



# Demographic Data Consultants

Nancy Hendrix, PhD, President

Consultants

Paula Mergenhausen, PhD

Robert Wyatt, PhD

## A DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF NASHVILLE AND MIDDLE TENNESSEE

1988

(615) 242-8847

176 Second Avenue N. • Nashville, Tennessee 37201

### TECHNICAL NOTES

The total number of households interviewed was 403. The number of valid cases is indicated for each table. The number varies depending on a variety of factors: the number of people answering the question, whether the question was asked about a household or about each individual in the household, and whether the question was applicable to adults only or to children too.

We refer to the period since the last survey as five years for ease of reading, but technically it has been more like five and one-half years.

## INTRODUCTION

The more things change, the more they stay the same. Or do they? What can be said of the status of the local Jewish population in early 1988? Nashville-Davidson County and the surrounding area have seen substantial economic and population growth since the last report on the demographic characteristics of the Jewish population of Nashville and Middle Tennessee and is conducted by Demographic Data Consultants, the Nashville-based market research firm which conducted the 1982 study. These two studies follow a 1949 report on the area population.

Estimates of the Jewish population in the Nashville-Davidson County and surrounding Middle Tennessee area are based on interviews with Federation members and non-members. The methods used to determine population size are discussed later in the report. The best estimates indicate that in 1988 the Jewish population known to the Federation is approximately 4299. This is not much greater than the population in 1982, 4283. What has happened?

Essentially, the number of households is growing faster than the population. While there are quite a few more households known to the Federation now, the average household size is considerably smaller. This shrinking of household size is a national phenomenon of long standing. From 1982 to 1988, the number of households increased from 1660 to 1845, but the household size declined from 2.58 to 2.33. In 1949, it had been almost three per household (2.97).

Despite the decline in household size, growth in the total Jewish population of the area (including those not on Federation lists) has increased as expected. The best estimate of the total, including those known to the Federation and others in the community not already identified, is 5442. At a household size of 2.33, these persons would represent 2336 households. Thus while the known population is smaller than anticipated, the total Jewish population has kept pace with the growth of the area as a whole. The large portion of unidentified Jewish persons in the region clearly presents a challenge to the Federation and to the organized Jewish community in the Nashville-Middle Tennessee area.

TABLE 1  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY SIZE

SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	%
1	114	28.3%
2	138	34.2%
3	71	17.6%
4	64	15.9%
5	13	3.2%
6	1	0.2%
7	1	0.2%
8	1	0.2%
TOTALS	403	100 %

Notes: Percentages sum to 100% where indicated, but because of rounding to the nearest tenth, the total may appear to be slightly more or less in some cases.

All tables are for 1988 unless otherwise indicated.

The biggest change in household size over the period between the surveys, in addition to the drop in average size, is the increase in the percentage of single-member households and the decrease in the number of five member households. The modal (most frequent) household size is still two.

As Table 2 demonstrates, average household size for Jewish communities around the country varies, but the average for most cities is not very different from Nashville's.

TABLE 2

## AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE/SELECTED JEWISH COMMUNITIES

CITY	SIZE	YEAR OF STUDY
ATLANTIC CITY	2.3	'85
CHICAGO	2.6	'82
CLEVELAND	2.8	'81
DENVER	2.2	'81
HOUSTON	2.63	'86
KANSAS CITY	2.5	'85
LOS ANGELES	2.2	'79
MEMPHIS	2.55	'77
MIAMI	2.2	'82
MILWAUKEE	2.5	'83
MINNEAPOLIS	2.6	'81
NASHVILLE	2.33	'88
NEW HAVEN	2.35	'87
NEW YORK	2.4	'81
PHILADELPHIA	2.5	'83
PHOENIX	2.4	'83
PITTSBURGH	2.5	'84
RICHMOND	2.4	'83
ROCHESTER	2.475	'80
ST. LOUIS	2.6	'82
SAN DIEGO	2.3	'79
ST. PAUL	2.3	'81
TAMPA	2.56	'82
WASHINGTON, D.C.	2.3	'83
WORCESTER, MA	2.5	'87

TABLE 3

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION

	1949	1982	1988	1949	1982 TOTAL	1988 TOTAL	1982 KNOWN	1988 KNOWN
0-4	7.9	6.5	7.4	214	320	394	278	311
5-14	12.5	14.0	13.0	335	689	689	600	544
15-19	5.8	7.1	5.2	156	350	272	301	215
20-29	13.6	11.4	8.2	364	561	434	488	343
30-59	46.2	41.4	47.9	1237	2038	2528	1773	1997
60 & over	14.0	19.6	18.3	372	965	1029	839	813
TOTALS	100%	100%	100%	2678	4923	5346	4279	4223

Another important demographic variable besides household size is age. We have broken age down in a number of different ways in order to make comparisons. Table 3 compares the present age-breakdown with 1949 and 1982 using categories from the 1949 report. It is interesting to note that the distribution of ages for 1988 looks more like the 1949 distribution in many ways than did the distribution from the last report. A major way that the 1988 distribution differs from the 1949 spread and is similar to the 1982 spread is in the larger proportion of senior citizens in the two most recent periods.

