

Misanthropolis: Do Cities Promote Distrust and Dislike of Humankind?

Draft: Wednesday 13th May, 2020

Abstract

We use pooled ~~US~~U.S. General Social Survey (GSS, 1972-2016) ~~data~~ to examine the relationship between urbanism and misanthropy (distrust and dislike of humankind). Three operationalizations of urbanicity and an extensive set of control variables are employed. Human evolutionary history (small group living), psychological (homophily or ~~ingroup~~in-group preference), and classical urban sociological theories suggest that misanthropy should be observed in the most dense and heterogeneous places, such as large cities. Our results mostly agree: overall, over the past four decades, misanthropy is lowest in the smallest settlements (except for the countryside), and the effect size of urbanicity is about half of that of income. It is only the largest cities that are robustly more misanthropic than smaller places. Yet, the rural advantage has now disappeared—from the early 1990s to the late 2000s, misanthropy has increased fastest in the smallest places (< 10k). The possible reasons for this trend are explored and directions for future research are discussed. The analysis is solely focused on the ~~US~~U.S., and the results should not be generalized to other countries.

KEYWORDS: CITY, URBANISM, TRUST, MISANTHROPY, DISTRUST, FAIRNESS, HELPFULNESS, HELP

“The more I learn about people, the more I like my dog.”~~Mark Twain~~¹¹ Mark Twain

[0.3em]

“To look at the cross-section of any plan of a big city is to look at something like the section of a fibrous tumor.” Frank Lloyd Wright

Urbanization has deeply affected many aspects of social, political, and economic life (Kleniewski and Thomas 2010). Before the industrialization ~~period~~took off, in the early 1800s, only a small

¹~~Interestingly, Cooper (2018) claims that misanthropy is a justified attitude towards humankind in light of how humans compare with animals.~~

¹Interestingly, Cooper (2018) claims that misanthropy is a justified attitude towards humankind in light of how humans compare with animals.

percent of the world population lived in cities; by 1900, however, the proportion more than doubled, to 13 percent, as people moved to be near factories and industrial sites (Davis 1955). In 1950, a third of the world population inhabited cities, and by 2050 it is estimated that city dwellers will represent approximately two thirds of the global population (<https://esa.un.org/unpd/wup>).

As urbanization rampantly adds tens of millions of people to cities every year, it is important to understand how city living affects the human condition, particularly as it relates to social interactions. Empirical evidence ~~demonstrates~~ is mounting that unhappiness with city life is common in developed countries (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015b, Sørensen 2014, Morrison and Weckroth 2017, Ala-Mantila et al. 2018, ?). Amin (2006), for example, argues that urban discontent for the vast majority of city residents emerges from the fact that:

“cities are polluted, unhealthy, tiring, overwhelming, confusing, alienating. They are places of low-wage work, insecurity, poor living conditions and dejected isolation for the many at the bottom of the social ladder daily sucked into them. They hum with the fear and anxiety linked to crime, helplessness and the close juxtaposition of strangers. They symbolise the isolation of people trapped in ghettos, segregated areas and distant dormitories, and they express the frustration and ill-temper of those locked into long hours of work or travel” (p. 1011).

Thrift (2005) proposes that urban misanthropy is therefore ‘natural’: “misanthropy is a natural condition of cities, one which cannot be avoided and will not go away” (p. 140). This leads to our research question, do cities promote misanthropy?

Such a hypothesis may seem incongruous, especially amid current pro-urbanism ~~trends and the scarcity of literature on the downsides of cities in relation to misanthropy~~ (Thrift 2005, Amin 2006, Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015b). The current COVID19 pandemic, however, has brought this subject to the forefront as the need for social distancing might exacerbate misanthropy among urbanites in months to come. The avoidance and distrust of ‘others’ ~~will only~~ may intensify, particularly in the largest and highly populated areas, due to fear of infection and death.

In this paper, we provide an up to date empirical analysis of the effect of urbanization on misanthropy by exploring this novel area quantitatively. We begin by defining these terms and discussing the literature on urbanism and misanthropy, then present our model, documenting how we use the received literature to control for an extensive set of variables, discuss results, and

conclude by highlighting the major takeaway for policy and practice.

Urban Misanthropy

“Here is the great city: here have you nothing to seek and everything to lose.” Nietzsche

Misanthropy stems from the Greek words *misos*, “dislike or hate,” and *anthropos*, “humans.” Misanthropy refers to the lack of faith in others and the dislike of people in general. Misanthropy is a critical judgment on human life caused by failings that are “ubiquitous, pronounced, and entrenched” (Cooper 2018, p. 7). Socrates argued that misanthropy develops when one puts complete trust in somebody, thinking the person to be absolutely true, sound, and reliable, only to later discover that the person is deceitful, untrustworthy, and fake. When this experience happens to someone often, they end up hating everyone (cited in Melgar et al. 2013).

How can cities produce misanthropy? There are several pathways or mechanisms. The most critical and illuminating observations are found in the classical ~~urban-sociological-theories~~theories.²

Early sociologists proposed that urbanization created malaise due to three core characteristics of cities: size, density, and heterogeneity—increased population size creates anonymity and impersonality, density creates sensory overload and withdrawal from social life, and heterogeneity leads to anomie and deviance, and to lower trust and wellbeing (see Park et al. ([1925] 1984), Simmel (1903), Tönnies ([1887] 2002), Wirth (1938), Putnam (2007), Okulicz-Kozaryn (2015a), Herbst and Lucio (2014), Postmes and Branscombe (2002), Vogt Yuan (2007), Smelser and Alexander (1999)).

Throughout our evolutionary history, humans have lived in small, low-density homogeneous groups. As hunter gatherers, humans lived in small bands of 50 to 80 people; later, they formed simple horticultural groups of 100 to 150 people, finally clustering in groups as large as five to six thousand people as they evolved into more advanced societies (Maryanski and Turner 1992). ~~This pattern shows that living~~ Living in large, dense, and heterogeneous settlements ~~is a trait that can~~

²White and White (1977) provides a wonderful summary of U.S. intellectual urban history. Interestingly, many of the urban critics lived and wrote in cities, e.g., Socrates in Athens, Benjamin Franklin in Boston and Philadelphia, Frank Wright in Chicago, and the authors of this paper live in Philadelphia and New York City. Note that although Benjamin Franklin was not anti-urban, like Henry David Thoreau or Thomas Jefferson, he did note problems associated with urbanization (White and White 1977, e.g., p. 32). We thank an anonymous reviewer for this point. Also note that much of the critical literature cited is dated—current literature tends to be pro-urban and avoid the dark side of urbanism—this is the contribution of present study to build on classic often forgotten theory and to update dated analyses with most current data.

~~be seen as contrary to the ordinary course of nature for human beings~~(city living) is, at least in some ways, incompatible with human nature.

