

## **THE IMPACT OF GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY ON JEWISH COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION: DISRUPTIVE OR SUPPORTIVE?**

**CHARLES JARET**

**Georgia State University**

One of American sociology's most persistent empirical and theoretical issues has focused on the significance and effects of geographic mobility on ethnic group social organization. American Jewish communities have often been the subject of research on this matter. Some studies have taken the ethnic group as the unit of analysis, examining changes in community institutions after movement occurs (Wirth, 1928; Sklare, 1972; Gans, 1958; Rosenthal, 1960b; Fishman, 1963), while others take a "micro" approach, focusing on either individuals or families to determine whether mobility is associated with changes in behavior or attitudes regarding the ethnic group (Fishman, 1968; Winch et al., 1967; Lebowitz, 1975). The studies have not yielded a consistent set of findings or conclusions. Indeed, the findings and conclusions illustrate two seemingly contradictory perspectives regarding the impact of residential mobility and ethnic community organization. One proposes that geographic mobility weakened community bonds and reduced participation, while the other claims that community bonds remain intact despite geographic movement, such movement often being essential for constructive innovation in ethnic group institutions.

The perspective that developed first may be labeled, from the ethnic group's point of view, pessimistic, since researchers found geographic mobility tied to a reduced sense of ethnic group solidarity and growing detachment from group life. R.E. Park took the position that movement is a disruptive influence to existing social relations, releasing the individual from traditional restraints and customs. It creates a new social type, the "marginal man," who has moved out of or abandoned one cultural setting but is not fully entered or at home in another. For Park, the image of the Jew moving out of, or emancipated from, European ghettos was an example par excellence of the marginal man (Park, 1928). Other sociological findings buttressed this perspective. Migration was linked to family weakening and disruption, reduced kin contact, reduction of primary relationships, reduced participation in voluntary associations, and a sense of rootlessness or transiency (Locke, 1960; Blumberg and Bell, 1959; Wirth, 1938; Zimmer, 1955; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Packard, 1972). Among Eastern European Jews in America, those most residentially mobile were seen as the ones giving up their cultural heritage to copy German Jews, or Gentiles, becoming "all-rightniks" (Wirth, 1928, 1964: 101-2). Recent research has

affirmed the significant role of high levels of geographic mobility in decreasing earlier levels of voluntary organizational membership and participation among native-born American Jews (Goldstein, 1971: 53). A preliminary analysis of data from the National Jewish Population Survey suggested a low level of geographic mobility among native-born Orthodox and Conservative Jews as an important factor for high levels of community participation (Lebowitz, 1972:2).

This was the dominant view in American sociology until the 1950s and early 1960s, when newer research produced contrary evidence strong enough to form an alternative, less pessimistic perspective, concluding that "the experience of moving is not nearly so destructive as some commentators have imagined." Litwak and others found evidence that the residentially mobile do have frequent and meaningful social interaction with kin, actively participate in voluntary associations, and quickly integrate themselves into the community (Litwak, 1960, 1961; Fellin and Litwak, 1963; Butler et al., 1973). Other researchers found that migration rarely occurs without support from kin, friends, or an institutional sponsor, that linkages with the community help the mover make the transition from old to new areas without experiencing the negative consequences cited above (Tilly and Brown, 1967; MacDonald and MacDonald, 1964). Some studies of Jewish movement and community patterns fit this perspective well. Lebowitz suggests that Jewish in-movers to one small city in many ways are more involved than those born there, that in-movers serve as a "social cement" holding the Jewish community together (Lebowitz, 1975:12). Sklare (1972), Sklare and Greenblum (1967), Gans (1958), and Rosenthal (1960 a, 1960 b) each describe different communities into which Jews have moved and settled. In each case they note that Jews did not so much drop out, setting aside Jewish social life and institutions, as adapt old social forms to new purposes, creating new, more flexible Jewish institutions. They suggest that geographic mobility is related to innovation and change in Jewish community life, rather than to its disorganization. Strauss observes:

Jews are pictured as moving upward, uptown, out-of-town, and though developing styles of living which appear extremely new, underneath still retain their essential Jewishness. Key symbols of continuity are Jewish food, family life, gestures, sayings, and a general feeling of ethnic likeness. (Strauss, 1968:13-14)

This paper takes up this long-standing issue, presenting some empirical evidence and suggesting a resolution of the dual perspective on the impact of geographic mobility on Jewish community organization, using the individual as the unit of analysis.