TABLE 4  
AGE\SEX DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE  
PERCENTAGES

AGE	SEX	
	MALE	FEMALE
0-4	3.5	3.8
5-9	2.7	2.9
10-14	3.8	3.5
15-20	2.7	2.4
20-24	2.2	1.7
25-29	1.8	2.3
30-34	3.7	5.0
35-39	5.1	6.5
40-44	6.2	4.4
45-49	2.9	2.9
50-54	2.1	3.1
55-59	2.6	2.7
60-64	2.9	2.2
65-69	2.1	2.6
70-74	2.2	2.5
75-79	1.4	1.4
80-84	0.7	0.4
85 and over	0.3	0.7
TOTAL	48.9 %	51.0 %
N=922		

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF CHILDREN EXPECTED BY THOSE  
EXPECTING TO HAVE CHILDREN IN THE FUTURE

NUMBER OF CHILDREN EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE
1	31.1%
2	55.6%
3	6.7%
4	6.7%
N=45	100%

There are fewer Jewish households reporting that they expect to have children in the future in 1988 than in 1982. The most significant change is that in 1982, 22% expected to have three more children while in 1988, less than 7% expected to have three.



TABLE 6  
MARITAL STATUS OF ADULTS (18 AND OVER)

NEVER MARRIED	12.9%
MARRIED	72.3%
WIDOWED	7.4%
DIVORCED	6.4%
SEPARATED	0.9%
TOTAL	100 %
N=698	

Married adults are even more the norm in 1988 than in 1982. There are fewer never married and widowed and more divorced and separated. The percentage married is close to what it was in 1949.

TABLE 7  
JEWISH IDENTITY

BORN JEWISH	82.9%	JEWISH NOW	88.2%
NOT BORN JEWISH	17.1%	NOT JEWISH NOW	11.8%
TOTAL	100 %		100 %
N=930		N=929	

TABLE 8

WORK ACTIVITY OF ADULT POPULATION

EMPLOYED FULL TIME OUTSIDE THE HOME	61.0%
EMPLOYED PART TIME OUTSIDE THE HOME	6.1%
STUDENT	5.4%
HOMEMAKER	10.5%
UNEMPLOYED SEEKING WORK	0.0%
AT HOME NOT SEEKING WORK	1.9%
RETIRED	14.9%
N=669	100.0%

The trend toward the two-earner family is reflected in the current study even more clearly than it was in 1982 when the trend was already obvious. The percentage of the sample working full time outside the home is up from 51.8% to 61%. The percentage of homemakers in the entire sample declined over the five-year period from 18.5% in 1982 to 10.5% in 1988. The percentage of retired persons is up, and the percentage of students is down.

Among females, 58% were employed outside the home, 48.5% full time and 9.5% part time. This is significant as at this point over half of the female population is engaged in outside employment. In 1982, the total for full and part-time workers was 45.7%. As a corollary, the percentage of full-time homemakers is down from 34.3% in 1982 to 18.6%. The percentage of retired females is up from 12.6% in 1982 to 16.5% in 1988. Other categories account for 6.9%.

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF ADULT POPULATION BY EMPLOYER

SELF-EMPLOYED	36.5%
EMPLOYED BY PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	49.8%
EMPLOYED BY STATE, LOCAL OR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	13.5%
OTHER	0.2%
TOTAL	100 %

N=460

There has been little change in the distribution of the adult population by employer over the period since the last survey. There is a slightly lower percentage of workers who are self-employed. A few more are employed in private enterprise. More Jewish workers are employed by some branch of the government in 1988 than in 1982.

EDUCATION

The percentage of the adult community that has completed at least four years of college has increased from 50% to 62%. The percentage with graduate degrees is up from 22% to 26%. The percentages in 1982 were already well above the averages for the nation as a whole. It is no surprise that the U.S. Jewish population is highly educated, but the statistics are an interesting counter to the stereotype that Southerners are not usually well-educated.

TABLE 10

OCCUPATION OF ADULT POPULATION

PROFESSIONALS	47.7%
MANAGERS AND OWNERS	27.5%
CLERICAL	8.3%
SALES	11.1%
CRAFTS	2.2%
OPERATIVES, SERVICE, AND OTHER WORKERS	3.3%
TOTAL	100 %
N=459	

TABLE 11  
1987 ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

INCOME	
UNDER \$10,000	3.9%
\$10,000-14,999	3.6%
\$15,000-19,999	7.8%
\$20,000-29,999	14.4%
\$30,000-49,999	27.9%
\$50,000-74,999	21.6%
\$75,000-99,999	6.9%
\$100,000 and over	13.8%
 TOTAL	 100 %

N=333 (83% of households responding)

The percentage of the sample households answering the question on income increased from 75% in 1982 to 83%. This is important as it increases the accuracy of estimates and allows planners to have a more complete picture of community resources and needs.