Crowding can be a significant problem in large cities~~which forces~~, which force a large number of people to live in close proximity (household crowding) and in a small amount of space (residential crowding). Crime increases with population size (Bettencourt and West 2010), as crowding is associated not only with higher levels of stress, and depression, but also with aggression (Regoeczi 2008, Calhoun 1962).

There are striking examples of crowding in the largest and densest cities around the world. New York City, for example, offers ~~some~~ 250 sq feet apartments—for a family of three this translates ~~to~~ into less than 100 sq feet per person. Remarkably, some New Yorkers already live in 100 sq feet apartments (???), and some apartments, or “cubbyholes,” are even smaller at 40 sq feet (?). In other dense cities, like Hong Kong, crowding can be even worse (?). To be sure, the majority of the urban population does not live in such extreme crowding conditions, and crowding is also an issue in smaller areas—many people often crowd in houses in small towns or villages. While high density is not the same as crowding, the two concepts are often correlated (Meyer 2013), and ~~in the densest cities, what many overlook, crowding probably has become more common in recent years~~ urban crowding is probably becoming more common as cities are becoming less affordable.³

~~Concurrently, evidence shows that~~ Concurrently, crime, traffic congestion, and incidence of infectious diseases (case in point, the current COVID19 crisis) do increase with population size (Bettencourt et al. 2010, Bettencourt and West 2010, Bettencourt et al. 2007).

~~In terms of heterogeneity, humans~~ Humans have in-group preference or homophily, and accordingly, lack preference for or dislike heterogeneity (Smith et al. 2014, McPherson et al. 2001, Bleidorn et al. 2016, Putnam 2007), which is a key defining feature of cities (Wirth 1938, Amin 2006, Thrift 2005). ~~Studies have shown that high diversity in U.S. communities are connected~~ High diversity is related to lower trust and less social participation (Paper et al. 1999, Alesina and Ferrara 2000, Luttmer 2001, ?, Rodríguez-Pose and von Berlepsch 2019). Diversity has also been considered a

³See for instance: Misra (2015), Florida and Schneider (2018), Weinberg (2011), Solari (2019), Schuetz (2019), Kotkin (2013) Density may impact pathology more than crowding (Levy and Herzog 1974). Yet, it is not only density and crowding, other factors such as social support and expectations matter as well (Cassel 2017, Chan 1978). Some studies didn’t find negative effects of density or crowding and results were mixed (Collette and Webb 1976). While it seems ~~to be~~ reasonable to assume that density and crowding are usually ~~positively~~ positively related, some studies do not find this to be the case (Webb 1975, Rodgers 1982). For a discussion and overview of density, crowding and human behavior refer to Boots (1979), Choldin (1978) and Ramsden (2009).

strong and ~~persisting~~ persistent barrier to developing trust across racial, ethnic or national origins (?). ~~More recent studies, have found that although city life is related to impersonal social relations, this only applies to neighbor relations—cities have higher levels of social interaction, participation in religious groups and volunteering than the suburbs (??).~~ Yet, cultural Cultural diversity can affect trust among residents of multi-ethnic and multi-religious places, generating animosity and creating conflict while simultaneously harnessing this multitude of experiences to create technological innovations, increase productivity levels, and enhance the supply and the quality of goods and services Rodríguez-Pose and von Berlepsch (2019).

~~How else can cities cause misanthropy?~~—It is well-known that city life causes cognitive overload, stress, and coping (Simmel 1903, Milgram 1970, Lederbogen et al. 2011). An overloaded system can suppress stimuli resulting in blase attitude (Simmel 1903)—city life can cause withdrawal, impersonality, alienation, superficiality, transitivity, and shallowness (Wirth 1938). Similarly, city life intensifies cunning and calculated behavior (Tönnies [1887] 2002), estrangement, antagonism, disorder, vice, and crime (Milgram 1970, Park 1915, Park et al. [1925] 1984, Betencourt and West 2010), which can lead to aggressive responses when interacting with others. Urbanism negatively influences the quality of nearly all social relationships (Wilson 1985). Moreover, urbanites tend to be ill-mannered and unreliable, which can lead to misanthropy (e.g., Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015b, Okulicz-Kozaryn and Valente 2017).

Steve Pile in his colorful writings about cities, for example, often invokes folklore characters that prey on humans (e.g., vampires, werewolves, ghosts) ~~to describe cities and urbanites (Pile 2005a,b, Pile et al. 1999).~~ Likewise, (Pile 2005a,b, Pile et al. 1999). Specifically, old cities carry melancholia (Pile 2005b), which can arguably easily translate into misanthropy. Nietzsche, one of the greatest observers of the human condition expressed misanthropic views himself (e.g., Avramenko 2004) ⁴ and made a powerful analogy using one the most iconic and crowded places in a city, the marketplace, while referring to ~~people~~ urbanites as “the flies in the market-place” (Nietzsche and Parkes 2005). ~~Urbanism negatively influences the quality of nearly all social relationships (Wilson 1985).~~ ~~Moreover, urbanites tend to be ill-mannered and unreliable which can lead to misanthropy (e.g., Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015b, Okulicz-Kozaryn and Valente 2017).~~

The aforementioned arguments suggest that ~~urbanites can~~ city life can make one become more

⁴He expressed dislike for the masses in the city and accordingly left the more densely populated areas for solitude in the mountains. See for example (Nietzsche and Parkes 2005).

distant from or hostile toward other human beings. Urban life is being “lonely in the midst of a million” (Twain), “lonesome together” (Thoreau), alienated (Wirth 1938, Nettler 1957), “awash in a sea of strangers” (Merry cited in Wilson 1985, p. 99) in a “mosaic of little worlds which touch, but do not interpenetrate” (Park et al. [1925] 1984, p. 40). Thus, we hypothesize~~that~~:

Urbanicity contributes to increased levels of misanthropy.

Gaps in the Literature

The urbanicity-misanthropy association is an under-explored area of research—only two studies examine this relationship employing quantitative methods (Wilson 1985, Smith 1997). Furthermore, Smith (1997) lists only a simple bivariate correlation between urbanicity and misanthropy among dozens of other bivariate correlations in a General Social Survey technical report. The report is published in a journal, but it is a carbon copy of the “GSS Topical Report No. 29,” that is mostly a listing of correlations with annotations as Smith (1997) was exploring factors relating to misanthropy in American society in general. Hence, the only quantitative study solely focusing on the urbanicity-misanthropy relationship is Wilson (1985). Ours is the second study focusing on this topic—such gap in the literature is rare.

