

MOBILITY AND JEWISH AFFILIATION:  
THE IMPACT OF SELF-SELECTION, DISRUPTION, AND DESTINATION

Steven M. Cohen

Introduction

The migration of East European Jews to the United States was one of the largest, if not the largest population transfers in Jewish history. From 1880 to 1921 close to two million Jews left Russia, Poland, and other East European countries to settle in the United States (Diamond, 1977). Like their migrating counterparts arriving in Central and Western Europe, most of these Jews concentrated in major metropolitan centers.

Once settled, the immigrants to America and their descendants began large scale processes of concentration, movement, reconcentration, and, eventually, dispersal. The history of Jews of Greater New York illustrates these patterns. It also represents the actual experiences of most American Jewish families in that the New York area has been home at some time or another, to most American Jews throughout the last century.

When turn-of-the-century Jewish immigrants to New York first arrived, they crowded the poor neighborhoods of the Lower East Side (in Manhattan) and Brooklyn's Brownsville section. Their children (the second generation), in turn, acquired the means to rent the thousands of apartments built for them (many by Jewish builders) in new middle-class areas of Brooklyn (Flatbush) and the Bronx (Grand Concourse, Pelham Parkway) (Moore, 1981). After the Second World War, young third generation Jewish families joined in middle-class America's move to the suburbs as they bought homes in Nassau County (Long Island), Westchester, Southeastern Connecticut, and Northern New Jersey. In the last two and three decades, large numbers of third and fourth generation Jews left the New York area and Northeast metropolitan region entirely, settling in the exurbs and the middle-size cities of the nation's Sunbelt (Newman and Halvorson, 1973; Goldstein, 1982). Each of these moves -- from immigrant enclave, to middle-class neighborhood, to suburb, and, finally, to the exurbs or Sunbelt -- further dispersed the Jewish population.<sup>(1)</sup>

This process can be illustrated through several examples. Immigrant Brownsville in the early twentieth century had a Jewish population density which, at times, exceeded 80 percent of the neighborhood's total population. Neighborhoods of second settlement, like Flatbush in the 1920s and '30s, were only one-half to two-thirds Jewish. Most post-War suburbs where Jews settled in large number were no more than

one-half Jewish, and often quite less. The areas of most recent Jewish settlement -- such as Phoenix, Arizona; Denver, Colorado; or Suffolk County, New York -- are even less densely Jewish. If the European Emancipation stimulated the move from traditional semi-rural communities to modern urban enclaves, the more recent and still ongoing experience of American Jewry has often meant frequent migrations from well-established, more densely settled Jewish neighborhoods to initially younger, less institutionalized communities with (and, again, initially) smaller numbers and concentrations of Jewish inhabitants.

For this reason and others, rabbis and other communal leaders have been concerned about Jewish mobility, fearing several adverse consequences. These include the potential for disaffiliation from the organized community by the migrants, for a weakening of institutions situated in areas undergoing abandonment by out-migrants, and for the huge costs entailed in erecting institutions in new areas of settlement. That survivalists' fears of lower affiliation rates by recent movers has some validity is easily demonstrated by data from the 1975 Boston Jewish community survey (see Fowler, 1977). Table 1 reports that affiliation rises with residential stability. Most consistently, those who had moved within the last four years were about a third as likely to belong to a synagogue as were residential veterans who had lived at least 18 years in their respective communities. Only 21 percent of those living in their town or neighborhood four years or less were synagogue members, as compared with 37 percent of those resident 5-8 years, 51 percent of those with 9-17 years of continuous residence, and fully 59 percent of those with 18 or more years in their communities. The table reports parallel findings for Jewish philanthropic giving. Only 20 percent of the newcomers (0-4 years of residence) reported making substantial contributions (\$50 or more) to Jewish charities as opposed to at least half of those with 9 or more years of stable residence.