## METHODOLOGY

Data for this study come from personal interviews of a 1975 sample survey of Jews in nine metropolitan Chicago residential areas. Most of the respondents were randomly chosen from a large list of Chicago Jews obtained by selecting "distinctive Jewish names: from telephone books, taking names of contributors to the annual Jewish fund-raising drive, and from a previous sample survey."<sup>1</sup> Although not a scientific or probability sample, it is believed to be as representative of Chicago Jews in those areas as is obtainable.<sup>2</sup> There were 273 interviews conducted, inquiring about residential history, participation in and perceptions of local

**TABLE 1**  
**Friends Most Time is Spent with by Years Living in Chicago**  
**(All Age Groups Combined)**

		<u>Years Living in Chicago</u>					
		Born in Chicago	Came when Young	Over 10	6 to 9	3 to 5	Under 3
Most Time w/ Friends	Jewish (75.5%)	80.3%	78.3%	57.8%	59.0%	52.1%	70.8%
	Both (18.0%)	15.9	21.7	29.6	33.6	0.0	2.8
	Non-Jewish (6.5%)	3.7	0.0	12.5	7.4	47.9	26.4
	Total	67.3	10.1	11.7	4.4	2.1	4.5

Tau C = .12  
Gamma = .34

Jewish community life, and most other major sociological variables. Response rate varied widely from one neighborhood to another; in some areas over 80% responded, while in other areas only about a third granted interviews. (For the two areas in which lower response rates occurred, rabbis and JCC officials agreed that their Jewish populations were relatively homogeneous in income, life-cycle stage, and levels of Jewish participation. It was felt, therefore, that the lower response rates did not create any sizable selective bias in a particular direction.) Interviews from each neighborhood were then weighted so as to represent the relative Jewish population sizes in those areas. Thus, the 273 interviews taken represent 893 Jewish households in nine residential areas.<sup>3</sup>

## FINDINGS

### *Mobility and Informal Jewish Social Interaction*

Are mobile Jews markedly different from geographically stable Jews in the extent of socializing enjoyed among a social circle of coreligionists? With number of previous residences and years living in the local area as measures of movement, there was a weak indication that the more mobile are less involved in Jewish social networks of friends and family. With in-movement to Chicago, however, the negative relationship between mobility and Jewish informal social relations is much clearer. In each age group, Jews growing up outside Chicago and then moving there have a smaller proportion of Jews as close friends than do those who have grown up in Chicago. Also, the shorter the time in residence, the less the social time spent with other Jews.

With income controlled, the same relationship appears, but when classified into subgroups—Orthodox/Conservative and Reform/Nonaffiliated—as illustrated in Table 2, the Reform/Nonaffiliated perpetuated relationships, i.e., recent movers spending more time with non-Jews, but the Orthodox/Conservatives didn't. Among

**TABLE 2**  
**Friends Most Time is Spent with by Years Living in Chicago by Branch of Judaism**  
**(All Age Groups Combined)**

		<u>Years Living in Chicago</u>					
		Born in Chicago	Came when Young	Over 10	6 to 9	3 to 5	Under 3
<u>Most Time w/ Friends</u>	Jewish (90.8%)	89.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%
	Both (8.4%)	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Non-Jewish (0.8%)	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>
		Tau C = -.04 Gamma = -.56					

		<u>Reform/Nonaffiliated</u>					
<u>Most Time w/ Friends</u>	Jewish (67.2%)	74.3%	67.9%	45.5%	50.6%	52.0%	65.1%
	Both (23.3%)	19.8	32.1	38.3	40.4	0.0	3.4
	Non-Jewish (9.5%)	5.9	0.0	16.2	8.9	48.0	31.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>61.8</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>5.8</b>
		Tau C = .16 Gamma = .34					

the Orthodox/Conservative, geographic mobility is *not* associated with less coreligionist interaction; if anything, it is associated with *more* Jewish interaction. Similar results were found with other measures of informal Jewish interaction: among Orthodox/Conservatives, movers knew more of their neighbors well than did stable residents. For Reform/Nonaffiliated, the reverse was true—the mobile knew fewer neighbors well than did stable Reform/Nonaffiliated Jews.

