

POPULATION MOVEMENT AND REDISTRIBUTION
AMONG AMERICAN JEWS

Sidney Goldstein

Introduction

Until the last few years, a reading of the American Jewish press has suggested that the major challenges facing the American Jewish community relate to the size of the Jewish population as it is affected by relatively high rates of intermarriage and very low rates of reproduction. Yet, while these concerns persist, more current news items point to a growing and substantial shift in the focus of concern to the relevance of population distribution in the future vitality of the community. The nature of the concern is clearly evident in such recent articles as, "Population Shifts Create New Problems for Jewish Federations"; "South Dakota's Lone Rabbi Travels Far and Wide to Sell Judaism to All"; "Jewish Outposts in Dixie"; "A Growing Trend: Jewish Population Moving from Northeast to Sun Belt"; "Being Jewish Where There Is No Community." Population movement and its impact on the Jewish community are clearly receiving concerted and concerned attention.

In the United States, the majority of persons arriving during the mass migrations of 1880-1924 seem to have been quite stable geographically. They settled in communities, often ports of entry, where there was a need for their labor; subsequently many established their own businesses; while socially and economically mobile, they, and often their children, remained in the same city, or at least the same metropolitan area, all their lives. It is this pattern which seems to be undergoing significant change. In the last half of the twentieth century, the kinds of education which American Jews obtain and the kinds of occupations which they now enter may often require geographic dispersion - movement away from family and out of centers of Jewish population concentration (Goldstein, 1981). Moreover, many high level positions require repeated movement which may make it more difficult for individuals and families to plant deep roots in any single Jewish community. Coming at a time when American Jewish fertility has reached what probably is its lowest level ever and when intermarriage and assimilation are inherently threatening the demographic and socio-religious vitality of the community, increased population mobility and dispersion throughout the nation create a new threat and new challenge to the community as a whole.

Yet migration may in its own way also contribute to renewed vitality by bringing more Jews to small communities which have not had the density sufficient to develop or maintain strong institutions or, as

Lebowitz (1975:8) suggests, by bridging the traditional age and affiliation cleavages, thereby providing the "social cement" necessary to hold a community together. Lebowitz uses the data from the National Jewish Population Survey for Portland, Oregon, a small Jewish community of about 8,000 persons characterized by a high level of migration, to explore the relation between migration and social organization. He concludes that in Portland, "immigrant" is an important, positively valued status through which unique identity and affiliation in communal life can be maintained. On the basis of this finding, he argues that contextual factors are important limiting conditions on the relation between residential stability and social integration.

Similarly, Jaret (1978) uses data from Chicago to test two different perspectives on the relations between geographic mobility and ethnic community organization; the first stresses mobility's disruptive and detaching qualities, and the second its power for community institution and social network building. He found that geographic mobility has different implications for the two sub-groups of Jews whom he compared: Reform/nonaffiliated and Orthodox/Conservative. As he put it, "For the former, evidence supported the older, pessimistic' perspective -- that mobility is linked to reduced ethnic identification and participation. Among the latter group, evidence supported the more modern perspective that mobility need not mean ethnic detachment and can even promote ethnic participation. Important in determining the effects of geographic mobility may be the nature of ethnic community identity-commitment orientation " (Jaret, 1978:18). If the differentials observed are general, any substantial increase in the proportion of Reform/nonaffiliated in the population could well be associated with both high levels of residential mobility and lower levels of Jewish social participation. But what is cause and what is effect remains to be determined. (See also Waxman, 1981.)

Although we have had reasonably reliable estimates of the distribution of the Jewish population among the various regions of the United States (e.g., Chenkin and Miran, 1981), much less is known about the extent and character of Jewish migration. Some insights may be gained from individual community studies, but, to the extent that each community is unique, the possibility of generalizing to the total American scene has been limited. Community studies have suggested, however, that high levels of population mobility characterize American Jews; in a number of communities as many as 70 percent of local Jewry were born in a different community than that in which they were living at the time of the survey (Goldstein, 1981:36-37).

Yet, it is also clear that the experience of populations varies considerably between communities. For analysis of national patterns, national statistics are therefore essential; the only such recent data are those available from the National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS).

Some preliminary assessment of the NJPS migration data was undertaken in 1974 (Massarik and Chenkin, 1974), and these, too, point to high rates of mobility. Further exploration of these data for fuller analysis of the specific characteristics of the migrant and non-migrant population and the direction of their movement in the United States provides the basis for the research undertaken in this paper. Before proceeding to a description of the survey and an analysis of the NJPS migration data, some background description of the changing regional distribution of the Jewish population is in order.

Regional Distribution

Estimates indicate that in 1900, 28 percent of the total American population lived in the Northeast, whereas 57 percent of American Jewry lived in this area, primarily in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey (Middle Atlantic). The North Central region accounted for the next largest number of Jews -- about one-fourth of all those in the nation, but this contrasted with one-third of the total U.S. population. Compared to the general population, Jews were also underrepresented in the South, where most were living in Maryland; and only a very small minority of the total American Jewish population lived in the West, just over 5 percent -- almost identical to the proportion of the general population living there (Table 1).

Thirty years later, due to the heavy concentration of Eastern European immigrants in the large cities of the Northeast, this region contained 68 percent of the American Jewish population, mostly in New York. The other regions of the country all contained smaller proportions of the Jewish population than they had in 1900. The sharpest decline occurred in the South, and Jews had clearly not yet joined the western movement on the same scale as had the rest of the population. The comparison between the Jews and the total U.S. population may, of course, be affected by the heavier concentration of Jews in urban places and metropolitan areas. The regional distribution of the total U.S. population also reflects the combined effects of the distribution of whites and non-whites. For example, if the comparison in 1968/70 is restricted to the metropolitan white population only, one finds the differences remain basically similar, with slight narrowing in the Northeast and South, and some accentuation in the West.