Wilson (1985) uses dated 1972-1980 GSS dataset, controls for only a handful of variables, and does not show trends over time. Arguably, like other contemporary social scientists such as Veenhoven (e.g., 1994), Meyer (e.g., 2013) and Fischer (e.g., 1982), Wilson has a slight urban bias—under-emphasizing and discounting urban problems. Likewise, Wilson (1985) provides a narrow sociological view on the topic. Therefore, the aim of this paper is precisely to fill this gap in the literature by providing an up to date quantitative analysis of the relationship between urbanicity and misanthropy. We control for an extensive set of variables, examine trends over the last four decades, and provide a much broader and interdisciplinary perspective than previous research.

The dearth of research on the link between urbanicity-misanthropy in urban studies seems to emerge from an avoidance to focus on the darker and misanthropic side of cities. As Nigel Thrift stated, there is “a more deep-seated sense of misanthropy which urban commentators have been loath to acknowledge, a sense of misanthropy which is too often treated as though it were a dirty secret” (Thrift 2005, p. 134):

The misanthropic city

Cities bring people and things together in manifold combinations. Indeed, that is probably the most basic definition of a city that is possible. But it is not the case that these combinations sit comfortably with one another. Indeed, they often sit very uncomfortably together. Many key urban experiences are the result of juxtapositions which are, in some sense, dysfunctional, which jar and scrape and rend. What do surveys show contemporary urban dwellers are most concerned by in cities? Why crime, noisy neighbors, a whole raft of intrusions by unwelcome others. There is, in other words, a **misanthropic** thread that runs through the modern city, a distrust and avoidance of precisely the others that many writers feel we ought to be welcoming in a world increasingly premised on the mixing which the city first brought into existence (Thrift 2005, p. 140 (“misanthropic” bolded by us).

Academic thinking about cities has for the most part swung in a pro-urban direction.⁴ The classical sociological urban theory (Wirth 1938, Milgram 1970, Park 1915, Park et al. [1925] 1984, Simmel 1903, Tönnies [1887] 2002) gave way to sub-cultural theory (Fischer 1975, 1995, Wilson 1985, Palisi and Canning 1983), while debates about the optimal size of a city (Richardson 1972, Singell 1974, Alonso 1960, 1971, Elgin 1975, Capello and Camagni 2000) emanated in the-bigger-the-better ideology (Glaeser 2011). Most recently, research has focused predominantly on the positive aspects of cities, a case in point being the bestselling book, the “Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier” (Glaeser 2011). While Glaeser (2011) is remarkably misguided (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015b, Peck 2016), it is important to underscore that this pro-urban trend emerged due to the many benefits of city life.

Many people, ~~particularly~~ notably Millennials, are drawn to metropolitan areas (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2018) given the many bright sides and positive aspects of city life: amenities, freedom, productivity, research and innovation, economic growth, wages, and multiple efficiencies related to density in transportation, public goods provision, and lower per capita pollution (Tönnies [1887] 2002, O’Sullivan 2009, Meyer 2013, Rosenthal and Strange 2002, Bettencourt et al. 2010). In general, there is no doubt that cities are the economic engines of today’s economy. Recent research has shown that diversity can be one of the reasons why cities are economic beacons as diversity positively impacts economic performance over time (e.g., Rodríguez-Pose and von Berlepsch

⁴There appears to be pro-urban bias not only in the ~~US~~ U.S. Hanson (2015), but in general in world development (Lipton et al. 1977).

2019). Even in terms of social relationships, cities have some advantages and score better than suburbs—although city life is related to impersonal social relations, cities have higher levels of social interaction, participation in religious groups and volunteering than the suburbs (??)

Method

Data

All variables come from the ~~US~~-U.S. General Social Survey (GSS; <http://gss.norc.org>). The GSS is a cross-sectional, nationally representative survey, administered annually since 1972 until 1994 when it became biennial. The unit of analysis is ~~at the individual level~~-a person and data are collected in face-to-face, in-person interviews (Davis et al. 2007). The full dataset contains about 60 thousand observations pooled over 1972-2016. All variables were recoded in such a way that a higher value means more.

As explained in the next subsection, the dependent variable, misanthropy, is continuous. Hence, we simply use ordinary least squares (OLS) to analyze the relationship between misanthropy and urbanicity.⁵ There is no need to use categorical or limited dependent variable modeling techniques as we do not have panel data. Multilevel techniques are not useful either as the GSS is only representative of large census regions, and we do not have the restricted GSS data with finer geographical information.

Misanthropy

We measure misanthropy, the dislike of humankind, by a three item Rosenberg’s misanthropy index (Rosenberg 1956), based on respondents’ answers to three questions (Smith 1997):

TRUST. “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” 1 = “cannot trust,” 2 = “depends,” 3 = “can trust.”

FAIR. “Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?” 1 = “take advantage,” 2 = “depends,” 3 = “fair.”

⁵~~There is no need to use categorical or limited dependent variable modeling techniques as we do not have panel data. Multilevel techniques are not useful either as the GSS is only representative of large census regions, and we do not have the restricted GSS data with finer geographical information.~~

HELPFUL. “Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?” 1 = “lookout for self,” 2 = “depends,” 3 = “helpful.”

Rosenberg defines misanthropy as a general uneasiness, dislike, and apprehensiveness towards strangers (Rosenberg 1956). Using three these questions, we utilized factor analysis with varimax rotation to produce an index, and we reversed it so that it measures misanthropy. Cronbach’s alpha is .67. Note that the distributions of these, as well as the descriptive statistics for all other variables, are in the supplementary material.

This measurement encompasses “faith in people,” “attitudes towards human nature,” and an “individual’s view of humanity.” Although, much controversy about the assessment of misanthropy exists in the literature, the Rosenberg scale has become the standard measure for self-reported misanthropy and was designed to assess one’s degree of confidence in the trustworthiness, goodness, honesty, generosity and brotherliness of people in general (Rosenberg 1956). The Rosenberg Misanthropy Scale has been a cornerstone on the GSS since 1972, and studies have shown that the measurement is not contaminated by social desirability bias (Ray 1981). The Rosenberg Misanthropy scale is not only mainstream, but also the most popular and widely cited measurement of misanthropy. Some authors (~~e.g., Wuensch et al. (2002)~~) (e.g., Wuensch et al. 2002) have used other scales, but their approaches are disjoint from the mainstream literature, and there is not much discussion of the concept or measurement that they used in their research.

As per the survey questions, strictly speaking, it is not the dislike of “all people,” but of “most people” that we are measuring. Wilson (1985) suggests it is dislike of strangers, specifically. Likewise, recently Delhey et al. (2011) have argued that “most people” predominantly connotes out-groups. Note that this relates to homophily/ingroup-in-group theory—a dislike for an ~~outgroup~~ out-group typically means relative preference for the ~~ingroup~~ in-group.