### *Mobility and Activism on Jewish Issues*

Activism in supporting Israel and Soviet Jewry was measured with the following Guttman-scaled items: attended two or more rallies in the past year, attended one rally, wrote letters of support to public officials or newspapers, contributed money to these causes, did none of these. In general, the young are somewhat lower on the Jewish activism scale than the old; among the under-35 group, about 50% rated as low or very low, 25% high and 25% very high. Among those over 35 years old, the

**TABLE 3**  
**Activism on Jewish Issues by Years Living in Local Area by Branch of Judaism,**  
**for Age Groups 45-54 and 55-64**

		<u>Years Living in Local Area</u>				
		<u>Under</u>	<u>3 to 5</u>	<u>6 to 10</u>	<u>Over</u>	
		<u>3</u>	<u>3 to 5</u>	<u>6 to 10</u>	<u>10</u>	
Orthodox/Conservative						
45-54						
<u>Jewish</u> <u>Activism</u>	Very Low (5.4%)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	Tau C = -.23 Gamma = -.34
	Low (10.3%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.4	
	Moderate (22.3%)	0.0	50.0	41.4	12.2	
	High (34.0%)	50.0	50.0	0.0	41.5	
	Very High (28.0%)	50.0	0.0	58.6	15.4	
	Total	12.4	12.8	23.7	51.1	100.0
55-64						
<u>Jewish</u> <u>Activism</u>	Low (14.0%)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.8%	Tau C = -.30 Gamma = -.60
	Moderate (32.4%)	0.0	38.7	0.0	36.9	
	High (15.3%)	0.0	0.0	25.9	19.1	
	Very High (38.3%)	100.0	61.3	74.1	22.2	
		Total	1.4	22.6	11.8	
Reform/Nonaffiliated						
45-54						
<u>Jewish</u> <u>Activism</u>	Very Low (18.3%)	0.0%	0.0%	15.8%	23.2%	Tau C = .06 Gamma = .10
	Low (36.0%)	100.0	0.0	31.2	29.4	
	Moderate (21.7%)	0.0	100.0	30.1	18.3	
	High (6.6%)	0.0	0.0	16.1	3.1	
	Very High (17.4%)	0.0	0.0	6.8	26.0	
	Total	9.5	1.9	29.8	58.8	100.0
55-64						
<u>Jewish</u> <u>Activism</u>	Very Low (17.8%)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	Tau C = .12 Gamma = .22
	Low (32.0%)	0.0	66.4	72.0	15.8	
	Moderate (20.8%)	0.0	28.9	28.0	17.7	
	High (8.6%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.4	
	Very High (20.8%)	0.0	5.6	0.0	28.5	
	Total	0.0	16.9	13.5	69.6	100.0
<u>Jewish</u> <u>Activism</u>	(20.8%)	0.0	28.0	0.0	28.0	17.7
	Tau C = .12					

Activism

figures were 36% and 38%, respectively, although there was marked variation from one branch of Judaism to another. Among Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and Nonaffiliated, the percentages high or very high were 71%, 46%, 39%, and 9%; the percentages low or very low were 7%, 15%, 35%, and 76%, respectively.

No consistent significant relationship was found between mobility and Jewish activism, using number of residences or years in local area as the independent variable and controlling for age. For long-distance movers the association is consistent, while recent in-movers are typically less active in supporting the Jewish causes than are those who have grown up in Chicago.

Upon closer examination of the data and a recombination of categories (into Orthodox/Conservative and Reform/Nonaffiliated), however, a familiar pattern emerges: the Reform/Nonaffiliated group exhibits lower levels of activism than the Orthodox/Conservative respondents. Among the Reform/Nonaffiliated, the highly mobile are usually less active than the geographically stable, while among the Orthodox/Conservatives, mobility usually results in as high or higher a level of activity in and support of major Jewish causes than does stability. This is most clearly illustrated among Orthodox/Conservatives and Reform/Nonaffiliated Jews in age groups 45-54 and 55-64, seen in Table 3. The levels of support for Israel and Soviet Jewry were found to be higher among Orthodox/Conservative, recently arrived, and shortest term Jewish residents than among Orthodox/Conservative longer-time Jewish residents. Among the Reform/Nonaffiliated the reverse is true; Jews newer to the area are lower in Jewish activism than are long-time residents.

