Author's response

May 14, 2020

Contents

1   Response to Editor

Clear urban or planning policy recommendations are needed. A section of Takeaway for Practice is encouraged to be included in this paper. (This section may be a short section. But it should be clear enough to present your policy recommendations for both local and international practice.)

Done! Please refer to the new section Major Takeaways in the manuscript.

In addition we would like to note that urban dislike of human kind just became a very timely topic due to the current covid19 pandemic!

2 Response to Reviewer #1

We are thankful to the reviewer for these constructive comments. You helped us improve our paper in a significant way. We have revised the manuscript in light of your comments–thanks to you, our paper is now better, more thorough and rigorous, and more balanced–thank you!

Two general comments:
1. Thank for pointing out the one-sideness! That was a great point! This was definitely an oversight in our part, ~~and perhaps the reason why we focused on just the negative side of cities is because our results indicated misanthropy in the largest places, thus we sought reasons to explain why that is the case, and as a result we ourselves became one-sided,~~ which was a mistake. ~~In fact, we have also written about the benefits of cities extensively, so this oversight was merely driven by the results and by us trying to make sense of them.~~
2. Dated literature like classical urban sociology–that's actually the point and one of our contribution: we connect with the forgotten classics, given that these days hardly anyone is critical of cities in the similar way as classics were–that's why many citations dated. We discuss this pro-urban trend more carefully, and we also added more recent citations~~as well~~.

This is a thought-provoking paper presenting interesting analysis of US General Social Survey data to explore the relationship of what the authors describe as misanthropy measures to their definition of urbanity.

Thank you; indeed, we didn't highlight enough novelty of this research, and now we do it better.

Nevertheless, I find the title quite misleading and overall I feel that the key arguments are quite weak and not supported by the literature reviewed or the analysis.

We agree in many ways, and we took steps to improve the literature review, interpret findings more carefully, and tone down key arguments where necessary.

In general we think, there were several major ~~shortcommings~~shortcomings: 1) we hardly presented the bright side of largest cities and didn't keep the balance of pros and cons. 2) We didn't pay enough attention to our result that misanthropy rose recently most in smaller places and has just reached about the same level as in the largest places. 3) We missed some literature and we didn't elaborate enough in some areas. 4) Literature, results, and conclusions were not well connected. We strived to fix these shortcomings.

We changed the title and added a statement about the generalizability of the results in the abstract.

In general, throughout the manuscript, we toned down the language where necessary, made it more specific and careful.

First, the review of literature appears to be one sided and mostly dated

Yes! Agreed! We added content on the bright side of urbanism; the datedness, however, ~~is mostly~~ has mostly to do with the fact that the research on misanthropy and urbanicity is dated. This is actually a contribution of our paper! We have highlighted that our research is novel and the extant study of misanthropy is dated in a new section looking at the gap in this literature.
We now discuss the bright side of urbanism in the literature review as well.

and in need of more elaboration, especially when discussing evidence suggesting that misanthropy is associated with living in cities.

Done; we have elaborated on the mechanism or path from urbanism to misanthropy; and we have added more literature.

Yes! We missed this point and simply didn't explain that there is indeed very little literature and mostly dated–these are simply limitation of the literature, not of our paper, but we didn't make this point clearly enough, now we do. Again, it's actually advantage of our paper.

The authors also seems to suggest that living in cities is always associated with crime and other social problems (is this the case for all cities?

No! of course not! But unfortunately, Indeed such impression could be made. Thank you for this point. It's now fixed–we're more careful in language and toned it down.

In addition please note that we do control for city ills, so ~~its~~ it's cities themselves not their ills. But we now note that ideally for future research, we should look at specific places, as you say with low crime, parks, etc

If there is a city with very low crime and very low levels of inequality and lots of parks, public spaces etc. is this still likely to have high levels of misanthropy and why?),

Great question! Now we consider it verbatim in paper in the discussion section and it ~~answer~~ is answered there.

