

MAY 1 - 1978

WHO SHALL LEAVE AND WHO SHALL STAY?
THE JEWISH POPULATION OF CENTRAL QUEENS

Steven Martin Cohen
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology
Queens College
Flushing, New York 11367

May, 1978

Prepared for:

Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York
130 East 59th Street
New York, New York 10022

INTRODUCTION

This report on the Jewish population of central Queens was commissioned by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York to provide a data base useful in deciding whether a YMHA should be built in that neighborhood. This report complements earlier studies of the area undertaken with similar purposes in mind.

The report consists of two main sections. The first estimates the area's Jewish population size and the proportion of the entire population which is Jewish. In so doing it develops and describes a procedure for estimating the Jewish population size and Jewish proportion of any large area or list of American names.

The second section presents the results of a sample telephone survey of residents in the target area and in an area abutting that neighborhood.

The target area, central Queens, is defined as the two postal zones of Rego Park and Forest Hills, the two zones immediately surrounding the proposed site for the YMHA (located in Forest Hills, near the Rego Park border). This area also corresponds, almost precisely, with that studied in an earlier Federation-commissioned census-based study of the neighborhood.¹ The abutting area, Kew Gardens, is the postal zone immediately to the south of Forest Hills. It was selected to determine whether distinctive neighborhood changes were occurring in an

area likely to affect the target area (to some extent, major thoroughfares provide barriers for the target area on other portions of its boundaries). Aside from the slightly lower proportion of Jews in Kew Gardens, variables reported on below are generally invariant across the three postal zones. The report is thus based on the entire sample of 400 telephone interviews selected to represent the Jewish population likely to make use of the proposed YMHA.

JEWISH POPULATION SIZE

The Estimates: Using methods described below, it is estimated that Jews comprise approximately 65% of the Forest Hills population, 71% of Rego Park's, and 48 of the residents of Kew Gardens.

The total estimated Jewish population size for the central Queens area is 79,300.

These figures are totally consonant with those reported in other studies of the area. The Morag et al. study² estimates the Jewish proportion as somewhere between 65% and 70%. Bernstein and Bondarin³ meanwhile, using a geographical definition of central Queens roughly 10% larger than the two postal zones employed here, estimate the Jewish population size at 85,000. The consistency of my own estimates with those of previous studies leads me to place considerable credibility in such techniques. The particular advantage of the method developed for this study is its relative ease and speed of application. It is to a

description of that method that I now turn.

Procedure for Estimating Jewish Population Size: Essentially the method relies on the use of a list of 46 common Jewish (see appendix). One would take a list of names names/ (e.g. residents of an area, users of a particular agency's services) and total the number of people possessing the common Jewish names. Then, since these names are believed to comprise 15.48% of all Jews, one would multiply the total possessing common Jewish names by the reciprocal of 15.48%, that is, by a factor of 6.46. This product (the total times the factor) would be an estimate of the total number of Jews on the list. One would divide that number by the total number of names (both Jewish and non-Jewish) on the list to derive the estimated proportion that is Jewish.

In detail, the steps taken to develop and apply this method are as follows:

First, I examined the list of UJA-Federation donors grouped by last name, listing every name that appears 450 times or more. This cutoff point is entirely arbitrary. One could introduce greater accuracy but a greater amount of work in tallying names by lowering the cutoff and increasing the number of designated Jewish names.

Names, such as Brown, Greene, and Smith, which could easily be non-Jews were excluded from the list leaving 46 names. These names comprised 15.48% of the 275,700 names found on the entire UJA-Federation list.

Research assistants then counted the number of times

these 46 names were found in neighborhood telephone directories, being careful to eliminate business listing. This number was then multiplied by 6.46 to yield the total estimated number of Jewish households in each neighborhood. This latter number was in turn multiplied by 2.56, the number of individuals living in each household, a number determined via the sample survey (see below). The resulting number, 79,300, is an estimate of the total number of Jews living in the area (or, in more general terms, found on a target list).

The denominator, that is, the total number of residents in the area, is found in the following manner. Multiply the number of listings per telephone directory page by the number of pages. Next, obtain an estimate of the number of listings devoted to businesses by randomly sampling the first ten names on a large number of pages in the director. Reduce the total listings by the percentage of business listings to obtain the total number of residential listings.

With respect to telephone directories, this method should be corrected for two small, offsetting factors. First, people with two or more telephone listings are counted more than once inflating both Jewish numerator and the (Jewish + non-Jewish) denominator. On the other hand, unlisted phones depress both numbers. Since social class and household type are probably the most critical factors affecting multiple listings and non-listings, it is doubtful that Jews differ from non-Jews living in the same class-homogeneous neighborhood with respect to

these listing characteristics. In any event, the presence of these complicating factors should not affect the estimates of the Jewish proportion and may slightly affect estimates of the number of Jews using the telephone directory for one's name counts.

