

THE DISTANCING OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY FROM ITS INSTITUTIONS

The Case of Jewish Schools

UZI REBHUN

Doctoral Student, Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics, The Harman Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

The research reported in this article explores the linkage between the Jewish community's increased geographic dispersion in recent years and its usage of community institutions, namely Jewish schools. Using data from Boston and San Francisco, this study found that a disproportionately large number of day schools are located in the older areas of settlement in the center and that fewer day schools are found in the suburban rings that are favored by families with young children. In contrast, the geographical distribution of supplementary schools closely resembles the residential distribution of school-aged children in each community. The spatial distance between home and day school may be an intervening obstacle in the parental decision to send children to day schools.

Urban residential distribution and mobility patterns of American Jews in the last few decades have been receiving increasing attention from social scientists and commentators on American modern life (e.g., Elazar, 1993; Fishman, 1963; Goldstein, 1981, 1991, 1992; Klaff, 1983; Newman & Halvorson, 1979). Jews participate in large numbers in the intensive suburbanization of the American urban middle class as a whole. Although they "remain over-represented in the inner areas of the cities when compared to the general population" (Klaff, 1983, p. 350), the greater than ever dispersal of the Jewish population is far beyond the general societal transformation and such instrumental matters as transportation, local government, and so forth. For Jews, the (voluntary or involuntary) urban setting as represented by the classical model of the "ghetto" had a powerful influence, whether viewed in terms of institutions and communal structure developed as an integral part of accommodation to American life or in terms of "self-maintenance as a viable community" (Fishman, 1963, p. 146). The developing patterns of greater geographic dispersion are indicative of successful integration. Yet, if a significant concentration of Jews around their in-

stitutions does not re-emerge, the community may have a lack of organizational cohesiveness and an inability to provide services to constituents who are located at quite widely separated points (Goldstein, 1981, 1991).

There is substantial agreement, among scholars and communal leaders alike, that a principal mechanism in the viability and continuity of the Jewish minority in the United States is religious education (Della-Pergola & Schmelz, 1989; Shluker, 1992). Several studies have indicated that participation in the Jewish education system, the type of education to which one has been exposed, and the number of years of exposure are significant factors affecting the degree of ethnic identification and community involvement in the long run (Cohen, 1974; Himmelfarb, 1977; Ribner, 1978). The critical role that Jewish education has played in perpetuating Jewish values and determining Jewish identity (worldwide) was endorsed in 1992 by the Second International Meeting of Jewish Demographic Policies. Later in the same year, the 32nd World Zionist Congress passed a resolution that "Jewish education is essential to Jewish demographic concerns since it provides, in its varied forms, a potential solution to

many of the problem areas.”

A possible linkage between Jews’ suburbanization and the various types of communal orientation, in which Jewish education serves as a major activity, has largely been recognized (Goldstein, 1981). Yet, despite this recognition, this linkage has seldom been empirically tested; at most it stimulated the Jewish community to call for further investigation that would be necessary to evaluate any mutual influences. In this article I intend to fill the lacuna by reporting a preliminary quantitative analysis of the relationships between residential redistribution and the location of Jewish schools in a relatively large metropolitan Jewish community in the United States.

My working hypothesis is that increasing residential redistribution toward the periphery of a metropolis does not necessarily imply the presence of a comprehensive or balanced set of institutions in these newer areas, particularly not day schools, which are large edifices whose construction and replacement are costly. Spatial distance would then imply functional distance from the Jewish communal services, as reflected in the lower enrollment of children in Jewish day programs; spatial distance is assumed to be an important variable affecting enrollment in the formal Jewish education system in the United States. This study is also meant to help local leadership and planners develop strategies and cope better with suburbanization.

METHODOLOGY

The analysis reported in this article uses data derived from the 1985 Population Survey of the Greater Boston Jewish Community (Israel, 1987) and data collected in the 1987/89 Second Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora (DellaPergola, et al., 1993; Isaacs, 1992).¹ The advantage of using the Jewish community of Greater Boston as a case study for this research is that it is to date the only Jewish community in the United States to have undertaken three successive comparable population surveys, thus making it possible to map residential trends over a period of three decades.