By 1980, the pattern had changed considerably, reflecting both the cutoff in large-scale immigration in the preceding decades and the effects of increasing internal mobility. Jews in large measure seem to have followed the pattern of redistribution characterizing the population as a whole; in fact, they may have been doing so to an exaggerated degree. For example, between 1930 and 1980, the percentage of Jews living in the Northeast declined from 68 to 57 percent. The decrease was even more substantial for the North Central states where

Table 1. Distribution of Total United States and Jewish Population, by Regions, 1900, 1930, 1968, and 1980

Region	1900		1930 (c)		1968 (d)		1980 (e)	
	Jewish (a)	United States (b)	Jewish States	United States	Jewish States	United States	Jewish States	United States
Northeast	56.6	27.7	68.3	27.9	64.0	24.2	57.3	22.3
New England	7.4	7.5	8.4	6.6	6.8	5.7	6.5	5.6
Middle Atlantic	49.2	20.3	59.9	21.3	57.1	18.5	50.7	16.7
North Central	23.7	34.6	19.6	31.4	12.5	27.8	11.7	26.5
East North Central	18.3	21.0	15.7	20.5	10.2	19.8	9.4	18.8
West North Central	5.4	13.6	3.9	10.9	2.3	8.0	2.3	7.8
South	14.2	32.2	7.6	30.7	10.3	31.2	16.0	32.5
South Atlantic	8.0	13.7	4.3	12.8	8.1	15.0	13.7	15.9
East South Central	3.3	9.9	1.4	8.0	0.7	6.6	0.7	6.4
West South Central	2.9	8.6	1.9	9.9	1.5	9.6	1.7	10.2
West	5.5	5.4	4.6	10.0	13.2	16.8	15.0	18.7
Mountain	2.3	2.2	1.0	3.0	0.9	4.0	1.7	4.8
Pacific	3.2	3.2	3.6	7.0	12.2	12.8	13.3	13.8
Total United States	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percent	1,058	75,994	4,228	123,203	5,869	199,861	5,921	220,099
Number (in 1,000s)								

(a) "Jewish Statistics," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 1 (1900), pp. 623-624.
 (b) U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1960 Census of Population*, Vol. 1, *Characteristics of the Population* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 1-16.
 (c) H.S. Linfield, "Statistics of Jews," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 33 (1931), p. 276.
 (d) Alvin Chenkin, "Jewish Population in the United States," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 70 (1969), p. 266.
 (e) Alvin Chenkin and Maynard Miran, "Jewish Population in the United States, 1980," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 81 (1981), p. 170.

Jews decreased from 20 percent of the national Jewish population in 1930 to only 12 percent in 1980. In contrast, both the South and the West contained growing proportions of the total U.S. Jewish population, reflecting the strong participation of Jews in the shift to the sunbelt and the western states. In contrast to the 3,000 Jews that are estimated to have lived in Florida in 1900, 455,000 are estimated to have been there in 1980. Although proportionally fewer Jews were located in the South and the West than the general population, the differences in distribution had narrowed considerably, even while the Northeast, and especially the Middle Atlantic sub-region, remained by far the largest demographic center of American Jewry. (See also Newman and Halvorson, 1979). These changes observed in regional patterns of population distribution are likely to become accentuated in the future as Jews seek jobs away from their communities of upbringing, as family ties become less important for third and fourth generation Jews, and as more Jews no longer feel it necessary to live in areas of high Jewish density. In an ecological sense, therefore, the population has already become and will likely continue to become a more truly "American population," with all this implies in terms of both assimilation and numerical visibility.

Source of Data

The absence of a question on religion in the United States decennial census precludes tapping the wealth of information that would otherwise be available from that source on the characteristics and distribution of the American Jewish population. In an attempt to provide data on American Jewry that would be national in scope, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds sponsored the National Jewish Population Study in 1970-71. The study was designed to sample the Jewish population, including marginal and unaffiliated Jews as well as those closely identified with the organized Jewish community, in every geographical region of the United States, and generally from every Jewish community within an initially estimated Jewish population of 30,000 or more (Massarik and Chenkin, 1973; Lazerwitz, n.d.). Interviews were also conducted in appropriate proportions in medium sized and small Jewish communities, and a special effort was made to contact Jewish households in a sample of counties that heretofore had been assumed to contain virtually no Jewish populations. Two types of samples were used: 1) an "area probability sample," collected by contacting and screening many thousands of households on a door-to-door basis in order to identify those which included a Jewish member; 2) a "list sample" based on households known to be Jewish through inclusion on lists furnished by Jewish communities or lists specifically developed for the study. These two sample groups were cross-checked and weighted to provide the needed balance between marginal Jews and those directly associated with the Jewish community.

Housing units were screened for the presence of Jewish respondents. If any of the occupants had been born Jewish, had a parent who had been born Jewish, or regarded themselves as Jewish, that housing unit was eligible for interviewing. Family members temporarily away, for example, at college, were assigned to the involved sampling unit if they were then living in some kind of group quarters or at an institutional setting. In this respect, the survey differed from U.S. Census procedures. Jews in homes for the aged, prisons, or custodial care in mental hospitals were excluded from survey coverage.

The final response rate among the Jewish housing units was 79 percent, with a total of 7,179 such households being interviewed. (For a full discussion of the sampling, interviewing, and weighting procedures, see Lazerwitz, n.d.). In order to adjust for the disproportional sample design, weights were assigned to both households and individuals. This report uses the individual weights; however, the 49 individuals who had been assigned weights of 50 or more are omitted from this analysis because their weighted number of 3660 would unduly have distorted the regional distributions. This procedure has resulted in a total weighted sample size of 33,165 individuals. Only individuals who were identified as Jewish are included in the current analysis.

To date, no full evaluation of the quality of the NJPS has been completed. In the absence of such an assessment, especially with respect to the quality of the data for purposes of regional comparisons, their use here for such analyses and for assessment of migration is exploratory in character; the patterns observed must be regarded as suggestive only, especially since subdivision of the population by region and migration status often leads to very few cases in particular cells.

The wide range of topics encompassed in the survey included mobility and housing. In this section were specific questions on the year in which each household member had moved to the current residence and the previous address. In addition, in order to provide comparability to the U.S. Bureau of the Census measure of migration, a question was asked on specific residence on April 1, 1965. Comparability, however, is reduced by the fact that the data collection for NJPS extended over two years and, therefore, for some respondents the interval was six rather than five years. This could bias the comparability in the direction of higher mobility for Jews because of the longer interval. For the head of the household, information was also collected on reasons for move. For the household members, information was collected on plans for movement within the next five years, including information on specific city, state, or country of intended destination.

In addition to these specific questions directed at mobility, the section of the questionnaire devoted to family background included a

question on the city, state, and country in which all household members were born and year of immigration to the United States for those born overseas. Thus, the basis is provided for obtaining information on lifetime movement, mobility between 1965 and the time of the survey, and the last move. Only the former two sets of information are used in this analysis, and particular attention is given to the "five-year question" since the characteristics of the population relate more directly to movement within the period immediately preceding the survey than they do to lifetime changes in residence. In using these data, additional background information collected on socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents are used as the basis for assessing the extent of migration differentials within the Jewish population.