A final word regarding error^r, or the accuracy of these estimates is in order. The major source of error in this method is sampling error, that is, the variation in the number of common Jewish names found in a population. That is, 10,000 Jews in one area might contain 1500 common Jewish names while a similarly sized Jewish population could contain 1600 names. Considering this problem, I estimate that a standard error is equivalent to $2.34 \sqrt{n}$ ($=\sqrt{npq} \cdot 6.46 = \sqrt{n} \sqrt{(.1548)(.8452)} \cdot 6.36$). One should add and subtract two standard errors ($=4.68\sqrt{n}$) to obtain a 95% confidence interval for one's Jewish population size estimate. In other words, if one were to estimate that a list contained 400 Jews, one would construct a band of 93.6 ($=4.68\sqrt{400}$) above and below 400 for an interval ranging from 306.4 to 493.6. For larger samples, the error variance problem is much less severe. For example, one standard error of estimate for the number of central Queens Jewish households is 556 or 1423 people (556×2.56). Thus, with 95% surety, one could estimate that the real Jewish population lies between 76,444 and 82,146 with 79,300 being our best single estimate of that population.

(I should note that the above calculations are those of a statistical non-expert. More precise estimates of error

require the services of a sampling statistician).

THE TELEPHONE SURVEY

Research assistants telephoned 400 residents of Forest Hills, Rego Park and Kew Gardens (225, 118 and 57 respectively). Respondents were neighborhood residents possessing common Jewish names whose numbers were listed in neighborhood telephone directories published by a private firm in cooperation with the telephone company.

The questionnaire took approximately five minutes to administer. In that time it was possible to cover quite a number of areas including basic demographic information (household type and composition; age; number of children; years of neighborhood residency; home ownership;) current evaluation of the neighborhood (street safety, street cleanliness, quality of schools and an overall attitude measure); perceptions of the neighborhood's future (same four items as above, rephrased); plans for moving (three items); and Jewish affiliation (service attendance and synagogue membership). For the complete questionnaire text, see the appendix.

Approximately 90% of the original sampling list were contacted. (This percentage could have been increased with more investment of time - and therefore money - into call-backs). The interviewers found women respondents were more likely to answer the telephone and to want to answer the schedule. As a result, there is an over-representation of women in the survey.

This bias does not affect informant-type questions (e.g. home ownership) but might affect opinion items. The only item so affected, it appears, is perception of street safety where women regarded streets as more dangerous than men. Otherwise, the female bias had no apparent influence on the survey responses.

Of all those contacted, slightly over 80% agreed to participate in the survey. Reasons for refusal were split almost evenly between the aged ("I'm too old;" "I'm too sick to talk now;" "My English isn't good;") and idiosyncratic refusals. Thus, the sample survey slightly under-represents the aged. The overall response rate is, by conventional standards, rather high indicating that sample bias, except as noted, is at a relative minimum.

The remainder of this report is divided into three sections. The first, "Frequency Distributions", reports the distributions of critical population characteristics. The second substantive section, "Newcomers and Veterans," describes the characteristics of recent migrants to the target area comparing them with longer-term residents. The final section is devoted to a multivariate analysis of the determinants of plans for out-migration, essentially answering the question, "Who Shall Leave and Who Shall Stay?"

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

Table 1 presents the distribution of household types. The first column contains the proportion of households by each category. The largest category of household (36%) is the married couple with grown children (youngest 18 or over). The other columns (average household head age, adults in the home, children at home, and children ever had) permit a better understanding of differences in these household types. The married couple with all children grown, for example, is upper middle aged (the head of household mean age is 61); very few of the grown children live at home (.4 per household); and, of course, combining grown children with adults yields an adult-at-home average of 2.4.

The next most frequent type of home is the married couple without children. The men in these families average 40 years of age. There are of course no children at home and all such homes have two adults, the man and wife, living in the household.

Another 17% of the households, are married couples with children. About half of these (9% of the total) have children who are at their youngest 5 years of age and the other half (8% of the total) have children whose youngest age is between 6 and 17. Both types of families with children report a mean of about one and a half of their offspring living at home.

There are about equal numbers of single and widowed households in central Queens (12% and 14% respectively). Single people

T A B L E 1

Characteristics of Household Types

Type	% of Total Households	Mean Age, Head of Household	Mean No. Children at Home	Mean No. Adults at Home
Single ^a	12	33	0.0	2.2
Married, no chil.	18	40	0.0	2.0
Married, Tots ^b	9	34	1.4	2.0
Married, School-children ^c	8	46	1.5	2.1
Married, all children grown	36	61	.4	2.4
Divorced-sep ^d	4	47	.5	1.7
Widowed ^e	14	66	.2	1.7
	100%			

^aOut of 48 single respondents, 32 are men, 16 are women.

