

A STUDY OF RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF JEWS
IN RHODE ISLAND, 1963-1972

BY NEHAMA ELLA BABIN, A.B., M.A.

The American Jewish community is very much concerned about the future of the Jewish population in the United States—its culture, religion, heritage, and demographic situation. Pressures exist within today's American society which could lead to significant changes for the American Jewish community. In their extreme form some of these pressures may even pose a threat to its very survival. Such concerns have led to a series of studies¹ of the Jewish group to understand its characteristics and its continually changing form.

One focus of such research is the demographic characteristics of the community to determine its size, distribution, composition, fertility, mobility, and growth patterns. The present study examines the mobility of one segment of the Jewish population in America, the residential mobility of Jews living in Rhode Island. Analysis and interpretation will be broadened in order to make the material more relevant to the American Jewish community as a whole.

An important demographic factor influencing the position of Jews in America today is their wide geographical distribution throughout the country. In the past Jews in the United States lived largely in areas inhabited heavily by other Jews, usually in urban environments with Jewish institutions and organizations close at hand. It is recognized historically that survival of a group or culture depends upon people maintaining contact with one another.² Similarly in past American Jewish history "residential clustering has been an important variable in helping to perpetuate traits, values and institutions important to Judaism."³ To assess the future of the Jewish community, therefore, it is essential to evaluate the extent and character of residential mobility and its impact on the geographic distribution of the Jewish population.

The American experience involving historically great social and political freedom has been a new one for Jews. They have been able increasingly to enter the economic world in almost any capacity that they wish. Consequently new economic opportunities are taking Jews away from their native communities into other parts of the United States where there are fewer Jews and fewer opportunities for contact with

¹Based on thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Sociology at Brown University, June, 1974.

Jewish organizations, culture, and religion. Gerhard Lenski states in his book *The Religious Factor* that one of the best indicators of the importance attached to family and kin groups (and ethnic/religious groups) by modern Americans is their willingness to leave their native community and migrate elsewhere.⁴

Also, residential mobility becomes important from the perspective of the areas receiving migration. It is important in terms of community planning to integrate newly arrived movers. In a transient society such as ours the Jewish community must provide means for attracting and absorbing quickly the new migrants into the Jewish social structure. On the other hand, mobility can affect the degree to which an individual desires to integrate into a community. As Goldstein has stated:

Research in depth is needed to ascertain how the communal orientation of Jews living in cities and in suburbs of differing Jewish density varies and what meaning the various activities have for the individuals, particularly as they relate to the larger question of Jewish identification . . . population distributions are important for the development of an area. They affect not only its size, but also the characteristics of its education, occupation and income groups. At the same time, migration may have an important effect on the migrant himself, particularly on the degree of his integration into the community.⁵

Thus, residential mobility is a potent factor affecting the Jewish community, and its evaluation is crucial to understanding the sociological characteristics of the American Jewish community today and in the future. It is a key to the broader subject of integration and the process of assimilation of the Jewish community into the larger American society.

The continued survival of the Jewish community is largely dependent upon the third and later generations. Consequently there is great concern within the Jewish community as a whole regarding the process and speed of assimilation by young Jewish Americans. Most third generation Jewish Americans are growing up as Americans rather than as Jews, and they no longer have the contact with the Old World Jews, who thought, lived, and existed largely as Jews and for Judaism. These young Jews are native Americans, born in this country of American-born parents, and for the most part brought up as middle-class Americans who only happen to be Jews.⁶ Consequently many of these young tend to wear their ethnicity lightly as one of their several roles and allegiances in American society. In their homes Jewish culture and religion generally play only a small circumscribed role.⁷ Considerable:

numbers of occupational and economic opportunities have been opened to the young Jews, who have increasing freedom to move into formerly closed neighborhoods and to associate freely with non-Jews in business or social situations.

In this regard it is important to determine the types of places to which young Jews in Rhode Island are moving, if there are many Jews in the areas receiving them, if they consider the ethnic composition of areas into which they move, if there will be other Jews to help ease integration into the community, and if these areas have Jewish institutions. This information can aid future research designed to learn if young Jews who have left the area to obtain education and jobs elsewhere desire to return to Rhode Island, to the areas where their families live. Even if the third generation is moving away from areas of high Jewish density, it may be possible to maintain ties over a distance with kin or family, who tend to be the major motivating force in the continuation of a culture and a people.

In short, the literature and statistical trends suggest that third generation Jewish Americans will become more assimilated than their parents, thus threatening the survival of the American Jewish community. The present study was directed to one aspect of this trend, the extent to which residential mobility may be contributing to the assimilation process.

In particular this study focused in depth on three problems. First, residential mobility including the volume, selective character, and destination of a sample of Jews in Rhode Island will be measured, analyzed, and interpreted. Second, the effect on residential mobility of group solidarity, as indicated by membership in synagogues and Jewish organizations, was measured. The mobility rates of third generation Jewish Americans of Rhode Island and the destinations of their moves were determined and analyzed. For all members of the sample, reasons for moving were also determined.

THE DATA

This study represents a follow-up to one aspect of a larger study, *A Population Survey: The Greater Providence Jewish Community*, completed in 1963 by Doctor Sidney Goldstein under the sponsorship of the General Jewish Committee of Providence, Inc.⁸ That study, encompassing the area designated as Greater Providence, included the cities of Providence and Pawtucket; the suburbs of Cranston, Warwick, and East Providence, as well as the towns of Barrington, Bristol, Warren,

East Greenwich, and West Warwick; and such smaller areas as Lincoln, Cumberland, and North Providence.⁹ The survey data were collected through face-to-face household interviews. Based on lists obtained from the General Jewish Committee and other Jewish organizations, and on information on new families in the community, a master listing of essentially all Jews in the Greater Providence area was assembled. In the final form this master list included all households where one or more adult members were known to be Jewish. Goldstein defined a household as all members of a family unit living together.¹⁰ Information was obtained on all members of the household unit regardless of whether they were all Jewish.

For the 1963 survey it was decided that, out of the total listing of 6,209 household units, a sample of 1,500 household units would be sufficient for proper and complete statistical analysis of the characteristics of the community. Thus, a sample of approximately one out of every four households was selected. To permit areal comparisons it was also necessary to define individual sections of the Greater Providence area which would be subject to separate analyses. The seven areas were: (1) Barrington, Bristol, East Providence and Warren; (2) Cranston; (3) Warwick, East Greenwich and West Warwick; (4) Pawtucket and its environs; (5) the South Side of Providence; (6) the North End of Providence; and (7) the East Side of Providence. Since some of these areas contained too few Jewish household units, they were oversampled. Random selection was used, the final sample amounting to 1,603 household units. However, completed interviews were obtained from only 1,420 of the units, thus reducing the sample by 183 household units. Weighting of the individual areas was applied in the analysis of the data for Greater Providence as a whole to insure that each area received proper representation.¹¹

In the present follow-up study a sample was taken from the original 1963 sample by means of systematic sampling. It was decided that for purposes of this study, given its limited purpose and restricted resources, only one-third of the 1,420 household units sampled in the 1963 survey sample would be used. A random number was picked between one and three, and then every third household was picked from the original sample of respondents. The final sample consisted of 473 household units, a total of 1,268 individuals.

Because this study is a follow-up of residential mobility patterns of the 1963 sample in the interval 1963 through 1972, the design called for determining where each of the 1,268 persons in the 473 households

was living in 1972, and comparison of the 1972 address of each individual with that of 1963.

As a first step, it was deemed that the most efficient and quickest manner in which to identify the 1972 residences of so many people would be through use of the R. L. Polk and Co. Inc. City Directories. Since it is the policy of the city directories to include only those persons aged eighteen and over, it was decided to exclude from the sample any individual who was under the age of ten years in 1963, thus assuring that each individual in the sample by 1972 would be at least eighteen years of age. In an analysis of "City Directories as Sources of Migration Data," Goldstein stated that it was found through tests that city directories are complete and highly accurate sources of data.¹² In addition, the directories are helpful in that they identify those persons who are still in school as "students" and those women whose husbands have died as "widows." The latter permitted identification of women whose husbands may have died since the 1963 survey.

The city directories for the following towns were carefully searched for each member of each household unit: Providence, Pawtucket, East Providence and Rumford, Cranston, Warwick, West Warwick, Woonsocket, Westerly, Newport, Cumberland, Lincoln, and Coventry.¹³ For the town of East Greenwich the 1971 Street Directory was used.¹⁴ In all, 837 of the 1,268 individuals were located in the city directories.

When this process was completed there were still 423 individuals who were not located in the directory listings. Consequently, as a next step the 1971 telephone directories for Providence and all other areas of Rhode Island were searched to find those missing and to verify some of those found in the city directories. The search in telephone directories led to further identifications and further extended the coverage of the list.

Next, an attempt was made to trace those persons who had died, whom the city directory either had not listed as deceased, or had omitted entirely. The Yearbooks published by the General Jewish Committee of Rhode Island contain lists of all those Jews who had died between 1963 and 1972. These lists were checked to account for Jews in the 1963 sample who had since died. Eighty additional persons were found in this manner.

Finally, as part of the record checking process, the files of the Jewish Federation of Rhode Island, successor to the General Jewish Committee, served as a last source of addresses. This master list is regularly revised

and is regarded as fairly complete. It records both changes in addresses within the community and removals through death and out-migration. These were thoroughly searched, and some of the resulting findings were again cross-checked in the telephone directories and city directories further to assure accuracy.

In order to obtain the still missing information on some individuals, as well as to obtain additional information on mobility, a mail questionnaire was sent out to each of the 473 household units in the original sample, requesting information on reasons for move, date of move, status of children and their place of residence, and information on deceased members of the family.

