

RAPID Number: -11291108



Borrower:

Call #: Soc 18.15

Lending String:

Location: 32044010240232

Patron:

ODYSSEY ENABLED

Journal Title: The Social science journal

Charge

Volume: 22 **Issue:**

Maxcost:

Month/Year: 1985 **Pages:** 89-101

Billing Category:

Article Author:

Borrowing Library:

Article Title: Urbanism, misanthropy and
subcultural processes.

NEW: Main Library

Imprint:

Email:

Special Instructions:

Notes:

Transaction Date: 11/29/2016 10:24:03 AM



Processing Notes:

- Not on Shelf
- Other problem

(please explain why below)

Other Notes:

Initials: _____

RAPID

ILLiad TN: 4791790



THOMAS C. WILSON

Gannon University

URBANISM, MISANTHROPY AND SUBCULTURAL PROCESSES

ABSTRACT

This study tests the proposition drawn from classical and subcultural urban theories that urbanism (i.e., population size) increases misanthropy (i.e., general negative feelings toward others). When relevant demographic variables are controlled, urbanism is found to increase misanthropy to an extent far less than might be expected on the basis of these theories. An inference drawn from subcultural theory, that the impact of urbanism on misanthropy will be strongest among members of relatively large subcultures, is also tested and is confirmed. Several implications are drawn for subcultural theory. First, while the theory correctly emphasized cross-subcultural encounters as a cause of misanthropy, it should more strongly specify that misanthropy results not simply from such encounters, but from the proportion of cross-subcultural encounters to all encounters with strangers. Second, subcultural theory may have overemphasized the misanthropy-inducing nature of city life by too strongly stressing urbanism as a cause both of subculturization and of persons' exposure to alien subcultures, and by overstating the effect of exposure to subcultural aliens on general views toward others.

INTRODUCTION

Evidence is mixed concerning the influence of urbanism on personal sentiments toward others who are not personally known. Most recently (Fischer, 1981), it has been reported that community size is associated with distrust of others, and since the association held even when rural-urban differences in population composition were controlled, it has been interpreted as an independent effect of urbanism. But evidence of this association has not been consistent. In an earlier multi-sample study, Fischer (1973) found an urbanism-distrust association to hold for only one U.S. sample, while no relationship was found—even at the zero-order level—for another sample of Americans. House and Wolf (1978) analyzed four surveys of representative samples of the U.S. population taken between 1952 and 1972, and found urbanism to be independently related to distrust in only one.

The present study will attempt to clarify these contradictory findings by addressing the relationship between urbanism and misanthropy. In this context, misanthropy refers to a general uneasiness and apprehensiveness toward or dislike of personally unknown others (cf. Rosenberg, 1956).

URBANISM'S EFFECTS

That urbanism increases distrust or misanthropy is consistent with classical urban theory's suggestion that urbanism negatively influences the quality of nearly all social relationships (Park, 1916; Simmel, 1950; Wirth, 1938; for a review, see Fischer, 1972; 1984: 28-32). But classical theory has been severely

criticized by later writers, especially Gans (1962a) who argues that phenomena like misanthropy and the way of life they imply result not from urbanism or other ecological processes *per se*, but from persons' social roles as indicated by their demographic characteristics. In this connection, Gans has mentioned three demographic variables: social class, lifecycle stage, and ethnicity (1962a, 1962b). Following Gans, any relationship between urbanism and misanthropy would be expected to vanish when these variables are controlled (see related arguments in Greer, 1962; Lewis, 1965; Young and Willmott, 1957).