Urbanicity

Urbanicity is measured in three ways to show that the results are robust to the definition. First, it is measured using deciles of population size (SIZE). Deciles are used to investigate if there are any nonlinear effects on misanthropy. Then, two other variables are used to measure urbanism

under their original GSS names: XNORCSIZ and SRCBELT.⁵ Both variables categorize places into metropolitan areas, big cities, suburbs, and unincorporated areas. The advantage of SIZE is that it allows us to calculate a misanthropy gradient by the exact size of settlement. XNORCSIZ and SRCBELT take into account the fact that populations cluster at different densities (e.g., suburbs are less dense than cities). The GSS does not provide a density variable.

The SRC BELTCODE measurement is arguably the best fitting to illustrate the urban vs. rural divide: the divide is between metropolitan areas vs. smaller areas (Hanson 2015), and SRC BELTCODE identifies the MSAs (metropolitan statistical areas). The GSS codebook descriptions follow:

SIZE. This code is the population to the nearest 1,000 of the smallest civil division listed by the U.S. Census (city, town, other incorporated area over 1,000 in population, township, division, etc.) which encompasses the segment. If a segment falls into more than one locality, the following rules apply in determining the locality for which the rounded population figure is coded. If the predominance of the listings for any segment are in one of the localities, the rounded population of that locality is coded. If the listings are distributed equally over localities in the segment, and the localities are all cities, towns, or villages, the rounded population of the larger city or town is coded. The same is true if the localities are all rural townships or divisions. If the listings are distributed equally over localities in the segment and the localities include a town or village and a rural township or division, the rounded population of the town or village is coded.

XNORCSIZ. Expanded N.O.R.C. size code. a. A suburb is defined as any incorporated area or unincorporated area of 1,000+ (or listed as such in the U.S. Census PC (1)-A books) within the boundaries of an SMSA but not within the limits of a central city of the SMSA. Some SMSAs have more than one central city, e.g., Minneapolis-St. Paul. In these cases, both cities are coded as central cities. b. If such an instance were to arise, a city of 50,000 or over which is not part of an SMSA would be coded '7'. c. Unincorporated areas of over 2,499 are treated as incorporated areas of the same size. Unincorporated areas under 1,000 are not listed by the Census and are treated here as part of the next larger civil division, usually the township.

SRCBELT. SRC beltcode. The SRC belt code (a coding system originally devised to describe

⁵Wilson (1985) uses these two variables in his study. One technical problem, however, is that he assumes that these variables are continuous. Wilson (1985) explicitly states that xnorcsiz is an ordinal variable, and we disagree: one cannot really say whether a suburb is larger than an unincorporated large area and smaller than an area of 50 thousand people.

rings around a metropolitan area and to categorize places by size and type simultaneously) first appeared in an article written by Bernard Laserwitz (*American Sociological Review*, v. 25, no. 2, 1960), and has been used subsequently in several SRC surveys. Its use was discontinued in 1971 because of difficulties particularly evident in the operationalization of "adjacent and outlying areas." For this study, however, we have revised the SRC belt code for users who might find such a variable useful. The new SRC belt code utilizes "name of place" information contained in the sampling units of the NORC Field Department.

Controls

In the choice of the control variables we follow Welch et al. (2007) and especially Smith (1997). The higher the social standing, the more favorable view of others, thus we control for income, education, and race. Social class literature suggests that individuals' social class should be assessed by using both objective (e.g., income and education) and subjective indicators (e.g., Kraus et al. 2009).⁶ Thus, a control for people's perceived social class is included as well.

Negative experiences are likely to increase misanthropy, therefore we control for fear of crime (there is no good measurement for actual victimization in the GSS). Crime is important because the larger the place, the more crime (Bettencourt and West 2010), and the more crime, the more misanthropy (Wilson 1985). We also control for unemployment, self-reported health and age. Since divorce is a predictor of misanthropy, we control for it and other marital statuses as well. Misanthropy should be higher among cultural groups and minorities that have been discriminated against, so we also control for race, being born in the United States, and religious denomination. Religious belief should reduce misanthropy. Misanthropy should be lower among older people, though some studies find a curvilinear relationship, therefore we control for age and age². Studies also show that men tend to be more misanthropic, so we control for gender. Recent movers should be more misanthropic. There is not a good control for recent moving in the GSS, but we use a proxy for international moving by controlling for being born in the US. Also, misanthropy should

⁶We thank an anonymous reviewer for this important point. Subjective class correlates with education and income moderately at about .4 (either continuous or polychoric). On one hand, subjective class and urbanicity are likely to be confounded. On the other hand, it turns out that correlations of urbanicity measures and subjective class are very small, below .1 (either continuous or polychoric). The social class item in the GSS reads: "If you were asked to use one of four names for your social class, which would you say you belong in: the lower class, the working class, the middle class, or the upper class?" and is coded from 1 (lower) to 4 (upper). We will just treat it as a control variable and enter it as a continuous variable without using a set of dummies.

be higher in the South, therefore we included a region “South” dummy variable.

In addition, we control for subjective wellbeing⁷ and health—the goal is to alleviate possible problem of spuriousness. It may be not the size of a place that causes higher misanthropy but it may be lack of success, unhappiness, or poor health that makes a person both move to a city and dislike other people. Concurrently, liberals and immigrants are more likely to live in cities and both groups are less satisfied with their lives (Berry and Okulicz-Kozaryn 2011, Okulicz-Kozaryn et al. 2014) and potentially more misanthropic. Thus, we control for political ideology and immigration status.

Data were pooled over many years, and hence we include year dummies.

Results

Table 1 shows the regression results. We use three measures of urbanicity, and each urbanicity measure is entered as a set of dummy variables to explore nonlinearities and the base case is the smallest place in the case of SIZE and SRCBELT and the second smallest category on XNORCSIZ: “<2.5k, but not countryside.” Coefficients of interest are those on the largest places such as the second largest category “192-618k”, and especially the largest ones “618k-” in Table 1, and corresponding the very largest and second largest places in Tables 2 and 3.

The first three columns in each table (a1, b1, c1) report basic results without any control variables. For all three urbanicity measures, the largest increase in misanthropy occurs in the largest place. In the case of SIZE and SRCBELT, the second largest effects tend to be on the second largest place. XNORCSIZ is more uneven and the second largest place does not have the second largest effect. Interestingly, in the case of XNORCSIZ, in addition to largest cities, the countryside (variable “country”) is quite misanthropic, perhaps countrymen are not used to swarms of people or perhaps they are countrymen because they dislike people.

The second columns (a2, b2, c2) in the tables add controls following Welch et al. (2007) and Smith (1997)—notably we control for objective and subjective social class. An interesting result on the XNORCSIZ variable is misanthropic suburbs, “places of nowhere,” thus confirming Kunstler

⁷It is important to stress the need to properly control for quality of life in cities and rural areas, thus we control directly for subjective wellbeing (SWB). And we included fear of crime as well, one of the most important confounders—crime increases misanthropy and tends to be higher in cities—and another key measure is income, which is controlled for.