^b"Married, Tots", means youngest children are 5 years or under.

^c"Married, Schoolchildren" means youngest children are between 6 and 17 years of age.

^dOut of 15 divorced-separated respondents, 4 are men, 11 are women.

^eOut of 49 widowed respondents, 9 are men, 40 are women.

are, as would be expected, the youngest household in the sample with a mean age of 33. Singles consist largely of people in their twenties, but also of more elderly individuals who have never married. Moreover, these singles tend to live in pairs (mean number of adults at home = 2.2) either with friends or lovers. About two-thirds of the singles in central Queens are men.

The widows and widowers in the sample are, as anticipated, the oldest in the sample (mean age = 66). The vast majority (80%) in this group are women. Moreover, contrary to the popular imagery, many of these elderly and widowed do not live alone. A good number live with their grown children or other adults (mean adults at home = 1.7).

The divorced and separated constitute the smallest proportion (4%) of the households. They average 47 years of age, report having .5 children at home, and average 1.7 adults at home.

To summarize, the central Queens Jewish population is characterized by a large proportion of upper-middle aged couples whose children have grown and left home. Only under a fifth of the families have children under 18, another eighth of the household are aged widows and widowers, and yet another eighth are singles.

Table 2 presents the age distributions of male and female adults. Consistent with the above description, a rather large proportion of the household heads (37%, more than a third)

T A B L E 2

Age Distributions of Respondents and Their Spouses

Age	Men (Male Respondents or Husbands)	Women (Female Respondents or Wives)	Heads of Households
	%	%	%
18-29	18	19	18
30-39	15	14	13
40-49	13	10	12
50-59	21	22	20
60-69	19	23	21
70-92	<u>13</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>16</u>
	100%	100%	100%
	N = (305)	(320)	(372)

are 60 or over. Another third (32%) are between 40 and 59. Less than a third (31%) are under 40. There is little difference in the age distributions of men and women.

Table 3 provides more information about the other portion of central Queens Jewish population, namely, the children. Again, the results bear out the main import of the household type findings. Thus, while 70% of the respondents have had children (column 1), only 32% report having children at home now (last column). More specifically, less than 10% of the respondents have children age 5 or under, only 14% have school age children (age 6-17) and fully 52% have children 18 years or older.

Table 4 crosstabulates occupation by household type. There are three non-employed categories: a very small percentage (1%) are students, while about one-eighth of the homes are headed by retirees and a roughly equal proportion are housewives (12% and 14% respectively, see last column). As might be expected, students are exclusively found in the single household type column, retirees are largely found in the older household types (married, grown children and widows) while housewives are largely widows and single people.

Over a quarter (27%) of the household heads are professionals, about an eighth (11%) are in business for themselves and a third (32%) are employed in a non-professional capacity. An interesting comparison is offered in the third, fourth and fifth columns which present the distribution of occupations

T A B L E 3

Distribution of Children Characteristics

Number of Children	Respondent Has Had (Total)	Respondent Has, Age 0-5	Respondent Has, Age 6-17	Respondent Has, Age 18+	At Home Now
	%	%	%	%	%
0	30	90	87	48	68
1	20	8	9	14	17
2	36	1	4	29	11
3	11	-	1	8	2
4+	3	-	-	1	-
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%

T A B L E 4

Head of Household Occupation by Household Types

	Household Type ^a							
	Single	Mar.0	Mar.5	Mar.17	Mar.18	Div.	Widow	All
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Prof'l.	25	28	51	39	27	36	11	27
Business	4	12	11	18	16	-	-	11
Employee	30	43	37	43	33	43	7	32
Student	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Retired	5	17	-	-	24	-	2	13
Housewife	<u>24</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>14</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N =	(48)	(59)	(36)	(28)	(130)	(15)	(54)	(370)

^aSee Table 1 for explanation of Household Type categories.

among married couples with young, school-age, and grown children respectively. Interestingly, the professional proportions rise dramatically, reading from right to left (from the families with the oldest to the youngest children). While only 27% of households with grown children report professional occupational status, nearly double that figure (51%) do so among those with children under 5. This trend in this one neighborhood reflects a pervasive trend affecting American Jewry generally: the shift in occupational composition from business to the professions. That the trend emerges in a community such as central Queens (as opposed to Manhattan neighborhoods where one might readily anticipate growing professionalization) testifies to the extent to which community services should adapt to a better-educated and presumably more sophisticated clientele, not only in the years to come, but at the present moment.