More recently, much interest in urbanism's effects has centered on Wirth's (1938) early observation that because of the city's population size, it is impossible for each urbanite to know personally all or even most others he encounters. That is, most persons encountered by the urbanite are strangers. Lofland (1973) notes that often the urbanite's sole basis for a relationship with those around him is the occupation of the same territory at the same time. Fischer (1984) points out that urbanites' perception of such strangers' "strangeness" results not only from their personal unfamiliarity, but because the urban stranger is likely to belong to a different ethnic, racial, class, or age group. One result of continual contact with strangers is the urbanite's tendency to classify others in terms of visible evidence such as dress, physical characteristics, and the like. Other results include fear, revulsion, and distrust directed to unknown others. Reactions of the latter sort seem to depend not so much on the personal threat presented by the stranger as on the degree to which the stranger is regarded as unusual. For example, in a study of a multi-ethnic community Merry (1981) found that Chinese-Americans feared black street youth more than did black or white residents, even though the Chinese-Americans were relatively rarely victimized by them. She concluded that fear among Chinese-Americans in her study ought to be understood as fear of the strange and unknown which both justified and reinforced "hostilities that stem from class conflict and racial and ethnic differences" (Merry, 1981; see similar arguments in Antunes et al., 1977; Brooks, 1974).

Perhaps the most systematic treatment of the effect upon social life of encounters with strangers is that of subcultural theory (Fischer, 1975). It specifies two principal effects of urbanism. First, urbanism (i.e., population size) creates viable social worlds for urbanites by differentiating the population into segments, each of which articulates unique norms, customs, beliefs, and values. As these segments or subcultures grow, attaining a "critical mass" and becoming more "institutionally complete," social life within them becomes more intense, by which is meant the antithesis of alienation and anomie. The second effect follows from the first. As a subculture becomes more complete and intense, its members are perceived to be and actually tend to become more unconventional according to the standards of nonmembers. Nonmembers' interaction with them is likely to be marked by suspicion and uneasiness similar to Simmel's (1950) reserved attitude (see related discussions in Fischer, 1984; Franck, 1980; Korte, 1980). This may account for the tendency of cities to be the sites of open group conflict (Lincoln, 1978; Morgan and Clark, 1973). It certainly leads to the general expectation that urbanites will be more misanthropic toward strangers.

However, an additional inference can be drawn from subcultural theory suggesting that the strength of urbanism's influence on attitudes toward others may depend upon persons' own subcultural affiliations and specifically upon the size of persons' subcultures. Large subcultures can be expected to attain critical mass and to be relatively institutionally complete nearly everywhere, and so members are afforded approximately the same opportunity for contact with co-members regardless of community size. But members living in the city are more likely than members living in less populous places to have encounters with subcultural aliens which results in uneasiness and suspicion. In sum, we can expect that urbanism will increase misanthropy among members of large subcultures because, for them, urban life increases the likelihood that strangers encountered will be outgroup members. Such is not the case for members of small subcultures, however, since small subcultures tend to attain critical mass, completeness, and intensity only in populous areas. In the city, we can expect that members of small subcultures will be more able to live their lives within the boundaries of their subcultures, and that while their encounters with subcultural aliens may increase, so also will their contacts with subcultural co-members. Thus, we can expect that urbanism will have little effect on misanthropy among members of small subcultures since the strangers they encounter in the city, though more numerous, will be no more likely to be outgroup members than strangers encountered in less populous areas.

maybe makes sense, but not sure!

THE PRESENT STUDY

In this study, data from the 1973 through 1980 General Social Surveys (Davis, 1980) will be used to test the relationship between urbanism and misanthropy as well as the inference drawn from subcultural theory that the effect of urbanism on misanthropy is greater among members of large rather than small subcultures.

Misanthropy refers not to dislike for all people, but rather to a dislike for and a feeling of uneasiness and apprehensiveness toward others who are personally unknown. In this study, misanthropy is measured by five items, each tapping respondents' perceptions of "most people." Following Fischer (1973; 1981), responses concerning most people should be understood to refer to most strangers, rather than to friends or kin. Respondents were asked whether, in their opinion, most people merely look out for themselves, whether most people would try to take advantage, and whether or not one can be too careful in dealing with most people. Complete data for these items, included in the 1973, 1975, 1976, 1978, and 1980 surveys, and for the independent variables to be described below, were available for 6,831 of 7,493 cases. Respondents were also asked whether or not he or she knows whom to count on, and whether or not most people care. These items were included in the 1973, 1974, and 1976 surveys, and complete data for them and the necessary independent variables were available for 4,128 of 4,487 cases.¹

In this study urbanism is operationalized as the population size of respondents' community. Three size measures were included in the GSS data and because each has its shortcomings, all will be included in the following analysis.