The most notable change in the distribution of income is the smaller percentages in the categories under \$30,000. It is also important that the percentage of households \$100,000 and over makes up more than one-tenth of the community. Some of the change in this distribution, but not all, is due to inflation.

## RESIDENCE

The Federation population is less geographically concentrated than in 1982. At that time 51% of all Jewish households lived in the 37205 zip code. By 1988 the percentage had declined to approximately 44%. Nevertheless most of the population is still centered in southern and southwest Nashville. The top four areas are still the same, but the order within the top four has changed a little. 37221, Bellevue, has overtaken 37215 as the second most populous area. Each has about 13% of the population, with Bellevue only slightly ahead of the Green Hills-Forest Hills area. 37212 is still fourth with about 6%. These four areas are joined by Franklin with 5%, and Brentwood with 3%. The remaining population (16%) is in 25 other zip codes each containing less than 3% of the population.

Respondents 65 and over live in a variety of zip codes, but are clustered in 37205 to a greater extent than other respondents. There are more zip codes with more than 3% of the seniors represented than in 1982.

### RESPONDENTS 65 AND OVER BY ZIP CODE

#### ZIP

37205	52.9%
37215	13.8%
37221	5.7%
37135	4.6%
37212	3.4%
37064	3.4%
37130	3.4%
ALL OTHERS	12.6%
TOTAL	100 %

N=87

## MIGRATION

While migration is an important factor in population growth, it is very difficult to measure using survey information. Migrants do not always affiliate with local organizations and thus are lost to interviewers. Our study estimates the number of unaffiliated persons but cannot predict on that basis the numbers of unknown persons who have recently migrated.

We can make an educated guess about migration based on the information which we have gathered nonetheless. Since the proportion of recent migrants based on the current survey is much smaller than the proportion surveyed in 1982 while the region is growing, we suspect that Jewish migrants are coming to the city but not affiliating in the same numbers as before with the Federation. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the unknown portion of the community population has grown much faster than the known portion.

To be specific, while 47 members of survey households in 1982 had moved to Nashville in the preceding twelve months, only eleven had done so in 1988. It may be that recent migrants may still affiliate but take longer to do so. The number having migrated in the preceding five year period is dramatically lower also. In 1982, the number was 181. The current number is 98.

### Birthplaces

About two-fifths of the Jewish residents of Nashville-Middle Tennessee were born in Nashville or Middle Tennessee. There are a greater percentage of native-born members than in 1982. While the flow of migrants from outside the region over the years has made the population a very cosmopolitan one, other factors are involved in the recent population mix. The number of children born in Nashville recently must be considered. These are added to the native-born population whether their parents were born here or not. There is some indication from interviewer comments that in recent years native Nashvillians who had moved away have come back to Tennessee. The percentage of Nashvillians in the population is also affected by out-migration of non-natives and deaths of non-natives.

The diversity of the population remains, though it is not as pronounced as before. In 1982 58% were born in the South and 92% were born in the U.S. While the most recent study shows that over 62% were born in the South and 94% were born in the U.S., a list of birthplaces still reads like an atlas of the nation and even the world. Poland, Germany, the USSR, and England are frequent birthplaces for respondents. Others come to Nashville from Africa, Czechoslovakia, Korea, Canada, Austria, Lithuania, Hungary, Iran, and Belgium.

One hundred persons in the present study were born in New York State, and 44 of those were born in New York City. But migrants come from other U.S. cities including Berkeley, California; Boston, Massachusetts; Joliet, Illinois; Portland, Oregon; Dallas, Texas; Youngstown, Ohio, etc. The non-Southern states sending the most migrants after New York are Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, Indiana, California, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Missouri, in that order. Also represented are Iowa, Maine, Delaware, West Virginia, Washington, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Oregon, Vermont, New Hampshire, Minnesota, and Rhode Island.

It should be noted that in addition to coming from such faraway sounding birthplaces as Seoul, Korea; Vienna, Austria; London, England; Moscow, USSR; Madison, Wisconsin; and New Haven, Connecticut, migrants move to Nashville who were born relatively nearby in Memphis and Bristol, Tennessee; Barbersville, Kentucky; Woodruff, South Carolina, and other neighboring cities and towns. The Nashville Jewish population is truly a mixture of people from a variety of origins.

#### Reasons for Moving

The three major reasons given for moving to Middle Tennessee were occupation or profession, family, and school. Family was actually mentioned more frequently than occupation or profession, but in more than half of these cases, the move was related to the job of a family member, usually a spouse or parent. In many other cases, family was apparently the primary reason for the move. Typical responses were, "My wife grew up here, and we wanted to come back;" "My children live in Nashville;" "I knew about Nashville because of my brother;" or "I came to join my sister."