Table 1. Percent of Synagogue Membership and Jewish Philanthropic Giving,<sup>(a)</sup> by Length of Residence<sup>(b)</sup>

Length of residence	Synagogue membership	Jewish philanthropic giving	Weighted N
0- 4 years	21	20	388
5- 8 years	37	46	119
9-17 years	51	59	176
18 or more years	59	52	240

(a) Those who reported total contributions of at least \$50 in the previous year.

(b) Length of residence is determined by responses to the question: "How many years have you lived in (CITY/TOWN/PART OF BOSTON)?"

Source: 1975 Boston Jewish Community Survey.

Clearly, the residentially mobile are less communally affiliated than the residentially stable; the question is why. Three sorts of reasons can be advanced. First, there may be an element of *self-selection*. That is, those who move may also be the types of people who would have been less often affiliated in any event. Second, the very act of moving may *disrupt* formal and informal ties to family, friend, local institutions and years may pass before they are reconstituted, if they ever are (see Joret, 1978). Third, since Jewish movers often move to new areas of Jewish settlement, they may experience a *contextual impact* of their new residential locale. To more fully appreciate the three plausible links between mobility and affiliation -- i.e. self-selection, disruption, and residential context -- we need to situate these three processes in larger historical and theoretical contexts and to examine the pertinent data.

### Self-Selection

In the United States as elsewhere, movers are different from non-movers; in particular, the mobile are younger and tend to have smaller families (Sandefur and Scott, 1981). Among Jews, these characteristics are associated with lower levels of ritual practice and communal affiliation (see Cohen, 1982). Hence, insofar as Jewish movers are similar to other mobile Americans, they will tend to derive from the more assimilated segments of the Jewish population.

Aside from these demographic considerations, cultural factors also suggest that Jewish migrants should maintain lower levels of Jewish identification even prior to moving. By virtue of their commitment to Jewish communal life, Orthodox and other observant Jews often develop strong ties to local Jewish institutions. In addition, Orthodox religious doctrine demands that worshippers reside within walking distance of the synagogue. For these and other reasons, the religiously observant or ethnically identified might be more reluctant to relocate (especially to new Jewish communities) than those whose involvement with and commitment to fellow Jews is much less pronounced.

These generalizations, while meant to apply to contemporary American Jews, have historical precedents in the nineteenth century and earlier. As a rule, European Jewish migrants with weaker ties to traditional Jewish life and community were more willing to move to areas lacking in heavy concentrations of Jewish population or in established communal institutions. The mass migration to the United States, for example, led rabbis and other East European traditionalists to brand the destination of many of their contemporaries as a *treyf medinah* ("unholy land"). Observers of the time contended that migrants were more secularized and assimilated than those who chose to stay behind. (Howe, 1976). Nineteenth-century French Jewry offers yet another example of self-selection influencing the decision to migrate. The Jews who left the traditional areas of settlement in Alsace-Lorraine for Paris were disproportionately drawn from the affluent merchant class (Hyman, forthcoming). More indigent Jews were probably less aware of emerg-

ing opportunities in new areas of settlement, or they were less capable of taking advantage of these opportunities, or they were simply more attached to their traditional communities.

American patterns of ongoing mobility and resettlement following the initial international migration has replicated many aspects of earlier European migratory behavior. Each new area of American Jewish settlement -- second-generation neighborhood; third-generation suburb; third- and fourth-generation Sunbelt community -- was probably first settled by Jews who were younger, more affluent, and generally more assimilated than those they left behind. Table 2, reporting the determinants of being a "newcomer", examines the extent to which recent movers in the 1975 Boston area shared these distinctive characteristics. (A "newcomer" or "recent mover" is defined here as one who has lived in the same town or neighborhood four years or less.)

The table's first column reports bivariate relationships between several independent variables and newcomer status. The second column reports the effects of adjusting for all these predictor variables simultaneously.