(2012)’s critique of suburbs. What is worth noting is that, in general, in more elaborate specifications, we find that the larger the place, the more misanthropy.

The addition of marital status in model 3 attenuates the effect slightly. Political ideology, subjective wellbeing (SWB) and health controls were postponed till model 4 because there are many missing observations.⁸ The addition of these controls in model 4 attenuates the slopes considerably by about a third or half. The “192-618k” size decile is similar in magnitude to smaller places—they are all more misanthropic than the base case, which in this case is places smaller than 2k. And “618k-” is markedly larger, about twice as large as “192-618k”—as is the case with SWB—it is the very largest places that differ from smaller places (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015b).

The final most elaborate specifications also show no significant misanthropy difference for the 2nd largest places—these results contradict earlier results where the second largest places were the second most misanthropic. Therefore results for the second largest places should be interpreted with care, and while the fullest specifications are the least biased in terms of omitted variables, the sample size is less than half of the more basic models due to missing observations on additional variables. Furthermore, the most elaborate specifications are rather over-saturated models with too many controls and the collinearity. —Hence, lower statistical significance and smaller effect sizes are somewhat expected.

According to the well laid out argument in Wilson (1985), the most complete quantitative treatment of the urbanicity-misanthropy nexus to date, there are two key variables of interest: crime and race. Like Wilson, for lack of a better variable, we are using fear of crime as a proxy in our analysis (AFRAID TO WALK AT NIGHT IN NEIGHBORHOOD), which is thought to increase misanthropy and correlate with urbanicity. Therefore, the inclusion of this variable should attenuate heavily the urbanicity-misanthropy relationship, and it does in model a4a. Wilson (1985) also argues that urban misanthropy is more common among whites than minorities. Inclusion of WHITE HOUSEHOLD dummy (without AFRAID TO WALK AT NIGHT IN NEIGHBORHOOD) in a4b has a similar effect to AFRAID TO WALK AT NIGHT IN NEIGHBORHOOD. Finally in model a4c both variables are entered together, and the urbanicity effect is heavily attenuated and barely significant. Results for the other two measures of urbanicity shown in tables 2 and 3 are similar. One difference is that

⁸These controls are not essential, if anything they over-saturate the model, but they are a useful robustness check; in addition there are many observations missing on them—another reason to add them later on due to the reduction in sample size. Note that Smith (1997) and Wilson (1985) did not control for political affiliation, or subjective wellbeing.

in table 2, the smallest areas (“countryside”) are slightly more misanthropic than the base case, “smaller than 2.5k but not countryside.”

In the most elaborate models, a4c and b4c (but not c4c), the largest places remain misanthropic, yet the magnitude is not greater than that for mid-sized places, suburbs, and even the countryside. Hence, the smallest places, housing hundreds or a couple of thousand people, but not more than about 10 thousand people or the countryside, are the most liking of humankind. As observed in model c4c, it is still the very largest places that are markedly different from other places. Importantly, as argued here, SRCBELT is the variable that measures best the urban-rural divide.

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.

Indeed, even if the results were insignificant, they would be still worth reporting—many would think that there is less misanthropy in cities—clearly we are in the midst of a pro-urbanism period, where it is fashionable to argue about city benefits (e.g., Glaeser 2011). However, the results show that there is no such benefit with respect to misanthropy—cities are at least slightly more misanthropic than other places.

Why did several midsize categories score relatively high on misanthropy? We do not have an explanation for this phenomenon. Perhaps, following Okulicz-Kozaryn (2016)’s rationale, such places strip people of the naturalness found in the smallest places, and yet do not provide amenities and the benefits found in the largest places.

Note that the effect sizes are considerable—all tables report beta coefficients and the effect size of the largest place is about as large as half of the effect of income. It is important to underscore that city living has an enormous effect size due to the urbanization scale—each year cities grow by tens of millions of people. To summarize, we find support for our initial hypothesis that urbanicity is related to increased misanthropy.

Table 1: OLS regressions of misanthropy. Beta (fully standardized) coefficients reported. All models include year dummies. Size deciles (base: <2k).

	a1	a2	a3	a4	a4a	a4b	a4c
2-4k	0.01	0.02**	0.01**	0.01*	0.02	0.01*	0.01
4-8k	0.02***	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***	0.02**	0.02***	0.02
8-14k	0.01**	0.04***	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***	0.02***	0.02**
14-24k	0.00	0.03***	0.03***	0.02***	0.02*	0.02**	0.01
24-41k	0.01	0.04***	0.03***	0.02***	0.02**	0.02**	0.02*
41-79k	0.01*	0.04***	0.04***	0.03***	0.02*	0.02**	0.01
79-192k	0.03***	0.04***	0.04***	0.03***	0.01	0.02**	-0.00
192-618k	0.04***	0.05***	0.05***	0.04***	0.02**	0.02***	0.01
618k-	0.09***	0.09***	0.09***	0.07***	0.05***	0.05***	0.02**
South	0.12***	0.10***	0.09***	0.10***	0.09***	0.09***	0.07***
subjective class identification		-0.10***	-0.10***	-0.09***	-0.09***	-0.08***	-0.08***
family income in \$1986, millions		-0.08***	-0.07***	-0.05***	-0.04***	-0.05***	-0.04***
protestant		-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.01
catholic		-0.02***	-0.02***	-0.01	-0.02*	-0.01	-0.02
unemployed		0.01**	0.01**	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
age		-0.32***	-0.34***	-0.39***	-0.47***	-0.41***	-0.50***
age squared		0.13***	0.14***	0.18***	0.25***	0.20***	0.28***
highest year of school completed		-0.24***	-0.24***	-0.22***	-0.21***	-0.22***	-0.20***
male		0.03***	0.03***	0.02***	0.04***	0.03***	0.05***
married			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
widowed			0.02***	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
divorced			0.04***	0.02***	0.02*	0.02***	0.02*
separated			0.04***	0.03***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02**
never married			0.01	-0.01	-0.02**	-0.02**	-0.03***
conservative				0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01
liberal				-0.03***	-0.02**	-0.03***	-0.02***
born in the U.S.				-0.02***	-0.02**	-0.00	-0.00
SWB				-0.13***	-0.14***	-0.12***	-0.13***
afraid to walk at night in neighborhood					0.09***		0.09***
white household						-0.12***	-0.12***
N	38236	33549	33545	27522	14034	27082	13799

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1;

robust std err

Table 2: OLS regressions of misanthropy. Beta (fully standardized) coefficients reported. All models include year dummies. Xnorsiz (base: <2.5k, but not country).