XNORCSIZ is a seven-point ordinal scale of population size, and SRCBELT is a four-point ordinal size scale. SIZE is a ratio measure of community size. Also included in the analysis is a fourth measure of urbanism, LOGSIZE, which is the log transformation of SIZE.²

Though we expect a direct relationship between urbanism and misanthropy, more than a zero-order relationship is needed to support subcultural theory. To support subcultural theory, any direct relationship between urbanism and misanthropy must persist even when demographic variables suggested by Gans (1962a, 1962b) are controlled. In this study, these controls are respondent's educational attainment and household income for social status; respondent's age, marital status, employment status, and presence of children in the household for lifecycle stage; and respondent's race for ethnicity.³

FINDINGS

In Table 1, we see that there is a very slight tendency for urbanites to be more misanthropic than others. Positive zero-order relationships (*r*'s) between urbanism and misanthropy indicators are found in 15 of 20 cases, but in only 10 cases are the relationships statistically significant. Further, one measure of urbanism (XNORCSIZ) is significantly and negatively related to two indicators of misanthropy. More importantly, the significant positive relationships are very small in magnitude, never exceeding $r = .07$, and averaging $r = .049$.

The first column of beta coefficients for each misanthropy indicator in Table 1 also shows that the effect of urbanism *per se* on misanthropy (i.e., net of variables tapping social status, lifecycle stage, and race) is very slight. These betas result from a series of four regressions carried out for each indicator, in which misanthropy was regressed on SIZE and the control variables; on LOGSIZE and the controls; on SRCBELT and the controls; and on XNORCSIZ and the controls. Net of controls, urban indicators were found to be positively related to misanthropy indicators in 15 of 20 cases, of which only 8 were statistically significant. Even when statistically significant, beta coefficients were extremely small, never exceeding beta = .05 and averaging beta = .041.⁴

In view of these small net relationships between urbanism and misanthropy indicators, it might be argued in support of both subcultural and classical theories that neither claims that urbanism is the only or the most important cause of misanthropy (see a related discussion in Fischer, 1981: 310). It might further be pointed out that in the present analysis, the 8 cases in which urban indicators were found to increase misanthropy net of controls greatly outnumber the single case in which a significant inverse relationship between urbanism and misanthropy was found (i.e., that of XNORCSIZ and "most people care"). But, on the other hand, it must be recognized that the coefficients indicating a significant net relationship between urbanism and misanthropy depend heavily on the present sample's large size for their statistical significance. Moreover, consistent with Gans' (1962a) position, zero-order urbanism-misanthropy relationships have been found both to be more often statistically significant and of greater magnitude than those found when covariates were controlled, suggesting that urbanites are more misanthropic than others at least in part because

Table 1. Correlations between Urbanism and Misanthropy

	Most People Look Out For Themselves (N = 6,831)			Most People Try to Take Advantage (N = 6,831)			Can't Be Too Careful With Most People (N = 6,831)			Don't Know Who To Count On (N = 4,128)			Most People Don't Care (N = 4,128)			
	r	Beta ^a	Beta ^b	r	Beta ^a	Beta ^b	r	Beta ^a	Beta ^b	r	Beta ^a	Beta ^b	r	Beta ^a	Beta ^b	
SIZE	.05*	.03*	.04*	.08*	.05*	.07*	.04*	.01	.03*	.04*	.04*	.05*	.03*	.02	.03*	
LOGSIZE	.06*	.05*	.07*	.07*	.04*	.08*	.04*	.02	.06*	.01	.01	.03	.00	.00	.02	
SRGBELT	.04*	.05*	.06*	.04*	.04*	.06*	.01	.02	.04*	-.00	.02	.04*	-.02	.00	.00	.02
XNORCSIZ	.02	.03*	.04*	.02	.01	.04*	-.02	-.00	.02	-.04*	-.01	-.00	-.06*	-.03*	-.02	