FINDINGS

Changes in Residential Distribution

The Boston SMSA comprises 82 different cities and towns. Due to the size of the sample and the way the Jewish population is distributed, it is not possible to estimate the number of Jews in each city and town separately. Cities and towns have been grouped into thirteen clusters that roughly correspond to CJP’s campaign and service delivery areas. For the purpose of this study, we further classified the Boston metropolitan area using a typological distinction between Core (which is somewhat west of Boston city), Bay Area, and Outer Ring areas (Table 1). The Outer Ring areas are newer sections that have experienced accel-

¹The sampling area of the 1985 Demographic Study of the Greater Boston Jewish Community included all the cities and towns in the 1980 Boston Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), plus additional areas served by the Combined Jewish Philanthropies (CJP) of Greater Boston, mainly the Brockton metropolitan area. Interviews were conducted with 1,446 respondents; approximately 800 of these were from lists developed by CJP using random-digit-dialing (RDD). The remaining 600 were drawn also by RDD from all households in the sampling area. A weighting factor was applied to combine the two subsamples and to oversample some geographic areas.

The Second Census of Jewish Schools in the

Diaspora was carried out during the school years 1987/88 and 1988/89. The scope of the census was limited to formal Jewish educational institutions—both day and supplementary—at all levels from preschool to the end of secondary school. The main instrument used in the census was a questionnaire mailed to the principals of all these Jewish schools. Special measures were taken to improve response rates, and a weighting procedure was used to take into account uncompleted questionnaires. The conventional distinction is made between the two main types of Jewish education: day school and supplementary school (both weekday and Sunday). This article considers pupils in the age bracket 6–17.

Table 1. The Jewish Population of Greater Boston, by Age, 1985; and Changes in Population Distribution 1965-1985 (Percentages)*

	1985				1965-1985	1975-1985
	Total	0-5	6-17	18+	Total	Total
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	5.8	12.8
(N) ^b	(226,000)	(14,183)	(28,845)	(182,972)	(+12,000)	(+25,000)
Core	36.7	39.2	31.3	37.3	-5.1	+15.3
Allston-Brighton	2.7	1.7	0.8	3.0	-52.0	-60.0
Brookline	11.5	7.4	8.1	12.3	-13.3	+23.8
Newton	15.0	19.0	19.0	14.1	+5.9	+47.8
North Central	7.5	11.1	3.4	7.9	+36.0	+30.8
Bay Area	20.7	20.4	12.7	22.0	-27.7	-6.0
Rest of Boston	8.4	10.3	5.5	8.7	-30.9	+5.6
Northeast	8.8	6.6	3.7	9.8	-37.5	=
Southeast	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	-20.0	-33.3
Outer Ring	42.5	40.4	56.0	40.7	+20.9	+73.3
South Central	7.5	7.2	10.6	7.1	+70.0	+21.4
Brockton Area ^c	3.5	2.4	5.8	3.3	-	+60.0
West	9.7	5.8	16.2	9.0	+46.7	+22.2
Northwest	5.8	4.4	6.4	5.8	+160.0	+18.2
Framingham ^{cde}	4.9	1.4	7.6	4.7	-	+120.0
North Shore ^{cd}	11.1	19.2	9.4	10.8	-	=

*Source: Israel, S. (1987) *Boston's Jewish Community: The 1985 CJP Demographic Study*, Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston; and our own processing of the 1985 Boston Survey, Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

^bThe study area in 1965 did not include the Brockton area and some other non-SMSA towns. A corresponding area estimate was used for 1985 to calculate changes in the size of the Jewish population.

^cNo area estimate for 1965.

^dNot in CJP service area. Samples are extremely small and estimates of the Jewish population in these areas are subject to a wide margin of error.

^eIncluding other SMSA that are not in CJP service area.

erated Jewish settlement in the last few years.

The area under study had some 226,000 Jewish inhabitants in 1985, an increase of 5.8 percent from 1965 and of 12.8 percent from 1975 (Table 1). The Jewish communities of Boston city and Allston-Brighton (which fall under the Boston municipality) had suffered a decline of one-third or more in the percentage of their population in the last 20 years. Newton, the North Central area, and since 1975, Brookline experienced a significant percentage growth. The great-

est percentage growth since 1965 was in the South Central, the West, and the Northwest areas; over the 10-year period beginning in 1975, the Jewish population of Brockton increased by 60%. In summary, therefore, metropolitan Boston generally presents an outward and predominantly westward trend of Jewish geographical redistribution.

It is not only that Jews are heading westward but their previous concentrated pattern has given way to a greater dispersion. A simple statistical measure that can demonstrate this tendency is the Jewish Environ-

ment Ratio (JER). The JER indicates how much more densely Jewish is the environment of the average Jewish individual than would be the case if the distribution of the Jewish population throughout the territorial divisions was the same as that of the total population (for a more detailed explanation of JER, see Bachi et al., 1988, pp. 112-114, 131-132). In the three succeeding surveys, the JER of Boston's Jewish population had changed from a level of 2.4 in 1965 down to 1.6 in 1975, and to 2.1 in 1985 (Bachi et al., 1988). That is to say, in 1965 the segregation of Boston's Jews was greater by 24% than would be expected if the distribution of the Jewish population over the territory were the same as that of the total population, whereas it was greater by only 16% and 21% in 1975 and 1985, respectively. These fluctuations reflect differences in the timing in which the residential redistribution took place. However, the population redistribution clearly resulted in a less segregated Jewish population in the new areas of settlement.