In all, 244 completed questionnaires were returned. This was a relatively low response rate, but an additional 249 individuals were accounted for in this way. For those individuals for whom no information of any type had been gathered follow-up telephone calls were made to the families. This led to the location of an additional 23 individuals.

In all, 1,189 individuals of 1,268 in the total sample were found. Seventy-nine persons remained for whom no information could be elicited.

THE HYPOTHESES

A dependent variable and several independent variables and indicators were used to test the following hypotheses:

- I. The Jews of Rhode Island are moving away from the more densely Jewish population centers in the Providence area to the suburban areas and to areas of Rhode Island where Jews have not lived before in any substantial numbers.
- II. Those who have strong affiliation with Jewish community organizations, and therefore greater commitment to the Jewish community, have lower rates of residential mobility than those who have weak affiliation.
- III. Compared to the first and second generation, third generation Jewish Americans are more frequently moving away from the locations of their families of procreation and the areas where kin reside to areas where the density of Jews is lower.

The dependent variable which has been studied and measured is residential mobility. The independent variables used to explain the amount, direction, and reasons for residential mobility are: age, generation, size of family, family composition, area in which the individual lived in 1963, ethnic density of area of origin and area of destination,

type of move, organizational memberships, and intention to move (as stated in the 1963 survey).¹⁵

Age, generation, the size of the family, and family composition reflect the stage in the life cycle of an individual and a family. In the pertinent literature, the stage of an individual's or a family's life cycle is regarded as a good indicator of potential to move or not to move. Consequently, this study used these variables to sort out stages of life as a factor which influences mobility, independent of religion.

The reasons for a move provide the basis for testing whether Jews are moving to be with other Jews, to be in heavily Jewish populated areas, or to be near Jewish institutions. A decreasing concern for population composition of the area of destination of a move, that is, a lack of concern for the religious composition of those among whom a Jew resides, may suggest a weakening of the ties to the Jewish community and a decreasing likelihood of maintaining Jewish identity.

Organizational membership is used as an index of degree of identification with the Jewish community. In this study it is measured in terms of synagogue membership and the number of Jewish and non-Jewish organizations to which each person belonged in 1963. Theoretically, the greater the participation of an individual in his community, the greater his presumed commitment to the community. If because of affiliations or commitment in a specific community there is little out-mobility, the community is more highly integrated and stable. Therefore, this variable is used here as an index of solidarity of the Jewish community.

The variable "intention to move" refers to a question asked in the 1963 survey questionnaire as to a family's intention to move within the next five years. The response in 1963 was then compared to actual residence in 1972. In this manner it was possible to determine whether or not Jewish families in Rhode Island who planned in advance to remain in a community or to leave it actually adhered to their plans. The extent to which plans were actually converted into action could suggest the value of such a question for predicting mobility in the future.

A question asked in connection with "intention to move" was the "intended destination" of the possible move. Comparison of the response to this question with the actual residence in 1972 provided the basis for determining the extent to which predictions from 1963 responses as to destinations of moves were accurate, providing a further basis for assessing the value of such a question for predictive purposes.

The pull of kin may bring Jews together even in a highly mobile society. Third, full families are the most potentially mobile of all household types—the larger the household size, the higher its rate of mobility.

Size of household and age of family members are indicators of family life-cycle stages. "Life-cycle stage" is used with increasing frequency in mobility investigations. Speare utilized life-cycle stage as an alternative control to age. "Studies have shown that among birth cohorts, life cycle experiences are varied."²² Goldstein illustrated that high mobility rates are largely due to limited segments of a population who make frequent moves. "The tendency to migrate differs markedly among various *age* segments of the population, being closely associated with economic considerations and particularly with job opportunities."²³

Consequently, housing needs for growing families become an important and major reason for residential moves. As early as 1926 Bowman claimed that people move for one main reason—to get better housing and neighborhoods.²⁴ In fact, individuals were more concerned about housing characteristics than about proximity to friends, relatives, work, or place of worship. While the earlier literature on residential mobility stressed mobility as a means by which distances from home to work, service institutions, and people were minimized, Rossi's findings opposed the traditional view.²⁵ It is possible that with modern mass transportation and communication technology distances are no longer important. According to Rossi residential moves are made most often to bring housing needs into line with family life cycle stage and financial capabilities. "Residential mobility is *primarily* a matter of . . . housing desires."²⁶

The Rossi data further indicate that a family's reported intentions about moving are a good indicator of how a family will actually behave. Therefore the expressed "intention to move" used as a variable should be a reliable predictor of mobility for Jews in Rhode Island. Speare discovered that the mobility process begins one step earlier, in that satisfaction with housing and location is a significant predictor of whether or not people will express a wish to move or will actually move.

Sidney Goldstein's work stands out as the most complete and informative in the area of residential mobility, migration, and other demographic characteristics of the State of Rhode Island and also on the Jewish American community both throughout the United States and in Rhode Island. Goldstein in a joint study with Kurt Mayer estab-

lished some demographic facts about Rhode Island which provide insights into Jewish residential mobility.²⁷

They observed that Rhode Island is in one of the most settled sections of the country, which is partially due to the early settlement of the state. Consequently, Rhode Island had the opportunity for early economic and demographic maturation. However, because of such maturation, Rhode Island as a whole was an area of out-migration for three decades, 1930-1960. Two out of every five persons had changed their residence between 1955 and 1960. Among these 40 per cent of Rhode Islanders who are movers, there are probably many who have made more than one move during this period. Between 1950 and 1960 Rhode Island as a whole, as well as the city of Providence, lost population through migration. This high rate of mobility for the state in general will affect the rate of mobility of subgroups such as Jews.

Goldstein and Mayer described three types of residential mobility within Rhode Island. First, although the central cities of Providence and Pawtucket are declining, there is much mobility within this area. Second, one-third of all migrants are moving away from the central cities. Third, residential movement within the suburbs is even greater than movement away from the central cities.

They also found that mobility rates for Rhode Island as a whole reflect the family cycle. Fifty-four per cent of the non-movers are children 5-14 years of age. The proportion declines for those in the 15-24 age group "when persons are both entering the labor force and establishing new families and households."²⁸ There is somewhat of an increase in the proportion of stability for those 25-44 years of age, when both careers and family size become more settled. Mobility is sharply reduced in the age group 45-64. Among the elderly, 65 years of age and over, the proportion of movers increases slightly, probably due to changes in family composition with resulting changes in housing needs.

REVIEW OF BACKGROUND LITERATURE

Considerable research has been done on migration and mobility, and a vast literature has been developed. It is important to understand why Jews move, and whether their residential mobility parallels that of other Americans or differs from it by virtue of their ties to a religious and ethnic cohort.

Everett S. Lee provided a useful conceptual framework and theory of migration. He "attempted the development of a general schema into

which a variety of spatial movements can be placed and, from a small number of what would seem to be self-evident propositions, to deduce a number of conclusions with regard to the volume of migration, the development of streams and counterstreams, and the characteristics of migrants."¹⁶

Lee also developed a set of hypotheses derived from the conceptual framework which he developed.¹⁷ They involve the "push and pull" factors which cause people to move. For purposes of this study, Lee's conclusion that the volume of migration can depend upon the diversity of areas and the diversity of people within the area is particularly relevant. The greater the differences, the greater is the volume of migration. Thus, if Jews are discovering different, newer, and more desirable areas in which to reside and have the resources to move, the rate of residential mobility will be high and continuous. Also, if they live in areas with a high degree of diversity of people, especially in terms of religious and ethnic background, Jews will have fewer ties to the area and therefore a greater tendency to be mobile than if they resided in a densely Jewish area.

Lee also stated that "the heightened propensity to migrate at certain stages of the life cycle is important in the selection of migrants."¹⁸ This is important in view of the reason Jews in Rhode Island are moving. It is possible that religious and ethnic ties play a minimum role in the inclination to move. Rather, needs associated with changing stages of the life cycle may be the major motivation for mobility, especially within the area, as has been proven for other Americans.

Peter H. Rossi's *Why Families Move* presents one of the first analyses of residential mobility. Rossi argued that the study of residential mobility is of importance because mobility is one of the most important forces underlying changes in urban areas.¹⁹ The significance of residential mobility lies in the fact that high mobility is an important factor in the creation of an area's social organization.

Neighborhoods whose residents are stable are likely to be characterized by growth of close interpersonal relations within this area . . . organizations flourish . . . residents take pride in living there and derive satisfaction from close association with others like themselves. The effect of mobility is to loosen an individual resident's bonds to the larger society itself and to deprive him of the satisfaction inherent in close association with his fellow men.²⁰

Most studies and research on the process of residential mobility used an ecological perspective, distinguishing mobile from stable areas. They

are generally restricted to census data which are collected and computed on specific areas.²¹ Rossi felt a need to integrate areal, household, and motivational studies so that areas of different mobility could be contrasted and the social psychology of mobility could be studied simultaneously.

Several of Rossi's findings are relevant to the study of Jewish residential mobility. First, he discovered that integration of an area is dependent on its rate of mobility. Second, the mobility rate of an area is more clearly related to the location of relatives than to the location of friends.

In his 1963 survey of the Jews in the Greater Providence area, Goldstein found that Jews "shared in the (migration) experience of the Greater Providence total population."²⁹

In general, the proportion of Jewish migrants differs within various age segments of the population. Also, since there is small movement into the Greater Providence area, mobility within the area becomes important.

Goldstein's findings show that movement within the Greater Providence area clearly was not random. The total geographic area in which Jews live in the Providence area has become much larger. Jews have been dispersing to the outer areas of the metropolitan area, but there are still areas of Jewish concentration which are identifiable.