	b1	b2	b3	b4	b4a	b4b	b4c
countryside	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***	0.04***	0.05***	0.04***	0.04***
2.5-10k	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02**	0.02**	0.02
10-50k	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***	0.02**
uninc med	0.00	0.02***	0.02***	0.03***	0.03**	0.03***	0.03**
uninc lrg	0.00	0.03***	0.03***	0.03***	0.03**	0.02***	0.02*
med sub	0.02**	0.04***	0.04***	0.05***	0.05***	0.04***	0.04***
lrg sub	0.03***	0.08***	0.08***	0.08***	0.07***	0.06***	0.05***
50-250k	0.04***	0.05***	0.05***	0.05***	0.03**	0.03***	0.01
gt 250k	0.10***	0.10***	0.10***	0.09***	0.07***	0.07***	0.04***
South	0.12***	0.10***	0.09***	0.10***	0.09***	0.09***	0.07***
subjective class identification		-0.10***	-0.10***	-0.09***	-0.09***	-0.08***	-0.08***
family income in \$1986, millions		-0.08***	-0.07***	-0.06***	-0.05***	-0.05***	-0.04***
protestant		-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.01
catholic		-0.02***	-0.02***	-0.01	-0.02*	-0.01	-0.02
unemployed		0.01**	0.01**	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
age		-0.32***	-0.34***	-0.39***	-0.47***	-0.41***	-0.50***
age squared		0.12***	0.13***	0.17***	0.25***	0.20***	0.28***
highest year of school completed		-0.24***	-0.24***	-0.22***	-0.21***	-0.22***	-0.20***
male		0.03***	0.03***	0.02***	0.04***	0.03***	0.05***
married			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
widowed			0.02***	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
divorced			0.04***	0.02***	0.02*	0.02***	0.02*
separated			0.04***	0.03***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02**
never married			0.01	-0.01	-0.02**	-0.02**	-0.03***
conservative				0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01
liberal				-0.03***	-0.02**	-0.03***	-0.03***
born in the U.S.				-0.02***	-0.02**	-0.00	-0.00
SWB				-0.13***	-0.14***	-0.12***	-0.13***
afraid to walk at night in neighborhood					0.09***		0.09***
white household						-0.12***	-0.12***
N	38236	33549	33545	27522	14034	27082	13799

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1;

robust std err

Table 3: OLS regressions of misanthropy. Beta (fully standardized) coefficients reported. All models include year dummies. Srcbelt (base: small rur).

	c1	c2	c3	c4	c4a	c4b	c4c
small urb	-0.01	0.02**	0.02*	0.01*	0.02*	0.01	0.02
13-100 sub	-0.01	0.04***	0.04***	0.03***	0.02*	0.02***	0.02
1-12 sub	-0.00	0.06***	0.05***	0.04***	0.04***	0.03***	0.03***
13-100 msa	0.03***	0.04***	0.04***	0.04***	0.02	0.02***	-0.00
1-12 msa	0.08***	0.09***	0.08***	0.07***	0.05***	0.05***	0.03***
South	0.12***	0.10***	0.10***	0.10***	0.09***	0.09***	0.08***
subjective class identification		-0.10***	-0.10***	-0.09***	-0.09***	-0.08***	-0.08***
family income in \$1986, millions		-0.08***	-0.07***	-0.06***	-0.05***	-0.05***	-0.04***
protestant		-0.01	-0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.01	-0.01
catholic		-0.02***	-0.02***	-0.01*	-0.02*	-0.01	-0.02
unemployed		0.01**	0.01**	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
age		-0.33***	-0.35***	-0.39***	-0.47***	-0.41***	-0.50***
age squared		0.13***	0.14***	0.18***	0.25***	0.21***	0.29***
highest year of school completed		-0.24***	-0.24***	-0.22***	-0.21***	-0.22***	-0.20***
male		0.03***	0.03***	0.02***	0.04***	0.03***	0.05***
married			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
widowed			0.02***	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
divorced			0.04***	0.02***	0.02*	0.02***	0.02*
separated			0.04***	0.03***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02*
never married			0.01	-0.01	-0.02**	-0.02***	-0.03***
conservative				0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01
liberal				-0.03***	-0.02**	-0.03***	-0.03***
born in the U.S.				-0.02***	-0.01*	-0.00	0.00
SWB				-0.13***	-0.14***	-0.12***	-0.13***
afraid to walk at night in neighborhood					0.09***		0.09***
white household						-0.12***	-0.12***
N	38236	33549	33545	27522	14034	27082	13799

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1;

robust std err

A look over time

Next, we complement our analysis by exploring the relationship between misanthropy and urbanicity over time. The advantage of the GSS is that it allows us to compare a span of over four decades. Figure 1 shows misanthropy by size of place over time. Overall, misanthropy remained highest in large cities until recently. Yet, around 2000, the trends have changed—misanthropy for largest cities (>250k) started to decline, and it started to increase steeply for the smallest places (<10k). Over the four decades, misanthropy has been increasing steadily for medium sized places. Hence, the overall urban misanthropy we observed is due to earlier time periods. These patterns

are similar when controlling for predictors of misanthropy. Predicted values are plotted in Figure 2, based on the regression from column a3a from Table 5 in the Appendix. There is convergence in misanthropy across urbanicity over time, with smallest places increasing their level of misanthropy the most.




Figure 1: Misanthropy by size of population over time. Smoothened with moving average filter using 3 lagged, current, and 3 forward terms.




Figure 2: Misanthropy by size of population over time. Predicted values from regression from column a3a from Table 5 in the Appendix. 95% CI shown.

Conclusion and Discussion

“Real misanthropes are not found in solitude, but in the world; since it is experience of life, and not philosophy, which produces real hatred of mankind.” Giacomo Leopardi

“Whenever I tell people I’m a misanthrope they react as though that’s a bad thing, the idiots. I live in London, for God’s sake. Have you walked down Oxford Street recently? Misanthropy’s the only thing that gets you through it. It’s not a personality flaw, it’s a skill.” Charlie Brooker⁹

City living has an enormous effect on humanity—the world is urbanizing at an astonishing pace—each year cities add tens of millions of people. Arguably the biggest divide is urban-rural, and it is important to investigate its multiple dimensions. In this article, we have focused on a novel area, the urbanicity-misanthropy nexus.¹⁰

Our evolutionary history (small group living), psychological theory (homophily or [ingroup](#) [in-group](#) preference), and classical urban sociological theory, all suggest that human dislike for other humans should be observed in the most dense and heterogeneous places such as cities. Our results mostly agree: misanthropy is lowest in the smallest settlements (but not in the countryside), and the effect size of urbanicity is about half of that of income. There are two important caveats. First, the urban misanthropy thesis holds up robustly for the large cities only (with more than several hundred thousand people). Second, the level of misanthropy in smaller areas has just now reached about the same level as in large cities. As a sidenote, our results confirm the findings of research examining subjective wellbeing (SWB) in cities—rural folks have also always been at an advantage when it comes to SWB (at least since the [US-U.S.](#) GSS started collecting data in 1972), but very recently this advantage has disappeared (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2018). We interpret this as evidence of a rural-urban divide and the fact that rural areas have been left behind (e.g., Fuller 2017, Hanson 2015).