Schools and Pupils Distribution

Because this study aims to contribute both to the theoretical field and to provide planners and communal leadership with practical information, those parts of Greater Boston that are not in the CJP service area are excluded from the analysis. In fact, the residential distribution of Jewish children aged 6 to 17 within the CJP service area differs only slightly from that reported in Table 1 (which also included non-CJP service areas). Still, approximately half of the Jewish children of Greater Boston in 1985 lived in the Outer Ring communities.

A simple cross-classification analysis shows a high correlation between the residential distribution of Jewish children and that of Jewish schools by the three aggregate areas: 37.7% of Jewish school-aged children (aged 6-17) of Greater Boston live in the Core where 37.0% of the Jewish schools are located; likewise, similar proportions of Jewish children and Jewish

schools—15.3% and 18.5% respectively—were found in the Bay Area (Table 2). In the Outer Ring the percentages were 47% and 44.5%. Yet, if one considers day schools and supplementary schools separately, a more complex pattern emerges. In the Core Area there were in 1987/89 nine Jewish day schools that accounted for 64.3% of all the day schools in metropolitan Boston, whereas only 37.7% of the total Jewish school-aged children resided there in 1985; by contrast, only four Jewish day schools (28.6% of the total) were located in the Outer Ring where about half of the Jewish school-aged children lived. Supplementary school distribution more closely overlapped with the children's residential distribution.

The residential distribution of the Jewish school-aged children who were receiving Jewish education in 1985 is indicative of an unbalanced scattering between the residential distribution of Jewish school-aged children and that of day school pupils: whereas only 37.7% of Boston's Jewish children lived in the Core Area, 78.5% of the day school pupils resided there. By contrast, the proportions in the Outer Ring were 47% and 21.5%, respectively.

It therefore comes as no surprise that the distribution of the day school pupils, measured by the location of schools, does not match the residential distribution of the total Boston's Jewish school-aged children. The difference is quite significant. As many as 90.3% of all pupils enrolled in Jewish day school programs attended schools located in the Core Area, and only 4.9% were in schools in the Outer Ring. The relative percentages of Jewish children living in these areas were 37.7% and 47.0%. Again, the residential distribution of the supplementary group corresponded more closely to that of all Jewish school-aged children in 1985.

The somewhat more extreme discrepancy between the distribution of Jewish day school pupils—by location of school—and that of Jewish school-aged children's place

Table 2. Type of School and Location, Boston's CJP Service Area 1985-1989 (Percentages)^a

Location	Total	Day Schools	Supplementary Schools
<i>Jewish Schools (1987/89)</i>			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(81)	(14)	(67)
Core	37.0	64.3	31.3
Bay Area	18.5	7.1	20.9
Outer Ring ^b	44.5	28.6	47.8
<i>Jewish Pupils (by Place of Residence, 1985)</i>			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(207)	(28)	(179)
Core	43.0	78.5	37.4
Bay Area	3.8	0.0	4.5
Outer Ring ^b	53.2	21.5	58.1
<i>Jewish Pupils (by Location of School, 1987/89)</i>			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) ^c	(16,601)	(2,500)	(14,101)
Core	48.0	90.3	34.5
Bay Area	14.5	4.8	17.6
Outer Ring ^b	37.5	4.9	47.9

^aSource: Our own data processing of the 1985 Boston Survey and of the Second Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora, Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Missing information from unreturned questionnaires of the Second Census of Jewish Schools was completed according to data of the 1981/83 First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora. Still, there are 15 schools (one day school in the South Central area, and 14 supplementary schools) which did not answer the questionnaire in either census.

^bExcluding Framingham and the North Shore, and other non CJP service areas.

^cWeighted.

of residence, can partly be explained by the fact that the Jewish day schools of the Outer Ring are all located in the Southeast and the South Central areas and Brockton; none are in the West or the Northwest. At the same time, the absolute majority (53%) of the Jewish school-aged children of the Outer Ring reside in the West and the Northwest. The three aggregate areas are spread along sequential geographic points, and within them the distance from one community to another is sometimes relatively great. It can be assumed that some of the parents in the West and Northwest outer Boston suburbs whose children were enrolled in Jewish day

schools found the Core's institutions more convenient in terms of driving distance and access.