The extent of Jewish affiliation in the area can be concisely understood in terms of synagogue attendance. (Other studies have shown that synagogue attendance is the best single predictor of other forms of Jewish behavior such as ritual performance, UJA giving, organizational membership, and, of course, synagogue membership). Almost two fifths of the population may be thought of as marginally Jewish as 39% of the men and 36% of the women attend synagogue never or only when weddings and bar mitzvahs demand their presence (Table 5). Another third or so (32% of the men and 37% of the women) can be regarded as

T A B L E 5

Synagogue Attendance by Sex

	Men (Male Respondents or Husbands) %	Women (Female Respondents or Wives) %
Never, or just for wed- dings and bar mitzvahs	39	36
High Holidays	32	37
More often but not weekly	15	18
Weekly	<u>15</u>	<u>9</u>
	100%	100%
	N = (295)	(302)

T A B L E 6

Distribution of Select Items

Belong to a Synagogue	44%
	(365)
Own Home	14%
	(397)

minimally affiliated Jews, that is, Jews who attend synagogue services only on the High Holidays (as well as, of course, family occasions). About another sixth of central Queens Jews may be thought of as "involved" since they go to services more often than High Holidays but not weekly. The remainder, about a sixth, report weekly synagogue attendance and ^amy be considered active Jews.

Consistent with these data, less than half (only 44%) of the households belong to a synagogue. Interestingly, in data not shown it was established that virtually all those who never go to services do not belong to a synagogue; virtually all who go more often than High Holidays do belong; while the large group who attends only High Holiday services are almost evenly split between synagogue members and non-members.

As a final note, the overwhelming majority (86%) of the area residents rent their apartments, as only a small minority (14%) are homeowners.

We now turn to a consideration of attitudes toward the neighborhood as well as related findings.

Table 7 through 11 provide an overall understanding of how central Queens residents relate to their neighborhood. Half the respondents report having a good number ("A lot" or "Some") friends in the area (Table 7). Moreover, almost half (46%) perceive that their closest of friends in the area are staying, a third (34%) see some friends staying and others moving out, and only about a fifth (20%) believe their close friends are

T A B L E 7

"How Many of Your Friends are in this Neighborhood?"

A lot	25%
Some	24%
Just a few	22%
None or hardly any	22%
	<hr/>
	100%
N =	(397)

T A B L E 8

"Of the friends you really care about
in this neighborhood, do you feel..."

Most are staying	46%
Some are staying, some moving out	34%
Most are leaving	20%
	<hr/>
	100%
	N = (383)

largely leaving the area (21%).

From Table 9 we learn that respondents are generally pleased with the area. When queried about specific issues - safety, cleanliness, and schools - roughly three-fifths gave favorable responses. However, when asked to summarize their feelings about the neighborhood, respondents were even more enthusiastic. A full fifth (20%) said they were "very happy" with the area and yet another three fifths (63%) said they were "happy" with living in central Queens.

But when we turn to their expectations for the future of the area (Table 10) quite a different picture emerges. Whether in terms of specific aspects of neighborhood life or the overall picture, residents are decidedly pessimistic about central Queens' future. Only 5% thought that all things considered, things would get better in their neighborhood. Two-fifths (41%) thought things would stay the same. In the context of a generally favorable view of the neighborhood currently, these respondents must also be regarded as optimists. But, more than half of the residents (54%) thought things will "get worse" in the next few years. Moreover, while feelings about the neighborhood's future generally are highly related to feelings about the future of specific aspects of the neighborhood, it is worthwhile to note that the most pessimistic views are voiced with respect to crime. Fully three-fifths (61%) of the residents expect street safety to deteriorate in the years to come.

T A B L E 9

Evaluation of Current Status of Neighborhood (4 Items)

	Street Safety	Street cleanliness	Schools	Overall
	%	%	%	%
Excellent ^a	10	8	8	20
Good	53	50	44	63
Unsure, in between	7	5	<u>-b</u>	5
Fair	26	25	33	11
Poor	<u>5</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>2</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%
N =	(400)	(400)	(204)	(400)

^a"Excellent, Good..." etc. are not the exact wordings of responses. For wording, see questionnaire in the appendix.

^b"Unsure" responses on the school question were excluded from the table since such respondents claimed they had no knowledge of local schools owing to their not having any children in local schools.

T A B L E 1 0

Expectations for the Neighborhood "In the next few years"

	Street safety %	Street cleanliness %	Schools %	Overall %
Get better	9	12	9	5
Stay the same	30	40	33	41
Get worse	<u>61</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>54</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%
N =	(340)	(324)	(219)	(344)

Table 11 presents the distributions of three inter-correlated questions which measure people's rootedness in the neighborhood. Approximately three-fifths to two-thirds of the residents can be regarded as highly rooted in the neighborhood. The rest may be considered the first candidates for moving should either their personal circumstances or neighborhood conditions warrant out-migration. Research on urban migration has not heretofore established the nature of the relationship between a person's predictions of migration with the actual event.