As compared to the most complete study to date on the relationship between misanthropy and urbanicity, Wilson (1985), our analysis use more data, an extensive set of control variables, and levels of size variables without forcing untenable assumption of interval/ratio scale and linear effects. Our results do not necessarily contradict, but rather extend Wilson (1985): there is misanthropy in the largest places for everyone (we find more robust evidence than Wilson (1985); and concurrently

⁹This echoes Simmel’s blasé attitude—in order to survive in a city, one must withdraw; see also Milgram (1970) and Lederbogen et al. (2011).

¹⁰For a long time social scientists have tried to understand how urbanization affects human beings. Yet the most sharp and critical observations were published decades ago—it is our contribution to connect with the illuminating classical studies amid current pro-urbanism trends. We offer the first up to date quantitative test based on a classic theoretical background.

confirm the finding by Fischer (1981) of a relatively strong relationship between community size and distrust). In addition, we also find that there is especially misanthropy for whites, and that rural misanthropy is on the rise.

The magnitude of the effect of urbanicity is important to consider. There is evidence of a large magnitude effect on trusting behavior. In one experiment, trust differed several-folds between city and town, strikingly a larger difference across gender—the trust benefit of being female over male is smaller than the benefit of town over city (Milgram 1970). While our results do not indicate a very strong effect of urbanicity on misanthropy, we do find a substantial effect—about half of the effect of income in our analysis¹¹—contraposing Wilson (1985), who argued that there’s only a small effect.

As in any correlational study, we cannot claim causality. There are, however, reasons to believe that urbanism causes misanthropy. Size, density, and heterogeneity are theoretically linked to many negative emotions (Wirth 1938), and make general dislike for humankind likely. Homophily and evolutionary arguments discussed earlier also support this reasoning. Furthermore, there is neurological evidence that city living is unhealthy to the human brain (Lederbogen et al. 2011) and experimental evidence that city living causes lower trust (Milgram 1970).

Reverse causality would not make sense: misanthropy or hatred of people, should not lead someone to live in places, like cities, unless one perhaps wants to harm people in some way, clearly these cases are rare.¹² This rationale should also exclude self-selection—if anything the opposite of misanthrope, people who love to be among many people, would choose to move to cities. This can also perhaps explain the result that while misanthropy is high in largest cities, it is also high in the smallest places of all: the countryside. Arguably many people tired of urban crowds move to the countryside. It also happens among generally city-loving Millennials (e.g., Dewey 2017).

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, and we also controlled for personal in-

¹¹One explanation is that people’s trust is low in cities mostly because there are simply too many people, not necessarily because they dislike people.

¹²Another potential reason for a misanthrope, or any non-conformist type, to live in a city is anonymity.

come. But what about an ideal city? Should we expect misanthropy in a city with low crime rates, low levels of inequality, with lots of amenities, parks, and public spaces, etc.? Possibly yes, but not at the same magnitude.¹³ It is the city itself, its core characteristics, size, density and heterogeneity that contribute to misanthropy. All large cities have high population by definition, moderate-high or high density (as compared to smaller places), and are also relatively heterogeneous as compared to smaller places, and these core characteristics are the likely drivers of misanthropy as explained throughout. Still, only future research could decisively answer this question. Our analysis is limited by the dataset used. Future research should control for all these things—parks, public spaces, quality of life in cities, etc., and examine the urbanity-misanthropy nexus of specific metropolitan areas in the United States.

Why are smaller places becoming more misanthropic like cities? One possible explanation is that rural folks and smaller places are being left behind (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015b). It is usually often overlooked that a significant divide in modern society is the urban-rural dichotomy (Hanson 2015, 2017). There is clearly rural resentment which could lead to increasing rural misanthropy, which we observed in this study,¹⁴ as rural folks feel that they are being governed by an urbanized elite. More research is needed to better understand this phenomenon.

Smith (1997) argued that the more subordinate a group is, and the more isolated the members of the group are, the greater the misanthropy; and that urbanicity has no direct impact on negativism. We disagree: while cities have never been subordinate, but always dominating (e.g., Okulicz-Kozaryn and Valente 2017),¹⁵ there are multiple theoretical reasons to believe that cities in fact do increase negativism—for a recent review see Okulicz-Kozaryn (2015b).

Hence, our conclusions are congruent to those of Schilke et al. (2015) with respect to trust—misanthropy can be higher in dominating places. Yet, at the same time, rural America has clearly increasingly become subordinated, and this is perhaps another reason why misanthropy is growing there.¹⁶

¹³These things can certainly ameliorate misanthropy levels as discussed in the last section of this paper.

¹⁴Although, the rural resentment may be more against cities or urbanites, rather than people in general. We thank an anonymous reviewer for these this point.

¹⁵In some specific cases this is not true—there are always exceptions to any social scientific rule. For instance, after the urban white flight and before the recent urban renaissance, at least in some ways, suburbs were dominating (e.g., Adams 2014).

¹⁶We speculate that the main reason is that rural areas have been left behind (Hanson 2015, 2017, Fuller 2017)—being left behind is not necessarily the same as being subordinated.

Major Takeaway for Policy and Practice

This study seeks to spark debate on an overlooked area of urban studies ~~by bringing to the forefront a much needed discussion on one of the negative consequences of city life, particularly in the largest metropolitan areas.~~

Our results find ~~robust~~ support for the existence of *Misanthropolis* ~~—metropolitan areas~~ —metropolis where distrust and dislike for humankind abound. It is undeniable that there are many economic, environmental, and social advantages to cities. Yet, it is important to recognize that metropolitan areas with a population size greater than several hundred thousand people are associated with misanthropy (and unhappiness (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2016)), while smaller cities with smaller populations are better places to live. At the same time, it must be noted that advocating for living in smaller areas for most people is problematic and unrealistic. The U.S. and world populations are projected to grow for some time and perhaps level off, but a dramatic decline is unlikely. Low-density non-urban living for most people is simply impossible, but one point is especially important to be made in this context: more consideration should be given to smaller areas that have been left behind, as lamented by some (e.g., Fuller 2017, Hanson 2015), but not heard by most. Redirecting resources away from smaller places should be given more thought and consideration.