Lifetime Migration Patterns

Judged by the lifetime migration measure, Jews display a high degree of mobility (Table 2). Just under one-third of both males and females were living in the city in which they had been born. The great majority of the population, therefore, had moved at least once and a considerable proportion seem to have moved a substantial distance. About 15 percent of all respondents were foreign born and therefore immigrants to the United States. An additional 20 percent were living in a state different from their state of birth, pointing to considerable shifting in residence within the United States itself on the part of the American-born population. Not surprisingly, high levels of short distance movement are also evident, with approximately one-third of the population having moved from their city of birth but living within either the same metropolitan area or the same state. Undoubtedly, a substantial proportion of the within-metropolitan-area migrants are persons who participated in the suburbanization movement that has characterized the United States during the twentieth century. That the overall mobility levels of Jews is not very different from that of the general population is evidenced in the fact that of the native born Jews, 25.3 percent were living in a different state than that in which they were born. For the total native white population of the United States, the comparable percentage was 28.4.

The patterns of lifetime migration are closely related to age. Reflecting that the opportunity to participate in lifetime migration increases with age, the greatest stability tends to characterize younger individuals, and the highest mobility rates occurred among the older population. The greatest degree of lifetime international movement characterizes the very oldest segment of the population and declines very sharply in younger age groups.

With the exception of the two older age groups, interstate lifetime migration rises with increasing age; about three out of every ten persons between ages 40 and 65 were living in a state other than that

Table 2. Lifetime Migration Status, by Age and Sex

Age	Same city	Same SMSA	Same state	Other state	Foreign country	Total	
						Percent	Number
<u>Males</u>							
0- 9	40.7	33.3	8.2	14.7	3.1	100.0	2,113
10-19	42.9	30.6	8.7	15.5	2.3	100.0	3,190
20-29	37.3	26.1	11.4	20.2	5.0	100.0	1,946
30-39	29.7	31.1	9.3	22.0	7.9	100.0	1,510
40-49	26.6	27.7	4.9	29.4	11.4	100.0	2,160
50-64	24.6	23.3	5.5	26.1	20.5	100.0	2,985
65 and over	11.7	7.8	1.4	14.6	64.5	100.0	1,620
All ages	31.5	26.3	7.1	20.4	14.7	100.0	15,524
Age 20 and over	26.2	23.5	6.4	23.0	20.9	100.0	10,221
<u>Females</u>							
0- 9	44.2	27.1	11.2	14.0	3.5	100.0	2,146
10-19	45.1	30.4	10.0	13.1	1.4	100.0	3,041
20-29	34.5	28.0	5.7	23.8	8.0	100.0	2,169
30-39	21.4	33.6	7.9	28.4	8.7	100.0	1,791
40-49	23.7	25.1	6.0	33.5	11.7	100.0	2,517
50-64	25.8	19.0	7.0	28.1	20.1	100.0	2,890
65 and over	14.1	8.1	1.8	16.6	59.4	100.0	2,150
All ages	30.3	24.4	7.1	22.3	15.9	100.0	16,704
Age 20 and over	24.0	22.3	5.6	26.2	21.9	100.0	11,517

Note: Persons of unknown birthplace have been excluded from this table. In most age categories, this group constitutes less than 2 percent, and in no instance are they as much as 4 percent of the total age group.

in which they were born. That one in five men and women aged 20-29 have also done so points to the considerable redistribution of the Jewish population and the even greater distribution which is likely during the remaining life span of these younger persons. Furthermore, only one in four persons, or even fewer, was living in the city of birth; even among those under age 20, less than a majority still live in the city of birth. A substantial number of these younger persons have, however, made a relatively short move, as suggested by the high proportions living within the same metropolitan area, again pointing to the redistribution that has occurred as a result of suburbanization. Clearly, for all age groups, movement is a common phenomenon, although the particular direction and distance of lifetime movement varies substantially by age.

Recent Migration Patterns

More related to current concerns are the data on recent movement. These and succeeding data sets are restricted to the population 20 years old and over to reflect adult movement only. As one would expect, they point to considerably greater stability since they refer only to the five to six year period preceding the survey.⁽¹⁾ Whereas three-fourths of the population age 20 and over were living in a different city than that in which they were born, this was true of only one-third of the adult population when the 5-year migration measure is used (Table 3). Perhaps more significant is that so many persons have moved during this short interval. Most of these moves were short distance, involving particularly movement within the same metropolitan area (18 percent of all adults) and to a lesser extent movement within the same state (6 percent); but 10 percent of the adult population were living in a different state or country than in 1965, indicative of the extent to which geographic mobility is characteristic of American Jewry.

As with the lifetime movement, the mobility status showed minimal differences between men and women. A slightly higher proportion of men were stable, as judged by continued residence in the same city or within the same metropolitan area, and fewer had made moves to other states. Both men and women followed the same general pattern of age differentials. Recent migration is more likely to occur among individuals at those critical stages of the life cycle associated with marriage and job mobility. Reflecting this pattern, about half of both men and women between ages 20 and 39 were 5-year movers, compared to only about 25-30 percent of those age 50 and over. For all age groups, the single largest proportion moved within the same metropolitan area, but the rate of such movement was considerably less for older persons

(1) For simplicity, this will be termed "5-year migration"; the 1970/71 survey years will be designated as 1970.

Table 3. Five-Year Mobility Status, by Age and Sex

Age	Same city	Same SMSA	Same state	Other state	Foreign country	Total	
						Percent	Number
<u>Males</u>							
20-29	54.1	25.9	5.3	11.4	3.3	100.0	1,953
30-39	45.5	26.9	8.4	14.4	4.8	100.0	1,511
40-49	69.9	17.9	5.3	5.4	1.5	100.0	2,065
50-64	73.5	13.9	5.8	5.3	1.6	100.0	2,953
65 and over	76.6	12.7	2.0	5.9	2.7	100.0	1,597
Age 20 and over	65.5	18.6	5.3	7.9	2.6	100.0	10,079
<u>Females</u>							
20-29	52.6	24.0	5.8	14.0	3.6	100.0	2,193
30-39	51.6	25.0	8.3	10.6	4.4	100.0	1,778
40-49	65.7	19.2	6.0	7.8	1.2	100.0	2,499
50-64	76.9	11.5	5.2	5.3	1.1	100.0	2,856
65 and over	67.8	14.4	5.5	9.5	2.8	100.0	2,102
Age 20 and over	64.6	18.0	5.9	9.0	2.4	100.0	11,428

than for younger ones. So, too, were the comparative levels of inter-state movement.

Thus, although the data suggest a high rate of movement in a relatively short period of time, they concurrently indicate that a disproportional amount of movement is within the same general area of residence. Such short-distance movement probably involves a change in housing related to the life cycle stage -- family formation and expansion, or possibly household dissolution for older persons. The higher mobility rates for older women compared to those for older men lend support to the latter interpretation, because women tend to survive their husbands. Equally important, a considerable proportion of the population made a longer distance move within this short time, especially men and women under age 40 and women age 65 and over. For younger individuals, such moves are most likely the result of changes in job location or possibly marriage. Among older women, the high level of mobility most likely is associated with a move either to join children following the death of a spouse or to a retirement area.