### *Mobility and Religiosity*

As with activism, questions measuring religiosity or, more precisely, religious observance were Guttman-scaled: attend worship services at least once a week, keep a Kosher home, light Sabbath candles at home, fast on the High Holidays, attend a Passover seder, and none of these things. As expected, the more traditional branches are more highly observant than the less traditional branches: scaling high or very high on religiosity among respondents were 75% of the Orthodox, 50% of the Conservatives, 12% of the Reform, and 9% of the Nonaffiliated.

In the sample as a whole, a weak negative correlation was found between religiosity and mobility: those who are less mobile are more religiously observant. (See Table 4.) As was previously the case, however, when the categories are recombined into Orthodox/Conservative and Reform/Nonaffiliated, the inverse relationship, while holding for the Reform/Nonaffiliated, all but disappears for the Orthodox/Conservative. Among Reform/Nonaffiliated, the more mobile are less observant than the stable: among Orthodox/Conservative, the geographically mobile and stable do not differ significantly in degree of religiosity. Furthermore, among Orthodox/Conservatives, those who have moved to Chicago most recently are the more observant. But, among Reform/Nonaffiliated Jews, there is a slight indication that the recently arrived are somewhat less observant.

## **DISCUSSION**

Two different perspectives on the relationships between geographic mobility and ethnic community organization pervade sociological thought. The first stresses mobility's disruptive and detaching qualities, while the other suggests its power for

**TABLE 4**  
**Religiosity by Level of Residential Mobility (Based on Age and Number of Residences)**  
**All Age Groups Combined**

		<u>Level of Residential Mobility</u>			
		Low	Moderate	High	
<u>Religiosity</u>	Extremely Low (10.0%)	10.4%	9.2%	10.3%	10.0
	Very Low (26.0%)	15.9	17.0	40.2	26.0
	Low (15.3%)	10.7	24.1	10.9	15.3
	Moderate (22.4%)	29.1	21.3	18.9	22.4
	High (17.8%)	22.9	21.4	11.5	17.8
	Very High (8.5%)	11.0	6.9	8.3	8.5
	Total	26.3	33.6	40.1	100.0

Tau C = -.18  
Gamma = -.22

community institution and social network (re) building. For the present data, among some Jews—the Reform/Nonaffiliated—higher levels of geographic mobility were related to less informal interaction with Jewish social networks, lower activism in support of Jewish international causes, and lower religious observance, hence supporting conclusions of the first perspective. However, for Orthodox/Conservatives, the findings were reversed: the more mobile had higher levels of informal social relations with coreligionists, were more activist in support of Israel and Soviet Jewry, and were more observant of religious traditions, supporting the conclusions of the second perspective. These data suggest, then, that there is no single, simple, “across the board” effect of geographic mobility on ethnic community organization. How can we account for this variable effect?

In America, over the past century, the character of geographic mobility has undergone great alteration. Initially, geographic mobility was accounted for primarily by movement of the poor and of those coming from “traditional” societies, be they rural American or village European. For these peoples geographic relocation usually meant a near total change in way of life, involving special hardships and replete with social disorganization, demoralization, and community detachment. Recent residential mobility has been greatest among the middle classes, and is usually urban-to-urban in nature. Change in way of life is minimal from such a move. Therefore, mobility does not have such disruptive implications for the mover. Contemporary Americans are increasingly socialized to expect and adapt to relocation, and institutional structures now exist to ease such transition. Socializa-

**TABLE 5**  
**Religiosity by Years Living in Chicago:**  
**Orthodox/Conservative and Reform/Nonaffiliated, All Age Groups**

		Orthodox/Conservative					
		Years Living in Chicago					
Religiosity		Born in Chicago	Came when Young	Over 10	6 to 10	3 to 5	Under 3
Extremely Low (0.9%)		1.1%	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Very Low (5.5%)		5.1	0.0	17.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Low (11.7%)		14.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Moderate (23.1%)		26.8	8.5	10.5	17.1	0.0	0.0
High (33.6%)		33.0	43.0	27.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Very High (25.2%)		19.3	48.5	44.5	82.9	100.0	0.0
Total		79.7	6.5	8.2	2.3	1.0	2.3 100.0

