

**UC Berkeley**  
**IURD Working Paper Series**

**Title**

The Effect of Urban Life on Traditional Values

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5gk4t7w7>

**Author**

Fischer, Claude S

**Publication Date**

1974

THE EFFECT OF URBAN LIFE ON TRADITIONAL VALUES\*

Claude S. Fischer

January 1974

Working Paper No. 222

\*The research reported here was supported largely by a fellowship from the Joint Center for Urban Studies of Harvard University and M.I.T. It represents a portion of dissertation work submitted to the Department of Sociology, Harvard University. The survey data used were obtained from the Roper Public Opinion Research Center, the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research and the Institute for Social Research. Neither these institutions nor the original investigators are responsible for the present use and interpretation of the data. Supplementary research funds were provided by Public Health Service Grant MH-18625 to Lee Rainwater, an Office of Education grant to Thomas F. Pettigrew and the Center for the Behavioral Sciences, Harvard. Thanks are rendered to Lee Rainwater, Barbara L. Heyns, David J. Armor, Andre Modigliani, Paul Burstein, Karl Dierup, and Ronald Abeles for helpful comments and assistance.

#### ABSTRACT

Three models predict an association between urbanism and non-traditional behavior: (1) that it is a function of the characteristics of individuals found in cities; (2) that it is due to the anomie of cities; (3) that it is due to the generation of and consequent influence of innovative urban subcultures. Secondary analysis of American survey data on religiosity, church attendance, attitudes toward alcohol and birth control confirm the general urbanism-deviance association. Controlling for covariates suggests that model 1 is inadequate for there remains an independent effect of residence -- albeit a quite small one -- unaccounted for by individual traits. Some suggestive data point to model 3 as the more accurate one.

The common observation that cities harbor unconventional behavior has been fundamental to theories relating urbanism to the individual. As many reviewers have noted, the Chicago School's understanding of urban life was largely founded on interpreting these non-traditional behaviors as evidence of the social disorganization intrinsic to cities. It is the purpose of this paper to investigate, first, whether that common observation is valid, and most importantly, why it is valid. Understanding the mechanism is critical to understanding urbanism itself.

This paper will therefore address the question: What is the effect of urban residence on the individual's adherence to traditional values? Our meanings should be made explicit: By "urban", we refer to the size of population concentrated at a place of settlement -- a demographically-defined rural to urban continuum. (We use this reductionist interpretation in order to avoid begging the question through introduction of sociological correlates into the definition of urban -- cf. arguments in Fischer 1972a:191-2; 1972b:1-3.) By "traditional value", we refer to an explicit norm dominant in a society, or, when in flux and ambiguous, previously dominant in a society. (The usage of traditionalism here is loosely equivalent to the notion of conservatism.) When referring to non-adherence, we will use the term, "deviance", meaning deviation from dominant cultural standards.<sup>1</sup>

Three theories have been proposed to account for an association between urbanism and deviance. The simplest model is that the deviance is a function of the specific characteristics of the individuals residing in cities -- their class, ethnicity, age, etc. (cf. Gans 1962;

Lewis 1965). Secondly, there is the model proposed by Louis Wirth (1938) in which the metropolitan experience itself -- overwhelming, rootless, impersonal and isolating -- generates anomie, and, as a consequence, deviance (cf. discussion in Fischer 1972a). Thirdly, mobilization theories of social change often interpret the city as a node of communication networks. In these centers are concentrated "modernizing agents" in such numbers that innovative subcultures arise which disseminate new perspectives and cultural values. The first to be exposed to these nontraditional ideas are other, proximate urbanites (Deutsch 1961; Sjoberg 1965; cf. also Fischer 1973; Inkeles 1969; Aksoy 1969; Schnaiberg 1971; Portes 1973).

These last two theories, though they differ, are both counterposed to the first in assuming that this urban effect is a contextual one, independent of the individual's own attributes. Both predict that, even after controlling for individual-level variables which contribute to deviance, there will remain a residual relationship between urbanism and deviance. Both imply that the nature of urban life itself -- be it anomic or communicative -- directly promotes deviance (without denying, of course, that mediated effects exist as well). A specific test of this prediction has, as far as we know, not yet been done. We shall make a first effort to do so.

The weight of evidence establishes an association between urbanism and deviance, confirming the common observation. Historically, the city has been and continues to be the locale of innovation (Turner 1940; Jacobs 1969; Thompson 1965; pp. 49-50; Feller 1973). Crime, at least property crime, is usually greater in the cities than in the countryside

(Wolfgang 1970; Hoch 1972). What might be termed "moral deviance" -- illegitimacy, alcoholism, divorce, irreligiosity, political dissent, smoking marijuana -- is more frequent in the city (Clinard 1963; Trice 1966; Argyle 1968; Willitis et. al., 1973; Lipset 1963, pp. 264-267; A.I.P.O. 1972, #82, cf. Swedner 1960:30-45). There are of course exceptions, but the general pattern is persistent.<sup>2</sup>

While this evidence is necessary, it is not sufficient to test the proposition that urban life per se directly fosters non-traditionalism. For that, correlated individual-level variables must be held constant. To conduct that test, we used an assortment of items from a varied set of national surveys. These problems are heterogeneous in their manifest contents, but all have one factor in common: each reflects a traditional-deviant dimension in a sphere of morality. They deal with religious belief and practice, attitudes and behavior with regard to alcohol consumption, attitudes toward sex, and reported experience with family authority patterns. No attempt will be made here to independently deal with any of these single topics in an adequate way. Rather, the intention is to accumulate replications applicable to the general area of traditionalism.

The hypothesis tested is that, across these varied topics, urbanism is associated with less traditionalism, and that the association persists after individual-level covariates are controlled.<sup>3</sup> A large partial association should not be expected, given the large proportion of the variance in the items which is due to their idiosyncratic, manifest contents, and given the stringency of the controls. However, what should be expected is a meaningful degree of cross-item, cross sample consistency.