Also please note ~~that the following~~ the following, which help to address this question:

"Political ideology, marital status, health, SWB, and notably race and fear of crime explain away much of the city disadvantage, but not all of it. Hence, the conclusion is that similar to studies examining SWB in urban areas (Okulicz-Kozaryn and Mazelis, 2016), it is cities, themselves, their core characteristics, and not city problems that are related to misanthropy."

"Can the relationship between urbanicity and misanthropy be spurious? Cities have many problems: notably urban poverty and urban crime–these problems could intensify misanthropy. In other words, if it were not for urban problems, then urbanicity would not cause misanthropy. There are many urban problems, and we cannot control for all of them, but we controlled for the key urban problem leading to misanthropy: fear of crime. We also controlled for personal income."

without any proper justification or evidence and some very poor argumentation.

We added more evidence and argumentation.

For instance, I find the analogy to the experiments with rats and overcrowding highly irrelevant. Measuring overcrowding typically refers to how many people live in a house and there could be overcrowded houses in rural areas as well as urban areas.

We have ~~remove~~ removed this reference and now discuss overcrowding and density more thoroughly.

Another key indicator which seems to be omitted in the discussion, is quality of life in cities and rural areas and there is a strong need to properly control for this before making any strong conclusions.

Agreed! We actually do control considerably for quality of life in cities, just didn't make this point more clear! Now we do!

Yes, good point, we now make the point that diversity can have a highly positive impact on economic performance. Yet there is literature showing negative effect of heterogeneity on trust and SWB, we cite that literature now as well.

Done!

we moved out much of text out of footnotes to the body–thank you! (we actually realized the same independently–that too much of important text was ~~burried~~ buried in footnotes)

Per ~~misanthorpy~~ misanthropy specifically: Again, we make the point clear that there is not much literature on misanthropy and cities, and this is the major contribution of this paper, it clearly fills this important gap, and we now also add more related literature to the manuscript.

We discuss the limitation of the dataset we use, unfortunately with surveys, there's always ~~nonresponse~~ non-response particularly with questions about political ideology and health. Note however, that model 4 is run as a robustness test. The previous 2 studies on misanthropy did not examine the effect of these variables. We now clearly state this ~~on~~ in the text. ~~TODO ADAM - Do we need to explain more? Not sure what s/he wants to know on a technical level??~~

Yes! we totally agree! In fact this was our own independent reflection upon rereading this paper now after few months. We now elaborate on over time trends. And make this a more central part of the story.

~~Yes, when we google scholar "geographies of discontent" we found that this literature totally supports our explanation that smaller places are being left behind. We incorporate that in the paper–however, the~~ The only "geographies of discontent" articles we found on Google scholar were for Europe; we do however cite Hanson that makes the point very well for the US.

We were not sure exactly what studies in social epidemiology you were referring to

No, cities have had the lowest and declining trust for decades and there is argument in the literature that the triumph of the city has less to do with cities improving than rural areas declining (Okulicz-Kozaryn, 2015)

~~TODO ADAM: again emphasize trend of increasing misanhropy in rural. TODO????MAYBE???TODO: DONE! (I TRIED TO TONE IT DOWN AND BE MORE "POSITIVE" ABOUT CITIES") make sure interpretation, results and conclusion toned down, balanced, double sided!!! objective, yes this is me! i'm positivist; and this is Apositivist journal! can write critical theory for antip'ode etc TODO: DONE! change conclusion more!~~

We changed the title from a statement to a question.

Abstract and conclusions were edited in 2 ways to reflect empirical results closer: toned down and added over-time trend, where misanthropy mist increased for smaller places

After having another look and thought about results more–we added a key point throughout:

Cities are misanthropic, but the rural-urban difference is disappearing.

References

OKULICZ-KOZARYN, A. (2015): *Happiness and Place. Why Life is Better Outside of the City.*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York NY.

OKULICZ-KOZARYN, A. AND J. M. MAZELIS (2016): "Urbanism and Happiness: A Test of Wirth's Theory on Urban Life," *Urban Studies*.