* $p < .05$.^aControl variables include age, marital status, presence of children, employment status, education, income, and race.^bControl variables include all of the above except race.

of their peculiar status, lifecycle stage, and racial characteristics. Perhaps the net urbanism-misanthropy relationships found here might be reduced still further if more or better measures of key demographic dimensions were available for use as controls. On balance, then, we conclude that if urbanism has any independent influence on misanthropy, it is extremely slight, and certainly less than we might expect based on classical or subcultural theories.

This conclusion is at odds with Fischer's (1981) findings of a comparatively strong independent relationship between community size and distrust. While Fischer did not control for race in his study, a race control would likely have made little difference in his finding since his sample was almost entirely white.⁵ However, in the present study the race control is important, and explains much of the urbanism-misanthropy relationship that might otherwise have been taken as an independent effect of urbanism. To begin with, nonwhites—who comprise about 11% of our sample—are both more urban and more misanthropic (with race coded for white, r's between race and misanthropy indicators range between -.12 and -.19 and r's between race and urban indicators range from -.14 to -.25). In addition, without the race control the net influence between urbanism and misanthropy in our data is more often statistically significant and of greater magnitude than that found when race is controlled. The second column of beta coefficients for each misanthropy indicator in Table 1 shows the results of an additional series of regressions of misanthropy on urbanism indicators controlling only for status and lifecycle stage variables. Significant positive urbanism-misanthropy relationships are found in 14 of 20 cases (compared to 8 cases when race is controlled). The highest beta observed is .08 (compared to .05 when race is controlled) and significant positive betas average .051 (compared to .041 when race is controlled).

That urbanism has been found to have a stronger independent influence in Fischer's nearly all-white sample than in our racially mixed sample suggests that the influence of urbanism on misanthropy may vary by race, a possibility that is consistent with the inference earlier drawn from subcultural theory. The large white subculture is likely to provide its members with a viable social world regardless of community size. But in the city, whites are not only more likely to encounter nonwhites because nonwhites are more numerous, but whites are also more likely to perceive nonwhites as subculturally "strange" or unconventional because of nonwhites' greater subcultural intensity. For whites, then, city life implies not only that a greater number of strangers will be encountered, but also that a greater proportion of them will be members of alien racial subcultures. Nonwhites can be expected to encounter more strangers in the city as well. But because their small subcultures are intensified by population size and the resulting urban subcultural processes, more of the strangers they encounter will tend to be the same racial subculture as themselves. As a result, for nonwhites the proportion of members of alien racial subcultures to all strangers encountered can be expected to vary little across the rural-urban continuum.

Whether the influence of urbanism varies by race was tested by repeating our earlier analysis, this time for whites and nonwhites separately. For each

racial group, each indicator of misanthropy was regressed upon SIZE and controls for lifecycle stage and status, upon LOGSIZE and the controls, upon SRCBELT and the controls, and upon XNORCSIZ and the controls. The results are presented in Table 2 which shows that findings for whites are similar to those discussed earlier for the entire sample (which is to be expected, since whites comprise the bulk of the entire sample). Positive urbanism-misanthropy relationships are found in 18 of 20 cases, of which 9 are statistically significant. The significant relationships are slight, never exceeding beta = .06 and averaging beta = .044. Therefore, among whites urbanism seems to have a very slight positive influence on misanthropy.

This conclusion cannot be supported for nonwhites. Because of the small nonwhite sample size and the weak relationship between urbanism and misanthropy, only one of the 20 beta coefficients for nonwhites is statistically significant. Interestingly, it suggests that for nonwhites, urbanism is inversely related to misanthropy (i.e., beta = -.10 for LOGSIZE and "Most people don't care"). In all, 12 of the 20 beta coefficients carry negative signs, and only 8 carry positive signs. If anything, the negative coefficients are of slightly greater magnitude than the positive coefficients (the highest negative coefficient is -.10 and they average -.049; the highest positive coefficient is .07 and they average .038). Thus, among nonwhites there is not even a consistent pattern of weak relationships to suggest that urbanism increases misanthropy.