We find that newcomers are indeed significantly younger; as a corollary, they are also much more likely than veteran residents to be single or to be without children. Very few of them are parents with children at home, older couples with no children, older singles, or widowed. We also find that recent movers are well-educated (B.A. or post-graduate degrees) and earn lower incomes. (2)

Of all these variables, age is the sole powerful determinant of residential mobility (see column 2). Accordingly, those in the early stage of the family life cycle, those with lower incomes, and those who are ritually non-observant are mobile largely because these types of people are young and it is youthfulness which promotes geographic mobility.

Since movers do differ from others in terms of age and other characteristics associated with communal affiliation, part of the reason newcomers are less affiliated than veterans may well derive from "self-selection," that is, factors antecedent to the decision to move. To the extent that age and the other predictors of moving fail to totally explain why movers less often affiliate than do the geographically stable, we could attribute a good part of the remaining linkage between mobility and (non)affiliation to mobility's disruptive effects. Conversely, were age and other background variables to totally explain the association of mobility with disaffiliation -- which they do not -- then the mobility/affiliation linkage would be attributed completely to self-selection, leaving no unexplained association for other factors such as disruption.

**Table 2.** Percent of Newcomers,<sup>(a)</sup> by Age, Family Life Cycle, Education, Income, and Ritual Observance (Multiple Classification Analysis)<sup>(b)</sup>

Characteristics	Unadjusted	Adjusted	N
<u>Age</u>			
18-24	77	63	181
25-34	75	66	244
35-44	16	25	114
45-54	9	22	120
55-64	16	24	110
65+	11	20	138
Unknown	26	21	16
Eta/Beta	.63	.43	
<u>Family life cycle</u>			
Single	79	53	257
Childless couple	70	45	72
Child(ren) under 6	52	46	67
Children at home	8	26	137
Older couple	14	39	166
Widow, older single	13	35	118
Divorced, separated	32	28	36
All intermarried	55	51	67
Unknown	-	-	4
Eta/Beta	.61	.19	
<u>Education/Income</u>			
Less than high school grad.	12	31	50
High school grad., under \$15,000	35	46	65
High school grad., \$15,000 and over	3	16	36
College, under \$15,000	68	53	163
College, \$15,000-\$30,000	41	42	99
College, \$30,000 and over	36	41	49
Post-B.A., under \$15,000	77	54	98
Post-B.A., \$15,000-\$30,000	54	42	78
Post-B.A., \$30,000 and over	29	41	86
All other; unknown	23	33	199
Eta/Beta	.44	.19	
<u>Ritual observance</u> (c)			
None	55	47	119
Low	50	41	419
Medium	28	35	251
High	33	49	133
Eta/Beta	.22	.08	
R		.68	
R <sup>2</sup>		.46	

## Disruption

The notion that moving disrupts or suspends links to the formal Jewish community -- such as the synagogue or philanthropic campaigns -- entails two interrelated propositions: (1) religious affiliation is primarily a "group phenomenon"; and (2) it is also a "localistic" one.

That religious participation reflects group ties and not merely commitment to tenets of a faith has long been readily apparent to both religious practitioners and observers. Rabbis, church fathers, classic sociological thinkers (Emile Durkheim being the most noted) and contemporary researchers have all recognized the social dimension to religious life and activity. One recent researcher provides a useful summary of this perspective:

---

Table 2. (cont'd.)

- (a) Newcomers are those residing in their "(CITY/TOWN/PART OF BOSTON)" four years or less and are scored 1; others receive a score of 0.
- (b) The figures reported in the "unadjusted" column are simply the percentages of the dependent variable for each category of each independent variable considered separately. In other words, with four independent variables, we have, in essence four two-variable tables reported in the unadjusted column.

The "adjusted" column reports percentages for each category of each independent variable after controlling for all other independent variables simultaneously. The differences between unadjusted percentages are, in part, a function of categories of an independent variable. As an example, the association of low ritual observance with being a newcomer is partially due to the association of low observance with young age.