While the two most important factors are work and family, people also come to Nashville in significant numbers to attend school, often graduate school, and then remain. There were a few unspecified non-job related reasons. In addition one respondent stated, "I came to escape Hitler." Another simply said, "I wanted to come to America." Finally, while no one mentioned climate specifically, it is evident that the Sunbelt location adds to Nashville's attractiveness. One respondent did explain his move by saying, "I came for my health."

#### When Migrants Came

Thirty-seven people in the sample had come to Nashville between 1911 and 1945. Eighty-five had moved between 1946 and 1960. Seventy-seven came in the sixties. The largest number of migrants moved here in the seventies, a total of 160. So far in the eighties the number is 149.



## Moving Away

Out-migration also affects a population, of course, and even though the region is growing, some people will move away. Migration away from Nashville in the last year involved at least one member in 24 of the survey households. In the last five years 62 households had at least one member to leave. The number in 1982 was 65. Of course when whole households leave, the household is no longer on the Federation list so that there is no way of counting these out-migrants with a survey of Federation members. This is an important reason why the Federation needs to keep accurate records on migration so that the best information is available for projections.

While in 1982 in-migration was reported to be much higher than out-migration, that is not the case now. In-migration to the region by Jewish households may be high, but it is not reflected in Federation membership. The effect of migration on population is discussed further under projections.

TABLE 12  
IMPORTANCE OF ISRAEL TO RESPONDENTS

1 is lowest importance.  
10 is highest.

SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
1	10	2.5%
2	3	0.7%
3	25	6.3%
4	19	4.8%
5	51	12.8%
6	29	7.3%
7	50	12.6%
8	67	16.9%
9	37	9.3%
10	106	26.7%
TOTALS	397	100 %

Members of the Middle Tennessee Jewish community rank Israel as very high in importance. The greatest number of respondents ranked Israel as high as possible, 10. There is a relative lessening of the importance of Israel from 1982 to 1988 based on the answers to this question. In 1982, 35% ranked Israel as 10. In 1988, the figure had dropped to about 27%. There were more very low responses as well as fewer very high responses in 1988.

One possible explanation for the change has to do with events occurring while the two surveys were being conducted. During the 1982 survey Israel was at war in Lebanon. During the most recent survey, the sampling period, December and January, coincided with a period of significant disturbances on the West Bank in Gaza. These events could clearly influence attitudes toward Israel.

It is interesting that while ratings of Israel's importance are actually lower now than they were five years ago, the respondents' perception of the change is very different from the reality. A new question was added this time which asked respondents whether Israel was of more, equal, or less importance to them than it was five years ago. Less than 5%, or 18, of the 395 respondents said less. Over twenty-five percent said more, and over 70% said equal.

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO STATEMENT  
 THAT ANTISEMITISM IS INCREASING IN THE NATION

RESPONSE

STRONGLY AGREE	10.5%
AGREE	36.8%
NO OPINION	23.8%
DISAGREE	28.0%
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1.0%
TOTALS	100 %

N=400

The Jewish population of Nashville-Middle Tennessee is less likely in 1988 to believe that anti-Semitism is on the rise in the United States. In 1982 the percentages strongly agreeing and agreeing were higher and the percentages uncertain and disagreeing were lower. In neither year did many respondents strongly disagree with the statement.

TABLE 14

MEMBERSHIP IN A TEMPLE, SYNAGOGUE OR SHUL

	% ALL HOUSEHOLDS	% MEMBER HOUSEHOLDS
THE TEMPLE	49.5%	63.4%
SHERITH ISRAEL	7.5%	9.6%
WEST END SYNAGOGUE	20.9%	26.8%
FRANKLIN HAVURAH	0.2%	3.2%
NON-MEMBERS	21.9%	
TOTALS	100 %	100 %

TABLE 15

MEMBERSHIP BY AGE

MEMBERSHIP	18-22	23-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 AND OVER
MEMBERS	80.0%	69.0%	76.6%	80.5%	75.6%	83.0%
NON-MEMBERS	20.0%	31.0%	23.4%	19.5%	24.4%	17.0%
TOTALS	5	29	107	82	78	94
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

TABLE 16  
MEMBERSHIP BY IMPORTANCE OF ISRAEL

MEMBERSHIP	1-4	5	6	7	8	9	10
MEMBERS	71.9%	78.4%	72.4%	82.0%	85.1%	81.1%	77.4%
NON-MEMBERS	28.1%	21.6%	27.6%	18.0%	14.9%	18.9%	22.6%
TOTALS	57	51	29	50	67	37	106
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

TABLE 17  
MEMBERSHIP BY AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT  
THAT ANTISEMITISM IS INCREASING IN THE NATION

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNCERTAIN	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
MEMBERS	69.0%	84.4%	81.1%	71.4%	100 %
NON-MEMBERS	31.0%	15.6%	18.9%	28.6%	0 %
TOTALS	42	147	95	112	4
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

N=400

Non-members tend both to strongly agree and to disagree with this statement in greater numbers than would be expected based on their proportion in the population. Members' tendency is rather matter-of-factly to agree, although as the frequency distribution for this variable indicated, they agree in smaller proportions than previously.