NEWCOMERS AND VETERANS

The presence of individuals who have recently taken up residence in the neighborhood is a sure sign of neighborhood vitality. An area where Jewish residents are largely old-timers is one where the Jewish population may be expected to decline. However, quite obviously, a neighborhood with a goodly number of recent Jewish in-migrants is one, if those trends continue, that can expect a constant replenishment of the Jewish population. Central Queens, fortunately, is decidedly a community of the latter sort. Fully a quarter (24%) of Jews living there now have moved into the area within the past five years (Table 12). It should be noted that since the sampling method relied on telephone directories, the most recent arrivals (perhaps within the last twelve months) were not sampled and hence the portrait of a community attractive to new Jewish

T A B L E 11

Indicators of Rootedness in Neighborhood

"Think of your neighborhood as your real home - the place where you really belong, as opposed to "just a place where you happen to be living."

Real home	67%
	(391)

"Would you like to move out of your neighborhood or would you like to stay?"

Like to stay	63%
	(384)

"How likely is it that you will be in this neighborhood 3 or 4 years from now?"

Very likely	34%	} ---58%
Likely	24%	
Unsure	10%	
Unlikely	18%	
Very unlikely	15%	
	<hr/>	
	100%	

N = (400)

T A B L E 12

Number of Years Resident in the Neighborhood

1-5 ^a	24%
6-10	18%
11-20	28%
21+	30%
	<hr/>
	100%
N =	(400)

^aResidents living in neighborhood less than a year were excluded by virtue of using telephone directories. Probably an additional 5% of the respondent households are resident in the neighborhood less than one year.

residents may be even rosier than that conveyed by Table 12.

Table 13 allows us to understand the characteristics of new versus old-time central Queens residents.

We learn that the most recent arrivals are somewhat more likely to be single; they are much more likely than old-timers to be married couples without children (fully a third - 33% - of the most recent arrivals fall in this category); and are much more likely to have very young children (over a fifth - 21% - are in this group); and contain a relatively small proportion (one-fifth or 19%) of couples with grown children. The divorced-separated households are slightly more prevalent among those resident 10 or fewer years in the community while the incidence of widowhood increases dramatically from 6% among recent arrivals to 22% among the most veteran residents.

As can be expected from these findings, more recent arrivals are much younger than the veterans: the average head of household age is 38 among the most recent residents and rises steadily to 58 among the 21-year-and-more veterans. Of course, the longer-term residents have had more children than the newcomers, but the number of children at home is fairly steady (about half a child on average) across all households.

Two occupational trends were of note. First, more recent arrivals are more likely to be incumbents of professional occupations and much less likely to consist of retired individuals (5% among the most recent group versus 22% among the

T A B L E 13

Select Characteristics by years of Residence in the Neighborhood

	Years of Residence			
	1-5	6-10	11-20	21+
Household Type	%	%	%	%
Single	16	10	12	11
Mar. No children	33	19	10	13
Mar., Tots	21	11	4	3
Mar., School-children	1	7	19	5
Mar., Grown children	19	36	39	45
Divorced-Separated	4	7	4	2
Widowed	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>22</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Mean Age, Head of Household	38	50	53	58
Mean No. of children	.9	1.3	1.6	1.6
Mean No. of children Home	.4	.4	.6	.4

Select Occupations				
% Professional	34	27	28	25
% Retired	5	10	14	21

Homeownership	6%	12%	14%	19%
%Members of Synagogue	24	42	55	51
%Where husband or wife attends services more often than High Holidays	24	32	34	33

TABLE 13 (Continued)

Select Characteristics by Years of Residence in the Neighborhood

	Years of Residence			
	1-5 %	6-10 %	11-20 %	21+ %
"A lot" or "Some" friends are in the neighborhood	41	53	57	48

Most close friends are staying	51	51	46	40

"Very safe" or "Mostly safe" to walk the streets of the neighborhood	80	66	54	56

Streets in the neighborhood are "Very clean" or "mostly clean"	65	62	49	57

Schools are "Excellent" or "Good"	42	54	53	56

Overall, "Very happy" or "happy" with the neighborhood	80	85	85	82

Street safety will <u>not</u> "get worse"	35	43	36	43

Street cleanliness will <u>not</u> "get worse"	45	57	49	59

Schools will <u>not</u> "get worse"	17	45	48	51

TABLE 13 (Continued)

Select Characteristics by Years of Residence in the Neighborhood

	Years of Residence			
	1-5 %	6-10 %	11-20 %	21+ %
All things considered, neighborhood will <u>not</u> "get worse"	39	49	46	50

Neighborhood is a "real home"	45	72	68	81

Would like to stay	51	69	64	69

"Very likely" or "likely" to be in neighborhood 3 or 4 years from now	41	62	62	66

Maximal N =	(95)	(73)	(112)	(120)

veterans). Both of these trends are no doubt due to the different age distributions among the years-of-residents groups.