The Eta/Beta statistics are measures of the total impact of a variable. The range in magnitude from .00 (no impact) to 1.00 (perfect identity) of the independent and dependent variable.

- (c) Summary score of three rituals: participation in a Passover Seder, lighting Sabbath candles, and keeping kosher at home.

Source: 1975 Boston Jewish Community Survey.

The religious...is composed of people in interaction with one another. (It) is characterized by normative expectations...enforced by sanction, ranging all the way from resounding approval to rejection from the group in disgrace. ...(They) are both socialized into the children... and continually reinforced by the members of the group. (White, 1968: 25-26).

The recent work of sociologist of religion Wade Clark Roof (1976) has demonstrated the localist quality to religious participation in America. Those who maintain localistic rather than cosmopolitan orientations and who are involved in local formal associations and informal networks, are also more likely, Roof finds, to participate in the locally based religious community. Writing about Protestant residents of a North Carolina town, Roof concludes that localism is a key link between residential stability and church involvement. In other words, veteran residents are more active in the church in large measure because they are more localistic than newcomers.

Other previous research in these and related areas is also highly suggestive. Recent migrants generally need at least five years of stable residence to attain the higher social participation levels of veteran residents (Zimmer, 1955). With regard to religious participation in particular, a recent study of Protestant and Catholic church-going reported lower levels of service attendance during the first five years of residence in a new community (Wuthnow and Christiano, 1979).

The research on mobility and Jewish affiliation in particular is rather sparse. One recent study of Chicago area Jews finds different effects for different denominations (Jaret, 1978). The analysis contends that Orthodox and Conservative Jews -- presumably with greater commitment to Jewish communal life -- retain high levels of involvement in spite of recent relocation. Other Jews -- Reform and non-denominational -- exhibited the anticipated adverse impact of residential mobility upon affiliation.

The extent to which mobility depresses affiliation even after taking into account self-selection (especially the youthfulness of newcomers) can be seen in Table 3. The unadjusted columns (1 and 3) repeat Table 1 where we learned that fewer newcomers than veterans either belong to a synagogue or contribute significant amounts to Jewish philanthropy. The adjusted columns (2 and 4) report the impact of length of residence upon synagogue belonging and philanthropic giving after controlling for age, education, income, family life cycle, and ritual observance.

Table 3. Percent of Synagogue Membership and Jewish Philanthropic Giving<sup>(a)</sup> by Length of Residence, Unadjusted and Adjusted for Age, Family Life Cycle, Education, Income, and Ritual Observance (Multiple Classification Analysis)<sup>(b)</sup>

Length of residence	Synagogue membership		Jewish giving		Weighted N
	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted	
0 - 4 years	19	31	20	30	388
5 - 8 years	37	38	46	44	119
9 -17 years	51	38	58	46	176
18 or more years	59	48	52	40	239

(a) Percentage who reported giving at least \$50 in the previous year to Jewish philanthropic causes other than the synagogue.

(b) See footnote (b) to Table 2.

Source: 1975 Boston Jewish Community Survey.

The results indicate that self-selection and disruption (or some other consequence of moving into a new neighborhood context) both play vital roles in explaining the link between high mobility and low affiliation. Moreover, the importance of self-selection differs for the two measures of affiliation, for reasons which will be made apparent.

Length of residence continues to exert a noticeable influence upon synagogue membership even after controls are introduced. Controlling for age and the other antecedent variables, only 31 percent of the newcomers (residents for four years or less) are synagogue members as opposed to 48 percent of the most established veteran residents (18 years or more of continued residence). On the other hand, the adjusted column for philanthropic giving shows a very ambiguous pattern. It suggests that self-selection almost totally explains the initial relationship between mobility and giving, and that disruption is of little if any significance.

Putting things in their simplest terms, we have found thus far:

(1) Both synagogue membership and philanthropic giving are less frequent among the residentially mobile than among their more stable counterparts.