In 1963, 72.5 per cent of the 6,200 Jewish households in Greater Providence were living in urban areas of Providence, as compared to 27.5 per cent living in suburban areas. Of the 72.5 per cent, one-half lived in the newer urban areas, which were of comparatively high socio-economic status. This is in sharp contrast to 1951, when 88 per cent of Jews in Greater Providence lived in the urban areas, with only 43 per cent of the total living in the newer urban areas and 11 per cent in suburban areas.

Consequently, the old ghetto area was in the process of disappearing in 1963 while the newer urban areas increased in their Jewish population. However, even the newer areas at that time were beginning to experience a decline in their Jewish population with the movement to the suburbs.

Goldstein discovered that in all of the areas there are significant differences among the migrants. In all areas of Providence itself, except the North End (which is an older section), the highest proportion of movers were 20-39 years of age. However, in the suburban areas—as

opposed to the three sections of central Providence—the migration rates even for those 40 to 60 years of age were high. Goldstein concludes therefore “. . . that the movement to the suburbs, while heaviest among those just establishing families, is by no means restricted to these groups, but characterizes the entire age range.”³⁰

Between 46 and 61 per cent of the persons living in the suburbs had moved there during the eight years preceding the survey. Of those living in the older urban areas of Providence, only 4 per cent had moved there during the eight years preceding the survey.

There is a significant difference between the suburban communities and the older sections of the cities in the percentage of persons whose previous residence was in the same section. In the suburban areas the percentage is low, whereas in older urban areas the percentage is high. Consequently, mobility rates must be interpreted differently for different parts of the city. In areas where the rate is high but movement was within the area, there is less possibility for rupture of Jewish community ties and organizations.

Jewish participation in the movement to the suburbs has been at a more accelerated rate than that of the general population. Regarding the degree and manner of dispersal of the Jewish population, Goldstein commented:

Within the central cities of the metropolitan area, 90 per cent of all Jews were concentrated within one-fourth of the census tracts. By contrast 40 per cent of the census tracts must be cumulated to encompass 90 per cent of all suburban Jews and these tracts are scattered over a larger geographic area (in 1963.)³¹

The 1963 data indicated that suburbs such as Warwick and Barrington had become very desirable areas of residence. Movement within the entire Greater Providence area indicated that Cranston was making large gains, as was Warwick, the East Side of Providence, Pawtucket, and Barrington in that order. However, the South Side and the North End sustained heavy losses. Also, there was no large movement from the suburbs back into the city.

In one of the questions in the survey questionnaire respondent was asked if he had any plans to move within the next five years and, if so, what the destination would be. This question is significant in that it could suggest the stability of various areas and could also aid in prediction of future migration patterns. However, Goldstein warned that the figures must be viewed with caution, since, among those who express plans to move, some never do, and, among those who do not plan to

move, some eventually do because of the development of unanticipated push or pull factors or both. Approximately 15 per cent of those interviewed planned to move within the next five years, 64 per cent had no plans to move, and 21 per cent did not know. The largest proportion who answered that they had no plans to move came from Cranston, Warwick, the East Side, and Pawtucket, thus indicating a high level of stability within these communities in 1963. Goldstein also found that the proportion of units planning to move varied inversely with the age of the head of the household. Those with intentions to move tended to be in the younger age group of the population.

One-fourth of those questioned did not have any idea as to the destination of possible moves. If the planned moves had been carried out to the destinations indicated in the 1963 survey, the East Side and Cranston would have gained residents, whereas the South Side, Pawtucket, and the North End would have experienced heavy losses.

In 1970, using the master lists of the Jewish Federation of Rhode Island, Goldstein found a continuing redistribution of the Providence Jewish population since 1963.³² A majority of Jews lived in the *newer* urban area in 1970. However, even this area has experienced some decline since 1963. In 1963, 50.1 per cent of the Jewish population lived in the newer urban area, as contrasted with 47.6 per cent in 1970. The greatest decline occurred in the old urban area. Whereas in 1963 22.4 per cent of the Providence Jewish population lived in older parts of the city, in 1970 only 16.6 per cent still resided in such areas. The suburbs gained Jewish population during those seven years, encompassing over one-third of the total Providence Jewish population, whereas in 1963 only 27.5 per cent of the Jewish population had lived in the suburbs of Providence.

In summary Goldstein concluded that:

. . . evaluation of both the past and future mobility patterns in Greater Providence suggests two simultaneous developments in the distribution of the population. A significant proportion of Jews will continue to be concentrated in the newer urban section of the central cities. At the same time, greater decentralization of the total Jewish population within the metropolitan area will take place through the growth of the suburban sector.³³

More and more Jews of Rhode Island are moving outward, away from central Providence, where they lived closely together, maintained constant contact, and were in close proximity to Jewish services and institutions. Participation in and commitment to the Jewish community

was easy and convenient in such close quarters. However, with movement to the suburbs, away from the centralized concentrated Jewish areas, an individual's ties with fellow Jews might become fewer and more tenuous. "The developing pattern seems to be even greater dispersion (into the general population) and more general residential integration of the Jewish community. As a result, institutions (will, in the future, probably) become located at quite widely separated points in the metropolitan area. . . ."34

The dispersion of the Jewish community, claimed Goldstein, had still not reached a serious stage in 1963. However, he speculated that with time there would be progressive movement away even from suburban areas. As the third generation reaches the age when it begins a new stage in the life cycle of marriage and career, the pressure toward assimilation could become greater. As Goldstein puts it: ". . . the Jewish population will become more truly an American population, with all this implies regarding opportunities for greater assimilation and less numerical visibility."35

Goldstein describes three aspects of the process of assimilation. First, for the first time Jews are entering occupations in which there were no Jews before. An increasing number of occupations require mobility to take advantage of opportunities all over the country. Jews in these various occupations will move more often, live in communities for only short periods of time, and often in areas where few Jews are living. Second, fewer and fewer Jews feel the necessity of living in areas of high Jewish concentration or even concern about the existence or lack of Jewish communities in the areas to which they move. Third, third generation Jewish Americans attach less importance to family or kinship ties than did first or second generation Jewish Americans.

The discussion of kinship and family ties is pertinent to the problem of Jewish mobility and assimilation. Since kinship ties are a primary method by which a religious group (and heritage and culture) perpetuates itself, it is of great relevance to this study to determine how mobility affects kinship ties. In particular, it is pertinent to ascertain if increasing geographical distances between third generation Jewish Americans and the second and first generations is detrimental to the Jewish American community.

In past sociological literature and in the analysis of urbanism and the urban way of life, the urban community was viewed as largely pathological. This point of view was held by intellectuals from

Toennies and Simmel, through Park and Burgess, to Wirth.³⁶ They felt that there was a steady decline in the importance of the family to the individual. It was assumed that migration, urbanization, industrialism, and acculturation would weaken or destroy close-knit networks of kinship. Consequently the family performed fewer and fewer functions. Most recent theorists have denied that relatives are of any importance to a family, that nuclear families are isolated. It is thought that the middle class and upwardly mobile individuals have the least awareness of kinship.

Arguments have also been presented to the effect that particularistic ties such as kinship are detrimental to our social system, which has a universalistic orientation which emphasizes functional achievement.³⁷

Consequently, due to the mobility which forms a part of the urban way of life, scholars doubted that anything but the isolated nuclear family could exist in American society and that, when children grew up, married, and moved away from their families, all ties between the new and original families of the individual would be terminated. In fact, Homans claimed that contact is one of the four major prerequisites for primary group cohesion.³⁸

However, the newer point of view holds to the contrary. In an informative volume on *Kinship and Geographical Mobility*, Piddington has collected a set of studies which indicate that mobility does not disrupt kinship ties and that kinship bonds outside the nuclear family tend to persist.³⁹

Helgi Osterreich in one of these studies based on a sample of middle-class English-speaking Canadians, found that geographical propinquity was not necessary for the existence of ties between kin and that the "modified extended" family (as Litwak called it) provided social, psychological, and economic support for members of the family, in spite of distances between those members.⁴⁰

Litwak coined the phrase "modified extended" family,⁴¹ observing that members of such families are better able to move because the family provides social, psychological, and economic support, while communication and mass transportation minimize the disruptive effects of mobility. Financial difficulties of moving are lessened when the family is at its peak earning capacity. If the extended family wants to see its member families become successful, it must accept one of the chief prerequisites to occupational success—geographical mobility.⁴²

Therefore, if the study of Jewish residential mobility reveals that Jews, and especially young Jews, are moving away from communities of high Jewish density and their families, the seriousness of the process must be viewed in light of these findings. In spite of geographical distance, ideological commitment can be maintained through kinship ties, even in a modern society in the face of new stimuli for different lifestyles.

The other side of the problem is the position of the individual in relation to the community which is the destination of the move. Zimmer, Lansing and Mueller, and Speare have all shown that social bonds increase with duration of residence.⁴³ However, the problem is that more and more occupations tend to take people from place to place after very short periods of time. More and more young Jews, especially in mobile occupations, will be moving from area to area often not remaining long enough in any one place to establish social, let alone Jewish bonds.

This mobility presents a serious problem to organizations within a community, leading to loss of members. "Not only is the specific relationship to the organizational personnel disrupted, but in addition all the relationships which the lost member had to other members have been broken."⁴⁴ Rossi claims that mobility presents two major problems for organizations:

- (1) how can organizations constantly attract sufficient new members to maintain organizational strength and
- (2) how can new members be rapidly inducted into the social group without continual disruption of the structure of the organization itself. When organizations or religious groups attempt to maintain group cohesion, mobility is a large barrier to their attempts. Various institutional devices can be used to cushion the impact of mobility but these devices are often time-consuming and costly.⁴⁵

Some writers claim that mobility is lessened when households within an area or community have developed strong interpersonal ties—such as memberships in organizations. However, Rossi states to the contrary that friendships and their locations are independent of intentions and inclinations to move, and that the existence or absence of ties does not affect a family's desire to stay or to move.⁴⁶ Thus the involvement of a Jew in his community through organizations will not affect his intentions to move. The second hypothesis of our study was intended to test Rossi's claim, using community organizational memberships and rates of mobility between 1963 and 1972.