DISCUSSION

That the slight tendency for urbanism to increase misanthropy is confined to whites, who are members of a large racial subculture, and is not found among nonwhites, who are members of relatively small racial subcultures, is consistent with our inference drawn from subcultural theory that the influence of urbanism on one's level of misanthropy depends on the size of one's subculture. We reasoned that regardless of subcultural size, in the city one will more often encounter others who are personally unfamiliar or unknown. But, the greater the size of one's subculture, the more urbanism will increase the proportion of subculturally alien strangers to all strangers encountered. This study by no means conclusively confirms this inference, and additional research is needed to test its generalizability. Questions which might be addressed include whether the influence of urbanism on feelings like misanthropy varies by size of persons' religious or ethnic group, or by majority versus minority status in such areas as sexual preference or other "lifestyle" variables (see Karp, Stone, and Yoels, 1977).

If our finding and the inference upon which it was based are correct, then we can draw two implications for subcultural theory. The theory stresses that, though both contact with strangers and that with subculturally alien strangers are more common in the city, only increased contact with personally unknown members of alien subcultures influences feelings like misanthropy. This position is probably correct since, while both whites and nonwhites surely encounter more strangers in the city than elsewhere, urbanism increases misanthropy only

Table 2. Correlations^a between Urbanism and Misanthropy, by Race

	Most People Look Out For Themselves			Most People Try To Take Advantage			Can't Be Too Careful With Most People			Don't Know Who To Count On			Most People Don't Care		
	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	Betas	
N =	6,094	737	6,094	737	6,094	737	6,094	737	3,668	460	3,668	460			
SIZE	.04*	-.04	.05*	.05	.02	.02	.03	.03*	.07	.07	.04*	.04*			
LOGSIZE	.06*	-.07	.04*	.04	.03	.03	-.05	.00	.03	.03	.01	.01			
SRCBELT	.06*	-.02	.04*	.03	.02	.02	-.00	.02	.02	.02	.03	.01			
XNORCSIZ	.04*	-.05	.01	.02	.00	.00	-.03	-.02	.03	-.03	-.03	-.05			

* $p < .05$.^aCorrelations controlling for age, marital status, presence of children, employment status, education, and income.

among whites. In addition, and contrary to subcultural theory, it appears that the mere frequency of encounters with subcultural aliens is not as important in engendering misanthropy as is the proportion of such encounters to all encounters with strangers. That is, it seems that urbanism increases misanthropy among whites not because it increases their contact with strangers and not merely because it increases their contact with subculturally alien strangers (e.g., nonwhites), but particularly because it increases the ratio of contact with subculturally alien strangers to contact with strangers in general. On the other hand, urbanism has no effect on misanthropy among nonwhites even though it is likely to increase their contact both with strangers generally and with subculturally alien strangers (e.g., members of other racial subcultures), presumably because the ratio of cross-subcultural contacts to all contacts with strangers remains relatively constant for nonwhites regardless of community size.

The principal intent of this study was to test the proposition implicit in classical and especially in subcultural theory that urbanism independently increases misanthropy. It has been found that urbanism does tend to increase misanthropy, among whites at any rate, but to an extent far less than might be expected on the basis of these theories. This finding not only fails to strongly support the theories, but is contrary to some previous research as well. House and Wolf (1978) used indicators of misanthropy similar to those employed here and found no net significant urbanism-misanthropy relationship whatsoever in three of their four samples. However, each of their samples was considerably smaller than that employed here. Had they combined them, their urbanism-misanthropy coefficients might have met the criteria for statistical significance though they likely would have remained very small in magnitude.