(2) Self-selection (that is, the association of moving with age and other factors which influence affiliation) is a significant explanation of the link between mobility and lower synagogue membership, and it is virtually the total explanation for the link between mobility and philanthropic activity.

(3) Apparently, disruption -- or some other consequences or derivatives of mobility -- operates above and beyond self-selection to depress synagogue membership but it (or they) has little effect upon philanthropic giving after the special character (youth, for example) of movers has been factored out.

These findings immediately raise the question of why one type of affiliation, synagogue membership, responds to the disruptive impact of moving while the other, philanthropy, does not. The most plausible explanation lies in the synagogue's localistic character (typifying American houses of worship generally) relative to that of philanthropy. Synagogues draw most of their congregants from local catchment areas. Like churches, synagogues are identified with the particular communities in which they are located; they provide services -- such as religious training for youngsters, worship services, facilities for celebrating major life cycle events -- for which residence in the vicinity is desirable. For these reasons and others, the synagogue community is indeed almost always a highly local one.

Philanthropic giving, on the other hand, entails a much less pronounced localistic dimension. Many donors to major Jewish charities are solicited through their business by leading members of industry-wide or city-wide informal Jewish networks. Donors who move from one neighborhood or town to another within a metropolitan area will probably maintain their philanthropic contacts and visibility. As a result, mobile Jews seem no less likely than stable residents to contribute significantly to Jewish causes once we take into account their lower ritual observance, younger age, earlier family life cycle, higher education, and lower income.

In sum, we find evidence of mobility's disruptive impact only upon joining a synagogue, a highly localistic institution. Self-selection does not entirely explain why fewer newcomers join synagogues than do veteran residents, although it does largely encompass why the former are less philanthropically active than the latter.

Undoubtedly, some component of mobility's disruptive impact can be regarded as entailing the types of neighborhoods in which the mobile choose to reside. In other words, not only does residential mobility disrupt ties with some formal Jewish institutions (such as synagogues) and informal Jewish networks, it also frequently brings one into a setting where few such ties characterize one's neighbors.

### Contextual Effects

By their very nature, the neighborhoods or towns to which many geographically mobile Jews move differ from areas where Jewish residence is more established (for comparison, see Zimmer and Hawley, 1959). The former are distinctive in four major ways: (1) in their residents' aggregate characteristics -- age, social class, family life cycle; (2) in the maturity of their Jewish institutions; (3) in the density of

their Jewish populations; and (4) in their proximity to major Jewish communities and central institutions.

To elaborate, movers often move to locales with many other recent migrants. Within metropolitan regions these areas often include gentrifying center city neighborhoods, or recent housing developments, or, in an earlier era, newly developed suburbs. On the national level, many recently booming Sunbelt communities have experienced a huge inflow of Jewish migrants. A recent study of the Denver Jewish population, for example, reports that about half of Denver's Jewish residents as of 1981 had come to that city in the last decade (Allied Jewish Federation of Denver, 1982). Areas which contain many recent migrants are also apt to consist of people who are young, in early stages of family development, and ritually less observant, for these are the characteristics associated with moving. Thus, a person who moves to an area attractive to other movers is likely to have Jewish neighbors (insofar as there are Jewish neighbors) with characteristics associated with low levels of communal affiliation.

Aside from the aggregate characteristics of the Jewish population in new areas of Jewish settlement, these areas are also likely to be deficient in well-established communal institutions. Since a critical mass of settled Jewish residents is often required to establish a synagogue, Jewish schools, Jewish shopping facilities (particularly kosher butchers), community-wide organizations (such as charitable campaigns), new areas of Jewish settlement are often under-institutionalized on a per capita basis. (Conversely, it is worth noting that one sign of a declining Jewish neighborhood is the presence of an overabundance of institutions relative to the number of Jews -- usually elderly -- who remain in the old neighborhood.) (3)

The third aspect of new areas of Jewish settlement which militates against communal affiliation entails their Jewish population size. By definition, new areas of Jewish settlement contain -- at least initially -- both small numbers and small proportions of Jews. While small Jewish communities could survive under medieval Christendom where wide social and political gulfs separated Jew from Gentile, the small community in an open society can often erect few barriers against assimilation. However, it should be noted that the limited amount of research on small-town American Jewry suggests countervailing sources of strength and weakness. The small size of these communities promotes a certain intimacy, solidarity, visibility, and coherence absent in larger communities. On the other hand, they can neither support many major institutions nor can they provide a large enough marriage market to preclude significant religious intermarriage (see, for example, Allied Jewish Federation of Denver, 1982).