Tau C = .15  
 Gamma = .48

		Reform/Nonaffiliated					
		Years Living in Chicago					
Religiosity		Born in Chicago	Came when Young	Over 10	6 to 10	3 to 5	Under 3
Extremely Low (14.5%)		12.2%	3.6%	16.2%	32.8%	0.0%	43.7%
Very Low (35.6%)		32.7	58.2	43.7	49.4	13.8	3.4
Low (16.8%)		22.1	14.2	3.8	13.4	6.6	3.4
Moderate (22.1%)		20.2	16.6	26.1	0.0	63.2	46.2
High (10.0%)		11.6	7.5	10.2	0.0	16.4	3.4
Very High (1.0%)		1.1	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0
Total		61.8	10.4	13.8	5.5	2.7	5.8 100.0

Tau C = -.07  
 Gamma = -.13

tion patterns and institutional adaptation both work to minimize the disorganizing effects of geographic mobility. Thus, earlier on, the first perspective was appropriate; today, the second perspective is accurate.

This explanation incorporates the historical development of both sociological perspectives, and is in agreement with the facts of American immigration and migration history. However, it does not explain the present situation, in which mobility lowers and disrupts the ethnic participation of some (Reform/Nonaffiliated) Jews, but seems to have no negative effect on (and sometimes actually increases) such participation among others (Orthodox/Conservatives). If the observed differences between the two groups resulted from differences in age or generation, or socioeconomic status, the above explanation would predict just the opposite results: mobility should show more negative consequences among older, more traditional, less middle-class Orthodox/Conservative Jews. Younger, more



modern, and more middle-class Reform/Nonaffiliated Jews should not be adversely affected by spatial movement. The empirical results were just the opposite, and were obtained even while controlling for the age factor.

Perhaps an important variable intervenes between the act (geographic mobility) and its behavioral consequences (areas of Jewish community life), either mitigating or promoting the influence of geographic mobility on ethnic participation. This important intervening factor may be the basic outlook or "identity-commitment orientation" to the ethnic group. The Orthodox/Conservative and Reform/Nonaffiliated categories may reflect two different basic "identity-commitment orientations" towards Jewish community life. The orientation represented by the Orthodox/Conservative group is a more traditional one, in which religion and ethnicity are taken as *the* basic facts of life, pervading almost all aspects of ethnic social life. A full life is lived within and through Jewish society and culture as much as possible. This ethnic community orientation resembles the type characteristic of self-enclosed, largely autonomous communities in which Jews lived prior to emancipation in Western Europe and into the twentieth century in Eastern Europe (Katz, 1961).

The identity-commitment orientation of ethnically conscious Reform/Nonaffiliated Jews resembles what has been termed by Janowitz, in another context, the "community of limited liability" (Janowitz, 1967; Suttles, 1972). This concept defines a local community by a set of social networks and institutions to which people are attached and committed voluntarily, in specialized ways, varying with certain predispositions and social characteristics, e.g., life cycle stage. Local community institutions and social networks serve limited individual needs and purposes. If these change, or are not satisfactorily met, withdrawal occurs. The degree to which a social identity and activity is involved in such a community may be great or negligible—some carry on an active social life within it, while others have little interest in it as a social arena, being active outside of it. Among Reform/Nonaffiliated Jews, Jewish religion and ethnicity, rather than being *the* basic fact of life, is one among a number of important voluntarily created and accepted roles comprising one's identity, to be assumed with hoped-for minimum "marginality." At certain times and in different situations the saliency of religion and ethnicity may recede or advance. This ethnic community orientation is a heritage of the *maskilim* or postemancipation Jews, living in and attached to two worlds, the traditional Jewish one and that of emerging, seemingly open Western European society, based on principles of the Enlightenment and democratic political ideals.<sup>4</sup>

The present empirical findings—that highly mobile Orthodox/Conservative Jews' participation in community life was usually equal to or greater than that of the geographically stable, while the highly mobile Reform/Nonaffiliated had lower levels of participation than the geographically stable—may result from a more traditional identity-commitment orientation towards the ethnic community, mitigating potentially disruptive effects of residential mobility and even permitting Jewish social activities to flourish despite residential change. Commitment to and desire for continued Jewish communal activity is strong enough to survive mobility, but also is dependent on the Jewish community to which one moves. The move itself may be made with the cooperation and support of a Jewish social network. But, for those with the "community of limited liability" orientation, residential mobility frequently seems to create distraction and disruption—bringing new opportunities and

outlets for activities, yet making participation in Jewish community life temporary and of lower priority.