Historical demographic characteristics of Rhode Island and mobility behavior of the general Rhode Island population serve as background to the Jewish mobility experience. Being a highly settled state characterized by economic maturity, there has been high out-of-state mobility of persons, especially young persons looking for economic, social, and educational opportunities. Also, within the state the direction of mobility has been heavily away from the central city area, and within the suburban area with some within city movement as well. Statistics on area of residence in 1963 and 1972 will determine if Jews are following the same mobility patterns. These data will also test if during the period between 1963, when Goldstein conducted his survey, and 1972 the mobility rate and directions marked out by Goldstein have continued.

If statistics indicate that Rhode Island Jews, and especially young third generation Jews, are choosing destinations far from established Jewish residential centers, the problem of maintenance of ties to the Jewish community arises. The literature claims that kinship ties are maintained despite geographical mobility in modern societies. Kinship is a major source of continuation of ethnic/religious groups. It is plausible that assimilation will not occur as rapidly as or to the extent that the Jewish community fears.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

To test the hypotheses of this investigation, four sets of statistics were tabulated: (1) selected basic characteristics, such as age, generation status, family size, and family composition of movers and non-movers to ascertain how they differ from each other; (2) rates and directions of residential mobility to ascertain the patterns of population redistribution; (3) organizational memberships, in order to determine how movers differ from non-movers with respect to integration into the community; (4) intentions to move and intended destinations of moves as stated in the 1963 survey compared to rates and directions of moves that actually occurred in the succeeding ten years.

Characteristics of Movers and Non-Movers

Reflecting the lower levels of Jewish immigration to the United States in recent decades, the statistics clearly point to an inverse relation between age and generational status.⁴⁷ Among the younger population there are few foreign-born and first-generation persons, and a large proportion of second-generation persons. Among the youngest age cohort 20 per cent were third generation persons. By contrast (Table 1)

a large majority of the older population are foreign born, or first generation, or both.

For purposes of this investigation, the entire sample was subdivided into those who had changed their address between 1963 and 1972 and those who had not. In the discussion which follows, these will be referred to as movers and non-movers respectively. In this tabulation movers include all those who changed their addresses whether within the same city, within the same suburb, between cities, between suburbs, between cities and suburbs, or from somewhere in Rhode Island to out-of-state. Later analyses will distinguish among these different categories of movers. The characteristics of respondents and non-respondents may differ in certain respects, especially since more of the non-respondents are more likely to have been migrants. (Migrants tend to be especially difficult to follow-up in longitudinal surveys.) Since these differences may be significant in interpreting results, a comparison of the basic characteristics of respondents and non-respondents is undertaken in Appendix A. The distribution of respondents (Table 2) is almost equally divided between movers and non-movers. Just over eight per cent of those in the 1963 sample died in the interval since then. The high percentage of persons in the original sample who were identified as movers between 1963 and 1972 suggests the importance of giving attention to this aspect of demographic behavior in any overall assessment of the community.

The data by age indicate that as people get older a decreasing number move. Therefore, the age of an individual clearly affects the likelihood of mobility. For example, over 60 per cent of those under age 30 had changed residence between 1963 and 1972, but under one-third of all those 40 and over did so. Only 17 per cent of those 70 and over had moved during the ten year period. As one would expect, deaths were most heavily concentrated in the oldest age groups (Table 3).

Examination of mobility status by generation suggests that movement occurs more frequently among second and third generation Americans; more of those who were foreign born and first generation remained stable. In short, there is an inverse relation between generation status and mobility (Table 4). Of course, these differentials by generation status reflect to a great extent the age differentials (Table 3) since generation status and age are highly correlated (Table 1).

When both age and generation status are controlled concurrently, a distinct pattern emerges (Table 5). The younger age groups in all

generation status categories are more mobile than the older age groups of the same generational status. But the data also suggest that, within the younger groups, mobility is greater among those in the more Americanized generation groups. In short, both age and generation status seem to affect mobility levels.

It is apparent (Table 6) that there is an inverse relationship between one's position in the family and mobility. Children, i.e. sons and daughters, are more likely to have higher rates of movement than their parents. However, this relationship is probably due in high degree to age—the children are members of younger age cohorts than are their parents and are therefore more likely to be entering a stage of the life cycle, such as marriage, higher education, and labor force participation, associated with greater mobility.

Earlier research suggests that, as a family grows larger, it is more likely to move. Rossi found that size of household is an indicator of family life cycle stage.⁴⁸ Consequently, housing needs for growing families become an important and major reason for residential mobility. The data on mobility status by household size provide an opportunity to examine whether such a relationship also characterizes the Jewish population.

The percentage of movers increases as families become larger (Table 7). The only exception to this pattern is the five-person household unit. Clearly, this suggests that families move in order to satisfy the increasing need for space as large family size creates pressures on existing space.

The positive relationship between size and mobility does not hold for each of the age categories. In fact, it holds only within the 10-19 age cohort and to a lesser degree for the 20-29 age cohort (Table 8 cites the percentage of movers in each size and age cohort).

It is clear that among younger persons 10-29 who belong to larger families the proportion of movers is larger. By contrast it is generally the smaller sized family units which have the highest rate of movers among those in age groups 30-49. These statistics indicate that the high proportion of movers among young age cohorts who belong to large families is a reflection of the life cycle of these individuals and their families. Families with children will be more mobile due to their growing need for more household space. Individuals 20-29 years of age leave home to form their own household upon marriage and to establish careers. Consequently there are two factors at work here—

age and life cycle stage—which interact in creating a likelihood of mobility. When an individual reaches certain ages in his life, he also enters new stages in his life cycle, whether it be the move away from the family of procreation for education or marriage, the establishment of his own family and career, or the decrease in his family size due to his own children leaving home to begin their own families. However, Speare warned that age and life cycle stage should not be confused.⁴⁹ Persons of the same age, but at different life cycle stages, are often quite different in mobility behavior, and *vice versa* persons of the same life cycle stage, but at different ages, are also often quite different in their mobility behavior.

Household composition may also affect whether individuals tend to be movers or non-movers. For instance, both lack of children or existence of children within a family may lead to an increase or decrease in the likelihood that a family moves. Family composition, like family size, can act as an indicator of family life-cycle stage.

The data suggest that the highest mobility (52 per cent) occurs among those who belong to families consisting of head of household, a wife, and children. A majority of the members of families in the other three categories are non-movers. Consequently, it is the members of “extended” families and childless couples who are more likely to remain in the same residence over long periods of time. However, it is possible that this occurs because those belonging to family units with children, relatives, or both, or childless couples may tend to be older people who because of age are not likely to be movers.

Again, age is used as a control to determine if the pattern of differentials by household composition persist. The results (Table 10) indicate that among persons under 30 years of age about three-fourths of those living in both husband-wife and husband-wife-children household units were mobile. Young couples are most likely to be establishing their own households and beginning new careers. The young couples with children are also likely to be establishing new households and going through periods of family growth during which they will often be searching for new housing to fit special needs. Among the 10-19 age group about three-fourths of those in units composed of head of family, wife, and children were mobile, but this percentage declined to less than half of those in the 30-39 year group and only one-quarter of the 40-49 year group. The data show that for persons 50-59 there is little difference by family type in the percentage classified as movers. Among the 60-69-year group, those living in husband-wife units had higher

rates of mobility than those in any other family type units. Again, it is clear that age is an important factor in likelihood of mobility. The younger age cohorts clearly have a higher proportion of movers than do the older age cohorts.

One of the most important questions to be examined for those who have moved between 1963 and 1972 is their reasons for making a move. Each mail questionnaire included the question "Why did you move to this location?" Two-thirds of the sample did not give a reason for the move (Table 11). This was due to the low response rate to the mail questionnaire in which this question was asked.

The greatest proportion of persons replying moved for spatial reasons—to increase or decrease the size of their living quarters. A large proportion of movers changed residence because they bought houses. Community characteristics as a whole (such as nicer or newer area, better schools, and proximity to services and various institutions, such as schools) are also a major reason that Jews in Rhode Island have moved. A small percentage of moves were made for reason of proximity—to be closer to relatives, jobs, stores, and other community services. Only 1.1 per cent of the respondents moved within the past ten years specifically to be in a Jewish neighborhood or to be near other Jews or Jewish institutions. However, the percentage of those recorded as moving for Jewish reasons might have been low because of the nature of the question in the questionnaire. No specific question was asked as to the influence of Jewish considerations in the decision to move or in choice of destination. An individual may move for reasons other than Jewish considerations, but may choose a location because other Jews live in the area. An additional question in future research may help to sort out these two processes.

In summary, the characteristics of the sample of Jews in Rhode Island and the movers among them are as follows: The sample is composed heavily of first and second generation Jewish Americans, and the greater number of people are concentrated in the 10-19, 40-49, and 50-59 age groups.

There is within the population an almost equal division between non-movers and movers between 1963 and 1972. The movers tend to be the younger segments of the sample, whereas the non-movers are more often among the late-middle-aged and elderly.

An analysis was then made of residence in 1972 in comparison with 1963. Non-movers were included (Table 13A). It must be recognized

that the 1972 distributions do not describe the actual residential pattern of the entire Jewish population of Rhode Island, since they exclude persons moving into the state between 1963 and 1972 and births occurring in the interval.

Among those who formerly lived in Barrington in 1963, 54.7 per cent still live there, 15.1 per cent had moved elsewhere in New England, 9.4 per cent to the East Side of Providence, and 3.8 per cent to Pawtucket. There was a small movement to the South Side of Providence, to other areas of Rhode Island, and to other parts of the United States.