Measurement Approaches

Although there is a close relationship between the spatial distribution of Jewish schools of both types and the residential scattering of pupils, the extent to which this relationship is causal cannot be determined from the available data, and further research is therefore required. However, there is ground for constructing some measures of dissimilarity of the distribution of the Jew-

ish schools or that of their constituencies relative to the residential distribution of all the Jewish school-aged children to provide a more meaningful assessment of the observations discussed above. The analysis used two different measurement approaches. The first was an index of *rates* of Jewish schools or pupils in Jewish schools per 1,000 Jewish school-aged children. The second index, the *percentage ratio of percentage distribution*, was arrived at by dividing the percentages of the Jewish schools and pupils in Jewish schools by the percentages of Jewish school-aged children for each of the three areas separately.

Regional variations in the rates of Jewish day schools are highly indicative: whereas for all metropolitan Boston there exists approximately half a Jewish day school per 1,000 Jewish children aged 6 to 17, in the Core Area this ratio is 0.99 and in the Outer Ring it is only 0.35. When the rates of day school pupils are considered, a pattern of consistency emerges: the rates are extremely high in the Core Area, reaching a level of 167.4 by place of residence (which reflects the current enrollment rates) and 221.8 by place of school, and only 36.5 and 9.7, respectively, in the Outer Ring.

A similar correlation is obtained by the second measurement approach. By allowing 100 to represent the overall existing ratio between the percentages of Jewish day schools and those of Jewish children, we arrive at figures showing the Core Area to be overrepresented with a ratio of 170.6 and the Outer Ring, by contrast, to be underrepresented with the ratio being only 60.9. These patterns of discrepancy, with slight fluctuations, characterize the ratios between day school pupils and all school-aged children both by place of residence and by location of school. The differences between the various areas for supplementary schools (or pupils) are largely negligible.

A summary measure that may be used to gauge the differences between the residential distribution of school-aged children and that of Jewish schools/pupils is the index of dissimilarity (Duncan & Duncan, 1955).

The index indicates the percentage of schools/pupils that would have to be redistributed to allow their spatial cluster to match that of school-aged children. The index shows that 26.6% of the Jewish day schools would have to be redistributed among Greater Boston's three aggregate areas for their spread to resemble that of Greater Boston's potential pupils. Among the supplementary schools, only 6.4% would have to be so redistributed. The index of dissimilarity between the distribution of Jewish pupils, by place of residence, and the residential distribution of the school-aged children reached the level of 40.8% for pupils in day schools but only 11.1% for pupils in supplementary schools. For pupils by location of school, the index of dissimilarity was 52.6% and 3.2%, respectively.

Other Intervening Variables: Do They Make a Difference?

One can reasonably argue that participation in Jewish educational programs is not solely affected by the distance between home and school but that other characteristics, such as the Jewishness of the household or the family's financial means, are plausible explanatory factors for the enrollment of children in parochial schools. Following this approach, those families who choose to live far from the Jewish center might have lower levels of Jewish identity and so would not send their children to a day school even if one was located nearby; by contrast, Jews who live in the inner parts of the metropolitan and in the more veteran areas of Jewish settlement have a higher level of Jewishness and tend more to enroll their children in all-day Jewish school. Jewish education may also be correlated with the economic status of the household. Taking into consideration the high cost of a full Jewish life—day school education, synagogue and Jewish Community Center membership, summer camp, and donations—low levels of income may prevent families from affiliating with the organized Jewish community and from sending their children to a Jewish

school.

Therefore, the first question to be raised is whether there are any significant differences in the levels of Jewish identification among Jews living in the Core, the Bay Area, and the Outer Ring that may explain the dissimilarities observed above. To test these relationships, we chose two different measures of Jewish identification: (1) synagogue or temple membership and (2) denominational preference; that is, self-description as Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, or other, which includes those not affiliated with any of the three major denominations within American Judaism. These two measures represent legitimate Jewish strategies of survival and continuity. Comparing the two most distant areas—the Core and the Outer Ring—it is evident that the Jewish population of metropolitan Boston in 1985 was very homogeneous: 43.3% of the Jewish households of the Core Area belonged to a synagogue as did 42.1% of the Jews in the Outer Ring. In addition, 86.6% of the Core area households reported having a denominational preference in comparison to 87.7% of those in the Outer Ring (data adopted and recomputed from Israel, 1987, pp. 105-115).

There is also no evidence that Jews of the Outer Ring are poorer than those living in the Core. Indeed, the opposite is apparent: in 1985, the median income of a Jewish household in the Core Area was \$36,000, whereas for the Outer Ring it was \$43,000 (with some variations among the communities within those areas). Moreover, although 20% of the Jewish households in the Core Area had an annual income of less than \$15,000 this was true for only 15% of the Jewish households in the Outer Ring (data adopted and recomputed from Israel, 1987, pp. 105-115).