Although there is considerable persistence of form and level of ethnic group activity despite geographic mobility, such persistence was found more among the Orthodox and Conservative: Reform and Nonaffiliated were considerably lower on all measures. This points to the difficulty (others claim ultimate impossibility) of sustaining the "maskilim/community of limited liability" orientation towards Jewish communal life in a highly mobile society. This orientation may indicate a stage in the transition to complete or "structural" assimilation. Although a sizable group in Chicago and other large cities, the Orthodox/Conservatives represent a minority of America's Jews. Given continuing Jewish geographic mobility in America, the net impact may be an eventual lowering of ethnic participation.

## CONCLUSION

Among two different subgroups of Jews, Reform/Nonaffiliated and Orthodox/Conservative, geographic mobility has different implications. For the former, evidence supported the older, "pessimistic" perspective—that mobility is linked to reduced ethnic identification and participation. Among the latter group, evidence supported the more modern perspective, that mobility need not mean ethnic detachment and can even promote ethnic participation. Important in determining the effects of geographic mobility may be the nature of ethnic community identity-commitment orientation.

There are several implications from this conclusion. Sizable numbers of Chassidic Jews have recently moved from Brooklyn neighborhoods to Rockland and other upstate New York counties, settling in suburban communities. What changes in their social life are consequences of this kind of residential shift, since the group clearly has a traditional Jewish identity-commitment orientation? The implication of this study is that their movement will not experience reduced levels of Jewish social participation; indeed, the amount of informal Jewish socializing, religiosity, and activism may well become even higher. On the other hand, for most of America's Jews, who fall into the Reform/Nonaffiliated category and possess the second of the two identity-commitment orientations, higher levels of residential mobility—other factors remaining constant—will probably lead to lower levels of Jewish social participation.

## NOTES

1. The source of distinctive Jewish names is a list used in Erich Rosenthal, "The Jewish population of Chicago, Illinois" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Department of Sociology, 1948) pp. 65ff. The contributors list included amount of donation. By taking a larger proportion of small donors it was possible to avoid biasing the sample or taking in a disproportionately large number of the more affluent. The previous sample survey referred to was conducted by Bernard Lazerwitz; the interview schedules are held in the archives of Spertus College of Judaica, Chicago. For a report based on that survey, see Bernard Lazerwitz, "Contrasting the effects of generation, class, sex, and age on group identification in the Jewish and Protestant communities," *Social Forces*, 49 (Sept. 1970):50-59.

2. It was possible to validate this sample's representativeness against outside criteria. Age data on Chicago Jews, gathered by the National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS), several years before this research, agrees closely with age composition of the respondents in this sample. Moreover, in the two largest Jewish areas of Chicago, W. Rogers Pk. and Skokie, the NJPS did a special telephone survey and found average Jewish household size to be 2.5 and 3.3, respectively. For those same areas, this research found average household size to be 2.8 and 3.5. In addition, synagogues in the areas studied were contacted; from that source the distribution of membership was 23% Orthodox, 34% Conservative, and 43% Reform. In this sample the distribution of members matched fairly well: 26.5% Orthodox, 26.0% Conservative, and 47.5% Reform.

3. For a full account of this methodology and the findings, see the work on which this report is based: Charles Jaret, "Residential mobility and local Jewish community organization," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Department of Sociology, 1977.

4. This discussion is not meant to imply that all Orthodox/Conservative and all Reform/Nonaffiliated Jews possess the orientations represented by their respective groups, as described above. Certainly there is some misclassification and oversimplification in interpreting Orthodox/Conservative and Reform/Nonaffiliated in this manner—differences within which the two groups are masked and some individuals are misclassified. What is proposed here is that the two different identity-commitment orientations are real, and that the Orthodox/Conservative and Reform/Nonaffiliated division is a reasonably good reflection of that difference. The basic ideology and history of the branches of Judaism suggest this interpretation, the comments of most of the interviewed Jews seem to support it, and no other variables included in this study seem to get at this issue any more closely or accurately.