Finally, new areas of Jewish settlement are often remote both from major institutions of Jewish life and the well-established networks of family and friends who help sustain Jewish identification. This remoteness may be seen either in metropolitan or in national terms. On the

metropolitan level, neighborhoods or suburbs of new settlement are often quite distant from major areas of historic Jewish concentration, where large proportions of densely settled Jews can be found.(4)

On a national level, Jews migrating to California or other Sunbelt destinations -- particularly if they are young -- often leave parents and grandparents behind in the older Northeastern metropolises along with mature synagogues, religious schools, Jewish community centers, and social service agencies. The very distance of family, friends, and formal institutions from migrants living in new areas of settlement precludes their having significant influence upon the Jewish identification of recent movers.

A detailed and thorough analysis of the contextual effects of area of settlement upon Jewish identification would aim at isolating the influence of each of the four factors noted immediately above. Undoubtedly, the character of the indigenous Jewish population in these areas, their small size and density, the relative immaturity of the organized community, and remoteness from centers of Jewish life should all influence individuals' levels of communal affiliation. Unfortunately, these factors are so inextricably intertwined -- they often characterize the same neighborhoods and communities -- that only a prodigious research effort with detailed historical and contemporary data on dozens of Jewish communities across the United States could even hope to properly tackle the task.(5)

Although the available data precluded such an effort, a more modest analysis was feasible. I categorized twenty Boston area localities by proportion of newcomers (those who moved within the last four years). The twenty localities (each consisting of one or more continuous towns or neighborhoods) were then divided into three groups: those with high, medium, and low residential turnover (or conversely, those with low, medium, and high residential stability). By comparing people of similar durations of residence residing in different types of neighborhoods, we can get some inkling of whether neighborhood context -- or at least one crucial aspect of that context -- influences communal affiliation.(6)

Table 4 reports synagogue membership rates by length of residence of individuals and residential turnover of their localities. The left panel reports unadjusted figures; the right presents membership rates adjusted for age, education, income, family life cycle, and ritual observance.

Holding recency of migration constant, we find few, if any, consistent differences in synagogue membership between the "medium" and "low" residential turnover areas. However, we do find that newcomers in "high" turnover localities are considerably less likely than other recent movers (i.e. those who chose "medium" or "low" turnover areas) to belong to a synagogue. Only 9 percent of high turnover area movers had joined a synagogue as opposed to 27 percent and 24 percent of newcomers in more residentially stable areas.(7)

Table 4. Percent of Synagogue Membership by Length of Residence and Neighborhood Residential Turnover<sup>(a)</sup>, Unadjusted and Adjusted for Age, Family Life Cycle, Education, Income and Ritual Observance (Multiple Classification Analysis)<sup>(b)</sup>

Length of residence	Neighborhood Residential Turnover						Weighted N		
	Unadjusted			Adjusted			High	Med.	Low
	High	Med.	Low	High	Med.	Low			
0 - 4 years	9	27	24	26	37	36	166	222	21
5 - 8 years	--	35	50	--	38	36	---	71	39
9 -17 years	--	51	59	--	40	43	---	105	54
18 or more years	--	63	60	--	52	47	---	132	89

(a) Turnover is measured by the proportion of area residents who have moved within the last four years. Areas - 20 in all - consist of individual Boston area towns and cities and collections of contiguous locales with small Jewish populations. "High" turnover areas include: Brighton, Somerville, West Roxbury, and Back Bay. "Low" turnover areas include: Newton, Marblehead, Swampscott, Winthrop, and Hyde Park. "Medium" turnover areas include the rest of metropolitan Boston.