## Data and Methods

In all, four sets of data were used: (1) American Institute of Public Opinion (Gallup) Surveys, one in 1957, another in 1969. These are representative cross-sections of the American population. (2) The 1968 Michigan Survey Research Center ("SRC") poll, which included an over-sample of blacks (16%). (3) The 1971 wave of the Institute for Social Research Income Dynamics Survey ("Income Dynamics") of heads of household under 60, including a double-sample of poor -- especially, urban poor -- families. (4) The Almond and Verba (1963) Five-Nation Citizenship Survey ("Almond and Verba"), taken in the United States, United Kingdom, West Germany, Italy, and non-rural Mexico.<sup>4</sup>

The surveys differ from each other in the specific indices of urbanism they present, but in all cases, they permitted use of a size-of-community measure. Important effects should be able to survive such variations.

The general procedure for most items and scales was to cross-tabulate them against community size in order to establish zero-order associations. Then, cross-tabulation controls were imposed to the degree to which sample sizes allowed and average within-subtable associations were calculated. In addition, regression analysis was performed to determine the partial associations of community size with the dependent variables when a large number of covariates are controlled. Tables 1, 3, 4, and 5 present zero-order results. Tables 2 and 5 present the effects of partialling, with the control variables indicated in notes to the tables.

In choosing control variables, we were somewhat constrained by the information available in a given survey. However, we were sensitive to the fact that urban dwellers differ from rural ones on a variety of

characteristics which in turn affect social attitudes, among them, age, stage in the life-cycle, religion, race, region and social class factors, especially education. It was usually possible to control for most of these, and, at a minimum (in the table analysis) for those the data indicated were most likely to foster spurious correlations. We have been duly reminded of the need to eliminate any possible individual-level explanations of contextual effects (Hauser, 1970).

A brief note on the use of size as the measure of urbanism: While the various criteria of "urbanism" have been debated, often vigorously, it is our contention, on theoretical grounds, that size is indeed the core element of urbanism (Fischer 1972). There are frequent measurement problems in delimiting urban areas. However, the consistency of findings elsewhere as well as here suggests that basic trends persist despite this definitional noise.

## Results

Religiosity and Church Attendance. Religiosity is not a unitary phenomena, and its different facets can lead to different predictions about its association with urbanism. Lenski (1963) argues in a Wirthian mode that the secularization and segmentalization of life in cities reduces religiosity, defined as intensity of faith. Herberg (1960) also adopts this premise about urban life, but argues that religiosity increases, precisely because it is an attempt to establish an identity in an impersonal environment (--religiosity as formal social integration).

For our purposes, we can distinguish belief from practice. While each probably interacts with urbanism in a somewhat different manner, both contain the traditionalism dimension which we are testing. Both should be negatively associated with city size after controls are applied.



To a certain extent, we are replicating and extending a recent study by Nelsen, Yokely and Madron (1971). Using American Gallup poll data, they found that orthodox beliefs decreased with increases in community size, but measures more indicative of practice did not. The orthodoxy effect persisted within levels of sex, education, age, region and religion. In the work below, we extended the analysis by using multiple samples and simultaneous multiple controls to isolate an independent urban effect. A religiosity scale was used to examine belief, and church attendance to examine practice.

The religiosity scale was created from items in the 1957 Gallup poll. These items are:

1. Do you believe that Jesus Christ was the son of God or just a man?
2. Do you believe that there is or is not a devil?
3. Do you think a person can be a Christian even if he doesn't believe every word of the New Testament is true?
4. Do you believe that there is or is not life after death?
5. Do you think that a person can be a Christian if he doesn't go to church?
6. Do you believe that religion can answer all or most of today's problems or is it largely old-fashioned and out of date?

Scoring these items in an orthodox direction and summing them yielded a scale with a reliability (alpha) of .66. Dichotomizing the scale and cross-tabulating it against community size yielded the results in Table 1, Panel A:  $\alpha_{\tau_b}$  of -.213. We find that religiosity decreased with community size and thus replicate previous findings.

The 1968 SRC survey also contained a religiosity probe, the text of which is:

Here are four statements about the Bible, and I'd like you to tell me which is closest to your view: 1. The Bible is God's Word and all it says is true; 2. The Bible was written by men inspired by God, but it contains some human errors; 3. The Bible is a good book because it was written by wise men, but God had nothing to do with it; 4. The Bible was written by men who lived so long ago that it is worth very little today.

(Scored in a religious direction.)

The relationship between making the most religious response and community size is displayed in Panel B of Table 1:  $\alpha_p$  of  $-.161$ .

Both these data sets indicate that the probability of discovering a conventionally religious person decreases with an increase in community size. However, to test our explanations for this effect, it was necessary to apply controls. We chose to control as many individual-level and confounding attributes as were available, meaningful and practical in order to isolate a contextual effect of community. (See the discussion by Hauser [1970] on the need for stringent controls to establish contextual effects.) The results of that procedure are shown in Table 2, Item 1. The first two columns of the table report the results of the cross-tabulation analysis.

The zero-order  $\tau_b$  is presented initially. (For the Gallup items reported throughout Table 2, community size was dichotomized at 25,000.) Then, controls were applied. They are listed in footnotes to the table. Subtables which had cells with an expected frequency of less than five were collapsed across levels when necessary (e.g., Protestant Southern "grade school" and "some high school" respondents were grouped together.) The weighted average of the subtable  $\tau_b$ 's was calculated (Blalock 1961: 234-242) and is presented in the second column.

The right-hand side of the table reveals the results of the regression analysis. The initial column displays the zero-order Pearson  $r$  between community size and the dependent variables. (The maximum number of categories in each variable was used for these calculations.)<sup>5</sup> The next column contains the Nth-order partial. (Again, the variables which were controlled are indicated in notes to the table.) The last column presents the proportion of the explained variance which community size adds once all other variables have entered the equation (--the increase in  $R^2$  over the new total  $R^2$ ). This measure provides a means of evaluating the relative contribution of community size to explaining the dependent variables, and partly compensates for lower than optimal reliabilities.