## REFERENCES

- BLUMBERG, LEONARD, and ROBERT BELL  
 1959 "Urban migration and kinship ties." *Social Problems*, 6 (Spring): 328-33.
- BUTLER, E., R. McALLISTER, and E. KAISER  
 1973 "The effects of voluntary and involuntary residential mobility on females and males." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 35 (May): 219-27.
- FELLIN, PHILLIP, and E. LITWAK  
 1963 "Neighborhood cohesion under conditions of mobility." *American Sociological Review (ASR)*, 28 (June): 364-76.
- FISHMAN, JOSHUA A.  
 1963 "Moving to the suburbs: Its possible impact on the role of the Jewish minority in American community life." *Phylon*, 24 (Summer): 146-53.
- GANS, HERBERT  
 1958 "The origin and growth of a Jewish community in the suburbs." In Marshall Sklare (ed.), *The Jews: Patterns of a Social Group*. Glencoe: Free Press.

## GOLDSTEIN, SIDNEY

1971 "American Jewry, 1970: A demographic profile." *American Jewish Yearbook*, 72:53.

## JANOWITZ, MORRIS

1967 *The Community Press in an Urban Setting*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

## KASARDA, JOHN, and MORRIS JANOWITZ

1974 "Community attachment in mass society." *ASR*, 39 (June): 328-39.

## KATZ, JACOB

1961 *Tradition and Crisis: Jewish Society at the End of Middle Ages*. Glencoe: Free Press.

## LEBOWITZ, BARRY D.

1975 "Migration and the structure of the contemporary Jewish community." Paper presented at the 70th annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, August.

## LITWAK, EUGENE

1960 "Geographic mobility and extended family cohesion." *ASR*, 25 (June): 385-94.

1961 "Voluntary associations and neighborhood cohesion." *ASR*, 26 (April): 258-71.

## LOCKE, HARVEY

1940 "Mobility and family disorganization." *ASR*, 5 (August): 489-94.

## MACDONALD, JOHN S., and LEATRICE D. MACDONALD

1964 "Chain migration, ethnic neighborhood formation, and social networks." *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 42 (January): 82-97.

## PACKARD, VANCE

1972 *A Nation of Strangers*. New York: McKay Publishers.

## PARK, ROBERT E.

1928 "Human migration and the marginal man." *AJS*, 33 (May): 881-92.

## ROSENTHAL, ERICH

1960 "This was North Lawndale: The transplantation of a Jewish community." *Jewish Social Studies*, 22 (April): 67-82.

1960 "Acculturation without assimilation." *AJS*, 66 (November): 276-88.

## SKLARE, MARSHALL

1972 *Conservative Judaism*, 2nd ed. New York: Schocken Books.

## SKLARE, MARSHALL, and JOSEPH GREENBLUM

1967 *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier*. New York: Basic Books.

## STRAUSS, ANSELM

1968 *The American City*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

## TILLY, CHARLES, and C.H. BROWN

1967 "On uprooting, kinship, and the auspices of migration." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 8 (1967): 139-64.

## WINCH, ROBERT F., SCOTT GREER, and RAE L. BLUMBERG

1967 "Ethnicity and extended familism in an upper-middle-class suburb." *ASR*, 32 (April): 265-72.

## WIRTH, LOUIS

1928 *The Ghetto*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- 1938 "Urbanism as a way of life." *AJS*, 44 (July): 3-24.  
 1964 "Some Jewish types of personality." In Albert J. Reiss (ed.), *Louis Wirth: On Cities and Social Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ZIMMER, BASIL

- 1955 "Participation of migrants in urban structures." *ASR*, 20 (April): 218-24.

### THE SHERROW MEMORIAL PRIZE

The Association for the Sociological Study of Jewry announces the annual Fred Solomon Sherrow Memorial Prize of \$250 for the best paper written by a student in the field of modern Jewry.

Graduate and advanced undergraduate students in sociology, social history, ethnography, sociolinguistics, and related disciplines are encouraged to submit papers of any length by May 1, 1979.

Fred Solomon Sherrow (1940-1971) received his Ph.D. in sociology from Columbia University. He wrote his master's thesis on Arab-Jewish relations in Palestine and his dissertation on religious intermarriage in the United States, coauthored a recently published study on religious apostasy, and investigated motivations for migrating to Israel.

The prize is funded by the Fred Solomon Sherrow Memorial Foundation and is administered by the ASSJ. Send submissions to the chair of the award committee: Prof. Steven M. Cohen, Department of Sociology, Queens College, Flushing, N.Y. 11367.