Also, foreign born and first generation Jewish Americans are mostly non-movers, whereas second and third generation Jewish Americans are more often movers, reflecting the younger age of the latter. Position in the family is also a factor affecting the likelihood of mobility.

A higher proportion of movers is found among those who belong to larger families. Further, those who are members of head-wife-children household type units are more likely to be movers. However, controlling for age in these two relationships there is indication that, though family size and type may be a factor in the tendency to be mobile, age is the overriding factor and determinant.

Finally, the data suggest that most people move because of housing needs—namely, space requirements—some upon purchase of a house. Very few move to be near Jews or Jewish institutions or to live in neighborhoods populated by Jews.

Therefore, the statistics support the findings in the literature. Age, life cycle stage, and housing needs account for the tendency to be mobile. It is apparent that the Jewish experience of mobility, as thus far described, parallels that of the general population.

However, lack of active concern for continued affiliation with the Jewish community as indicated by reason for move does not necessarily imply a lessening commitment of mobile persons to Jews and things Jewish. Though the decisions affecting the mobility behavior of Jewish Americans in Rhode Island were not cited specifically in terms of Jewish considerations, such factors still may affect the location choice. Further, ties may be maintained in spite of population redistribution, even for the younger segments of the sample who are the most mobile. Regretfully, no questions were asked specifically as to whether consideration was given to Jewish factors in making a decision to move. However, the nature of the redistribution, examined in detail in the following section, may contribute further insights into assessment of this issue.

Rates and Direction of Residential Mobility 1963-1972

Basic to the hypotheses being tested here are questions related to where persons moved—to determine if they are moving away from the established Jewish residential centers and farther away from each other. An assessment of residential redistribution between 1963 and 1972 was made to determine whether the movement involved greater dispersion.

First, it was essential to ascertain the areas of residence in 1963 of the movers and non-movers. The statistics indicate that Barrington had the greatest percentage of movers followed by Warwick and the East Side. Cranston, Pawtucket, and the North End contained the greatest percentage of non-movers. The high percentage of deceased in the North End and the South Side reflects the older population in these areas. It is deemed important that in all areas no fewer than one-third of the population were movers, while in some areas the level was considerably higher, attesting to the high degree of mobility in all Rhode Island communities. It must be emphasized, however, that some of this mobility was local in character, that is, within city or suburb. Later analysis will be directed to mobility including non-local moves.

Of those who lived in Cranston in 1963, 67.7 per cent still lived there in 1972; 5.2 per cent moved to New York or New Jersey, and a small percentage to other areas of the United States and New England. Interestingly, 2.6 per cent (or 6 persons) moved from Cranston to the nearby South Side of Providence, indicating that there is some slight movement of Jews back into older and more central areas of the city, away from the suburbs.

Warwick retained 65.5 per cent of the sample residents between 1963 and 1972. Six per cent moved to the East Side, whereas 4.8 per cent moved to Cranston. An equal proportion of persons moved from Warwick to other areas of Rhode Island, other sections of New England, and other parts of the United States.

Approximately 53.7 per cent of the 1963 Jewish residents of the sample from Pawtucket still resided there in 1972. As many as 10.1 per cent moved to the East Side. However, 7.4 per cent moved elsewhere in New England. Other areas of Rhode Island and other areas of the United States each account for 4.7 per cent of former Pawtucket residents. Similar small numbers of former Pawtucket residents moved into Barrington, Cranston, and the South Side.

Only 44.3 per cent of those who had lived in the South Side still lived there in 1972, thus suggesting that the South Side has a higher

rate of out-migration than the other areas. However, it must be noted that 13.5 per cent of former South Side residents died during the ten year period, and no information was received on another 13.5 per cent of the South Side sample. As many as 9.9 per cent of the former South Side residents moved to Cranston, and 7.8 per cent to the East Side. Only a very small proportion moved out of state.

The North End of Providence still has 52.6 per cent of those persons who lived there in 1963. The East Side and Cranston each account for 5.3 per cent of former North End residents; 5.2 per cent have moved to New York or New Jersey, or other parts of the United States, and 3.9 per cent to other sections of New England. A very small percentage have moved to Barrington, Warwick, the South Side, and other parts of Rhode Island.

As many as 55.6 per cent of the former East Side residents remained on the East Side, while 15.5 per cent have moved outside the state to other areas in New England, to New York and New Jersey, or to other areas of the country. A small proportion of East Side residents moved to Cranston, the South Side, and Pawtucket.

In summary, the mobility experience between 1963 and 1972 has in general been similar for all the communities involved, but for all areas a majority of the 1963 residents who are still alive live in the same area. However, perhaps more significant is the considerable portion of the population of each area who have moved outside the area. Interesting too is the fairly heavy out-of-state mobility, especially to other areas of New England, New York, and New Jersey. This is reasonable since adjacent areas of New England, such as Boston and close urban areas of New York and New Jersey, offer a large number of economic social, and educational opportunities.

Net gains and losses have resulted from both out-of-state movement and redistribution within Rhode Island (Table 14). Barrington, Cranston, and Warwick gained people through the intra-state exchange, whereas Providence and Pawtucket lost during the ten-year period. But all areas lost considerable numbers to out-of-state moves. The data suggest that the net intra-state losses of the city areas were compounded by the out-of-state moves. For the suburbs, the net gains from intra-state movement were erased by the out-of-state moves. To what extent these net losses were replaced by in-migration from outside Rhode Island cannot be ascertained by the follow-up survey.

Mobility has thus far been defined in terms of "movers" and "non-

movers." For purposes of measuring the patterns of redistribution, it is important to define more precisely the different types of moves and movers. Six categories of movers have been established for such purposes: (1) city to city; (2) city to suburb; (3) city to out of state; (4) suburb to city; (5) suburb to suburb; (6) suburb to out of state. The category "city" includes Providence proper, including the South Side, the North End, and the East Side, and adjoining Pawtucket. "Suburb" includes Cranston, Warwick, Barrington, and other parts of Greater Providence, encompassed by the survey.

The percentages of the sample living in the city and suburbs in 1963 and in these two areas as well as out of state in 1972 have been determined (Table 15). It is clear that the proportion of the 1963 sample still living in the city had declined by 1972. Fourteen per cent of the 1963 sample moved out of state by 1972. If the distributions are restricted to those who are known to have moved within the state, the data point to increasing suburbanization of the Jewish population. Whereas 29 per cent of the 1963 sample lived in the suburbs in 1963 37.3 per cent of those still known to be in the state in 1972 were suburban residents. Again, it must be emphasized that these data do not include Jews who moved into the state after 1963. Assuming that these persons settled disproportionately in the suburbs, the distribution between city and suburbs would have changed even more sharply.

The two distributions have been cross-tabulated to permit fuller assessment of this shift (Table 16). Of those members of the sample who lived in the city in 1963, 66.8 per cent lived in the city in 1972, while 8.9 per cent had moved to the suburbs. However, as previously noted, as many as 14.4 per cent moved outside Rhode Island. By contrast, a higher percentage of suburban dwellers in 1963 were still living in the suburbs in 1972 (73.9 per cent), suggesting that suburban areas are somewhat more stable in residence than the older city areas. Interestingly, as many as 5.7 per cent of suburbanites moved to the city. But again, as many as 13 per cent have moved out of state. Thus, a considerable number of both city and suburban dwellers left the state; whether or not they were replaced by in-migrants cannot be ascertained by these data.

Attention was then focused exclusively on the *movers* between 1963 and 1972 and the types of moves that occurred in the interval (Table 17). Among those movers who lived in the city in 1963, 48.6 per cent had moved within the city area and 18.6 per cent moved to the suburbs. As many as 29.2 per cent of the former city residents out-migrated from

Rhode Island. Of those mobile persons who lived in the suburbs in 1963, 49.4 per cent moved to other locations in the suburbs and only 12.8 per cent moved to the city during the ten year period. About 29 per cent of the suburban movers left the state. This number may be even somewhat higher for the suburbs compared to the city, because of the greater percentage of "no information" cases among the suburban sample. In short, only half of the suburban and city movers shifted to places within their respective areas and almost another third left the state. Mobility thus led to considerable redistribution of the Jewish population.

Age and generation again add further to an understanding of the characteristics of movers making different types of moves. It is apparent from the statistics that the extent of mobility varies within age groups by previous place of residence and also that different age cohorts are more likely to make certain types of moves.

For both 1963 city and suburban residents, younger persons were much more likely to have moved by 1972 than older ones. This is especially true of those under age 40. However, among the three youngest groups more of those who lived in the city had moved by 1972. This difference was especially true of those in the 40-59 age group. Among the aged, about one-third of those living in the city died between 1963 and 1972, in contrast to only 60 per cent of those in the suburbs, no doubt reflecting the greater concentration of old persons within the city group. If this differential in mortality experience is taken into account, only minimal differences remain between the mobility experience of older city and suburban residents.

Among the two youngest age cohorts the great proportion of moves made during the ten year period were out of state (Table 19). Fifty-five and 2/10 per cent of the movers 10-19 years of age made moves from the city to out of state, and 54.9 per cent of those 10-19 made moves from the suburbs to out of state. This age group also had a high rate of intra-suburban moves. About 26.7 per cent of the movers 20-39 years of age were intra-city and intra-suburban. There was a sharp decline in the proportion of out-of-state moves among the two older age cohorts. Among movers 40-59 years of age and 60 years of age and over, the greatest percentage of moves were intra-city and intra-suburban. Within the three youngest age groups there was a fairly similar proportion of moves being made from city to suburb. Most striking, however, was the high percentage of young persons leaving the

state. It emphasizes, in turn, the dependence of the community on a counterstream of in-migration for continued maintenance of its size, not to mention growth.