Our finding is somewhat more difficult to reconcile with those of Fischer, who reported an independent relationship between community size and a scale of items similar to the misanthropy items used here (Fischer, 1973) and who later reported that urbanism is independently associated with distrust of others, particularly strangers (Fischer, 1981). In both of Fischer's studies, the independent influence of urbanism was found to be considerably stronger than that reported here. This inconsistency may have resulted from differences between the urban measures employed in this study and those used by Fischer (though his urban measures differed between the 1973 and 1981 study). However, the community size measures used here, while each is open to some criticism, together constitute an arguably adequate treatment of urbanism, particularly since subcultural theory sees the processes that give rise to urban misanthropy (e.g., subcultural intensity) as ultimately arising from population size. Another difference between the present methods and those of Fischer has to do with control variables. As discussed earlier, Fischer (1981) did not control for race, though that probably had little effect on his findings. In his earlier study (Fischer, 1973) he did control for religion, father's occupation (in addition to status measures for the respondent), and region, though no theoretical rationale was given for the inclusion of these control variables. In this study, the selection of control variables to be included in the analysis has been informed by the theoretical work of Gans (1962a), and the controls included tapped demo-

graphic dimensions strongly suspected as sources of spuriousness in the relationship between urbanism and its supposed effects on attitudes and behavior.

Methodological issues aside, mixed findings from the past along with the present study strongly suggest that urbanism has no great impact on anything like misanthropy. This conclusion holds several implications for subcultural theory. First, subcultural theory may have overstated the role of urbanism as a cause of subculturization. An extensive body of literature documents various urban subcultures, including those based on ethnicity (Gans, 1962b), occupation (Lipset et al., 1956; Pilcher, 1972), sexual preference (Hoffman, 1968), and deviance (Bahr, 1973). However, all but the smallest population concentrations allow for some differentiation along age, class, ethnic and racial lines, as well as for the emergence of peculiar norms and behavior patterns. Granted, subcultural diversity is almost certainly greater in the city, but subcultural differentiation is by no means confined there. Gans (1962a) argued that Wirth's early urban theory was not so much descriptive of the city as of modern society in general. Perhaps the same is true of subcultural theory. [to some degree](#)

Second, subcultural theory may have overstated the role of urbanism as a cause of exposure to alien subcultures. Almost everywhere persons can encounter others who are not only personally unfamiliar, but also subculturally different. The frequency of such encounters and the degree of difference perceived between self and other, while greater in the city, is perhaps not enough greater to cause marked rural-urban differences in feelings about "most people." Further, not only do nonurbanites have occasion to visit the city personally, they also have the opportunity to visit it vicariously through the media, especially television, where members of alien social worlds are regularly portrayed.

Third, subcultural theory may have overstated the influence of subcultures and exposure to their members upon one's general views toward others. Recalling Merry's (1981) findings, it is likely that at least some times persons manage their attitudes toward strangers according to their perceptions of subcultural differences between those strangers and themselves. But the crucial question is how frequently such differences are perceived, or relatedly, how great they must be in order to be perceived. Some members of urban subcultures are both very different and quite easily recognized as such (e.g., bag ladies, punk rockers, and so forth). However, not all alien subculture members wear their membership on their sleeves. The proportion of perceivably different strangers to all strangers encountered is not known, nor is the degree to which these proportions differ across the rural-urban continuum. It seems safe, however, to suggest that for urbanites and non-urbanites alike, the world of strangers is divisible into two broad categories: first, the bulk of strangers who regardless of their true subcultural membership are not perceived to differ from oneself in any salient way; and second, a minority of strangers who are perceived both to be very different from and perhaps threatening to oneself. If this second category of strangers is in the minority both in the city and elsewhere, one would not expect its members to come to mind when persons assess the qualities of "most people," nor would one expect general assessments of this sort to strongly vary as a function of urbanism. On the contrary, it would be expected that

"most people" are regarded as substantially similar to oneself or, at most, a bit different in a benign and neutral way.