A COMPARATIVE LOOK: GREATER BOSTON AND THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Recent sociological studies of Jews in the United States have pointed to substantial

communal variations (DellaPergola, 1984; Rebhun, 1993; Tobin, 1985). In all demographic, socioeconomic, religious, and institutional aspects the Jews are a very heterogeneous population "spread along an extended continuum" (Tobin, 1989, p. 63). One may therefore ask whether the relationships between the spatial distribution of the Jewish school-aged children and that of Jewish schools and pupils, as found in Greater Boston, indeed characterize other Jewish communities in America. Thus, although the focal interest of this study is the Jews of Greater Boston, an attempt was made to provide comparative data from another Jewish community and to evaluate the extent to which the above findings can be applied to a somewhat wider scene. The Jewish community of the San Francisco Bay Area was chosen for this comparative examination.

A demographic survey of Jews in the San Francisco Bay Area was conducted in 1986 and comprises the seven-county region of San Francisco County, Marin County, Sonoma County, the Peninsula (North and South), San Jose County, and the area served by the Jewish Federation of the Greater East Bay, i.e., Contra Costa and Alameda Counties. Approximately 223,000 Jews lived in the San Francisco Bay Area at the time of the survey. Hence, from a quantitative point of view the Bay Area Jewish community and the Greater Boston Jewish community are similar.

In those areas for which previous estimates are available, the San Francisco area Jewish communities had experienced significant growth. The 1959 Jewish Population Study estimated the number of Jews in San Francisco County to be 46,616; by 1986 this figure had grown to 52,143, an increase of 12% (Tobin & Sassler, 1988). Yet, the greatest increase occurred in the areas surrounding San Francisco: in Marin County, which in 1959 had a Jewish population of only 2,700, the number of Jews had increased to 19,100 (a growth of over 600%) and on the Peninsula, from 16,700 to 47,000 (a growth of 187%). Hence, the

community had simultaneously both grown and become more diffuse, heading northward and southward. Table 3 shows that if only the areas covered by the 1959 and the 1986 surveys are considered, the relative proportion of San Francisco's Jewish community declined from 70% to 44%; by contrast, in Marin County, where in 1959 only 4% of the Jewish population had resided, 16% of the Jews lived in 1986, and on the Peninsula the figure increased from 25% to 40%.

Among Jewish school-aged children (6-17) of the San Francisco Bay Area in 1986, 14% lived in San Francisco County. This is a much lower proportion than the Jewish population of all ages living in San Francisco County. This observation, augmented by additional data not reported here, points to an aging Jewish population in San Francisco County as compared with other parts of the area under study. On the other hand, the newer areas of Jewish settlement in the North and East Bay have higher percentages of school-aged children than their rela-

tive share among the total Jewish population. The proportion of children of the Silicon Valley adequately matches that of the total Jewish population among the San Francisco Bay Area.

Based on the aggregate division to four major regions, there is a high correlation between the residential distribution of Jewish school-aged children and that of Jewish schools (third column of Table 3 and first column of Table 4). Yet, if only day schools are considered, significant differentials emerge; in 1987/89 nearly one-quarter of all the Jewish day schools in the San Francisco Bay Area were located in San Francisco County, but only 14% of the children aged 6 to 17 resided there. By contrast, only one Jewish day school (7.7% of the total) was operating at that time in the Northern Area, which accounted for 17.7% of school-aged children. Likewise, less than one-quarter of all day schools were located in the East Bay where one-third of the Jewish school-aged children lived. An inverse relation occurred in the Silicon Valley

Table 3. Changes in Population Distribution 1959-1986 (Percentages)^{ab}

	1986				1959	1986
	Total	0-5	6-17	18+	Total	Total
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(222,847)	(16,122)	(34,452)	(172,273)	(66,026)	(181,696)
Core	23.4	22.6	13.6	25.4	70.6	43.9
San Francisco County	23.4	22.6	13.6	25.4	—	—
Northern Area	12.8	16.0	17.7	11.6	—	—
Marin County	8.6	10.7	11.1	7.9	4.1	16.2
Sonoma County	4.2	5.3	6.6	3.7	—	—
Silicon Valley	37.5	37.4	37.3	37.6	—	—
North Peninsula Div.	11.4	9.4	9.6	11.9] 25.3] 39.9
South Peninsula Div.	9.9	12.3	10.9	9.5		
San Jose County	16.2	15.7	16.8	16.2	—	—
East Bay	26.3	23.9	31.4	25.5	—	—
Contra Costa County	10.7	8.8	16.5	9.7	—	—
Alameda County	15.6	15.1	14.9	15.8	—	—

^aAdopted from: Tobin, Gary A; and Sassler, Sharon. (1988). *Bay Area Jewish Community Study, Special Report: Demographic Profile*, pp. 20, 22, 66.