TABLE 18  
MEMBERSHIP BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE

MEMBERSHIP	HOUSEHOLD SIZE				
	1	2	3	4	MORE THAN 4
MEMBERS	78.9%	75.4%	79.4%	81.3%	76.9%
NON-MEMBERS	21.1%	24.6%	20.6%	18.7%	23.1%
TOTALS	114	138	68	64	13
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

N= 397

There is no clear relationship between membership and household size.

TABLE 19  
MEMBERSHIP IN A TEMPLE, SYNAGOGUE, OR SHUL  
BY SEX OF RESPONDENTS

MEMBERSHIP	SEX	
	FEMALE	MALE
MEMBERS	78.7%	77.4%
NON-MEMBERS	21.3%	22.6%
TOTALS	207	195
	100 %	100 %

N=402

As one would expect, membership in a Temple, synagogue, or Shul was not related to the gender of the adult who responded to the questionnaire. In 1982 there appeared to be a slight and statistically nonsignificant tendency for female respondents to represent households who had joined one of the organizations.

TABLE 20

MEMBERSHIP BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

MEMBERSHIP	UNDER \$10K	\$10K 15K	\$15K 20K	\$20K 30K	\$30K 50K	\$50K 75K	\$75K 100K	\$100K +
MEMBERS	84.6%	50.0%	76.9%	70.8%	77.4%	79.2%	73.9%	87.0%
NON-MEMBERS	15.4%	50.0%	23.1%	29.2%	22.6%	20.8%	26.1%	13.0%
TOTALS	13	12	26	48	93	72	23	46
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

N=333

The relationship between family income and membership in a Jewish religious institution is neither simple nor statistically significant. Nevertheless both high and low income families are clearly disproportionately more likely to be members than one would expect from their percentage in the sample.

TABLE 21

THE WORK OF THE FEDERATION HAS  
INDIRECT BENEFITS FOR RESPONDENT'S HOUSEHOLD

AGREE	70.1%
DISAGREE	10.3%
UNCERTAIN	19.6%
TOTAL	100 %
N=398	

TABLE 22

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERATION MAKE A STRONGER COMMUNITY

AGREE	78.4%
DISAGREE	6.0%
UNCERTAIN	15.5%
TOTAL	100 %
N=399	

TABLE 23

THE WORK OF THE FEDERATION HAS  
IMPORTANT DIRECT BENEFITS FOR RESPONDENT'S HOUSEHOLD

AGREE	41.1%
DISAGREE	32.1%
UNCERTAIN	26.8%
TOTAL	100 %
N=399	



TABLE 24

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION OF DIRECT BENEFITS FROM  
FEDERATION AND IMPORTANCE OF ISRAEL

RATING OF ISRAEL (10=HIGHEST IMPORTANCE)	AGREE FEDERATION HAS DIRECT BENEFITS
1-4	28.1%
5	25.5%
6	31.0%
7	56.0%
8	37.3%
9	54.1%
10	50.5%

While the relationship between the way respondents ranked Israel's importance and whether they agreed or disagreed that the federation work has direct benefits for their household is not a perfect linear one, it does appear that those who rank Israel as very important tend to be more likely to believe that the Federation has direct benefits for their household than those who rank Israel as not important.

TABLE 25

## VISIT TO ISRAEL BY IMPORTANCE OF ISRAEL TO RESPONDENT

## IMPORTANCE OF ISRAEL (SCALE OF 1-10)

VISIT TO ISRAEL	1-4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NO	84.2%	76.5%	62.1%	65.3%	74.6%	50.0%	34.3%
YES	16.6%	23.5%	37.9%	34.7%	25.4%	50.0%	65.7%
	57	51	29	49	67	36	105
TOTALS	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

N=394

Although the relationship between visiting Israel and the importance of Israel to a respondent is not perfect, there is in 1988, as there was in 1982, a general tendency for the percentage of those having visited Israel to rise as the rating of Israel's importance rises. In 1982 over half of those rating Israel as 10 had been to Israel. In 1988 almost two-thirds of those rating Israel as 10 had made a visit. The relationship is statistically significant at the .0001 level. The relationship is most likely a feedback relationship with those rating Israel as more important being more interested in visiting and those having visited ranking Israel as more important as a result.