Homeownership is directly related to years of residence, rising steadily from 6% among the most recent residents to 19% among the old-timers. Two explanations are offered for this finding. First, homeowners are less likely to leave a community than apartment dwellers. As a consequence, the proportion of homeowners in a given area should rise with years of residence as the apartment dwellers leave at a faster rate than those who have sunk money into a home. A second explanation suggests that homes are less available now than they were years ago or, alternatively, what vacant housing exists in the area is largely of the rental rather than the ownership variety. Probably the relationship between ownership and years of residence is due in part to each of these explanations but the extent to which they are valid is unknown.

There has been some speculation that the recent Jewish immigration to the area contain a large proportion of Orthodox families. This speculation is not borne out by the data. The proportion of synagogue members among recent arrivals is less than half that among long-term residents (24% versus 51%). The difference in service attendance rates is less striking (24% versus 33% respectively are homes where an adult attends services more often than High Holidays) but nevertheless, the trend is in the same direction. Most recent residents, largely owing to their more youthful character are also, on the whole, less

affiliated with Jewish life than their elder predecessors in the neighborhood.

The remaining portion of Table 13 compares the neighborhood attitudes of newcomers with oldtimers. In the main, there is little difference between these groups regarding their current feelings about the area: newcomers are as likely as oldtimers to express satisfaction both with the neighborhood generally and with specific aspects of the area. However, the newcomers are somewhat less optimistic about the neighborhood's future. There seems to be a threshold point, though, where feelings of optimism tend to level off. Thus, the most recent residents (5 years or less) are more pessimistic than all others, but there seems to be little difference in feelings about the future among longer-term residents of varying years of residence in the area.

Two explanations are offered for this finding. One is that optimism improves with time. A few years of living in central Queens is enough to bring the newcomer up to the oldtimer in terms of feelings about the area's future. A second alternative is that people who are uneasy about the area are more likely to move while those who are optimistic are inclined to remain. Again, it is impossible to sort out the relative validity of each of these explanations.

Finally, the lower levels of optimism among recent residents is paralleled by the lower levels of rootedness in the area. The most recent arrivals are about 20%-25% less likely

to express an interest or likelihood of staying in central Queens. But there is little variation among the other groups. Here, too, two explanations are offered for this finding. It is possible that the recent arrivals are "moving-types", that is, people who inherently are less likely to establish roots wherever they settle. In large part, as we shall see in the next section, proneness to move is a function of age. Younger people are less likely to express rootedness. The recent arrivals are younger, and consequently they are also likely to report they are most prepared to leave the area.

Another explanation is that within the first five years, people who are unhappy with the area and say they are likely to move out do just that. The longer-term residents, are in effect, "purged" of these malcontents and left with fairly high levels of "stayers". Only a longitudinal study (i.e. a follow-up of these respondents over the years) can sort out these various explanations.

WHO SHALL LEAVE AND WHO SHALL STAY?

Understanding the factors most clearly associated with intentions of staying or leaving in a neighborhood is useful for a number of reasons. First, such an understanding gives some inkling as to the future composition of the neighborhood. Second, knowing what aspects of the neighborhood, or which neighborhood perceptions are crucial in prompting residents to

say they will leave, can also help shape neighborhood preservation policies. Policies can be formulated either to correct the most odious aspects of a neighborhood or to improve specific public images of the neighborhood.

Table 14 presents the bivariate correlations between a variety of selected variables and the question, "How likely is it that you will be in this neighborhood 3 or 4 years from now?" (possible responses: "Very likely," "Likely," "Unlikely," "Very unlikely"). Since the recent residents more often said they are "unlikely" or "very unlikely" to remain in the neighborhood, a separate analysis is presented for these respondents. Thus, the first column of Table 14 refers to the newcomers, the second column pertains to the rest of the sample, and the last column reports on the total sample.

Variables which generally make a difference in likelihood of remaining include age, years of residence (for the total sample only), homeownership, evaluation of the schools, evaluation of the neighborhood overall, estimation of future street cleanliness, estimation of future school quality, estimation of the neighborhood's future overall, and perception of whether friends are staying or moving out.

To elaborate, older people are more likely to report they are staying in the area. Years of residence in the area is related only in the total sample since there is indeed a difference in likelihood of staying between the most recent arrivals (1-5 years) and all the rest (6 or more years).