A similar pattern was evident as between the different generations of movers (Table 20). Movers of the second and third generation had a considerably higher proportion of moves out of state than did movers who were first generation and foreign born. Twenty-nine and 2/10 per cent of moves made by third generation Jews were from city to out of state, and 50.0 per cent were from suburb to out of state. Approximately 45.4 per cent of moves made by second generation Jews were from city to out of state, and 33.9 per cent of moves from the suburbs to out of state.

In summary, among the foreign-born and first-generation movers there was a higher proportion of intra-city and intra-suburban moves than among the two later generational groups. The second and third generations, while also having a substantial percentage of intra-city and intra-suburb moves, were characterized by their high percentage of out-of-state moves. The first, second, and third generations all had similar proportions of moves from city to suburbs.

It is relevant to this study to determine why Jewish Americans in Rhode Island are moving and to consider possible relationships between the reasons for moves and the types of move made.

Reasons for moving can serve as an indicator of priorities in the mobility decision-making process of the Rhode Island Jews. It provides information about the strength of ties to fellow Jews. Lack of concern for population composition or religious composition in areas of destination may suggest a weakening in the concern for maintaining a Jewish community and weakening of ties to this community. Lack of interest can indicate, but does not necessarily lead to, an individual's loss of identity as a Jew, since ties and identification can be maintained in ways other than residence in a densely populated Jewish neighborhood.

No matter what the reason, the overwhelming proportion of moves were intra-city, intra-suburb, or from city to suburb (Table 21). Most out-of-state moves were made by those who had bought a house or were affected by parental decision. Interestingly, the two individuals who wanted to live in a Jewish neighborhood made moves from the city to the suburbs. Most moves did not explicitly involve commitments to the Jewish community, although they were made to areas and communities adjacent to or near the old established Jewish residential centers, thus

making possible continued contact with the Greater Providence Jewish community. Movement to a specific area for a specific reason does not necessarily preclude desire to remain in proximity to Jews and things Jewish, given modern means of communication and travel.

It is, as mentioned earlier, not only important to know how Jews have redistributed themselves during the past ten years, but also to ascertain if they are moving to areas where they will reside near other Jews in order that ties to Jews and the greater Jewish community will be maintained. The greater the density of the Jewish population within a community, the easier it becomes to maintain affiliation with other Jews.

For this analysis density was measured by determining the percentage distribution of Jews of the sample living in each census tract of Rhode Island. This was done twice—first for the residential distribution in 1963 and then for the 1972 distribution. It must be emphasized, however, that the latter pertains only to those persons in the original sample who were followed-up and does not, therefore, necessarily fully reflect the distribution of the total Jewish population. It excludes not only cases which could not be followed, but also newcomers to the Rhode Island Jewish community who had no opportunity to be represented in the longitudinal study sample. Also, the measure of density is a crude one—reflecting the percentage of the total population sample living in a given location rather than the percentage of the population in the area which was Jewish. It would seem inappropriate therefore to use this measure. However, comparison of the two potential indices of density using 1963 data only suggests that the results using the cruder measure would not vary significantly from those using the more refined measure, especially in view of the density categories applied. Areas defined as “very high” contained 10-15 per cent of the total Jewish population, “high” areas 5-9.9 per cent, “moderate” 1-4.9 per cent, and “low” less than 1.0 per cent.

In general, during the ten years from 1963 to 1972 there was movement to areas with lower density of Jewish population (Table 22). Almost half of the moves made by people who previously lived in areas of very high Jewish density were to areas of only moderate or low Jewish density. Only 27.4 per cent moved to areas with very high density. In contrast only 16.3 per cent of moves made by previous residents of areas of high Jewish density were made in high density areas. Interestingly, while as many as 30.2 per cent of moves made by former residents of

high density areas were to very high density areas, an additional 53.5 per cent of the moves were to areas of lower density.

Among former residents of areas of moderate population density, the greater proportion of moves were within the same area while only a few moves were made to areas of higher density. About 40.6 per cent of former residents of low density areas moved within the low density area while almost all others moved to moderately dense areas.

Overall, the largest proportion of the sample over the past ten years moved to areas of lower density (Table 22A). Totals indicate that a little over a quarter of the people moved to areas of higher Jewish density. Significantly, the greatest percentage of Jews who moved to or within areas of similar density were those who had lived in areas of moderate ethnic density. Also, over half of those who had lived in low density areas moved to areas of higher Jewish density. However, the most important conclusion drawn from these data is that overall a significant proportion of Jews are moving away from highly "Jewish" areas.

In summary, the Jews of Providence are indeed moving away from the established Jewish residential centers, and the Jewish population is becoming more widely dispersed, especially those of later generational status.

The data show the high degree of mobility in all Rhode Island communities, and also the fairly heavy out-of-state mobility.

Significantly, between 1963 and 1972 the suburbs of Barrington, Cranston, and Warwick gained people, while Providence and Pawtucket lost people. However, all areas lost considerable numbers to out-of-state moves. Most importantly, the gains made by the suburbs were erased by out-of-state moves. However, it must be emphasized that the 1972 data do not include persons who moved into the state, so that the overall net effect of migration is not ascertainable here.

When discerning the type of moves being made, it is clear that the greatest proportion of moves within Rhode Island have been to the suburbs—indicating an increasing suburbanization of the Jewish population. A considerable percentage of the moves were out-of-state. Only half of the moves made were within the area in which the individual had lived prior to the move, thus suggesting a considerable redistribution of the Jewish population.

Also significant is the fact that younger Jews of later generational status are more like to make out-of-state moves than are older Jews of

earlier generational status. Older Jews who are foreign-born and first-generation Americans are more likely to make intra-city and intra-suburban moves. Jews of first, second, and third generational status each have a fairly similar proportion of moves from the city to the suburbs.

Most moves did not explicitly involve commitments to the Jewish community, although they were made to areas and communities adjacent to or near the old established Jewish residential centers, thus making possible continued contact with the Greater Providence Jewish community.

However, even though the moves are made to adjacent areas, these areas tend to be lower in ethnic density than the areas of previous residence. Most Jews are moving into areas with lower concentrations of Jewish population.

In conclusion, the data indicate that Hypotheses I and III are supported. The Jewish population is becoming increasingly suburbanized (I). It is moving to areas where geographical contact with other Jews is decreased due to the lower ethnic density of the new areas of residence. This process is true not only for the general Jewish population but also for the third generation Jewish Americans who are moving at even higher rates and more frequently to locations other than the established Jewish residential areas that are lower in density of Jewish population (III).

Organizational Memberships

The third phase of the analysis focuses on the relationship between mobility and organizational membership. Its purpose is to determine if non-movers can be differentiated from movers according to organizational memberships in the community, i.e. does membership influence whether a person changes his place of residence? This was an attempt to measure the effect of group solidarity of the Jewish community on Jewish residential mobility. The second hypothesis states that "those who have greater affiliation with the Jewish community organizations, and therefore greater commitment to the Jewish community, have lower rates of residential mobility than those who have weak affiliation." This assumes that memberships may indicate that certain activities are important to an individual, that he is concerned with ties to organizational goals and people. If so, then organizational membership serves as an indication of an individual's integration into a community, and the solidarity of the community.

For this purpose the number of memberships each person had in Jewish and non-Jewish organizations and in synagogues was compared for movers and non-movers. These memberships are the ones that were reported in the 1963 survey only. The nature of the follow-up survey precluded obtaining more recent information.

There is an inverse relationship between membership in Jewish organizations and mobility—the more Jewish organizations to which an individual belonged, the less likely was that individual to move between 1963 and 1972. Persons not belonging to any Jewish organizations have the greatest proportion of movers, 57.3 per cent, compared to only 23.1 per cent of those who belonged to seven or more organizations (Table 23).

The same inverse pattern emerges in the relationship between non-Jewish organizational membership and mobility. Those belonging to a greater number of non-Jewish organizations were less likely to move than those belonging to few organizations.

Synagogue membership *per se* did not in itself seem to affect mobility to the same degree as membership in organizations as a whole. Those who did *not* belong to a synagogue were more likely to be movers than non-movers (Table 25) to only a slight degree.

The results have been described for each type of organization separately. Thus far the hypothesis would seem to be supported. However, the results must be viewed with caution. It is possible that people do not join organizations until they have lived in a community for a period of time. Then, being more certain that they are not going to move they may feel freer to join organizations and invest time, money, and commitment. In short, they may remain in a community for reasons other than institutional and organizational ties and responsibilities. Organizational membership may reflect residential stability rather than cause it.

In order to assess more fully the effect of Jewish memberships on mobility, the joint effect of Jewish organizational and synagogue memberships were examined (Table 26).

Of those who belonged to synagogues but did not belong to Jewish organizations, 60.4 per cent moved. Those who belonged neither to Jewish organizations nor synagogues also had a large proportion of movers. The highest stability was manifest by those who belonged to both a synagogue and Jewish organizations; of these only 44 per cent moved. However, the proportion of movers among those who did not

belong to a synagogue but belonged to Jewish organizations is also somewhat low, 48.7 per cent. These data suggest that synagogue membership in itself is not strongly associated with stability. However, in combination with organization membership it is associated with the lowest mobility level. But, most interesting, the mobility of those belonging to synagogue, but no Jewish organizations, is even higher than that of those with no synagogue or membership affiliation at all.

When the relationship is controlled first by age and then by generation, the following results emerge (Table 27). The highest rate of mobility was among those 10-19 years of age who belonged to Jewish organizations but not to a synagogue, or to neither; whereas those 20-29 years of age who have the greatest proportion of movers belong to a synagogue but not to Jewish organizations. The same is true of the 30-39 year age cohort. It is also apparent that the groups with the highest percentage of movers are those in the younger age cohorts regardless of type of membership.