^bComparisons were made for those areas surveyed in both the 1959 and the 1986 studies.

Table 4. School and Location: San Francisco Bay Area 1987/89 (Percentages)*

Location	Total	Day Schools	Supplementary Schools
<i>Jewish Schools (1987/89)</i>			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(61)	(13)	(48)
Core	16.4	23.1	14.5
Northern Area	11.5	7.7	12.5
Silicon Valley	36.1	46.1	33.4
East Bay	36.1	23.1	29.6
<i>Jewish Pupils (by Location of School, 1987/89)</i>			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(7,919)	(1,531)	(6,388)
Core	21.2	39.0	16.8
Northern Area	7.7	6.9	8.0
Silicon Valley	37.2	32.8	38.2
East Bay	33.9	21.3	37.0

*Source: Our own data processing of the Second Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora, Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Missing information from unreturned questionnaires was completed according to data of the 1981/83 First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora.

where the proportion of Jewish day schools exceeded that of school-aged children.

As in the case of Greater Boston, the geographical distribution of the supplementary Jewish schools corresponded more closely to the residential distribution of the Jewish school-aged children. The index of dissimilarity between the distribution of Jewish day schools and the residential distribution of the school-aged children reached the level of 18.3%; a much smaller diversity of only 5.9% was found for supplementary schools.

Finally, the lower part of Table 4 reports the distribution of Jewish pupils by location and type of school. The percentage of children of San Francisco County who in 1987/89 were enrolled in Jewish day schools was nearly threefold their percentage among the total school-aged children (39% and 13.6%, respectively). By contrast, only 7% of all pupils receiving all-day Jewish education were enrolled in the single school of the Northern Area, whereas that area's share of

the total number of school-aged children was as high as 13%. A similar disproportion of fewer pupils than children also exists in the East Bay. The distribution of the supplementary school pupils more accurately matches the residential distribution of all school-aged children of the San Francisco Bay Area in 1986. The index of dissimilarity between the distribution of pupils, by location of school, and that of Jewish school-aged children was 25.4% for pupils in day schools and 9.7% for pupils enrolled in supplementary schools.

The two Jewish communities of Greater Boston and the San Francisco Bay Area differ from one another in the magnitude of the differential between the residential distribution of school-aged children and the geographical distribution of day schools and day school pupils. Yet, our working hypothesis, according to which a disproportionately large number of Jewish day schools are located in the more veteran areas of Jewish settlement in the center and

fewer are found in the suburban rings that are favored by families with young children, is reinforced by empirical evidence from the Jewish community of the San Francisco Bay Area. On the other hand, the geographical distribution of the supplementary schools and that of pupils in these schools closely resemble the residential distribution of the school-aged children in each community.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING

One hundred years after the massive migration of European Jewry that eventually transformed the American community into the largest in the world, American Jews of today must depend substantially on themselves to maintain their numbers. American Jews do not operate in a social vacuum. Rather, they are part of the open and competitive contemporary American society into which they have successfully integrated, experiencing significant socioeconomic and cultural changes—in varied rhythms and levels along time and space. Jewish leadership and communal services must build into their planning adaptive ways and means to meet these social changes and to ensure that communal ties and religioethnic identification are not disrupted (Elazar, 1982). The cultural factor—namely, the ability to preserve group identity and transmit it to future generations—and the biological-demographic factor are the two forces that shape the demographic continuity of a subpopulation, such as the Jews in the United States.

In this research an attempt was made to assess the correlation between the residential clustering of the Jewish population in Greater Boston and the distribution of Jewish schools in that area. It was hypothesized that intensive decentralization may result in a distancing of Jewish schools—mainly day schools, which require a significant physical infrastructure and high operational costs. This distance between home and school may then be identified as an intervening obstacle in the parental decision to send children to parochial schools, as re-

flected in enrollment rates. Analysis of the data largely supports our premise: whereas the spatial distribution of Jewish supplementary schools and that of supplementary school pupils was found to correlate strongly and positively with the residential structure of the Jewish school-aged children as a whole, most of the Jewish day schools were located in the inner city and in the older suburbs that had dense concentrations of Jews in the past. In contrast, the newer suburbs and exurbia of Jewish settlement that attract mostly young families exhibit looser ties between the number of Jewish day schools and their potential pupils. This latter situation is dramatically seen in the number of children enrolled in day school programs by place of residence.