It is not possible to directly compare the mobility patterns of the American Jewish population to those of the total white U.S. population since NJPS used a different coding system. However, taking these differences into account, the evidence suggests a very close

similarity in mobility levels. In contrast to the 65 percent of the Jewish population living in the same city in 1970 as in 1965, 54 percent of the total white population was living in the same house in 1970 as in 1965 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973:Table 1). Some movement between houses within the same city is to be expected, but these two statistics can be regarded as quite comparable, as can the 18 percent of the Jewish population that moved within the same metropolitan area and the 21 percent of the U.S. population who changed only county of residence. Just over 9 percent of the total U.S. white population, aged 20 and over, changed state of residence in the five year interval; this is slightly higher than the comparable percentage for American Jews. Overall, therefore, these data suggest that the Jewish population adheres very closely to the patterns characterizing the American population as a whole.

Origin-Destination of Recent Migrants

Attention turns next to movement in terms of place of residence and place of origin for 5-year movers. This assessment is undertaken from two perspectives: 1) For each of the major regions of the United States, with New York City counted as a separate region, an attempt is made to ascertain the extent to which the adult population resident in the region at the time of the survey was characterized by particular 5-year mobility patterns. 2) For those individuals who, in this analysis, were identified as having made an interstate move, determination is made of the region of origin of the move in relation to the region of residence in order to allow assessment of the direction of the migration streams for longer distance movement.

With the exception of women in Middle Atlantic states, at least 60 percent of the adults in all regions were living in the same city in 1970 as in 1965 (Table 4). However, mobility was somewhat less prevalent among residents in the northeastern part of the United States than it was in the rest of the country. In large measure, this differential reflects the considerably greater rate of intra-metropolitan movement characterizing New England, New York City, and the Middle Atlantic states, especially in the New York City area. Clearly, in these older parts of the country, movement to the suburban areas has contributed disproportionately to the total mobility of the population living there at the time of the survey. The one-in-four persons who moved within the New York City metropolitan area stands in very sharp contrast to the low levels of such mobility in the South and the West. Even when movement within the state is added to the intra-metropolitan movement, the differentials still remain sharp.

Contrasts also extend to the levels of interstate mobility of the various regions. Only a small percent of the population resident in the New York City area had moved in within the previous five years from

Table 4. Region of Residence in 1970 by Five-Year Mobility Status, by Sex (Persons Age 20 and Over)

Region	Same city	Same SMSA	Same state	Other state	Foreign country	Total	
						Percent	Number
<u>Males</u>							
New England	64.9	17.9	5.4	10.8	0.9	100.0	664
New York City	61.9	29.1	2.8	3.0	3.1	100.0	4,254
Middle Atlantic	61.0	14.5	10.4	13.5	0.6	100.0	1,448
North Central	67.6	13.1	8.2	6.9	4.2	100.0	1,601
South	75.3	5.5	2.7	15.8	0.8	100.0	1,019
West	71.4	5.6	7.1	12.5	3.4	100.0	1,092
<u>Females</u>							
New England	63.0	17.2	8.1	10.5	1.2	100.0	754
New York City	61.7	28.2	3.8	2.8	3.4	100.0	4,818
Middle Atlantic	58.7	13.8	10.4	16.4	0.8	100.0	1,681
North Central	69.6	14.6	6.3	7.0	2.6	100.0	1,665
South	71.0	5.9	2.0	20.2	0.8	100.0	1,229
West	67.8	3.4	10.8	14.8	3.2	100.0	1,281

other states and almost as low a level characterized the North Central region. By contrast, in New England and the Middle Atlantic states as well as in the South and the West, at least 10 percent of the population had lived in another state in 1965, and this proportion was considerably higher for males in the Middle Atlantic and the South and for women in the West, Middle Atlantic, and South.

Some caution must be used in interpreting these statistics, since some interstate movement, especially in New England and the Middle Atlantic states could, in fact, be equivalent to suburbanization, given the smaller size of the states and the existence of many metropolitan areas that extend across state boundaries. This possibly is less likely in the South and the West where states are larger and where more of the intra-metropolitan movement is therefore within the state. The conclusion, seems justified, however, that during the period 1970-1976, the Jewish population resident in the South and the West was substantially augmented, and a considerable shifting of the Jewish population occurred between states in the Northeast and the Middle Atlantic region.

A final point revealed by the data in Table 4 is the quite substantial role of recent international movement in adding to the population of some regions. For New York City, for example, immigrants constituted as large a proportion of the population as did interstate movers. In the North Central region and the West, immigrants constituted a noticeable percentage of the total population, but well below the levels

of interstate movement. For the other regions of the country, immigrants constituted 1 percent or less of the total resident population.

That distance is a factor in influencing the streams of interstate movement is clearly evident (Table 5). For both males and females, the largest single migration stream is intra-regional, with about half of the interstate migrants moving within the region of residence. But the data also suggest that movement does not always occur equally in both directions. In New England, for example, almost 80 percent of the men and 70 percent of the women had moved either within the region itself or from the adjoining Middle Atlantic region. For both males and females, as many as three-fourths of those moving to states of the Middle Atlantic region also were intra-regional movers or from New England, as was true for the men who moved to New York City. The absence of separate data on migrants originating in New York City precludes a breakdown of the specific place of origin within the region on the part of those moving from the Middle Atlantic states. The North Central states also drew most heavily from among states within their own region, but the sources of migrants from outside the region were more widespread. By contrast, in the South one in four migrants came from the Middle Atlantic states, and 11 percent of the men and 8 percent of the women came from the North Central region. This pattern is consistent with the earlier noted decline in the relative proportion of Jews living in the Northeast and North Central part of the United States and the gains in the proportion living in the South. For the West, the data are distorted somewhat by the considerable proportion of males of unknown origin. Overlooking this, the single largest group came from other western states; the next most common region of origin was the Middle Atlantic, followed by the North Central. For women, the South accounted for more migrants to the West than did the North Central region, but the differences were small. For the West, the South, and the North Central region, New England provided a minimal number of migrants.

Among men, immigrants accounted for proportionally more of the migrants to the North Central region than they did to any other region, including New York City; elsewhere, the proportion never exceeded 7 percent. For women, New York City had by far the highest proportion of immigrants in its migration group, almost 18 percent, and this was followed by just over 10 percent for the North Central region and 7.5 percent for the West. The reasons for the regional differences in the proportion of male and female immigrants in the migrant streams is not at all clear, but could be related to the small number of cases.