The data show that the association of community size with the Gallup religiosity scale persisted after controls for individual-level variables were applied. The association with the single "Bible" item in the SRC survey became marginal, though in the predicted direction.<sup>6</sup>

With regard to religious practice, predictions vary. The hypothesis consistent with the present model is of less observance in cities. (On the other hand, Herberg [1960] and Winter [1964] argue that church attendance, at least, should increase with urbanism because the church

provides a substitute for missing community integration.) Consistent with the hypothesis, two recent reviews concluded that "the larger the community, the lower the level of religious observance" (Argale 1968, p. 425; Carlos 1970).

All four surveys used here included measures of church attendance. The results for these probes are presented in Table 3.

Contrary to the generalization, but consistent with Nelsen et al. (1971) and with other Gallup polls (A.I.P.O., #19, 1967; #31, 1968; #55, 1970), there was a negligible association of church attendance to city size in the North American data.<sup>7</sup> However, in the European nations of the Almond and Verba study, there was some negative association with community size.

When the effects of controlling for covariates are assessed -- in Table 2, Item 2 -- the negative associations are found to be strengthened, though the North American ones are still of only marginal substantive significance.

The SRC data suggest an explanation for the lack of relationship in the United States samples. When size of S.M.S.A. was crossed by a center city-suburb factor in an analysis of variance design, there was a significant ( $p = .002$ ) interaction: large S.M.S.A. suburbanites attended a great deal more than did their center-city neighbors. When this design was in turn crossed by a variable indicating whether or not the respondent had a child in the home, the results revealed that one sub-group stood out alone from the large community size-low attendance pattern: large S.M.S.A. suburbanites with children. These people were

the greatest attenders of all (by self-report, of course). The other large S.M.S.A. groups (no-children suburbanites, children and no-children center city people) were the lowest attenders of all. The three-way interaction was significant at  $p < .10$ ; and suburbanites with children differed from those without children and from center-city parents at  $p < .02$  in each case. One implication to be drawn is that the "social participation" component of church attendance -- as opposed to the religiosity component -- may be leading "familistic" suburbanites to church and masking the predicted effects. Consistent with this explanation was Carlos' (1970) finding that distance from Montreal city-center was positively associated with Roman Catholic attendance at mass, but negatively associated with devotional practices.<sup>8</sup>

The SRC data also suggest that the negative effect of urbanism on attendance may be mainly a large metropolis effect. Reported attendance dropped precipitously among residents of the New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago areas. The 16th order partial (see note d of Table 2 for the 16 controls) for a dummy variable representing these three places was  $-.059$  ( $p < .05$ ), as opposed to the  $-.037$  (N.S.) reported in Table 2, Item 2B, for community size as a whole.<sup>9</sup>

In sum, though the associations are quite small, there is some indication that urbanism has an independent effect on traditionalism as reflected in religiosity, thereby supporting the second and third urbanism models.

Attitudes Toward Alcohol. Attitudes toward drinking form another domain which represents traditionalism. Such attitudes tend to be associated with a general conservative morality (Pullman 1958; Trice 1966, p. 18; and, here: the index used below correlated with the

religiosity scale at .36). The prediction is that conservative attitudes towards drinking should be independently and negatively associated with urbanism.<sup>10</sup>

In general, urban persons are more favorable to drinking and drink more themselves (Trice 1966, pp. 18, 22). This was reflected in the present data. Table 4 displays a 1957 Gallup item asking persons whether or not they indulged. This item was then combined to form a scale with two others: "Do you object to women drinking in public places such as bars and restaurants or not?", and "Would you favor or oppose a law forbidding the sale of all beer, wine and liquor throughout the nation?" (alpha = .68). With the scale as a whole -- and each item separately -- there was a strong monotonic association with community size.

Table 2, Item 3 shows that the association persisted after controls, thereby replicating the modest effect demonstrated with religiosity. No major interactions were found.

Sexual morality. This value area is certainly one which should reflect a general traditional-deviant dimension. Liberal attitudes towards premarital sexual behavior are clearly associated with community size (Reiss 1967; A.I.P.O., #52, 1969). Other topics in this sphere also show more traditionalism in smaller towns (at least in terms of expressed values, if not behavior): dissemination of birth control (A.I.P.O., #39, 1968; #57, 1970); easing abortion laws (#54, 1969); easing divorce laws (#41, 1968); tolerance of nude photographs, actors and topless waitresses (#49, 1969); the proper age for unchaperoned

dates (in France: Goode 1963:31); the propriety of kissing in public (in the Netherlands: Polls, Fall, 1966:57), and so on.

To test whether these associations might be explained by the personal attributes of urban and rural persons, a 1969 Gallup item on dissemination of birth control information to teen-age girls was analyzed. Table 4, line 3, shows the expected negative association of the traditionalistic response with community size. Table 2, Item 4, shows the association to persist after controls. This is the third realm of traditionalism which shows the same independent effect of urbanism.

Family Authority Patterns. The nature of authority in the family (or, at least, the Western ideal) can also be placed on a traditionalism dimension, with patriarchal forms at the conservative end. There is some evidence to support the commonplace notion of greater liberalism in urban households. Douvan and Adelson (1966:310-315) found, in national surveys of adolescents, rebellion and precocious adulthood among large-city youth compared to traditional parental dominance in the families of rural youth. Urbanites in Holland were less likely to state an adherence to traditional child-rearing than were their rural countrymen (Polls, Winter, 1967:69), and Danish city residents were more likely to report that the father performed housework than were non-city people (Polls, Summer, 1967:23). (However, in a comparison of Detroit families with a sample of farm families, Blood and Wolfe [1960] failed to find differences in family power structure; nor did they report any differences by place of origin [cf. Centers, Raven and Rodriguez 1971, for comments].)