(b) See footnote (b) to Table 2.

Source: 1975 Boston Jewish Community Survey.

Clearly, then, some quality relating to residential turnover in a town or neighborhood has some influence (either before or after the move) on a mover's likelihood of joining a synagogue. The degree to which Jewish movers select their new neighborhoods on the basis of the availability of Jewish communal institutions is unknown. To illustrate, in a recent survey, nearly 40 percent of New York area Jews reported that it was "very important" for them to live "near a synagogue that appeals to you" and more than half said it was "very important" for them to have "a sizeable number of Jews in the neighborhood" (Ritterband and Cohen, 1982).

Available data are insufficiently detailed to sort out the pre-moving from the post-moving influences of neighborhood context. Nevertheless, the data do indicate that, all other things being equal, newcomers with the same characteristics (age, family, etc.) but moving to different neighborhoods, will have different propensities to join a synagogue because of the areas they choose. To some small, but noticeable extent, the neighborhood context affects Jewish communal affiliation above and beyond the individual characteristics of the people in those neighborhoods; and, since movers are more prone to choose neighborhoods with larger proportions of recent migrants, they are also

prone to choose areas which are less likely to promote communal affiliation. Precisely why and how these neighborhoods exert their influence -- whether their aggregate population characteristics, Jewish population density, organizational immaturity, or remoteness from centers of Jewish life are most important -- remains beyond the limits of the available data to determine.

### Concluding Discussion

This analysis supports the assumption that high residential mobility -- a distinctive Jewish behavioral response to modernity -- is a crucial factor influencing communal affiliation. Movers are indeed less often affiliated than non-movers. In part this is so because movers are initially different from -- primarily younger than -- the residentially stable. Indeed, this process of self-selection is the principal reason why recent movers contribute less often to Jewish philanthropic causes. However, joining a synagogue is a far more localistic behavior than participating in Jewish charitable drives. As a result, synagogue membership is adversely affected by residential mobility as well as the latter's antecedents (especially age and family life cycle).

In particular, the residentially mobile disrupt their ties to family, friends, and formal institutions; and it may take them five or more years to re-establish those ties in their new residential locales. Moreover, they are likely to move to those areas where residential mobility is high and where, as a consequence, established Jewish informal networks and mature communal institutions are relatively rare.

In sum, large-scale residential mobility, like other forms of demographic change brought about by Jews' encounter with modernity, is associated with a complex gamut of consequences for Jewish identification in contemporary America. On the one hand, it betokens successful integration into the social mainstream, and the acquisition of absolute freedom in selecting where to live and when to move. These were freedoms generally denied Jews in pre-modern times. On the other hand, residential and other forms of mobility and change, typifying much of Jewish life in the modern era, tend to generally reduce the diffusion and intensity of Jewish practice and affiliation.