The NJPS data point to substantial stream and counterstream movement among most regions, and, reflecting the varying magnitude of the streams, the net effect is a redistribution of the Jewish population among the regions of the United States. The top panel of Table 6, based

Table 5. Region of Current Residence by Region of Residence in 1965 for Persons Living in a Different State, by Sex (Persons Age 20 and Over)

Region, 1970	Region of Residence, 1965						Foreign country	Unknown	Total	
	New England	Middle Atlantic	North Central	South	West	Percent			Number	
	<u>Males</u>									
New England	44.0	35.2	5.5	3.3	2.2	5.5	4.4	100.0	90	
New York City	16.2	55.9	3.4	5.7	0.7	10.4	7.7	100.0	297	
Middle Atlantic	19.0	56.1	1.8	13.6	2.7	1.8	5.0	100.0	221	
North Central	2.8	10.5	48.6	6.5	2.8	20.2	8.5	100.0	247	
South	0.0	26.1	10.6	50.8	0.5	1.0	11.1	100.0	199	
West	0.0	13.9	4.9	0.0	46.9	6.8	27.5	100.0	309	
	<u>Females</u>									
New England	30.8	38.5	4.8	4.8	1.9	6.7	12.5	100.0	104	
New York City	7.9	48.8	5.8	9.1	1.8	17.6	9.1	100.0	330	
Middle Atlantic	20.4	54.9	2.1	8.8	1.8	1.5	10.4	100.0	328	
North Central	2.1	10.7	47.3	3.7	3.3	10.7	22.2	100.0	243	
South	1.5	23.7	8.4	60.2	1.1	1.8	3.3	100.0	274	
West	0.0	7.8	5.0	8.1	57.0	7.5	14.6	100.0	321	

on migrants of known regional origin and destination, shows a total of 1,088 interregional migrants⁽²⁾ between 1965 and 1970. By far the largest streams involved movement between New England and the Middle Atlantic states and between the Middle Atlantic states and the South; in both sets, the movement was substantial in both directions. A significant number of 1965 Middle Atlantic state residents also moved to the West by 1970, but the reverse movement was small by comparison. In fact, the total movement out of the West of 47 sample members was far below that out of any other region, being equal to only 10 percent of the largest regional out-migration, that of the Middle Atlantic states, and only one-fourth that of movement out of the South.

More significant perhaps is the net exchange between regions, the details of which are in the lower panel of Table 6. Generally consistent with patterns noted earlier for changes in regional distribution of population, New England lost migrants to all regions, except for a small gain from the West. The Middle Atlantic states were also net losers of migrants except for their exchange with nearby New England. In turn, whereas the North Central states gained from their exchange with the Northeast (New England, the Middle Atlantic), they lost to the South and West. The South gained from all parts of the United States except the West, but especially from the Middle Atlantic states. Finally, the West, because it had relatively few out-migrants to the rest of the country, gained from all regions but New England and, like the South, gained especially from the Middle Atlantic states.

The overall effect of these interregional gains and losses was a net loss in migrants by New England and the Middle Atlantic regions amounting to 3.7 and 0.8 percent, respectively, of their 1970 populations. The North Central region was characterized by a near balance in gains and losses. By contrast, the South and West both experienced fairly substantial gains in the five-year interval, equal to 2.1 and 4.0 percent, respectively, of their total adult population. Clearly, then, these data on interregional movement point to a shift of the Jewish population to the South and West despite fairly substantial movement among all regions and considerable countermovement for many.

Socioeconomic Differentials

As earlier analysis has shown, the mobility of American Jewry is very much affected by age. Because migrants respond differentially to the stimulus for movement and to the attractions of different types of locations, based to some degree on their own social and economic characteristics and to some on the characteristics of the places of origin and destination, they tend to be differentially concentrated in selected socioeconomic segments of the population. Within the constraints of this analysis, attention can be given to only three such factors: marital status, education, and occupation.

⁽²⁾ For 344 known interstate migrants, or 11.6 percent of all interstate movers, state of origin was not known.

Table 6. Interregional Migration Streams and Net Migration Gains or Losses, 1965-1970 (Persons Age 20 and Over)

1965 Residence	1970 Residence					Total
	New England	Middle Atlantic	North Central	South	West	
<u>Interregional Streams</u>						
New England	-	199	15	13	0	227
Middle Atlantic	148	-	65	174	91	478
North Central	10	41	-	54	33	138
South	11	116	43	-	28	198
West	4	20	17	6	-	47
Total	173	376	140	247	152	1,088
<u>Net Movement</u>						
New England	-	+ 51	+ 5	+ 2	- 4	
Middle Atlantic	-51	-	+24	+58	+ 71	
North Central	- 5	- 24	-	+11	+ 16	
South	- 2	- 58	-11	-	+ 22	
West	+ 4	- 71	-16	-22	-	
Total 1970 gain or loss	-54	-102	+ 2	+49	+105	
Gain or loss as percent of 1970 population	-3.7	-0.8	+0.1	+2.1	+4.0	

Stages of the life cycle can affect the volume and distance of movement. If movement is job related it is likely to involve greater distances than movement related to housing needs associated with changes in marital status or family size. Similarly, the break up of a marriage either through divorce or death may result in residential movement and account for different patterns of movement for divorced and widowed individuals than for those still married. Within the Jewish population, the large majority (62 percent) of males between ages 20-29 are still single, but by the next oldest age group, virtually every male in the sample (92 percent) was married and this level remains almost constant until the 65 and over age group (Table 7). Only among the oldest group is there a notable rise in percent of widowed, but even this is low compared to women, reflecting the sex selectivity of mortality. For males, therefore, the only relevant comparisons of migration in relation to marital status are between the youngest age group and all other ages.

The comparison indicates that stability is to a very great extent associated with being single. Sixty-two percent of the single males age 20-29, in contrast to only 42 percent of the married ones, were living in the same city in 1970 as in 1965. Here it must be pointed out that NJPS counted students at universities as members of their parents' households so that education related movement is not counted unless an independent household is established in the process. Since a high proportion of Jewish males in this age group are still enrolled in universities, the comparatively high level of stability is understandable. This partly explains why only 7.5 percent of all single males age 20-29 were interstate migrants in this period, in contrast to 18 percent of married males. Clearly, completion of education is associated with entry into the labor force and family formation, both of which serve as major stimuli to longer distance movement. These life cycle factors continue to affect mobility in the next highest age group, but above age 40, married males tend to become much more stable and much more of the movement that does take place is within the same metropolitan area. Among the very oldest age group, over three-fourths of the married males have not changed city of residence, but this is also true of just over 70 percent of the widowed. For males, therefore, only among the very youngest age group does marital status have a significant impact on mobility behavior.