T A B L E 1 4

Correlations between select variables and likelihood of staying in the neighborhood, disaggregated by length of residence

	Years of residence		
	1-5	6+	All
Age, Head of Household	.38	.24	.33
Years of Residence	.01	.07	.18
Homeownership	.20	.12	.17
Street safety - now	-.03	.08	.01
Street cleanliness - now	.13	.17	.13
Schools - now	.38	.17	.21
Overall - now	.27	.33	.31
Street safety - future	.14	.12	.17
Street cleanliness - future	.53	.25	.33
Schools - future	.15	.33	.34
Overall - future	.51	.26	.33
No. friends in the neighborhood	.15	.13	.08
Friends staying/moving out?	.31	.34	.31
	Maximal N = (91)	(289)	(400)

However, the effect of years of residence is nonexistent within these two groups. In other words, the likelihood of staying is lower among most recent arrivals and then increases and reaches a plateau after 6 or more years of residence.

Homeowners are slightly more willing to say they will remain in the neighborhood than renters. Much of the reason for this relationship is that homeowners generally have a more favorable view of the neighborhood and its future.

The four items referring to current evaluation of the neighborhood are moderately interrelated. That is, people who think one aspect of the neighborhood - such as the schools - is satisfactory are apt to think other aspects - cleanliness, street safety, and overall evaluation - are also satisfactory. However, there are considerable differences in the extent to which these items are related to predictions of leaving. Street crime, for example, does not appear as a major concern among central Queens residents and is not related to willingness to stay. Street cleanliness has only a very weak relationship. School quality perceptions are indeed related but, interestingly, much more so ($r=.38$) among the newcomers than among the veterans. The overall evaluation of the neighborhood probably best captures this domain of items and shows moderate relationships with reported propensity to leave.

Turning to the questions about respondents' expectations for the future - four items which are also interrelated - we find some anomalous findings. For the total sample and the

veterans, all items except (again) street safety expectations are related to staying in the neighborhood. Among the newcomers, street cleanliness expectations and overall expectations are highly related to the dependent variable. The unusual findings among the newcomers is difficult to interpret except if one takes into account their small sample size (N=91) and discounts these findings to sample error.

Interestingly, number of friends in the neighborhood is only marginally related to staying in the area, but, perception of whether one's close friends are staying is moderately related to expressions of remaining in the central Queens area.

These findings are summarized in the regression equations presented in Table 15. The dependent variable is regressed upon the four variables representing different conceptual domains. The four variables selected were the only ones with significant effects upon the dependent variable in the total sample and in the veteran subsample.

The four variables have roughly equal impacts on staying among veterans and the total sample. Thus, older people, those who are most happy with the neighborhood, those most optimistic about its future, and those who see their close friends remaining are more likely to say they are staying.

Among the newcomers, though, the patterns are somewhat different. Current evaluation of the neighborhood and perceptions of friends staying are hardly important in determining one's chances of staying in the neighborhood. Rather, age is

T A B L E 1 5

Regression of Likelihood of Staying in the Neighborhood Upon
Four Predictors, Disaggregating by Length of Residence.
(Entries are standardized regression coefficients).

	Years of Residence		
	1-5	6+	All
Age, Head of Household	.28	.22	.28
Overall evaluation of neighborhood	.17	.21	.20
Friends staying/moving out?	.11	.24	.20
Overall prediction of neighborhood's future	.34	.16	.21
Multiple R	.59	.49	.53
Maximal N =	(95)	(305)	(400)

slightly more important for this group and one's optimism about the neighborhood is the most critical determinant.

In brief, much as one would expect, perception of the neighborhood - both its current status and its future - are critical determinants of people's plans for staying in the area. Moreover, also as might be anticipated, it is the older people who are most stable. But, somewhat surprisingly, perception of one's friends leaving emerges as an important factor influencing one's chances of staying.

The propensity of younger people to leave the area should not be viewed, necessarily, with alarm. For it is also younger people who are most likely to move into the neighborhood.

The crucial role played by perceptions and attitudes toward the neighborhood suggests strongly that image is a vital factor influencing people's migratory behavior. The extent to which image of the neighborhood can in fact be manipulated is of course subject to question. People are intimately aware of changes in their neighborhood and public campaigns cannot completely overcome unfavorable and easily perceived objective changes. Nevertheless, attentiveness to mood, rumor, and the content of people's perceptions especially during neighborhood crisis periods (e.g., housing or school busing disputes) can be critical in preventing destabilization.

The finding that perceptions of one's close friends staying influencing one's own decision to stay (especially among recent arrivals) suggests the possibility of momentum,

either in the beneficial or deleterious sense. Thus, persuading residents to stay is likely to induce their immediate friends and neighbors to remain. Conversely, there is potential for ever-mushrooming flight - every person who leaves is impetus for yet others to consider the same alternative.