When other things are equal—socioeconomic status or the *feasibility* of sustaining the expenses of private education; the socio-cultural motivation or the *desirability* for intensive Jewish socialization of children on the part of their Jewish parents; and the *availability* of pupils as affected by the variable size of Jewish birth cohorts—the spatial location of educational institutions is an intervening obstacle in imparting Jewish knowledge and values through the formal educational system of Jewish day schools. The supplementary type of Jewish education seems to be more flexible and can adjust rapidly to social changes of residential redistribution of the kind examined here.

The large majority of American Jews today are native born. They have high levels of education, their occupational patterns are shifting into professional and managerial positions, and their social and economic status is rising. Under such conditions, their geographic residential dispersion reflects more and more decision making based on the economic benefit and the trade-off between time and space; it is less dependent on the desire to live in close proximity to other Jews and to Jewish institutions. Hence, a physical infrastructure must be planned to take into account the population's distribution over a larger met-

ropolitan space. This is most important in regard to those institutions that are truly dedicated to Jewish survival; to such effect, religious schools can be viewed as one of the most important determining factors, along with the home. Moreover, previous studies and also first evidence from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) claim that former students of the most intensive full-time Jewish education programs score higher on Jewish identification than those who attended only part-time schools, when adjustment is made for other variables including parents' religiosity (Cohen, 1974; Fishman & Goldstein, 1993; Rebhun & DellaPergola, 1993; Ribner, 1978).

More than the tendency itself to move outside the cities' center, it is the nature of the new spatial distribution of a more dispersed Jewish population that makes it difficult to provide communal services. Some institutions, such as supplementary schools and also synagogues, can adjust more easily to these kind of regional changes: because they operate in relatively small edifices, additional institutions could be established within an acceptable driving/walking distance from Jewish residential concentrations. By contrast, day schools require large buildings and expensive infrastructure that are costly to replace and to disperse in different places. This becomes even more complex since Jews' geographic mobility is dynamic and they move further to the exurbs beyond the suburbs.

In such conditions of geographic mobility the center of the city may perhaps still be found as the "mean center" of the areas where Jews live. An attempt to reach potential constituencies of Jewish education must therefore give special attention to suitable organized transportation. The number of women in the labor force is growing, and more people "work outside of the central business district or even the city limits" (Elazar, 1993, p. 2) and therefore cannot combine driving to work with driving the children to school. Effective organized

transportation is needed to overcome the obstacle of commuting between home and school. This transportation network should be based on a large number of vehicles, each picking up pupils from a relatively small number of stations in a single residential area and bringing pupils to school and back home within a reasonable time.

Community planners and educators should also develop ways to attract families to Jewish schools, despite the geographic distance. An attempt should be made to subsidize considerably the tuition in Jewish day schools. Taking into account that there are basic operational expenses, regardless of the number of pupils in a given school, any diminution in tuition that is followed by a meaningful growth in enrollment may bring about a substantial increase in income far beyond the increase in expenses. In addition, the federation's allocation to Jewish education should be increased.

Finally, educators and consultants need to develop special programs and curricula to ensure the quality and superiority of the Jewish educational system over the public one. The strong positive value placed by Jews on providing their children a good education should overcome any instrumental obstacles of convenient geographical access and financial costs. This will ensure the maintenance of enrollment rates and a lively all-day Jewish educational system.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research is an original attempt to substantiate conclusions on the topic being discussed using empirical data; this was done by combing different, yet complementary sets of data that were brought into a homogeneous format. It should be regarded as only preliminary and exploratory research. The data upon which we have relied have many limitations that should ideally be remedied in future studies and before modeling the results: community coverage should be extensive, and an effort should be made to tie the dependent variable more directly to the explanatory variables. It will also be