A similar pattern emerges (Table 28) when generation status is controlled. Regardless of type of memberships, the later generations, second and third, have a higher rate of mobility. Interestingly, among the third generation, the greatest percentage of movers belonged to both a synagogue and Jewish organizations, or only a synagogue. These persons are younger, many probably maintaining memberships through their parents.

However, the important point is that the statistics indicate that organizational memberships do not affect mobility behavior as much as do age and generational status. High rates of organizational membership are not consistently associated with low mobility. Memberships may be a means by which people who have just moved integrate themselves into a stable community. Synagogue membership may merely be for the sake of children's Jewish education. Memberships in either Jewish organizations or synagogues could be a means for establishing social and economic connections quickly.

The fact that most of those in the sample did belong to either a synagogue or Jewish organizations or both indicates a highly integrated Jewish community and a high degree of Jewish identification in the Greater Providence area. However, mobility rates were high despite this fact. Identification with the Jewish community is not necessarily hampered by these high rates, if such mobility does not interfere with continued affiliation. What is important is the destination of the moves

being made. If mobility is to areas adjacent or close to those areas in which the Jewish institutions and services are located Jewish community ties need not be severed. Modern transportation and communication can overcome geographic gaps.

Among those who belong to both a synagogue and Jewish organizations or to a synagogue only, slightly more of those who resided in the city in 1963 moved than of those who had resided in the suburbs. This differential would be increased if account were taken of the larger number of city residents who died between 1963 and 1972, reflecting the older age of the city population. Among Jews who belonged only to Jewish organizations or to neither a synagogue nor Jewish organizations, city residents moved somewhat less frequently than suburban residents.

Among those who lived in the city in 1963, the single largest percentage of movers made moves to other places in the city regardless of membership patterns. For example, of those who belonged to both a synagogue and one or more Jewish groups, 50 per cent moved within the city. But significantly of the small group who belonged neither to a synagogue nor an organization, 58 per cent moved within the city. For the mixed categories of membership (Yes - No and No - No) the levels of intra-city mobility were somewhat lower. If anything, these data suggest that for the city population membership or lack of it does not significantly affect mobility patterns. Of those with both a synagogue and other memberships as well as those with just a synagogue membership a higher percentage compared to those with no affiliation at all moved out of state, suggesting that membership does not serve to reduce longer distance movement which is more likely to lead to a disruption of affiliation.

With the exception of those belonging to a synagogue, but not to other organizations, the largest percentage of mobile suburban residents moved within the suburban areas. Few moved into the city. There was an unusually large out-of-state movement only among those belonging to a synagogue. The data for the suburban population, as for the city population, do not suggest that synagogue or organization membership serves as a deterrent to mobility beyond the immediate confines of the areas in which a move need not disrupt organization affiliation.

People who made intra-suburban and intra-city moves generally would have access to Jewish institutions and services and organizations since they moved to nearby areas. However a high proportion of movers who belonged to both a synagogue and Jewish organizations or just to

a synagogue moved out of Rhode Island, but having held memberships once before they will probably do so again. Also since the out-of-state movers (Table 13A) were going mainly to other areas of New England or to New York or New Jersey, there were likely to be abundant opportunities to associate with a Jewish community because of their prevalence in these areas.

In conclusion, the data suggest that Hypothesis II is not supported. Organizational membership, and related commitment to a community, do not deter mobility. Other factors appear to be more important in an individual's decision to move. Therefore, community stability cannot be strongly associated with memberships people hold within that community, and community solidarity cannot be assumed from these affiliations.

Intentions to Move and Destinations of Intended Moves

Intentions to move and destination of intended moves have proved to be a useful predictor of mobility rates and streams. In 1963 intention and plans to move were asked of each household as a unit, rather than of each individual separately. In the present study (with the exception of studies displayed in Table 34) each individual was categorized in terms of the 1963 response of his household. Therefore, it can be expected in assessing the 1972 results that younger persons are not likely to adhere to intentions expressed ten years before by the heads of their households with reference to the household as a whole. Within these limits the 1972 data were reviewed to determine the degree to which the 1963 intentions materialized.

In 1963 the majority of the sample had no plans to move. Only 4.1 per cent planned to move within the following year, and an additional 9.3 per cent within the next five years (Table 31).

Of those who planned to move within one year following the survey in 1963, 75.0 per cent actually moved sometime between 1963 and 1972. Of the people who planned to move within five years, 71.3 per cent actually moved. By contrast, only 39.1 per cent of those who said they had no plans to move did, in fact, move. Apparently, those who state definite time periods during or at the end of which they intend to move, *do* in fact move to a greater degree than those who indicate no plan to move, although the move does not necessarily occur during the exact time span specified in 1963. Those who are vague in their plans, do not know, or have no plans at all are not as likely to move.

The relationship between planned and actual mobility with age controlled was then tabulated (Table 33). The age cohorts in which intention to move seemed to predict actual mobility were those 30-39 and 50-59 years of age. The youngest persons 10-19 showed little difference in the percentage that did plan to move and the percentage that did not plan to move. This close similarity is probably due to the fact that the intentions of younger persons to move were in fact those of the head of the household applied to each individual member of the family. The intentions therefore, were not adhered to by the younger people.

Consideration of the head of the household alone leads to the conclusion that the plans to move are accurate to a high degree. Over three-quarters of those who in 1963 had made plans to move within the following year did in fact move. The same is true of those who planned a move within the next five years. A great majority of those who had made no plans to move, did *not* move during the ensuing ten year period. These statistics are somewhat more accurate than those for all members of the sample (Table 32), especially for those who expressed no plan to move in 1963. Overall, however, the difference between the two sets of statistics is not sharp.

The validity of the predictions based on stated intention also depends on whether the actual date of move coincided with intended date to move. The data indicate (Table 35) that of those in 1963 who planned to move within the following year, 25.0 per cent did move between 1963 and 1964. Of those who had planned to move within the next five years 43.2 per cent actually did so, whereas 18.6 per cent of those who had planned to move within the next five years did not do so until 1968 or later. By contrast, only 9.0 per cent of those with no plans to move in 1963 did move within five years. The predictions of the exact date of move did not prove to be highly accurate, although the question on plans did serve to a relatively high degree to distinguish those who moved sometime between 1963 and 1972 from those who did not.

It is also worthwhile to determine if those who in 1963 intended to move and who stated a preferred destination actually did move to the area of their choice (Table 36). Clearly, most people expected to move to other parts of the United States, followed in order by the East Side and Cranston.

The planned destinations as they are related to actual destination of moves were reviewed (Table 37). In all, out of 161 planned moves with expressed destinations 59, or 37 per cent, were realized. Of those

who in 1963 planned a move and expressed a desire to live in Barrington, 62.5 per cent were living there in 1972. Almost half of those who chose Cranston lived in Cranston in 1972 with 21.1 per cent residing in the North End and 10.5 per cent on the East Side of Providence. All of those (only 5 in all) who chose Pawtucket as a destination are now living outside of Rhode Island in other parts of the country. About 40.0 per cent of those who chose to live in Warwick are now living there. Over half of those who chose the East Side were living there in 1972; 18.2 per cent lived in Pawtucket and 6.8 per cent lived on the South Side in 1972. As many as 18.1 per cent of those who preferred to live on the East Side moved out of state to other areas of New England, New York, New Jersey, and other parts of the country.

Seventy persons had hoped to move elsewhere in the United States. One-fourth of these people actually moved to the East Side, but an even greater proportion moved out of Rhode Island to New York and New Jersey (17.1 per cent) and to other parts of New England (11.4 per cent), thus realizing their expectations. In all, seventy-one persons had hoped in 1963 to move out of Rhode Island. However, 143 actually moved out of Rhode Island and were living elsewhere in New England, New York, New Jersey, or other parts of the United States by 1972.

In summary, the intentions to move and the planned destinations proved fairly accurate in predicting actual moves. On the whole people did not move during the exact time period that they had intended to move, thus indicating that, while people are fairly certain about an eventual move, they are less accurate about the exact time of the move and the realization of the specific destination.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Though the community of the future is facing difficult challenges, there is also reason for optimism. One of the more obvious reasons relates to the finding in this study that, although many young Jews are moving far from home and from traditional residential areas, others are moving to such places as New York and New Jersey, where there have always been large communities of Jews with considerable opportunity to interact with other Jews. This condition, however, may not exist in other areas of the country which are attracting an increasing number of Jews in pursuit of certain career goals.

Another important reason for optimism is kinship, as cited by Osterreich. No matter what the geographical distance between members of a family, the psychological and ideological commitment to the family

and what the family stands for and believes may be maintained. Today, with modern communication and transportation, the problem of distance is somewhat alleviated. The important point is that family and kin can be the major means through which young Jewish Americans maintain their ties with other Jews and Judaism. To what extent they serve this function remains to be demonstrated.

A third reason for optimism is the observation of sociologists who have studied religion in relation to third generations in America and their problems of assimilation. They suggest that with the third generation Jew there is a return to Judaism, although the form of identification may be different from that in earlier generations.

According to Herberg, with disintegration of the old ethnic subcommunities Americans have experienced a growing need for some type of group to serve as an anchor in modern society.⁵⁰ Lenski believes further that urbanism in America has brought and still brings people of diverse backgrounds into constant association with one another. It is necessary consequently to ignore differences for the well-being of society.⁵¹ However, the Triple Melting Pot, the rising middle class culture, and the depersonalizing pressures of modern society, cause contemporary man to experience the urgent need to maintain a personality against the mass culture. There is a social necessity to belong, and "in our society religion is a socially accepted way of perpetuating group differences" (Sklare).⁵² Religious association can become the primary context of self-identification and social location for the third generation Jew. As stated by Sklare:

Such identification became compelling since it was the only way in which the American Jew could now locate himself in the larger community.⁵³

Gans points to the decline of discrimination as a major reason for affiliation of Jewish youth with the Jewish community.⁵⁴ The decline of discrimination and the Triple Melting Pot has weakened the incentive to move away from Jewish institutions. This has also worked in the opposite direction in that lessening discrimination by non-Jews has contributed to the growing problem of intermarriage. However, Gans indicates that Jews no longer have the incentive to "pass" as non-Jews, especially since on their own they can do well economically and socially.