CONCLUSION

Central Queens is a heavily (two-thirds) Jewish area with an apparent steady influx of fairly young new arrivals. It does contain a goodly number of middle-aged and elderly Jewish residents. Moreover, the modal household is an upper-middle-aged couple whose children have grown and left home. People are generally happy with the neighborhood, they are fairly well-rooted in the area. On the other hand, they fear for the neighborhood's future. Thus, there is some degree of sensitivity to long-term changes or precipitous events which could alter the neighborhood's quality. Such circumstances warrant ^{developing} the ability to mobilize local opinion leaders and community media to promote favorable attitudes toward the area so that ^t is underlying stability may be ensured.

NOTES

- ¹Blanche Bernstein and Arley Bondarin, "The Jewish Population and Social Service Needs in Central Queens", Center for New York City Affairs, New School for Social Research, 1973, mimeo.
- ²Haim Morag et al., "Study of the Jewish Population and Social Needs in Central Queens," Central Queens YM & YWHA, May 1973.
- ³Bernstein and Bondarin, op. cit.

List of Common Jewish Names

The following 46 names and name groups are the most frequent entries on the UJA-Federation list of donors. Individuals with these names constitute 15.48% of the list. The reciprocal of .1548 is 6.46.

Adler	Kaufman (or -nn)
Berger	Klein
Berman	Levine
Bernstein	Levy
Cohen	Newman
Epstein	Rosen
Fein ^a	Rosenberg
Feldman	Rosenthal
Fink ^a	Ross
Friedman	Roth
Gold	Rubin
Goldberg	Schneider
Goldman	Schwartz
Goldstein	Shapiro
Goodman	Siegel
Greenberg	Silverman
Gross	Simon
Grossman	Solomon
Horowitz	Stein
Jacobs	Steinberg
Kahn	Stern
Kaplan	Weinstein

^aIndicates any and all names starting with "Fein" or "Fink"

QUESTIONNAIRE

Hello. Is (Mr/Mrs) NAME home? My name is _____
and I'm calling from the Queens College Department of Sociology.
We're doing some research on how people feel about your neighbor-
hood and I wonder if I may ask you just a few question. It won't
take longer than five minutes.

(If more information requested: This research was com-
misioned by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York.
They're interested in expanding services in this area - perhaps
in building a YMHA - and they would like to know more about
people living in the neighborhood).

Do you think of your neighborhood as your real home - the
place where you really belong - or do you think of it as just
a place where you happen to be living?

1. Real home
2. Just a place

Would you like to move out of your neighborhood or would
you like to stay?

1. Move out
2. Stay

For how many years have you been living in the neighbor-
hood?

Do you own or rent your home or apartment?

1. Own
2. Rent

How safe do you think it is to walk the streets of your neighborhood at night?

- | | |
|------------------|----------------|
| 1. Very safe | 2. Mostly safe |
| 3. Mostly unsafe | 4. Very unsafe |

How clean are the streets in your neighborhood? Are they

- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1. Very clean | 2. Mostly clean |
| 3. Mostly dirty | 4. Very dirty |

How would you rate most public schools in your neighborhood?

- | | |
|--------------|---------|
| 1. Excellent | 2. Good |
| 3. Fair | 4. Poor |

Overall, how happy are you with your neighborhood?

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Very happy | 2. Mostly happy |
| 3. Mostly unhappy | 4. Very unhappy |

How many of your close friends are in this neighborhood?

- | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1. A lot | 2. Some |
| 3. Just a few | 4. None or hardly any |

Of the friends you really care about in this neighborhood, do you feel

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Most are staying | 2. Some are staying, some moving out |
| 3. Most are leaving | |

In the next few years, do you think that your neighborhood's street safety will

- | | |
|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. Get better | 2. Stay about the same |
| 3. Get worse | |

In the next few years, do you think your neighborhood's street cleanliness will

1. Get better
2. Stay about the same
3. Get worse

In the next few years, do you think your public schools will

1. Get better
2. Stay about the same
3. Get worse

In the next few years, do you think that overall, with all things considered, that your neighborhood will

1. Get better
2. Stay about the same
3. Get worse

How likely is it that you will be in this neighborhood 3 or 4 years from now?

1. Very likely
2. Likely
3. Unlikely
4. Very unlikely

Now we have just a few background questions and then we'll be through.

Are you married, divorced or separated, widowed, or single?

(If married): How old is your (husband/wife)?

How old are you?

How many children have (you/your wife) ever had?

What are their ages?

How many of them live at home?

Do you belong to a synagogue?

And how often would you say you go to services?

1. Never or just for weddings and bar mitvahs
2. Just for the High Holidays
3. More often than the High Holidays but not every week
4. Just about every week or more often.

And how often would you say your (husband/wife) goes to services?

1. Nver or just for weddings and bar mitzvahs
2. Just for the High Holidays
3. More often than the High Holidays but not every week
4. Just about every week or more often

What is (HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD: you/your husband's) principal occupation?

(If in business): (Do you/does he) own (your/his) own business or work for someone?

Including yourself, how many adults live in your household?