The cross-national Almond and Verba survey contained a number of items on family authority. Scales constructed of these items which

referred to the respondent's present patterns of decision-making turned out to have poor cross-national reliability. Two scales dealing with the person's family of origin were sufficiently reliable to use. (The reliabilities are reported in Table 5, last rows of Panels A and B.) The first, concerning the individual's influence in his family, was constructed of the following items:

1. As you were growing up, let's say when you were around 16, how much influence do you remember having in family decisions affecting yourself? Did you have much influence, some or none at all?
2. At around the same time, if a decision was made that you didn't like, did you feel free to complain, did you feel a little uneasy about complaining, or was it better not to complain?
3. If you complained, did it make any difference in your parents' decision? Did it make a lot of difference, some or none?
4. At the same time, did you remember ever actually complaining -- do you remember doing this often, once in a while or never?
5. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the amount of influence you had in family decisions when you were about 16?

The items were scored in a "no influence," "dissatisfied," direction, indicating an authoritarian pattern.

This scale was then correlated with the size of town in which the individual was born. Results are displayed in Panel A of Table 5.



Three methodological points should be noted: (a) All the items were worded in the same direction, posing a potential response set problem (though the behavioral nature of the responses asked for should help mitigate against that problem). (b) The items deal with the age of 16, but were correlated with community size at birth. (Place at age 16 was unavailable.) This probably worked to reduce the correlations. (c) The first set of controls which were applied were demographic ones temporarily prior to age 16: sex, age, race and religion. It would have been desirable to control for parental social class, but that was unavailable. Given the inheritance of status, one might consider using present social class as a substitute for parental class, but that, we believe, violates the logic of the causal analysis. (E.g., the nature of the child-rearing may determine future social class.) Nevertheless, such an operation was performed and is presented in Table 5 for the reader's own evaluation.

The results trended marginally in the predicted direction of more youth influence in urban families, but for one anomaly: Italy. That result indicates that there was a significant independent effect of community size, but in the traditional direction! The reasons for this outcome may lie in the nature of the survey or in the nature of Italian families, but we will not detour here to pursue the problem.

Instead, we turn to the second scale measuring decision-making in the respondents' family of origin, this one dealing with the division of authority between the parents. It contained the following two items:

1. We're interested in how decisions were made in your family when you were a child, let's say when you were 16. Here's a list of ways of making family decisions. By and large, how were

decisions made in your family? [Responses:] By and large, father made decision; by and large, mother made decision; both parents acted together; both parents acted individually.

2. What about decisions on the punishment of children for misbehavior. How were these made? [Responses same.]

The items were scored from low for "mother" to high for "father."

The results are presented in Panel B of Table 5. Though largely non-significant, they are in the predicted direction of less paternal authority in urban homes. (The low scale reliabilities should direct attention to the "% of explained variance" row which indicates that size of community made important contributions to that variance which could be accounted for.) Though the two decision scales are largely independent of each other (last row of Table 5), they show a similar, somewhat negative, pattern (except that the Italian anomaly is muted for the decision-making scale.)

Though these data are more ambiguous than we would have desired, their general pattern seems again to confirm the hypotheses.

#### Discussion

Setting aside the subtleties, complexities, and specific aspects of the data we have considered, and searching it for some general consensus, it seems fair to draw the following two conclusions: (1) Traditionalism -- in terms of expressed values -- is negatively associated with community size. Though two exceptions were found here -- church attendance in North America and family authority patterns in Italy -- the persistent trend of the present data and much data reported by others is in that direction.

(2) There seems to be a slight but real independent effect of urbanism in the non-traditional direction, net of mediating individual characteristics. This is not an incontrovertible conclusion for the partial associations were, in most cases, quite small. In addition, it can always be argued that there remained other individual-level variables left uncontrolled (cf. Hauser 1970). Thirdly, there remained the hard-to-disentangle problem of self-selection.<sup>11</sup> However, considering the cautions against expecting high associations which we advanced earlier, the fact that 22 out of 24 highly controlled partial correlations were negative and 14 of those statistically significant (at  $p < .05$ ), it would seem harder to make the case that the hypothesis being tested was not supported. (Restated: Even though the correlations are quite small, the result of consequence is the pattern of associations. By sign test, the number of negative partial correlations is significant at  $p < .01$ , and the number of significant ones is 14 times greater than chance expectation.)

If it is the case that urban residence has an independent effect on traditionalism, there still remains the issue of whether the urban anomie or urban value-diffusion model is the better explanation of that effect.

We can provide two cautious suggestions in this regard by first making the following distinctions: (1) The Wirthian model presumes that the effects of urbanism are due to the nature of population concentrations per se not to the specific attributes of the populations within the city (cf. Fischer 1972a). The value-diffusion model requires the presence of specific groups ("modernizing agents") in the urban environment who diffuse innovation, and thus it makes the effects of

urbanism contingent upon the particular social composition of a specific city. (That composition is considered to be partly a function of size.)

(2) The urban anomie model emphasizes synchronic processes -- impersonality, anonymity, disorganization, etc. -- in shaping deviance. The communications model, stressing cultural transmission, implies that the effects of urbanism can be carried over time by people as part of their learnt value system.

Two analyses of the data imply that the value-transmission model is more accurate with regard to these distinctions: (1) For the SRC 1968 survey, we obtained data on respondents' counties of residence -- the closest practical unit to their specific communities. These data were merged with the interview material.<sup>12</sup> Two scales derived from a factor analysis -- (a) county socio-economic level and (b) the presence in the county of "primary individuals"<sup>13</sup> -- and the proportion non-white were entered into the regression analysis after the 16th-order partials were calculated. (The reader will recall that two variables of a contextual nature were already among the 16 previously entered -- region of birth and region of present residence; see note 3.) The effect for both the SRC items -- "Bible" and church attendance -- was to reduce the community size partial correlation to nil. The  $-.057$  of Table 2, Item 1B, was reversed to  $+.014$ . At the same time, the three county variables had multiple partial R's of  $.12$  in both cases ( $p < .001$ ). The implication is that the social composition of these urban areas (above and beyond the individual's own social traits) explain what effects size may have.<sup>14</sup>

(3) Regarding the distinction on cultural persistence, the independent influence of community of origin argues that value transmission processes may be a more valid explanation of urban effects than

is contemporaneous ecology. In much of the data, when it was available, size of community of origin ("raised," "grew up," or "born" in) had close to the same level of association with the dependent variables as did size of present community. For the Gallup surveys, that information was not available, but for the other church attendance data and the SRC "Bible" item it was. In those cases, the zero-order  $r$ 's for place of origin were about  $\pm .03$  different than the  $r$ 's for present place. The partial correlations tended to differ by about the same amount. In a few cases, size of community of origin was significantly correlated with the dependent measure even after size of present place -- and everything else -- was controlled.<sup>15</sup> The relative importance of origin, removed many years from current opinion, implies that a model which emphasizes the process of socialization rather than synchronic reactions to the environment may be the more accurate one.