Because of the city's population size, urbanites spend much of their time, in Merry's (1981) terms, "awash in a sea of strangers." Urban theory has long supposed that this results in a strong tendency for urbanites to bear general negative sentiments toward others they encounter, and subcultural theory is the most recent version of this thesis. While it offers a promising conceptual scheme for understanding some of the outcomes of cross-subcultural encounters entailed by life among strangers, it should be recognized that general feelings like misanthropy as an outcome of urbanism are more likely the exception rather than the rule.

NOTES

1. The 1972 through 1980 GSS's were available for this research, but the 1972 GSS was not included because its measure of income, a necessary control variable, was incomparable with other surveys. Four of the five misanthropy items are variant wordings of items included in the Rosenberg Misanthropy Scale (Rosenberg, 1956). Three of these were measured on three-point scales including a neutral response category. These were: "Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?"; "Do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?"; and "Generally speaking would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with most people?" Agreement/disagreement responses were obtained for the fourth item: "Most people don't really care what happens to the next fellow." Agreement/disagreement responses were also obtained for a fifth item not included in the Rosenberg scale: "These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on." These five items were recoded so that highest scores were assigned for the most misanthropic responses.

In the 1976 GSS, the most recent survey in which all five misanthropy items were included, correlations among the items ranged from $r = .24$ to $r = .46$, and a factor analysis of the items resulted in a single significant factor, further indicating that they hang together empirically.

2. Subcultural theory suggests that population size results in misanthropy only indirectly (i.e., through subcultural diversity). However, urbanism is here operationalized solely in terms of size not only for practical reasons (i.e., there is no measure of diversity in the GSS), but especially because it is subcultural theory's concern with size that gives it its urban focus. The effects of population size are of interest in this study, not the effects of diversity *per se*.

The shortcomings of the ordinal size measures (XNORCSIZ and SRCBELT) are that both are somewhat gross and, as ordinal measures, are not strictly appropriate for use in the regression analyses to be reported here. Blalock (1979) defends the use of ordinal measures in regression noting that their use seldom influences findings. He recommends that such findings be compared with those based either on a statistical method appropriate for ordinal data or—as will be done here—with findings based on interval-level data (e.g., SIZE and LOGSIZE).

Both XNORCSIZ and SRCBELT appear as nominal scales in the GSS surveys, and have been recoded into the following ordinal scales.

XNORCSIZ

1. Open country, not within an SMSA.

2. Unincorporated area, not within an SMSA.
3. Small town (pop. 2,500-9,999), not within SMSA.
4. Small city (pop. 10,000-49,000), not within SMSA.
5. Unincorporated area, within SMSA.
6. Medium city (pop. 50,000-250,000), or suburb, within SMSA.
7. Large city (pop. 250,000 plus), or suburb, within SMSA.

SRCBELT

1. Rural (counties having no cities of 10,000 or more).
2. Other urban (counties having cities of 10,000 or more, but not coded 3 or 4 below).
3. Central city or suburbs of 100 largest SMSAs (but not coded as 4 below).
4. Central city or suburbs of 12 largest SMSAs.

SIZE and its log transformation LOGSIZE is the population to the nearest 1,000 of the smallest civil division listed by the U.S. Census which encompasses the respondent's residence. As such, the major shortcoming of these measures is that they tap the size of suburbs without regard to the size of central cities with which they may be contiguous.

All four measures of size are based on U.S. Census reports, and do not rely on respondent's report. The correlations among the measures are as follows.

1	2	3
---	---	---

1. SIZE			
2. LOGSIZE	.61		
3. SRCBELT	.40	.70	
4. XNORCSIZ	.28	.69	.75

3. Educational attainment is years of schooling completed. Marital status is coded for married; employment status is coded for full-time employed; presence of children under 18 is coded for present; and race is coded for white. Household income is coded as follows.