## Notes

1. In this regard, Jews were no different from other American white ethnics. Once concentrated, they too dispersed with the passage of time and the acquisition of some measure of affluence. See Lieberman, 1963.
2. Although the better-educated moved recently slightly more often than the less well-educated, the more affluent *within* education groups are more stable (or less mobile) than less affluent respondents.
3. This circumstance of under-institutionalization has a number of historic parallels, not least significant of which concerns the origins and early development of Polish Jewry. For three hundred years German Jews migrated eastward, into Poland, even as Polish Jewish boys were sent back to yeshivas located in Germany to obtain suitable Talmudic training. Only at the end of the fifteenth century did Polish Jewry found its first indigeneous Talmudic academy of significance, marking the beginning of one of Jewish history's most creative Talmudic communities (Shulvass, 1975).
4. In Boston, Newton-Brookline/Brighton serves this function of historic concentration. "Northeast Philadelphia" with its large first and second generation Jewish population is such an area; and in New York several heavily Jewish neighborhoods come to mind: Flatbush, Boro Park, Brighton Beach, Forest Hills/Rego Park, Riverdale are but a few.
5. For this investigation, I initially (and ultimately vainly) attempted to unentangle these several factors. I isolated twenty towns, neighborhoods, or collections of such entities in the Boston area, assigned measures pertaining to several locality-wide characteristics, and tried to assess the relative importance of each type of characteristic for determining a neighborhood's mean level of communal affiliation. Unfortunately, the characteristics, crudely measured at best, so often corresponded -- a quality statisticians called "multicollinearity" -- that no unambiguous results could be derived.
6. As can be seen from the table, few if any respondents who had lived in their areas more than four years were living in high turnover areas. Thus, in examining the impact of neighborhood turnover, we can compare "high" with "medium" turnover neighborhoods only for those with four years residential duration or less; at the same time, we may compare "medium" with "low" turnover neighborhoods for people with all levels of residential duration.
7. The right panel, presenting membership rates controlling for the several background variables, reports some narrowing of the differences between newcomers in high turnover and their counterparts in

other areas. Nevertheless, at least 10 percentage points continue to separate newcomers in high turnover neighborhoods from the synagogue affiliation rates of recent movers into other areas.

### References

1. ALLIED JEWISH FEDERATION OF DENVER, *The Denver Jewish Population Study*, 1982.
2. COHEN, S., "The American Jewish Family Today," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 82, 1982, pp. 136-154.
3. DIAMOND, J., "Jewish Immigration to the United States, 1881-1976," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 77, 1977.
4. FOWLER, F.J. Jr., *1975 Community Survey: A Study of the Jewish Population of Greater Boston*, Boston, Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, 1977.
5. GOLDSTEIN, S., "Population Movement and Redistribution Among American Jews," *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 24 (June), 1982, pp. 5-23.
6. HOWE, I., *World of Our Fathers*, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1976.
7. HYMAN, P.E., *Emancipation and Social Change: Alsatian Jewry in the Nineteenth Century*, forthcoming.
8. JARET, C., "The Impact of Geographical Mobility on Jewish Community Participation: Disruptive or Supportive?" *Contemporary Jewry*, Vol. 4 (Spring-Summer), 1978, pp. 9-21.
9. MOORE, D.D., *At Home in America: Second Generation New York Jews*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1981.
10. NEWMAN, W. and P. HALVORSON, "American Jews: Patterns of Geographic Distribution and Change, 1952-1971," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 18 (June), 1979, pp. 183-193.
11. RITTERBAND, P. and S.M. COHEN, "The Social Characteristics of the New York Area Jewish Community," New York, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, 1982.
12. ROOF, W.C., "Religious Causal Relationship in Contemporary Society: A Theory of Local-Cosmopolitan Plausibility," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 80, no. 3 (November), 1974, pp. 643-664.

13. SANDEFUR, G.D. and W.J. SCOTT, "A Dynamic Analysis of Migration: An Assessment of the Effects of Age, Family on Career Variables," *Demography*, Vol. 18 (August), 1981, pp. 355-368.
14. SCHULVASS, M.A., *Jewish Culture in Eastern Europe*, New York, Ktav, 1975.
15. WHITE, R., "Toward a Theory of Religious Influence," *Pacific Sociological Review* (Spring), 1968, pp. 23-28.
16. WUTHNOW, R. and K. CHRISTIANO, "The Effects of Residential Migration on Church Attendance in the United States," in R. Wuthnow (ed.), *The Religious Dimension: New Directions in Quantitative Research*, New York, Academic Press, 1979.
17. ZIMMER, B.G., "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 20, 1955, pp. 218-224.
18. ZIMMER, B.G. and A.H. HAWLEY, "Suburbanization and Church Participation," *Social Forces*, Vol. 37 (May), 1959, pp. 348-354.