#### Conclusions

(1) A variety of published data confirms the observation that urban residence is associated with deviance from traditional values.

(2) Secondary analysis of four national surveys containing items indexing traditionalism indicates that urban residence per se has small but real effects on adherence to traditional values. That is, urban-rural variations in individual characteristics do not completely explain the urbanism-deviance association.

(3) Two theories could account for this small residual effect: that urban life generates anomie and social disorganization; and that cities generate deviant subcultures which influence others around them. Some suggestive evidence supports the latter model.

One would not wish to exaggerate the strength of these effects (Individual attributes are clearly more important than ecological factors), nor the conclusiveness of these results, nor to minimize the complexity of the issue dealt with here. But, hopefully, this is just an opening attempt to resolve empirically a critical issue in urban theory -- the relationship of urbanism to deviance.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>We recognize the complexity involved in the concepts of tradition and deviance. There is no intention of referring to tradition in any of its usages in theories of unilineal evolution, nor in theories of psychological dimensions of modernism. It refers here merely to a norm adhered to by a plurality of a society (or, when changing, previously so adhered to). Similarly, "deviance" is not meant to connote negative sanctioning; nor do we ignore subcultural variations. It is simply deviation from that central norm. Though the theoretical fogs around these terms are dense (cf. Gusfield 1967; Armer and Schnaiberg 1972), the present usages should be sufficiently concrete.

<sup>2</sup>Some forms of deviance, of course, almost require rural residence (e.g., cattle-rustling). More seriously, there are other reversals, for example, divorce in Japan and Egypt (Kawashima and Steiner 1960; Abu-Lughod 1964). This raises the problem of determining what is traditional and what is deviant. (Easy divorce is traditional in both nations.)

<sup>3</sup>It should be noted that in the analysis we also controlled for region of the country which is, of course, not an individual-level attribute. We did so because we interpret region (e.g., South in the United States) to be a proxy for individual cultural attributes hard to measure in another way (e.g., the historical experiences of the family line).

This procedure is, of course, debatable. Its effect is to prejudice the tests against the hypotheses.

<sup>4</sup>The Gallup data was obtained from the Roper Public Opinion Center via the Center for the Behavioral Sciences, Harvard University. The SRC and Almond and Verba surveys were obtained from the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research. "Income Dynamics" was obtained by Professor Lee Rainwater from I.S.R. on Public Health Service grant MH-18625. Parts of the data analysis were conducted together with Andre Modigliani and Paul Burstein.

<sup>5</sup>Community size was measured by ordinal scales of five to ten categories in the various surveys, except for the Gallup poll. There, an internal scale was simulated by assigning numbers to the categories equal to 1/1000 of the lower limit of these categories (e.g., 1000 for communities of one million or more).

<sup>6</sup>Some interactions can be noted in passing: The associations were weak or non-existent among Catholics (both in SRC and Gallup -- which is similar to the Nelsen et al. findings); the effects were weakened when specific Protestant denominations were examined in the SRC poll (as one might expect, since choice of denomination is itself, to a certain extent, a reflection of religiosity). Interestingly, there was an association among those who reported no religion (SRC:  $t_b = -.256$ ,  $\chi^2_p = .075$ ,  $N = 36$ ).

The SRC data permitted an analysis of variance test of the center city-suburb X S.M.S.A. interaction. Before controls were applied, there was none. Only the main effect of S.M.S.A. size was significant. After controls for demographic, class and life-cycle variables were applied, there was a significant ( $p = .003$ ) interaction in that the size-irreligiosity association was only true for center-city residents.



<sup>7</sup>The correlation between the 1957 church attendance variable and the 1957 religiosity scale is .27. (In the SRC data, the correlation between the "Bible" item and attendance is also .27.)

<sup>8</sup>The center city-suburb analysis sheds light on some contradictory literature in the area. Carlos (1970) and Tallman and Morgner (1970) found church attendance to be greater in suburbs than in the center-city. Zimmer and Hawley (1959) and Hawley and Zimmer (1971) found the opposite. The resolution is that each study dealt with urban areas of different sizes, the first two with large metropolises (Montreal, Minneapolis-St. Paul), the latter two with smaller urban areas. The SRC data reveal that in the larger S.M.S.A.'s (e.g., Chicago, Boston, San Francisco), suburbanites were the more attendant. In smaller S.M.S.A.'s, it was just the contrary. Speculations as to why this is the case, we shall leave to others.

<sup>9</sup>Interactions: The attendance effect was, as was the religiosity effect of urbanism, generally greater among Protestants than among Catholics or Jews. This was not, however, the case for German or Italian Catholics where a substantial town-size effect was observed.

<sup>10</sup>There is some question about the validity of the Gallup drinking item (Keller 1962). The possibility that we are not measuring behavior but, instead, perceived proper behavior, is always possible. Even the latter is, however, a commentary on traditionalism.

<sup>11</sup>There are two indications in the data that imply that self-selection does not account for our results: (1) When the analyses were performed on subsamples of persons who were living in communities of the same size as those within which they were born or raised (i.e., people

who had not selected themselves into a new size category), the effects that were observed were not reduced and were occasionally strengthened (in all but the Gallup data where community of origin was not available).

(2) The independent effect of size of community of origin (discussed below) also indicates that self-selection is probably not the explanation for the results.

<sup>12</sup>Thanks to the Servicing Section of the Inter-University Consortium for its assistance in this process.