1. \$0-4,999
2. \$5,000-9,999
3. \$10,000-14,999
4. \$15,000-19,999
5. \$20,000-24,999
6. \$25,000 plus

4. It was suggested by a reviewer that the urbanism-misanthropy relationship might vary from year to year in a systematic way. To test this, the analysis was repeated for each separate GSS survey in which any of the misanthropy indicators was included. No systematic year-to-year variation was found, and the findings for each year support those for the pooled data.

5. Fischer noted the racial composition of his sample in a personal communication.

REFERENCES

- Antunes, G., F. Cook, T. Cook, and W. Skogan. 1977. "Patterns of Personal Crime Against the Elderly: Findings from a National Survey." *Gerontologist*, 17: 321-327.
- Bahr, H. M. 1973. *Skid Row: An Introduction to Disaffiliation*. New York: Oxford.
- Blalock, Hubert M. 1979. *Social Statistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brooks, J. 1974. "The Fear of Crime in the U.S." *Crime and Delinquency*, 20: 241-245.
- Davis, James Allen. 1980. *General Social Surveys, 1972-1980*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Fischer, Claude S. 1972. "Urbanism as a Way of Life: A Review and an Agenda." *Sociological Methods and Research*, 1: 187-242.

- _____. 1973. "On Urban Alienations and Anomie: Powerlessness and Social Isolation." *American Sociological Review*, 38: 311-326.
- _____. 1975. "Toward a Subcultural Theory of Urbanism." *American Journal of Sociology*, 80: 1319-1341.
- _____. 1981. "The Public and Private Worlds of City Life." *American Sociological Review*, 46: 306-316.
- _____. 1984. *The Urban Experience*. Second Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Franck, K. A. 1980. "Friends and Strangers: The Social Experience of Living in Urban and Non-Urban Settings." *Journal of Social Issues*, 36: 52-71.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1962a. "Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life: A Reevaluation of Definitions." Pp. 625-648 in A. M. Rose (ed.), *Human Behavior and Social Processes*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- _____. 1962b. *The Urban Villagers*. New York: The Free Press.
- Greer, Scott. 1962. *The Emerging City*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hoffman, M. 1968. *The Gay World*. New York: Basic Books.
- House, J. S. and S. Wolf. 1978. "Effects of Urban Residence on Interpersonal Trust and Helping Behavior." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36: 1029-1043.
- Karp, David A., Gregory P. Stone, and William C. Yoels. 1977. *Being Urban*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath.
- Korte, C. 1980. "Urban/Non-Urban Differences in Social Behavior and Social Psychological Models of Urban Impact." *Journal of Social Issues*, 36: 29-51.
- Lewis, O. 1965. "Further Observations on the Folk-Urban Continuum and Urbanization." Pp. 492-500 in P. H. Hauser and L. Schnore (eds.), *The Study of Urbanization*. New York: Wiley.
- Lincoln, H. R. 1978. "Community Structure and Individual Conflict." *American Sociological Review*, 43: 199-219.
- Lipset, S. M., M. Trow, and J. S. Coleman. 1956. *Union Democracy*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Lofland, Lyunn. 1973. *A World of Strangers*. New York: Basic Books.
- Merry, Sally Engle. 1981. *Urban Danger: Life in a Neighborhood of Strangers*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Morgan, W. R. and T. N. Clark. 1973. "The Causes of Racial Disorders." *American Sociological Review*, 38: 611-624.
- Park, R. E. 1916. "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment." *American Journal of Sociology*, 30: 577-612.
- Pilcher, W. W. 1972. *The Portland Longshoremen: A Dispersed Urban Community*. New York: Holt.
- Rosenberg, M. 1956. "Misanthropy and Political Ideology." *American Sociological Review*, 21: 690-695.
- Simmel, G. 1950. "The Metropolis and Mental Life." Pp. 409-424 in K. H. Wolfe (ed.), *The Sociology of George Simmel*. New York: The Free Press.
- Wirth, L. 1938. "Urbanism as a Way of Life." *American Journal of Sociology*, 44: 1-24.
- Young, M. and P. Willmott. 1957. *Family Kinship in East London*. Glencoe: The Free Press.