TABLE 26  
 ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

	YES
JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER	56.3%
HADASSAH	31.5%
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN	38.2%
ORT	13.4%
WOODMONT COUNTRY CLUB	13.2%
B'NAI B'RITH	18.9%

N=403

TABLE 27  
 READING HABITS

	OFTEN	SELDOM	NEVER	
THE JEWISH OBSERVER	58.6%	24.3%	17.0%	(N=399)
INTERNATIONAL/NATIONAL NEWS	40.1%	27.4%	32.5%	(N=394)
FEDERATION ACTIVITIES	40.4%	29.2%	30.5%	(N=394)
LIFECYCLES	37.0%	24.1%	39.0%	(N=395)
CENTER SCENE	43.1%	27.6%	29.3%	(N=392)

TABLE 28

RECREATIONAL SERVICES

RESPONDENTS PURCHASING SERVICES  
OTHER THAN THOSE OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

CHILDREN'S DANCE OR GYMNASTICS	7.7% (N=403)
OTHER CHILDREN'S ATHLETIC PROGRAMS	7.4% (N=403)
ADULT HEALTH OR RACQUET CLUB	20.6% (N=402)
ADULT EXERCISE OR DANCE CLASSES	19.1% (N=403)

The most interesting aspect of the information on the purchase of recreational services is that respondents tend to purchase services for themselves from organizations other than the Jewish Community Center in greater numbers than for their children. The Center is planning its own survey to determine to what extent it is meeting the needs of members and to anticipate future needs. Much of the demographic data in this report is important for that effort as well.

## POPULATION GROWTH PROJECTIONS

Populations change because of four variables, fertility, mortality, immigration, and outmigration. None of these variables can be adequately measured using survey methods alone. Birth and death registration have been developed for a variety of reasons, but one consequence of their prevalence is better population projection. It is crucial in the opinion of Demographic Data Consultants that the Federation undertake this task as soon as possible. We have stressed earlier in the report the importance of keeping up with migration, people moving to Nashville and from Nashville. We cannot overemphasize this point. Had this same suggestion been adopted after it was made in 1982, we would have better data today to make projections, and planning could go forward with more confidence.

### Births

We noted the instability of birth rates in the last report. The experience of the past five years illustrates our point well. We were reluctant to predict that present birth rates would continue into the future. Survey evidence shows that they did not. The birth rate from 1982 to 1988 has increased dramatically. The number of children aged zero to four years has kept pace accordingly. Neither previous birth rates nor expectations of birth predicted this small baby boom. We correctly chose to use the higher birth rate of the non-black population of the U.S., over the lower traditional Jewish birth rate, in calculating life table values for population projections. We still did not expect the change that occurred. Part of what happened is that while not many recent Jewish migrants to the area affiliated with the Federation or its organizations, the ones who did are by and large the migrants who have preschoolers.

An examination of the households with small children reveals that a disproportionate number of children between zero and four years of age were born to parents who have moved to Nashville or the surrounding area since the last survey. Almost a third of the children born since the last survey were born to this group of migrants. More than forty percent were born to migrants who moved here before 1982. Indeed the majority of the babies were born to parents who had moved to Nashville or the larger area in the seventies and eighties. Native Nashvillians had fewer than their share of babies. It is not unusual for migrants to have larger numbers of young children, but since the sample in 1982 already was composed of a greater number of recent migrants than is the case today, the birth rates at that time should have presumably reflected the effect of young families.

Since there are more three year olds than any other group of preschoolers, it is possible that some births were in response to the concern about the size of the population. There has been emphasis on fertility as a major factor in population growth. The demographic report stressing smaller household size was released in the last half of 1982 so that births occurring in 1984 would have been children conceived not many months after the report was distributed. This speculation is just that; there is not abundant evidence that pronatalist campaigns succeed, but the idea should not be dismissed since in a small community a small number of individual decisions can make a great deal of difference.

The child-woman ratio is higher in 1988 than it was in 1982 for two reasons. There are slightly more children in the relevant group, and there are fewer women of childbearing age. There are fewer women in the sample who were pregnant at the time of the survey than in 1982. Fewer women expect to have more children than did at that time. Does this mean that the birth rate will go down? It is certainly possible since it has been higher in the last five years than is normal for the population, but we feel that to predict a downturn after an underprediction of births would be to anticipate more of a swing than is likely. Thus we are choosing again the cautious route of assuming that births in the population will mirror those in the nonblack population at large.

### Migration

Migration is another wild card in population projections. Since the area is growing it would be simple to predict an increase in migration over that predicted for the past five year period. The problem is that migrants do not appear to be affiliating with the Federation in the same numbers as in the past. Thus we cannot predict an increase in the known population unless we assume that this trend does not continue. Another problem has been alluded to before also. That is the problem of differential affiliation of migrants by age and fertility. Without a large survey of the unaffiliated it is impossible to know how this population will affect the known population.