<sup>13</sup>The factor scales were constructed from 1970 Housing Census data (the only 1970 census data then available) and some 1960 data. County SES was composed of median education (1960), median rent and percent of units without plumbing (1970). Alpha was .85. "Primary individuals" was composed of percent population over 65, percent unmarried females, number of people per household and number of rooms per house (as measures of single individuals). Alpha was .78.

<sup>14</sup>An objection can be raised to the use of the "primary individuals" county factor as a control. Reflecting the presence of single people as it does, it may be precisely the "anomie" variable which Wirth described as the mediator of urbanism and deviance. It is composed of items such as percent unmarried females which some investigators have used as indices of anomie.

We do not agree that this variable necessarily measures anything more than population composition (i.e., that unmarried females necessarily imply anomie in the Durkheimian sense). Nevertheless, we experimented with excluding it. County SES and county non-white explain away the urban correlation almost as well as the three combined. For "Bible," the

community size correlation is reduced by these two controls from -.057 to +.016 (and the multiple partial R for the two controls is .09,  $p < .01$ ). For church attendance, the two reduce the partial correlation from -.037 to +.008 (multiple partial R = .07,  $p < .05$ ).

While the presence of "singles" is a statistically significant force towards non-traditionalism, it does not seem to be the critical intervening variable explaining the urban effect.

<sup>15</sup>Specifically: In the SRC "Bible" item, the 20th-order partial for size of community raised in was -.047 ( $p < .10$ ). In the Income Dynamics church attendance data, the partial after entry of current community size was -.060 ( $p < .001$ ). In the British and German attendance results, the similar partials for size of town born in were -.089 and -.082 (both  $p < .01$ ), respectively.

## REFERENCES

- Abu-Lughod, J. 1964. "Urban-Rural Differences as a Function of the Demographic Transition: Egyptian Data and an Analytic Model." American Journal of Sociology 69 (March): 476-490.
- Aksoy, S. 1969. "The Impact of Urbanization on Change." Mimeo. Harvard University Center for International Affairs (January).
- Almond, G. and S. Verba. 1963. The Civic Culture. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- American Institute of Public Opinion (A.I.P.O.) Gallup Opinion Index. Princeton: A.I.P.O.
- Argyle, M. 1968. "Religious Observance." In D. L. Sills (Editor) International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: MacMillan and Free Press.
- Armer, M. and A. Schnaiberg. 1972. "Measuring Individual Modernity." American Sociological Review 37 (June): 301-316.
- Blalock, H. M. 1960. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Blood, R. O. and D. M. Wolfe. 1960. Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living. New York: Free Press.
- Carlos, S. 1970. "Suburban-Urban Religious Participation." American Journal of Sociology 75 (March): 742-759.
- Centers, R., B. H. Raven and A. Rodriguez. 1971. "Conjugal Power Structure," American Sociological Review 36 (April): 264-277.

- Clinard, M. B. 1963. "Deviant Behavior: Urban-Rural Contrasts."  
 In C. E. Elias, Jr., J. Gilles and S. Reimer (Editors) 1964.  
Metropolis: Values in Conflict. Belmont, California: Wadsworth:  
 237-244.
- Deutsch, K. 1961. "Social Mobilization and Political Development."  
American Political Science Review 55 (December): 493-515.
- Douvan, E. and J. Adelson. 1966. The Adolescent Experience. New York:  
 Wiley.
- Feller, I. 1973. "Determinants of the Composition of Urban Invention."  
Economic Geography 49 (January): 47-58.
- Fischer, C. S. 1972a. "'Urbanism as a Way of Life:' A Review and an  
 Agenda." Sociological Methods and Research 1 (November): 187-242.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 1972b. "The Metropolitan Experience." Paper prepared for the  
 National Academy of Sciences; Working Paper #195, Institute of  
 Urban and Regional Development, Berkeley.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. "Toward a Subcultural Theory of Urbanism." Paper  
 presented to The American Sociological Association, New York City.
- Gans, H. J. 1962. "Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life." In  
 A. M. Rose (Ed.), Human Behavior and Social Processes. Boston:  
 Houghton-Mifflin: 625-648.
- Goode, W. J. 1963. World Revolution and Family Patterns. New York:  
 Free Press.
- Gosfield, J. R. 1967. "Tradition and Modernity: Misplaced Polarities  
 in the Study of Social Change." American Journal of Sociology 72  
 (January): 351-362.
- Hauser, R. M. 1970. "Context and Consex: A Cautionary Tale."  
American Journal of Sociology 75 (January): 645-664.

- Hawley, A. H. and B. G. Zimmer. 1970. The Metropolitan Community. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Herberg, W. 1960. Protestant, Catholic, Jew. Garden City, New York: Anchor.
- Hoch, I. 1972. "Income and city size." Urban Studies 9 (October): 299-328.
- Inkeles, A. 1969. "Making Men Modern: On the Causes and Consequences of Individual Change in Six Developing Countries." American Journal of Sociology 75 (September): 208-225.
- Jacobs, J. 1969. The Economy of Cities. New York: Random House.
- Kawashima, T. and K. Steiner. 1960. "Modernization and Divorce Rates in Japan." Economic Development and Cultural Change 9 (October): Pt. II, 213-239.
- Keller, M. 1962. "The Definition of Alcoholism and the Estimation of its Prevalence." In D. J. Pittman and C. R. Snyder (Editors) Society, Culture and Drinking Patterns. New York: Wiley: 310-329.
- Lenski, G. 1963. The Religious Factor. Garden City, New York: Anchor.
- Lewis, O. 1965. "Further Observations on the Folk-Urban Continuum with Special Reference to Mexico City." In P. H. Hauser and L. Schnore (Eds.), The Study of Urbanization. New York: John Wiley: 491-503.
- Lipset, S. M. 1963. Political Man. Garden City, New York: Anchor.
- Nelson, H. M., R. L. Yokley and T. W. Madron. 1971. "Rural-Urban Differences in Religiosity." Rural Sociology 36 (September): 389-396.
- Portes, A. 1973. "The factorial structure of modernity," American Journal of Sociology 79 (July): 15-44.
- Pullman, D. R. 1958. "Some Social Correlates of Attitudes Toward the Use of Alcoholic Beverages." Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol 19 (December): 623.

