple membership suggest that both the local communities and the national community face major challenges in better integrating those moving about the country. In particular, how can the more recent migrants be attracted into the organized religious and social life of the local community especially when they are likely to leave it in the near future? How can their identification with Judaism be maintained as they move about the country? From a national point of view, these patterns raise the question whether the non-affiliated find other ways, formal or informal, to express their Jewishness.

Conclusion

Several interrelated changes have led to the evolution of a national Jewish community, particularly in the decades following the massive influx of East European Jews. The East European immigration, supplemented by refugee movements in the decades following immigration controls, transformed American Jewry from an insignificant minority to a significant, complex sub-society, recognized as one of the major religious groups in the nation. However, the slowdown in the growth rate resulting from lower immigration led to increasing "Americanization" of the Jewish population; growing proportions of Jews were third, fourth, and even fifth generation Americans.

Concurrently, changes on the larger American scene have allowed greater acceptance and integration of Jews into the American social structure. The wide range of educational, occupational, and residential opportunities for Jews has resulted in increased social and geographic mobility, including high rates of migration across state and regional lines. In the process, the Jewish population has been redistributed within and between metropolitan areas and regions, so that it has generally come to reflect more closely the national pattern of population distribution. Geographically also, therefore, the Jewish population has become much more integrated into the wider American community. In the process, individuals, both movers and stayers, developed familial, social, and economic networks—Jewish and non-Jewish—that span the nation.

From a demographic perspective, we must therefore recognize the concurrent existence of a national and a local community, and take account of both levels in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the Jewish-American sub-society. In particular, questions need to be asked and answered about the impact of high levels of mobility and greater dispersion across the nation on individual Jewish

identification and on the ability of the local community to provide the institutional support needed to enhance such identity. A full assessment of these relations must await availability of national data with sufficient information on mobility and indices of identification and integration. In the meantime, limited insights can be gained by evaluation of information from local surveys. The 1987 study of the Rhode Island Jewish community has been used here for such an exploratory assessment.

It confirms the relatively high rates of mobility that characterize the Jewish population, whether measured by lifetime movement or by mobility within recent years. Compared to 1963, the 1987 Rhode Island data also suggest that recent immigrants are coming to the State from greater distances within the United States than did earlier ones. The study results also suggest, although indirectly through use of data on expected mobility, that repeat movement characterizes an important segment of the Jewish population, reflecting the heavy concentration of Jews among the highly educated and in those professions which increasingly involve employment for others, rather than self-employment. The generally direct relation between educational and occupational achievement on the one hand and rate and recency of mobility on the other points to mobility as being an inherent feature of Jewish American life for decades to come and stresses the need to recognize its importance both locally and nationally. As fertility levels persist at near or below replacement levels, as immigration remains low (except for the irregular influx of Soviet Jews with varying degrees of commitment and involvement), and as intermarriage rates remain high, internal migration has assumed greater importance in the demographic dynamics of American Jewry, on both the individual and community level.

Overall, the analysis of Rhode Island data on membership in Jewish organizations, and especially on affiliation with a synagogue or temple indicates that recent and repeat mobility are associated with lower membership rates. To the extent that such patterns reflect the impact of migration, they suggest that the increasing tendency of Jews to move may well affect their degree of integration into the organized Jewish life of the community. Whether this occurs because of local barriers to such membership—lack of contacts and information, high “initiation” fees, residential dispersion vis a vis locations of institutions and services—remains to be determined. It may well reflect a generally lower desire to affiliate among the highly mobile segment of the population—reflecting in turn their specific combination of socioeconomic characteristics. Regardless of reason, such relations to mobility suggest that the lower affiliation rates may, in turn, contribute either to the maintenance or to the exacerbation of high rates of intermarriage and assimilation. To what extent, in the case of migrants, informal interaction with Jews through work, neighborhood, and friendship patterns serve as a substitute, for the formal, institutional ties, remains to be explored.

The Rhode Island data also indicate the positive contributions that population mobility makes to smaller and moderate-sized Jewish communities. Between 1963 and 1987, Rhode Island Jewry declined from about 20,000 to 17,000 persons (even fewer, if non-Jews in Jewish households are not counted). Some of this decline reflects low fertility. Much of it represents losses due to migration, especially of younger segments of the population. Yet, the available evidence, limited as it is, suggests that these losses would have been far greater without the in-migration that

characterized the period. Of the 1987 population, about 40 percent were in-migrants since 1960. For many of these, duration of residence exceeds ten years and affiliation levels closely resemble those of the natives. Migration may thus play a key role in giving smaller or moderate sized Jewish communities such as Rhode Island the population density needed to maintain or even to strengthen the basic institutions essential for enhancing group identification and enrichment. The push and pull forces that lead some to leave, others to enter, and still others both to enter and leave in a relatively short time thus can have diverse effects on both the individuals and the communities of origin and destination.