### Deaths

Death rates are more stable. The best measures come from death registration systems. While the Federation is without a formal system and cannot provide complete data on deaths, the information that is available indicates that the death rate is up. Data from the survey alone would be misleading. There were 51 deaths from Yom Kippur to Yom Kippur according to Federation sources, essentially the religious organizations. The survey indicates only thirty-seven of these. This is to be expected. Some of the deaths reported by Federation sources are not for Nashvillians. More importantly the death rate is nearly always higher than a survey can indicate, since if a whole household

disappears through death, the death would obviously not show up in a survey. With the large number of single householders among the elderly, this is not a trivial matter.

Older populations have higher death rates as a matter of course, particularly when there are a large number of persons in the very oldest groups. The current death rate of the U.S. population as a whole is 8.7 per thousand. While the Jewish population has had a higher death rate than the population at large, we used the rate for the U.S. non-black population to make projections for 1988. This procedure overestimated the number of persons in the highest age group who would survive for five years. The Federation death statistics explain this finding through a higher than usual death rate.

Again, it would be useful for the Federation to introduce and perfect a death registration system that keeps up with the age at death so that better indicators are available for statistical purposes.

#### Life Table Estimates

We suggest, in the absence of better records, projecting the age distribution of the 1992 population by again applying survival ratios for each age group based on recent life tables for the white population of the U.S. and computing the expected number of births from age specific fertility ratios of the present female white population. The problems with this method are clear. Over the last five years the birth rate and the death rate of the Jewish Federation population was actually higher than that for the white population as a whole. This is therefore a conservative estimate of births.

In regard to births, the decision is occasioned partly by the observation that the number of births for 1987 was lower than that in previous years and partly by a desire not to overreact to what may be a temporary rise in births during the other years since 1982. In any case, the problems with predicting births should be taken seriously, and planning for preschoolers should proceed after obtaining as much information as possible on who is moving to Nashville and how many are affiliating with the Federation with how many children.

Another drawback to the method we are choosing to project the population is that, as noted above, the non-black death rate may be too low for the local Jewish population, particularly if there are large numbers of the "old old." We recommend this method in any case because as we stated before, we believe that the aging of the U.S. population as a whole is beginning to catch up with the aging of the Jewish population.

To handle the difficulties that migration causes for the age distribution, we propose increasing the number of births slightly over what the life table would project to take into account differential affiliation of migrants with young children.

If the ratio of known to unknown population stays the same, the total population in 1992 would be around 5714. This is based on 4514 persons surviving from the present population plus net migration of 30 persons per year and a known population of 79%. With a household size of 2.33, there would be almost 2453 households.

In general we urge caution. These projections are only broad guidelines. There is no crystal ball; there are only shadowy indications of the future. But while the past does not predict the future, it can serve to enlighten us about possibilities. The projections must be understood simply as what the population would look like in 1992 if the simplifying assumptions made turn out to have been appropriate.

The Council of Jewish Federations describes two communities with about 5,000 Jews. One is an aging community. The other is in the Sunbelt and has grown to possibly 15,000. The needs of the communities differ. Neither is Nashville. While the Federation population is aging, the higher birth rate will keep the community vital, and migration should continue.

Nashville may well be at the crossroads that will determine whether it will go the way of the aging community which is really not growing much or whether it will become a center of influx of upwardly-mobile migrants and retiring Jews from other parts of the country. Part of the answer to the question may depend on the willingness of the leadership to follow suggestions from the Council of Jewish Federations to network with other communities for the purpose of easing transition of migrants and to identify, involve, and serve the needs of the expanded population. Otherwise it is possible that out-migration from Nashville could overtake in-migration, and the city could become a stopping point on the way further South or West. Instead, there is evidence that the Nashville/Middle-Tennessee area will meet the challenge of change and become one of the most dynamic centers of Jewish life in the Sunbelt.



PROJECTED AGE DISTRIBUTION OF  
KNOWN JEWISH POPULATION IN 1992

	EXPECTED
10-14	241
15-19	314
20-24	218
25-29	167
30-34	175
35-39	373
40-44	496
45-49	450
50-54	244
55-59	217
60-64	217
65-69	203
70-74	181
75-79	170
80-84	92
85 & over	31
TOTALS	4364

See next page for migration information.

1992 KNOWN POPULATION COMPARED WITH 1988 AND 1982 KNOWN POPULATIONS

AGE	EXPECTED 1992	ACTUAL 1988	ACTUAL 1982
0-4	264	314	274
5-9	311	241	313
10-14	241	314	287
15-19	314	219	304
20-24	218	168	205
25-29	167	176	291
30-34	175	375	406
35-39	373	500	445
40-44	496	456	231
45-49	450	250	197
50-54	244	224	226
55-59	217	228	265
60-64	217	219	240
65-69	203	203	214
70-74	181	202	154
75-79	170	120	115
80-84	92	47	60
85 & over	31	43	56
TOTALS	4364	4299	4283

Note: These figures include an estimate of ages for those in the sample who refused to give their age. Thus the figures are slightly different from those in Table 2 which are based on answered ages only.