Reflecting the younger age at which women marry, the data from NJPS show that a majority of women (53 percent) in the 20-29 year age group were married. Like males, virtually all of the women between ages 30 and 50 were married, but the proportion of widowed females showed a noticeable increase by ages 50-64, and became particularly sharp in the 65 and over age group, in which at least 40 percent of the women were widowed. As for males, being single in the youngest age group was associated with greater stability. Among married women not only was there much more movement, but a considerable part of the

Table 7. Distribution by Five-Year Mobility Status, Marital Status and Age, by Sex

Age and marital status	Same city	Same SMSA	Same state	Other state	Foreign country	Total		Distribution by marital status
						Percent	Number	
<u>Males</u>								
<u>20-29</u>								
Single	61.9	23.1	5.4	7.5	2.0	100.0	1,206	61.8
Married	41.8	30.0	5.1	17.8	5.3	100.0	730	37.4
Divorced	40.0	46.7	0.0	0.0	13.3	100.0	15	0.7
Widowed	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	-	1	0.1
<u>30-39</u>								
Single	70.4	14.8	8.8	2.5	3.7	100.0	81	5.4
Married	42.9	28.1	8.5	15.6	5.0	100.0	1,386	92.5
Divorced	82.1	10.7	7.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	28	1.9
Widowed	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	-	4	0.2
<u>40-49</u>								
Single	68.6	14.3	4.3	5.7	7.1	100.0	70	3.4
Married	69.8	18.3	5.2	5.3	1.4	100.0	1,961	95.1
Divorced	66.7	5.6	22.3	5.6	0.0	100.0	18	0.9
Widowed	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	12	0.6
<u>50-64</u>								
Single	84.3	5.6	4.6	2.8	2.8	100.0	108	3.7
Married	73.0	14.0	5.9	5.5	1.6	100.0	2,774	93.7
Divorced	80.6	9.7	0.0	6.5	3.2	100.0	31	1.0
Widowed	69.6	28.3	0.0	0.0	2.2	100.0	46	1.6
<u>65 and over</u>								
Single	87.0	7.4	5.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	54	3.4
Married	76.8	12.9	1.8	6.0	2.5	100.0	1,373	86.4
Divorced	71.4	9.5	4.8	14.3	0.0	100.0	21	1.3
Widowed	71.6	13.5	2.1	7.1	5.7	100.0	141	8.9
<u>All ages</u>								
Single	65.1	20.5	5.5	6.6	2.3	100.0	1,519	15.1
Married	65.0	18.6	5.4	8.3	2.6	100.0	8,224	81.8
Divorced	71.7	14.2	6.2	5.3	2.7	100.0	113	1.1
Widowed	72.5	16.2	1.5	5.4	4.4	100.0	204	2.0

Table 7. (Continued)

Age and marital status	Same city	Same SMSA	Same state	Other state	Foreign country	Total		Distribution by marital status
						Percent	Number	
<u>Females</u>								
<u>20-29</u>								
Single	65.8	20.5	5.9	7.1	0.6		988	45.2
Married	41.5	26.7	5.8	19.8	6.3		1,152	52.7
Divorced	46.3	31.7	0.0	22.0	0.0		41	1.8
Widowed	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)		5	0.2
<u>30-39</u>								
Single	73.8	18.5	0.0	7.7	0.0		65	3.7
Married	49.4	26.2	9.1	10.7	4.6		1,629	92.2
Divorced	75.9	7.4	0.0	13.0	3.7		54	3.0
Widowed	84.2	0.0	0.0	10.5	5.3		19	1.1
<u>40-49</u>								
Single	81.0	10.3	0.0	8.6	0.0		58	2.3
Married	69.2	18.2	4.2	6.9	1.4		2,218	89.3
Divorced	18.8	31.8	34.4	14.9	0.0		154	6.2
Widowed	64.2	13.2	3.8	18.9	0.0		53	2.2
<u>50-64</u>								
Single	91.3	6.0	1.4	0.0	1.3		150	5.3
Married	75.7	11.7	6.0	5.5	1.1		2,320	81.6
Divorced	71.9	14.1	7.9	6.3	0.0		64	2.3
Widowed	82.1	10.1	0.6	5.8	1.3		308	10.8
<u>65 and over</u>								
Single	60.9	4.9	1.6	31.5	1.1		184	8.9
Married	73.9	16.3	1.4	5.6	2.8		909	44.4
Divorced	88.7	8.3	1.5	1.5	0.0		133	6.5
Widowed	62.7	16.3	6.4	10.8	3.8		824	40.2
<u>All ages</u>								
Single	68.8	16.5	4.4	9.6	0.7		1,445	12.8
Married	63.7	18.9	5.6	8.9	2.8		8,228	72.6
Divorced	56.7	19.3	13.5	10.1	0.4		446	3.9
Widowed	68.0	14.2	4.9	9.9	3.0		1,209	10.7

(a) Fewer than 10 widowed persons in the age group.

movement involved a change in state of residence. As many as one in five of all 20-29 year old married women were living in a different state compared to only 7 percent of single women. Among married women 30-39, there was an almost equally high level of movement, but more of it was over shorter distances. Among older married women, the levels of stability rose considerably, and only 5-7 percent engaged in interstate movement in the five-year interval.

Among married and widowed women in the 50-64 age group, the differences in mobility patterns tend to be small, although married women were slightly less stable because a higher proportion moved within the same state. Widowed and married women age 65 and over, however, show very sharp differences. The latter, like married women aged 40-64, were quite stable; most of whatever movement occurred took place within the same metropolitan area. By contrast, over one-third of the widowed women moved during the interval and considerably more of the movement was interstate or within state but outside the metropolitan area. This suggests that widowhood leads many older women to move substantial distances. That the movement patterns of single women age 65 and over more closely resemble those of the widowed than they do the married suggests that absence of close family ties may help explain greater mobility and especially the considerable amount of interstate movement. It also may reflect the possibility that a number of women reported as single were in fact widowed but misclassified. For women as men, therefore, marital status clearly has a substantial impact both on the level of stability and on the type of move made by those who change residence.

Although the patterns of marital status differ for men and women, the patterns of mobility within the married segment are very much alike. This similarity suggests that movement involves entire households; that, at least in the 1960s, mobility decisions were made and carried out by household units as a whole and not by individuals within them. Only among the single, the widowed, and the divorced is mobility likely to be a one-person action. Moreover, in the period under study, mobility decisions, especially those that were job-related, were likely to have been made in terms of the needs of the heads of households, who were predominantly male. Because of these considerations, the analyses of education and occupational differentials in mobility that follow will be restricted to the males, the large majority of whom (87 percent) were the heads of households (Massarik and Chenkin, 1973).