For reasons cited in the introduction to this paper, findings about the extent and impact of migration based on any single community may be atypical—even though every scholar would like to think his or her study community represents the country as a whole. Whether the conclusions based here on the Rhode Island survey are also valid for other communities in the United States remains to be fully tested. That they may be supported to a considerable degree is suggested by some evidence from the 1975 and 1985 surveys of Boston's Jewish population. Cohen's (1988) analysis of the 1975 Boston Jewish Community Survey reports that both synagogue affiliation and Jewish philanthropic giving rise dramatically with residential stability. With controls for other key variables, the differentials by duration diminish but persist for synagogue membership; however for philanthropic giving, only the most recent settlers continue to have lower levels. Further evidence from the 1975 Boston study (Goldscheider, 1986) indicates that those whose duration of residence in Boston was less than three years had significantly lower levels of Jewish values and personal religious ritual. The differences were not simply a reflection of age and education, but were attributed to the direct consequences of the migration process. However, the effects of migration tended to be short term, not extending beyond three years.

The more recent 1985 data from Boston (Israel, 1987) suggest that mobility also has a substantial impact on organizational affiliation. Data showing the number of organizations to which individuals belong in relation to where they lived in 1975 indicate that, of those who were in the same town in 1975 and 1985, 63 percent were not affiliated and 18 percent belonged to two or more organizations. By contrast, of those who lived outside Boston in 1975, 86 percent were not affiliated and only 4 percent belonged to two or more organizations. These differentials were especially pronounced among the middle aged: 57 percent of the non-migrants belonged to no organization compared with 80 percent of those moving from outside Greater Boston, and 20 percent of the stable population compared to only 1 percent of the movers belonged to two or more groups.

Full evaluation of these relations requires better data, both locally and nationally, so that one can assess how the positive and negative effects vary by type of movement, by socioeconomic composition of the migrant streams, by size of community of origin and destination, and by the type of indices used to measure integration and identification. What is even clearer now than when the migration data from NJPS were first evaluated is that mobility and redistribution are of such magnitude and importance that, in both research and planning, great weight must be attached to the earlier conclusion (Goldstein, 1982) that changes of residence have great significance for the communities of origin and destination as well as for

migrating families and individuals. Moreover, as such movement extends over a growing web of metropolitan areas, states, and regions, it takes on national importance. National and regional institutional networks may then be essential to help maintain the linkage of individual Jews to Judaism as they move from one community to another and to facilitate the linkages among communities, especially smaller ones, so that together they can better meet the needs of both their stable and their mobile populations.

Notes

1. This is a revised version of the paper presented at the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, 16-24 August 1989. The paper has also been published in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*.
2. Year of arrival refers to the year of the most recent move to Rhode Island. Therefore, some persons who had been born in the State, moved away, and then returned would be classified as in-migrants. Only those who never left the State are listed as "Always in Rhode Island."
3. Cohen (1988) notes a similar situation for philanthropic giving. He posits that mobility has much more effect on synagogue membership than on charitable giving because the former is more localistic in orientation whereas the latter is more "cosmopolitan".

References

- Cohen, S.M. (1988). *American Modernity and Jewish Identity*. Tavistock Publications, New York.
- Friedman, P.B., and Zober M. (1989). "In the Community: Current Jewish Population Studies". *Contemporary Jewry*, Vol. 10. pp. 1-8.
- Goldscheider, C. (1986). *Jewish Continuity and Change*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Goldscheider, C. and Goldstein, S. (1988). *The Jewish Community of Rhode Island: A Social and Demographic Study, 1987*. Jewish Federation of Rhode Island, Providence.
- Goldstein, S. (1964). *The Greater Providence Jewish Community: A Population Survey*. General Jewish Committee of Providence, Inc., Providence, Rhode Island.
- Goldstein, S. (1982). "Population Movement and Redistribution Among American Jews". *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 24. pp. 5-23.
- Goldstein, S. (1987). *Demography of American Jewry: Implications for a National Community*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations. Parsippany Papers III, New York.
- Goldstein, S. (1988). *A 1990 National Jewish Population Study: Why and How*. Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Hebrew University, Jerusalem. (Occasional Paper 1988-04).
- Goldstein, S., and Goldscheider, C. (1968). *Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Israel, S. (1987). *Boston's Jewish Community: The 1985 CJP Demographic Study*. Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, Boston.

Jaret, C. (1978). "The Impact of Geographic Mobility on Jewish Community Participation: Disruptive or Supportive?" *Contemporary Jewry*, Vol. 11. pp. 9-20.

Lebowitz, B. D. (1975). "Migration and the Structure of the Contemporary Jewish Community". *Contemporary Jewry*, Vol. 2.

Phillips, B. A. (1986). "DJN and List Samples in the Southwest: Addendum to Lazerwitz," *Contemporary Jewry*, Vol. 7. pp. 103-109.

Ritterband, P. (1986). *The New Geography of Jews in North America*, North American Jewish Data Bank, Council of Jewish Federations, New York. (Occasional Paper No. 2).

Roof, W.C. (1976). "Traditional Religion in Contemporary Society: A Theory of Local-Cosmopolitan Plausibility." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 41. pp. 195-208.

Wuthnow, R., and Christiano K. (1979). "The Effects of Residential Migration on Church Attendance in the United States." in Wuthnow, R. (ed.) *The Religious Dimension: New Directions in Quantitative Research*. Academic Press, New York.

Zimmer, B. (1955). "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 20. pp. 218-224.