The projections are based on estimates of births and deaths. Only the 0-4 group is adjusted for migration and only for 1988. In planning it is important to take into account the fact that the age groups will be affected by migration too.

Those in their 20's may be smaller; those in their 30's larger, etc. It is impossible to predict the exact age distribution as affected by migration because our information is too limited.

In 1982 we projected an additional 200 persons as a net increase in migration over the five-year period. There were more Jewish migrants than that to the area, but fewer(98) affiliated with the Federation. Thus we predict that by 1992 the net migration for the Federation itself will be at the rate of 30 per year or 150 for the 5 year period. This assumes that migration will increase or that the rate of affiliation will increase. If both increase dramatically, the community will obviously grow faster. We make this more conservative prediction based largely on the experience of the last five years. We do not simply extrapolate from the present rate of migration and affiliation, however, since the trend over the long term has been a fairly steady addition to the Federation.

## DESIGN AND METHODS

A joint effort by the long-range planning committee of the Federation and Demographic Data Consultants resulted in the revised questionnaire. An effort was made to keep the 1988 questionnaire as close as possible to the 1982 instrument so that comparisons could be easily made. Among questions asked for the first time were questions about the Observer, recreational activities outside the Jewish Community Center, and , for those not born in Middle Tennessee, reasons for moving to the area.

The questionnaire was pretested and then used to interview a randomly selected sample of households. Of 469 households in the original sample, 26 were chosen by a non-random method explained below; of the 442 in the random sample, 377 participated. Six and three-tenths percent refused to participate, and 8.7% had non-published numbers or were not at home. This completion rate of 85% of the random sample is outstanding for a survey of its kind and surpasses even our own success in the previous Federation survey. The completion rate is a tribute to the persistence of Demographic Data Consultants and the cooperation of the Federation households.

As before, a master list of Federation members provided by the Federation was used as the definition of the known Jewish population in Middle Tennessee. The list was checked for duplicates and these were eliminated along with names of persons whose addresses were outside Middle Tennessee.

In order to describe a larger population than that circumscribed by the master list of the Federation, we used the same method as in 1982 to estimate the size of the Jewish community unidentified by membership in the Federation. The method is that used by Fred Marrarik and Al Chenkin among others to estimate the number of Jewish persons, both nationally and in specific locales, who are not in contact with the groups studying them. The method takes advantage of the fact that a small number of Jewish surnames have been designated as distinctively Jewish. While all persons named Levine are certainly not Jewish, a good number are likely to be.

As before, we listed all names on the Jewish Federation list that were on the list of 35 distinctively Jewish names provided by Professor Chenkin. We compared these names with a list of names of persons with similar surnames in the Nashville and Franklin phone directories. There were 189 such names on the Federation list, 5 fewer than 5 years ago. When the list from the phone book was called, it was determined that 51 of those with distinctive surnames did indeed have at least one household member who was Jewish. Simple mathematics shows that adding the 51 not previously identified households to the 189 on the Federation list gives 240 households with distinctively Jewish names in the area.

Since the Federation had only identified 189, or 79% of the households, it is assumed that at least 21% of the Nashville-Franklin Jewish community is not known to the Federation. This assumption is based on the idea that there seems to be no compelling reason why the Federation should be less likely to have identified households with distinctively Jewish names than those with other names or conversely why households without distinctively Jewish names should be more likely to participate in the Federation. The conservative assumption is made for the purposes of estimation that last names have absolutely no effect on whether or not a person is identified with the Federation or not. Therefore if there are 21% of the homes with distinctive last names unknown to the Federation, there are likely to be at least that proportion of the whole community unknown to the Federation.

The sample of respondents who completed interviews was composed of 377 households randomly selected originally from the master list and 26 respondents added from those not previously known. It should be remembered that about 94% of the sample is the known population, whereas the actual population, as estimated above, includes a much smaller percentage of affiliated persons. Thus to adequately describe those not in contact with the Federation would require a decision to reach out to those not yet identified and affiliated and make them a more integrated part of the Nashville Jewish community. Short of such an effort only a rough estimate of the extent of the unaffiliated can be made and no complete profile can be drawn.

Caution should be exercised in generalizing from the following description of those previously unknown Jewish households and individuals who were interviewed. The average age of the group is similar to that of the larger sample. As before, however, there are a large number of persons in their twenties who are unaffiliated. There are also persons in most other age groups including a number of senior citizens. Sex, marital status, and education of the unaffiliated is like that of the larger known group. Income of the newly identified clusters mainly in three groups, \$50,000-\$74,999 \$30,000-\$49,999, and \$20,000-\$29,999. The group not in contact with the Federation is slightly more likely to be employed by government than the sample at large. Perhaps most importantly, this segment of the population is more likely than the known population to have moved to Nashville/Middle Tennessee in the last five years.