For men, higher education is associated with a tendency toward higher 5-year mobility levels. Whereas 72 percent with less than a secondary education were living in the same city in 1970 as in 1965, this was true of only 57 percent of those with post-graduate education

Table 8. Distribution by Five-Year Mobility Status, Education and Age (Males)

Age and education	Same city	Same SMSA	Same state	Other state	Foreign country	Total	
						Percent	Number
20-29							
None/primary	52.6	42.1	0.0	0.0	5.3	100.0	19
Secondary	46.3	32.0	1.7	12.6	7.4	100.0	175
College	60.3	21.9	6.2	7.9	3.7	100.0	1,112
Post-graduate	49.1	25.9	4.3	18.9	1.7	100.0	582
30-39							
None/primary	0.0	42.9	14.3	0.0	42.9	100.0	7
Secondary	64.3	27.8	2.8	4.0	1.2	100.0	252
College	46.4	24.4	11.2	16.1	1.7	100.0	577
Post-graduate	36.8	29.1	8.2	17.5	8.6	100.0	653
40-49							
None/primary	76.4	9.1	7.3	0.0	7.3	100.0	55
Secondary	71.9	18.6	4.5	3.2	1.6	100.0	645
College	69.7	18.5	5.4	5.3	1.1	100.0	699
Post-graduate	66.9	17.9	6.0	7.8	1.4	100.0	626
50-64							
None/primary	75.3	11.3	6.7	1.3	5.3	100.0	150
Secondary	82.3	10.9	2.2	3.6	0.9	100.0	1,209
College	66.1	17.5	9.1	5.1	2.2	100.0	997
Post-graduate	72.2	9.3	6.0	11.3	1.2	100.0	503
65 and over							
None/primary	71.9	17.1	1.9	7.3	1.7	100.0	531
Secondary	78.9	8.8	2.7	6.7	2.7	100.0	475
College	82.2	9.1	1.7	4.8	2.2	100.0	230
Post-graduate	79.8	15.7	1.8	1.3	1.3	100.0	223
All ages							
None/primary	71.8	16.3	3.2	5.4	3.3	100.0	762
Secondary	75.4	15.2	2.8	4.7	1.8	100.0	2,756
College	62.9	19.6	7.4	7.7	2.4	100.0	3,615
Post-graduate	57.3	20.7	5.8	12.9	3.2	100.0	2,587

Table 9. Distribution by Five-Year Mobility Status, Occupation and Age (Males)

Age and occupation	Same city	Same SMSA	Same state	Other state	Foreign country	Total	
						Percent	Number
<u>20-29</u>							
Professional	37.0	37.3	8.4	11.8	5.5	100.0	638
Managerial	59.1	17.4	7.4	10.7	5.1	100.0	242
Clerical/sales	59.0	15.8	3.6	19.8	1.8	100.0	278
Blue collar	54.7	33.5	2.4	5.9	3.5	100.0	170
<u>30-39</u>							
Professional	40.1	26.6	11.0	13.9	8.4	100.0	700
Managerial	46.2	26.5	5.2	21.1	1.0	100.0	502
Clerical/sales	52.8	32.8	9.2	5.2	0.0	100.0	229
Blue collar	62.9	19.4	3.2	1.6	12.9	100.0	62
<u>40-49</u>							
Professional	68.6	16.3	5.3	7.7	2.2	100.0	627
Managerial	68.0	20.3	6.2	4.8	0.7	100.0	888
Clerical/sales	76.6	13.4	5.0	4.4	0.6	100.0	321
Blue collar	72.5	18.5	3.0	1.5	4.5	100.0	200
<u>50-64</u>							
Professional	71.6	12.6	6.7	7.4	1.7	100.0	525
Managerial	72.9	13.5	8.8	3.8	1.1	100.0	1,212
Clerical/sales	72.1	16.4	2.7	7.6	1.2	100.0	592
Blue collar	78.7	13.6	1.0	2.9	3.7	100.0	381
<u>65 and over</u>							
Professional	75.6	19.0	1.8	0.6	3.0	100.0	168
Managerial	80.6	9.3	5.1	2.1	3.0	100.0	237
Clerical/sales	75.4	10.6	0.7	12.0	1.4	100.0	142
Blue collar	82.7	10.0	0.9	3.6	2.7	100.0	110
<u>All ages</u>							
Professional	54.6	23.5	7.6	9.8	4.6	100.0	2,658
Managerial	66.6	17.6	7.0	7.3	1.4	100.0	3,081
Clerical/sales	68.2	17.5	4.1	9.2	1.0	100.0	1,562
Blue collar	72.4	18.3	1.9	3.1	4.3	100.0	923

(Table 8). Reflecting the generally higher levels of movement, more of those with higher education were involved in all kinds of movement than were those with less education, and the differentials were greatest for destinations involving longer distances. For example, among those with less than a secondary education, 16 percent moved within the same metropolitan area, as did almost 21 percent of the post-graduates. However, only 5 percent of men in the lowest education group made an interstate move, whereas 13 percent of those with post-graduate education did so. These data thus support the thesis that higher education serves to stimulate moves that are job-related and therefore also results in moves that are between labor markets and involve greater distances.

These overall educational differentials may vary considerably by age since both the educational composition varies by age and type of move is a function of age. Controlling for age, however, indicates the important role of education in mobility, especially for the younger age groups. For the 30-39 age group, for example, the proportion who remained in the same city declined from almost two-thirds of those with secondary education to just over one-third of those with a post-graduate education. While quite similar proportions in each educational level moved within the same metropolitan area, the proportion moving to other states increased from only 4 percent of those with a secondary education to over 17 percent of those with a post-graduate education. Similar patterns, although not quite as sharp, characterize the age groups between 40 and 64. For the oldest age group, however, stability is much higher at all educational levels. The evidence that fewer older males with higher education make interstate moves may reflect a greater tendency on the part of higher educated males to remain in the labor force to a later age and therefore not to engage in post-retirement migration on a permanent basis.

The occupational differentials in mobility closely parallel those noted for education, as expected.⁽³⁾ For all the age groups combined, the level of stability among males varied substantially from a high of 72 percent of those with blue collar jobs to only 55 percent of those engaged in professional work; and professional men are found more frequently in each of the internal mobility categories than are those in managerial, clerical/sales, and blue collar work (Table 9). The patterns of differences among the lower three occupational groups is not as clear, except for the considerably lower proportion of blue collar workers who moved between states or within the same state outside of the metropolitan area. These data therefore suggest that it is largely white collar employment, especially in the professions, which leads to longer distance movement for Jewish males. The somewhat lower proportion of managers who moved between states may stem from the stronger

(3) The data used in the analysis on occupational differentials refer only to those males who were in the labor force at the time of the survey; it therefore does not include retired persons.

ties which they develop to a given location through ownership of a business. As Jewish men take more appointments as employed managers, their participation in interstate movement can be expected to rise. This possibility is supported by the age specific data.