- Reiss, I. 1967. The Social Context of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness.  
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Schnaiberg, A. 1971. "The Modernizing Impact of Urbanization: A  
Causal Analysis." Economic Development and Cultural Change 20  
(October): 80-104.
- Sjoberg, G. 1965. "Cities in Developing and in Industrial Societies:  
A Cross-Cultural Analysis." In P. H. Hauser and L. F. Schnore (Eds.),  
The Study of Urbanization. New York: Wiley: 312-363.
- Swedner, H. 1960. Ecological Differentiation of Habits and Attitudes.  
Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup.
- Tallman, I. and R. Morgner. 1970. "Life-Style Differences Among Urban  
and Suburban Blue Collar Families." Social Forces 48 (March): 334-348.
- Thompson, W. R. 1965. A Preface to Urban Economics. Baltimore:  
Johns Hopkins.
- Trice, H. M. 1966. Alcoholism in America. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Turner, R. E. 1940. "The Industrial City: Center of Cultural Change."  
In C. F. Ware (Ed.), The Cultural Approach to History. New York:  
Columbia University Press: 228-242.
- Willitis, F. K., R. C. Bealer and D. M. Crider. 1973. "Leveling of  
attitudes in mass society: Rurality and traditional morality in  
America." Rural Sociology 38 (Spring): 36-45.
- Winter, G. 1964. "The Suburban Captivity of the Churches." In  
C. E. Elias, Jr., J. Gillies and S. Riemer (Eds.), Metropolis:  
Values in Conflict. Belmont, California: Wadsworth: 79-84.
- Wirth, L. 1938. "Urbanism as a Way of Life." American Journal of  
Sociology 44 (July): 3-24.

Wolfgang, M. E. 1970. "Urban Crime." In J. Q. Wilson (Editor)

The Metropolitan Enigma. Garden City, New York: Anchor: 270-311.

Zimmer, B. G. and A. H. Hawley. 1959. "Suburbanization and Church

Participation." Social Forces 37 (May): 348-354.



Table 1. The Association of Religiosity Measures to Size of Community,  
by Survey.

Panel A. Gallup Religiosity Scale <sup>a</sup> (1957)							
		Size of Community <sup>b</sup>				Total	$\tau_b$
		Farm & Country	Under 25,000	25,000- 500,000	500,000 +		
% HIGH		71.1	71.4	57.7	42.9	59.7	-.213***
	<u>N=</u>	(450)	(283)	(390)	(452)	(1575)	

  

Panel B. SRC. 1968: Belief in Bible Item <sup>c</sup>						
		Size of Community			Total	$\tau_b$
		Outside S.M.S.A. <sup>d</sup>	S.M.S.A.	Large S.M.S.A.		
% who believe Bible is "All True"		63.0	55.6	40.9	55.2	-.161***
	<u>N=</u>	(697)	(509)	(394)	(1600)	

<sup>a</sup>See text for items in the scale.

<sup>b</sup>Size of city or of central city if respondent lives in a suburb.

<sup>c</sup>The item is presented in the discussion.

<sup>d</sup>Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (urbanized with central cities of 50,000 or more).

\*\*\* p < .001

Table 2. The Association of Traditionalism Items to Community Size, before and after controls, by survey, by item. (Decimals dropped)

Item	Table Analysis		Regression Analysis		
	Before Controls	After Controls <sup>a</sup>	Before Controls	After Controls <sup>a</sup>	
	Zero-Order $\tau_b$	Avg. Within Controls $\tau_b$	Zero-Order $r$	Partial $r$	% of Expl'ned Variance
1. Religiosity					
A. Scale, (Gallup) <sup>c</sup>	-218***	-128**	-287***	-206***	13.5
B. "Bible"(SRC) <sup>d</sup>	-161***	-068	-184***	-057*	1.6
2. Church Attendance					
A. Gallup 1957 <sup>e</sup>	040	048	022	-002	0.0
Gallup 1969 <sup>f</sup>	-001	-009	-015	-076*	12.3
B. SRC 1968 <sup>g</sup>	-024	-064	-021	-037	1.3
C. Income Dyn. <sup>h</sup>	-048***	-053*	-054*	-058*	5.9
D. Almond & Verba <sup>i</sup>					
U.S.A.	-034	-030	-057	-081*	10.0
U.K.	-135***	-139***	-146***	-195***	21.5
Germany	-182***	-168***	-227***	-213***	12.5
Italy	-094**	1	-102**	-136***	11.7
Mexico	-038	1	-054	-048	6.3
3. Drinking (Gallup) <sup>j</sup>					
A. Doesn't drink	-208***	-133***	-205***	-110***	8.0
B. Scale	-241***	-155***	-280***	-150***	6.2
4. Birth Control for Teenagers (Gallup) <sup>k</sup>					
	-103***	-100*	-136***	-110***	19.3

<sup>a</sup>See notes to specific items for controls used. Note also: "% of Expl'ned Variance" refers to that proportion of the total variance explained by all variables which urbanism independently accounts for.

<sup>b</sup>Weighted average of  $\tau_b$ 's for subtables created by controls. See discussion in text.

<sup>c</sup>Table controls were: religion, region (South/nonSouth) and education. Regression controls were: religion (two dummy variables), occupation, education, race, age, sex and region.