Gans has cast motivation for affiliation in a negative role. On the positive side, however, the third generation feels secure in its "Ameri-

canness" and, therefore, no longer feels the need for the attitude of rejection characteristic of previous generations. It feels no reluctance in its identification as Jewish and affirming its Jewishness. If these arguments are valid, Marcus Hansen's famous dictum may yet be realized: "What the son wishes to forget, the grandson wishes to remember."⁵⁵ If these other forces are operating within Rhode Island and the United States the geographical redistribution of the Jewish population may not operate to the detriment of the Jewish American community, even though it presents new challenges. Judaism specifically and religion in general may continue to play an important role in modern society, if, as has been argued, "Man turns to religion to provide him an inexpugnable citadel for the self in a world in which personal authenticity is threatened on every side; indeed the quest for personal authenticity is itself substantially a religious quest."⁵⁶ However, all of the suggested relationships remain speculative. They all require intensive research on the nature and degree of Jewish identification and of the forces operating to strengthen and weaken it. This study has been able to explore only a limited segment of the processes involved and must be regarded as suggestive rather than definitive.

CONCLUSION

Many issues have been raised in this study concerning the residential mobility of Jews in Rhode Island. Most important, three major hypotheses were presented around which smaller questions were centered. These hypotheses were:

- I. The Jews of Rhode Island are moving away from the more densely Jewish population centers in the Providence area to the suburban areas and to areas of Rhode Island where Jews have not lived before in any substantial numbers.
- II. Those who have strong affiliation with Jewish community organizations, and therefore greater commitment to the Jewish community, have lower rates of residential mobility than those who have weak affiliation.
- III. Compared to the first and second generation, third generation Jewish Americans are more frequently moving away from the locations of their families of procreation and the areas where kin reside to areas where the density of Jews is lower.

Overall, Hypotheses I and III have been supported by the findings, whereas Hypothesis II has not been supported.

Though those members of the sample who maintained a close affiliation within the Jewish community through organizational and synagogue

membership were less likely to be mobile than those who did not, memberships and commitment to a community were not a deterrent to residential mobility. It appears that community solidarity and stability cannot be correlated with memberships held within the community. At most, these commitments merely reflect, for a variety of motives, solidarity with the community, but they do not seem to influence or prevent mobility.

During the past ten years Rhode Island Jews have been continuing the process that Goldstein described in 1963—movement away from the older central urban areas to newer urban areas and suburban areas. This pattern parallels the residential mobility patterns of the general Rhode Island population. Movement is away from older central urban Providence, such as the South Side and the North End, to the newer urban areas such as the East Side of Providence and to the suburbs, especially Warwick and Cranston. Intra-city and intra-suburban mobility account for a fair proportion of the high mobility rates. Out-of-state moves have also reached a substantial level among Rhode Island Jews.

Within Rhode Island these residential moves are taking people into areas of the state where the density of the Jewish population is substantially less than the areas from which they came. The newer areas probably can provide these Jews with more comfortable community living, possibly better schools, and the opportunity to buy homes with adequate space. These newer communities may also offer better housing and educational opportunities for people beginning new stages in their life cycle. These communities are close enough to the central urban area to permit easy commutation to jobs. This pattern is consistent with Lee's suggestion that diversity between areas is an important factor in mobility, where one area has characteristics that another one does not. Obviously, the newer urban and suburban areas are attracting numerous new residents because of the advantages they are deemed to have over the older urban areas. And, indeed, the findings do indicate that these anticipated characteristics are the most prominent reasons for moving.

Though all of the processes described are characteristic of the whole sample, they are even more prominent among young third generation Jewish Americans. In fact, a major finding of the study is that age and generational status override other factors in determining an individual's propensity to move. Young people are more likely to move than are older people. Third generation Jewish Americans are moving

away from the areas where their families reside more frequently than are any other age group. They move to locations of lower Jewish density at higher rates than older Jews, and are more likely to move out of state.

These facts could be viewed with concern by the Jewish community in America as a whole. Geographical proximity and constant close contact with other Jews is reduced greatly when young Jews move away on their own. To the extent that the third generation is depended upon for the continuation of a viable American Jewish community, the greater potential for assimilation inherent in the changes noted in this study provide the basis for increased concern for the future strength of the Jewish community in the United States. Counter-vailing reasons for optimism, however, are also presented in this study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I should like to express my appreciation to Professor Sidney Goldstein and Professor Colin Loftin of the Department of Sociology at Brown University for their guidance and encouragement. I am also grateful to the Jewish Federation of Rhode Island for their assistance in the gathering of information. A special "thank you" is extended to the Rhode Island Jewish Historical Association for making the study possible.

NOTES

¹For example, three studies which illustrate the range of investigative work are Sidney Goldstein, "The Changing Socio-Demographic Structure of an American Jewish Community," (Jerusalem, 1966), and Nathan Glazer, "American Judaism," (Chicago, 1957), or Will Herberg, "Protestant, Catholic, Jew," (New York, 1956).

²Sidney Goldstein, Rf. 9, p. 16.

³Sidney Goldstein, Rf. 11, p. 43.

⁴Gerhard Lenski, Rf. 15, p. 214.

⁵Goldstein, Rf. 11, pp. 48-49.

⁶Herbert Gans, Rf. 4, p. 558.

⁷Gans, p. 558.

⁸Sidney Goldstein, Rf. 8.

⁹Goldstein, Rf. 8, pp. 2-3.

¹⁰Goldstein, Rf. 8, pp. 5-6.

¹¹In order to account for those household units from whom no interview was obtained, 136 cases were chosen randomly from 1,420 cases of completed interviews. The data cards for the 136 cases were duplicated and added to the 1,420 cases to give a total of 1,556. This was done for each area individually so that replacements came from within the same areas as "refusals" and "no contacts."

¹²Sidney Goldstein, Rf. 5, p. 169.

¹³City directories are published every other year. Those used for this study were published in 1971.

¹⁴Though city directories have been proven to be complete and accurate, they present one serious problem. Not all towns of Rhode Island have city directories, especially if they are smaller towns. Presently, there are no city directories for East Greenwich, South Kingstown, Narragansett, North Providence and Johnston.

¹⁵The variables age, generation, size of family, family composition, 1963 area of residence, organization memberships, and intention to move are characteristics of the sample population as stated in 1963.

¹⁶Everett S. Lee, Rf. 14, p. 52.

¹⁷Lee, pp. 53-54.

¹⁸Lee, p. 57.

¹⁹Peter H. Rossi, Rf. 18, p. 31.

²⁰Rossi, p. 31.

²¹Rossi, pp. 18-19.

²²Alden Speare, Rf. 20, p. 449.

²³Goldstein, Rf. 8, pp. 99-100.

²⁴LeRoy E. Bowman, Rf. 1, p. 158.

²⁵Rossi, p. 90.

²⁶Rossi, p. 97.

²⁷Sidney Goldstein and Kurt B. Mayer, Rf. 7.

²⁸Goldstein and Mayer, p. 13.

²⁹Goldstein, Rf. 8, p. 99.

³⁰Goldstein, Rf. 8, p. 103.

³¹Goldstein, Rf. 11, p. 43.

³²Goldstein, Rf. 11, p. 48.

³³Goldstein, Rf. 11, p. 43.

³⁴Goldstein, Rf. 11, p. 43.

³⁵Goldstein, Rf. 11, p. 37.

³⁶Leonard Blumberg and Robert Bell, Rf. 2, p. 328.

³⁷This point, made by Talcott Parsons, can be found in *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*, Ruth N. Anshen, ed., which was cited in Helgi Osterreich, "Geographical Mobility and Kinship: A Canadian Example," *Kinship and Geographical Mobility*, 6 (1965), p. 130.

³⁸This point, made by George Homans, can be found in Eugene Litwak, Rf. 16, p. 385.

³⁹Ralph Piddington, Rf. 17.

⁴⁰Helgi Osterreich, "Geographical Mobility and Kinship: A Canadian Example," *Kinship and Geographic Mobility*, 6 (1965), p. 130.

⁴¹Phrase taken from Eugene Litwak, Rf. 16, p. 385.

⁴²Litwak, p. 387.

⁴³Alden Speare, Rf. 21, p. 457.

⁴⁴Rossi, p. 59.

⁴⁵Rossi, p. 62.

⁴⁶Rossi, pp. 97-98.

⁴⁷Generation has been divided into five categories which are defined as follows: (1) Foreign Born — born in country other than the U.S.; (2) First Generation — person born in U.S. but both parents foreign born; (3) Mixed First Generation — person born in U.S., but one parent foreign born, one American born; (4) Second Generation — person born in U.S., both parents American born; (5) Third Generation — person born in U.S., both parents born in U.S., 2-4 grandparents born in U.S.

⁴⁸Rossi, p. 77.

⁴⁹Speare, Rf. 20, p. 457.

⁵⁰Will Herberg, Rf. 13, pp. 69-72.

⁵¹Lenski, pp. 8-10.

⁵²Marshall Sklare, Rf. 19, p. 134.

⁵³Sklare, p. 134.

⁵⁴Gans, p. 559.

⁵⁵Marcus Hansen, Rf. 12, p. 495.

⁵⁶Herberg, p. 76