necessary to verify the findings reported here. It is to be hoped that an additional demographic study of the Jewish communities of Greater Boston and San Francisco Bay Area will be executed shortly; a new Census of Jewish Schools in the United States is now under way (spring 1994) as the initial project of the recently established Statistical Data Bank on Jewish Education in the Diaspora.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research that supplied the findings reported in this article was conducted in the Division of Jewish Demography and Statistics of the Avraham Harman Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The author wishes to express his appreciation to several organizations and persons who have been helpful in this research: Paul Ritterband, Barry Kosmin, and Jeffrey Scheckner of the North American Jewish Data Bank in New York for providing the tape of Boston's 1985 Jewish Community Survey; H. Zohar and Z. Inbar of the Joint Program/Pincus Fund for Jewish Education under whose sponsorship the Censuses of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora were held; and Leora Isaacs of the Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA) for being responsible for data collection of the School Censuses throughout the United States. Sergio DellaPergola kindly read a draft of this article and made valuable suggestions. Beny Anderman ably assisted in data processing and Judith Even provided editorial comments on this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Axelrod, Morris, Fowler, Floyd J., & Gurin, Arnold. (1967). *A community survey for long range planning: A study of the Jewish population of Greater Boston*. Boston: The Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston.
- Bachi, Roberto, DellaPergola, Sergio, & Klaff, Vivian Z. (1988). *Urban ecology of the Jews in the Diaspora*. Final Report on Project 82-03427 of the U.S.-Israel Binational Science Foundation.
- Cohen, Steven M. (1974). The impact of Jewish education on religious identification and practice. *Jewish Social Studies*, 36(3-4), 316-326.
- DellaPergola, Sergio. (1984). Population data—a global perspective. In Jerry A. Winter & Levin I. Lester (Eds.), *Colloquium on Jewish population studies*, Vol. 2 (pp. 22-30). New York: Council of Jewish Federations.
- DellaPergola, Sergio, & Schmelz, Uziel O. (1989). Demography and Jewish education in the Diaspora: Trends in Jewish school-aged population and school enrollment. In Harold S. Himmelfarb & Sergio DellaPergola (Eds.), *Jewish education worldwide: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 43-68). New York: University Press of America.
- DellaPergola, Sergio, Rebhun, Uzi, & Sagi, Dalia. (1993). *Highlights on Jewish education in the Diaspora, The Second Census of Jewish Schools 1987/89*.
- Duncan, Otis D., & Duncan, Beverly. (1955). A methodological analysis of segregation indexes. *American Sociological Review*, 20, 210-217.
- Elazar, Daniel J. (1982, Summer). Jews on the move: The new wave of Jewish migration and its implications for organized Jewry. *Journal of Communal Service*, 58(4), 279-283.
- Elazar, Daniel J. (1993). The new geo-demographics of American Jewry. *Jerusalem Letter*, No. 278. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs.
- Fishman, Joshua A. (1963, Spring). Moving to the suburbs: Its possible impact on the role of the Jewish minority in American community life. *Phylon*, 146-153.
- Fishman, Sylvia B., & Goldstein, Alice. (1993). When they are grown they will not depart: Jewish education and the Jewish behavior of American adults. *Research Report*, 8. Jewish Education Service of North America.

- Goldstein, Sidney. (1981). Jews in the United States: Perspectives from demography. In *American Jewish Year Book* (pp. 3-59). New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Goldstein, Sidney. (1991). American Jews on the move. *Moment*, 16(4), 24-29, 49-51.
- Goldstein, Sidney. (1992). Profile of American Jewry: Insights from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey. In *American Jewish Year Book* (pp. 77-173). New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Himmelfarb, Harold S. (1977). The non-linear impact of schooling: Comparing different types and amounts of Jewish education. *Sociology of Education*, 50(2), 114-132.
- Isaacs, Leora. (1992). Statistical highlights of Jewish schooling in the U.S. *Trends*, 16, Jewish Education Service of North America.
- Israel, Sherry. (1987). *Boston's Jewish community: The 1985 CJP Demographic Study*. Boston: Combined Jewish Philanthropies.
- Klafl, Vivian Z. (1983). The urban ecology of Jewish populations: A comparative analysis. In Uziel O. Schmeltz, Paul Glikson, & Sergio DellaPergola (Eds.), *Papers in Jewish Demography 1981* (pp. 343-361). Jerusalem: The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Newman, William M., & Halvorson, Peter L. (1979). American Jews: Patterns of geographic distribution and change, 1952-1971. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 18(2), 183-193.
- Rebhun, Uzi, & DellaPergola, Sergio. (1990). The sociodemographic and Jewish identity context of mixed-marriage among Jews in the United States in 1990. In Robert Bonfil & Shulamith Shahar (Eds.), *The Family*. Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel and the Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History.
- Rebhun, Uzi. (1993). The community as an explanatory variable of Jewish identity. *Contemporary Jewry: A Research Annual*. Jerusalem: The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 8, 301-36 (in Hebrew).
- Ribner, Sol. (1978). The effects of intensive Jewish education on adult Jewish lifestyles. *Jewish Education*, 46(1), 6-12.
- Shluker, David. (1992, Spring). The communal education restructuring conundrum. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 68(3), 239-252.
- Tobin, Garry A. (1989). A sociodemographic profile of Jews in the United States in the 1980s. In Uziel O. Schmeltz & Sergio DellaPergola (Eds.), *Papers in Jewish Demography 1985* (pp. 43-65). Jerusalem: The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Tobin, Garry A., & Sassler, Sharon. (1988). *Bay Area Jewish Community Study, Special Report: Demographic Profile*. San Francisco: Jewish Federation.