Again, as with education, general stability is much higher for all occupational categories within the older population than in the younger one; and in the younger age groups, the general patterns noted for the population as a whole obtain. For the 30-39 year age group, for example, the level of stability is much greater for the blue collar than for white collar males; in fact, it varies indirectly with the hierarchy of occupations, with only 40 percent of the professionals living in the same city in 1970 as in 1965 compared to 63 percent of the blue collar workers. While considerably more of the white collar workers moved within the same metropolitan area than did blue collar workers, even sharper differentials characterize movement between states. Almost 14 percent of the professionals and over one in five of those engaged in managerial work made an interstate move during the five year interval compared to only 5 percent of the clerical/sales workers and less than 2 percent of those in blue collar work.

Although not as sharp, the same pattern of differentials in interstate movement characterized those age 40-49. Above age 50, however, the relation between occupation and movement became less distinct; for all occupational groups, the vast majority continued to live within the same city and most of the movement that did occur was local. Interstate movement occurred less frequently for professionals and managers, especially in the 65 and over group, lending support to the earlier posited thesis that continued labor force participation by older professionals and managers may explain lower rates of long distance movement by older, more educated Jews. For reasons that are not clear, participation of clerical/sales workers in such movement was higher in both older groups than in those of men between ages 30 and 50. Clearly, occupational affiliation in conjunction with stage of the life cycle accounts for considerable difference in levels of stability and type of mobility within the Jewish male population.

Conclusion

Whether judged by wider regional distribution, by greater dispersion throughout the metropolitan areas, by an increasing tendency to reside in smaller towns, or by lesser segregation within cities and suburbs, it is clear that the patterns identified in this analysis reflect wider residential dispersion and point to an increasing "Americanization" of the Jewish population. The relatively high rates of mobility shown by the data from the National Jewish Population Study, as measured either by lifetime movement or by mobility within the five years preceding the survey, lend support to the thesis that Jews are participating

in the major currents of population redistribution characterizing the American population as a whole. Even while distinct areas of Jewish regional population concentration remain, and while Jews continue to be highly concentrated in metropolitan areas, the observed patterns of redistribution have resulted in fewer Jews in the Northeast and North Central regions and more in the South and West, substantial decreases in the concentrations in central cities, and possibly (from evidence not fully available in this analysis) even some reduction in the suburban population as Jews join the movement to non-metropolitan areas, to smaller urban places, and even to rural locations. Regardless of which migration stream becomes more popular, the net result is likely to be a much more geographically dispersed Jewish population in the decades ahead.

That this trend is likely seems to be reinforced by the socioeconomic differentials observed. The tendency for migration rates to be higher for those with more education and for education to be positively correlated with movement involving greater distance suggests that the continuing high levels of college and university enrollment of Jews will in turn be conducive to continuing high levels of movement. Such a conclusion is given weight by occupational differentials which pointed to a positive association between white collar employment and levels and distance of mobility; if more Jews should enter jobs in industry and commerce rather than establishing businesses of their own, the need to seek job opportunities at more distant points may grow. Moreover, the migration effects of both changing education and occupational patterns may be compounded by changes in marital and fertility behavior. If age at marriage rises, if the propensity to marry at all declines and the tendency to disrupted marriage rises, if fertility remains at low levels, conditions conducive to stability or to only short-distance mobility may weaken further and even higher levels of mobility and movement involving greater distances may result.

The patterns observed in this evaluation and their likely continuation in the 1980s suggest that Jewish population movement must be considered as a key variable in any assessment of the future strength of the American-Jewish community. Taken in conjunction with a likely stabilization, if not reduction, in total size due to low fertility and high rates of intermarriage, greater dispersal provides additional challenges to the community's vitality. On the one hand, high levels of movement and especially repeated movement may result in weakening of individual ties to local communities and a consequent weakening of Jewish identity on both attitudinal and behavioral levels. It may, in turn, contribute substantially to the maintenance of high rates of intermarriage and increasing levels of assimilation. But, on the other hand, the shifts associated with population movement may also produce needed reinforcement to smaller communities, giving them the population density needed to maintain basic institutions essential for

group survival and enrichment. Which course will be followed and how it may vary by type of movement, socioeconomic composition of the migrant streams, and size of community of origin and destination needs to be evaluated more fully.

What is clear, even in the absence of additional research, is that the ongoing redistribution patterns require that individual Jews and especially the organized community view the American-Jewish community from both the local and the national perspectives. Changes in residence have significant implications for the migrating individual or family and for the communities of origin and destination. To the extent to which such moves embrace a growing web of metropolitan areas, states, and regions, they take on much broader significance and require recognition that a national perspective is also needed if the potentially negative consequences of migration are to be mitigated and full advantage is to be taken of the positive contributions that such movement can make.

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to Dr. Sergio DellaPergola, whose initial work with the NJPS data has greatly facilitated the current research. The helpful comments of Drs. U.O. Schmelz and Zvi Eisenbach are much appreciated.

References

- CHENKIN, A. and M. MIRAN, "Jewish Population in the United States, 1980," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 81. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1981.
- GOLDSTEIN, S., "Jews in the United States: Perspectives from Demography," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 81. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1981, pp. 3-59.
- JARET, C., "The Impact of Geographical Mobility on Jewish Community Participation: Disruptive or Supportive?", *Contemporary Jewry*, 4 (Spring/Summer), 1978, pp. 9-20.
- LAZERWITZ, B., n.d., *National Jewish Population Study: Methodology*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.
- LAZERWITZ, B., "An Estimate of a Rare Population Group: The U.S. Jewish Population," *Demography*, 15 (August), 1978, pp. 389-394.
- LEBOWITZ, B.D., "Migration and the Structure of the Contemporary Jewish Community," *Contemporary Jewry*, 2 (Fall/Winter), 1975.

MASSARIK, F. and A. CHENKIN, "U.S. National Jewish Population Study: A First Report," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 74. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1973.

MASSARIK, F., *National Jewish Population Study: Mobility*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1974.

NEWMAN, W.N. and P.L. HALVORSON, "American Jews: Patterns of Geographic Distribution and Change, 1952-1971," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 18 (June), 1979, pp. 183-193.

U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, *Mobility for States and the Nation*, Subject Reports PC(2)-2B. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

WAXMAN, C.I., "The Fourth Generation Grows Up: The Contemporary American Jewish Community," *Annals, AAPSS* (March), 1981, pp. 70-85.