- <sup>d</sup>Table controls were: religion and education. Regression controls were: race, sex, Protestantism, Jewish, age, education, occupation, income, stage in the life-cycle (five dummy variables), father's occupation, region raised in and present region (South/nonSouth).
- <sup>e</sup>Table controls were: sex and education. Regression controls were: religion (two dummy variables), sex, education, occupation, income, race, age and region.
- <sup>f</sup>Table controls were: sex and education. Regression controls were: Protestantism, sex, race, education, region, and income.
- <sup>g</sup>Same as in note d.
- <sup>h</sup>Table controls were: religion (with Protestants divided into Baptists and others) and education. Regression controls were: age, race, education, income, occupation, Protestantism, life-cycle stage (five dummy variables).
- <sup>i</sup>Table control was religion. Regression controls were: age, sex, social status (scale composed of education, spouse's education, income and interviewer rating of SES), occupation, life-cycle (five dummy variables), years in present town, region (poor versus rich), and race and Protestantism where appropriate.
- <sup>j</sup>Table controls were region and education. Regression controls were: sex, age, race, Protestantism, occupation, education and region.
- <sup>k</sup>Table controls were Catholicism and education. Regression controls were: education, sex, race, region, Catholicism and income.
- <sup>l</sup>Since there was no variance in religion for these two nations, the control could not be applied.
- \*For table analysis:  $\chi^2$  or summated  $\chi^2$  significant at beyond the .05 level. For regression analysis, F-tests on coefficients significant at beyond the .05 level.
- \*\*...beyond the .01 level.
- \*\*\*...beyond the .001 level.

Table 3. Church Attendance by Community Size, by Survey

Panel A. Gallup: "Did you, yourself, happen to attend church (or synagogue) in the last seven days?"

	Size of Community <sup>a</sup>				Total	$\tau_b$
	Farm & Country	Under 25,000	25,000-500,000	500,000 +		
1957 % "Yes"	49.0	48.5	53.9	51.8	50.9	.027
<u>N=</u>	(461)	(295)	(397)	(469)	(1622)	
1969 % "Yes"	43.1	39.5	42.1	41.3	41.7	-.008
<u>N=</u>	(399)	(253)	(368)	(509)	(1529)	

Panel B. SRC, 1968: "Would you say you go to church regularly, often, seldom or never?"

	Outside S.M.S.A. <sup>b</sup>	S.M.S.A.	Large S.M.S.A.	Total	$\tau_b$
% "often" or "regularly"	55.5	55.6	51.8	54.6	-.024
<u>N=</u>	(712)	(518)	(409)	(1639)	

Panel C. Income Dynamics, 1971: "How often do you go to church?"

	Outside S.M.S.A.	S.M.S.A.	Large S.M.S.A.	Total	$\tau_b$
% "Never"	25.7	24.9	27.9	26.3	
% "once per mo."	17.1	19.6	22.5	20.0	
% "once per week"	17.1	18.0	15.4	16.7	
% more often	40.1	37.5	34.1	37.0	-.048***
<u>N=</u>	(1428)	(1427)	(1959)	(4814)	

(Table 3 Continued)

Panel D. Almond and Verba, c. 1960: "About how often do you attend services?" (Asked only of church members.)

	<u>Under 5,000<sup>c</sup></u>	<u>5,000- 100,000</u>	<u>Over 100,000</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u><math>\tau_b</math></u>
U.S.A., % "weekly," or more	48.9 <u>N=</u> (276)	51.9 (243)	45.5 (409)	48.1 (928)	-.034
U.K., % "occa- sionally," or more	75.3 <u>N=</u> (219)	71.7 (273)	59.8 (358)	67.6 (850)	-.135***
Germany, % "occa- sionally," or more	77.2 <u>N=</u> (342)	65.7 (315)	54.5 (246)	67.0 (903)	-.182
Italy, "weekly," or more	64.9 <u>N=</u> (316)	59.4 (524)	47.4 (114)	59.7 (954)	-.094**
Mexico, "weekly," or more	--- <u>N=</u>	77.8 (418)	74.5 (545)	75.9 (963)	-.038

<sup>a</sup>Size of city or of central city if respondent lives in a suburb.

<sup>b</sup>Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

<sup>c</sup>"Size of Town"

\*\*  $\chi^2$  significant at  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $\chi^2$  significant at  $p < .001$ .

Table 4. Attitudes Towards Drinking and Towards Birth Control,  
by Community Size (Gallup).

Item	Community Size <sup>a</sup>				Total	T <sub>b</sub>
	Under 5,000	5,000- 25,000	25,000- 500,000	500,000 +		
"Do you have occasion to use alcoholic beverages?" 1957						
% "No"	53.9	51.9	39.0	27.0	42.1	-.244***
N=	(460)	(291)	(397)	(466)	(1614)	
Drinking Attitudes Scale <sup>b</sup> , 1957						
% Conservative	53.0	50.5	37.9	20.2	39.5	-.202***
N=	(455)	(283)	(385)	(450)	(1573)	
"Do you think birth control pills should be made available to teenage girls?" 1969						
% "No"	81.2	80.3	77.8	67.6	75.7	-.117***
N=	(398)	(254)	(369)	(506)	(1527)	

<sup>a</sup>Size of city or of central city if respondent lived in suburb.

<sup>b</sup>See text for explanation.

\*\*\* $\chi^2$  significant at  $p < .001$ .

Table 5. Zero-order and Partial Correlations of Family of Origin Decision Patterns with Size of Town Born In, by Nation (Almond and Verba).

Scale	Nation				
	U.S.A.	U.K.	Ger.	Italy	Mexico
A. Influence as a Youth Scale					
Zero-order r	-100**	-064	-168***	+085**	-125***
Partial r <sup>a</sup>	-062	-044	-130***	+088**	-117***
% of Explained Var.	4.2	3.2	16.9	32.6	44.6
Partial r, controlling for status	-020	-018	-080*	+140***	-049
Reliability	.677	.654	.767	.739	.673
N=	(903)	(933)	(874)	(785)	(930)
B. Parental Decision-Making Scale					
Zero-order r	-094**	-058	-081*	+018	-071*
Partial r <sup>a</sup>	-089*	-057	-063	+019	-064
% of Explained Var.	39.8	16.8	11.0	1.5	14.1
Partial r, controlling for status	-088*	-057	-061	+037	-047
Reliability	.562	.633	.633	.714	.567
N=	(816)	(853)	(892)	(920)	(832)
Correlation of Two Scales	.096	.051	.101	.087	.041

<sup>a</sup>Partial controlling for sex, age, and race and religion where appropriate.

\*p < .05

\*\*p < .01

\*\*\*p < .001