Although heterogeneity can contribute to misanthropy in cities, if mechanisms are in place to facilitate dialogue across different groups and if people are encouraged to interact with each other, that is, if the “melting pot” really happens, and the “other” becomes a fellow human being, then diversity can yield important social and economic benefits (Rodríguez-Pose and von Berlepsch 2019). In places where it is not possible to build dialogue between different groups of people, where connection and meaningful exchange does not occur, and groups and communities remain in their own spaces, living side by side and yet miles apart, misanthropy can thrive and undermine any social and economic benefits from a diverse environment (Rodríguez-Pose and von Berlepsch 2019). There ~~'s~~ is a case to be made in favor of more recreational opportunities and events, community services, and social spaces in the largest cities to promote social connections and create a sense of community. It is up for future research to determine whether these recommendations can in fact curtail misanthropy in cities.

Misanthropy may not seem tangible or meaningful for practitioners at a first glance. However, when consideration is given to how misanthropy can cause negative outcomes, there ~~'s~~ is a reason

to be ~~concern~~concerned. Misanthropy reduces people’s desire to invest and to be involved in their communities and may remove social bonds that deter people from harming others (Weaver 2006, Hirschi and Gottfredson 1993, Fafchamps and Minten 2006, Walters and DeLisi 2013). Furthermore, misanthropy is correlated with dysfunctional and animus behaviors such as homophobia, sexism, racism, and ageism (Cattacin et al. 2006).

It’s impossible to overlook the current COVID19 pandemic—infectious disease spread the worst in large cities (Bettencourt et al. 2010). This health crisis will arguably further exacerbate misanthropy in the largest metropolitan areas, as fear and suspicion of the ‘other’ increases—many people fled New York City for example, to stay away from other people.

This study focuses solely on the U.S. and the results and takeaways for practice may not be generalized to other countries. There ~~’s~~is a reason to believe that future research in other developed countries will find similar results, especially in Western countries where people are unhappier in the largest metropolitan areas, and therefore more likely to be misanthropic. (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015b).

In developing countries, however, cities may not be more misanthropic for one simple reason—life is simply often unbearable outside of the city, without necessities such as access to healthcare and basic consumer goods. Misanthropy is arguably less likely if cities, and only cities, provide basic needs. This is, however, an speculation and cross-country research is needed.

References

- ADAMS, C. T. (2014): *From the outside in: Suburban elites, third-sector organizations, and the reshaping of Philadelphia*, Cornell University Press.
- ALA-MANTILA, S., J. HEINONEN, S. JUNNILA, AND P. SAARSALMI (2018): “Spatial nature of urban well-being,” *Regional Studies*, 52, 959–973.
- ALESINA, A. AND E. L. FERRARA (2000): “Participation in Heterogeneous Communities,” *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper*.
- ALONSO, W. (1960): “A theory of the urban land market,” *Papers in Regional Science*, 6, 149–157.
- (1971): “The economics of urban size,” *Papers in Regional Science*, 26, 67–83.

- AMIN, A. (2006): “The good city,” *Urban studies*, 43, 1009–1023.
- AVRAMENKO, R. (2004): “Zarathustra and his Asinine Friends: Nietzsche on Post-modern, Post-liberal Friendship,” in *American Political Science Association. Chicago, Annual Meeting: np*, 1–30.
- BERRY, B. J. AND A. OKULICZ-KOZARYN (2011): “An Urban-Rural Happiness Gradient,” *Urban Geography*, 32, 871–883.
- BETTENCOURT, L. AND G. WEST (2010): “A unified theory of urban living,” *Nature*, 467, 912–913.
- BETTENCOURT, L. M., J. LOBO, D. HELBING, C. KÜHNERT, AND G. B. WEST (2007): “Growth, innovation, scaling, and the pace of life in cities,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104, 7301–7306.
- BETTENCOURT, L. M., J. LOBO, D. STRUMSKY, AND G. B. WEST (2010): “Urban scaling and its deviations: Revealing the structure of wealth, innovation and crime across cities,” *PloS one*, 5, e13541.
- BLEIDORN, W., F. SCHÖNBRODT, J. E. GEBAUER, P. J. RENTFROW, J. POTTER, AND S. D. GOSLING (2016): “To Live Among Like-Minded Others: Exploring the Links Between Person-City Personality Fit and Self-Esteem.” *Psychological Science*.
- BOOTS, B. (1979): “Population density, crowding and human behaviour,” *Progress in Geography*, 3, 13–63.
- CALHOUN, J. B. (1962): “Population density and social pathology.” *Scientific American*.
- CAPELLO, R. AND R. CAMAGNI (2000): “Beyond optimal city size: an evaluation of alternative urban growth patterns,” *Urban Studies*, 37, 1479–1496.
- CASSEL, J. (2017): “Health consequences of population density and crowding,” in *People and buildings*, Routledge, 249–270.
- CATTACIN, S., B. C. GERBER, M. SARDI, AND R. WEGENER (2006): “Monitoring misanthropy and rightwing extremist attitudes in Switzerland. An explorative study,” .

- CHAN, Y. (1978): "Life Satisfaction in Crowded Urban Environment," *Hong Kong History and Society*.
- CHOLDIN, H. M. (1978): "Urban density and pathology," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 4, 91–113.
- COLLETTE, J. AND S. D. WEBB (1976): "Urban density, household crowding and stress reactions," *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 12, 184–191.
- COOPER, D. E. (2018): *Animals and Misanthropy*, Routledge.
- DAVIS, J. A., T. W. SMITH, AND P. V. MARSDEN (2007): *General Social Surveys, 1972-2006 [Cumulative File]*, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- DAVIS, K. (1955): "The origin and growth of urbanization in the world," *American Journal of Sociology*, 429–437.
- DELHEY, J., K. NEWTON, AND C. WELZEL (2011): "How general is trust in "most people"? Solving the radius of trust problem," *American Sociological Review*, 76, 786–807.
- DEWEY, C. (2017): "A growing number of young Americans are leaving desk jobs to farm," *Washington Post*.
- ELGIN, D. (1975): *City size and the quality of life*, US Government Printing Office.
- FAFCHAMPS, M. AND B. MINTEN (2006): "Crime, transitory poverty, and isolation: Evidence from Madagascar," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 54, 579–603.
- FISCHER, C. S. (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*, 306–316.
- (1982): *To dwell among friends: Personal networks in town and city*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL.
- (1995): "The subcultural theory of urbanism: A twentieth-year assessment," *American Journal of Sociology*, 543–577.

- FLORIDA, R. AND B. SCHNEIDER (2018): “The Global Housing Crisis. Scarce, unaffordable housing is not a local problem in a few places, but is baked into the 21st-century global city. It’s time for cities, nations, and global leaders to start acting like it.” *City Lab*.
- FULLER, T. (2017): “California’s Far North Deplores Tyranny of the Urban Majority,” *The New York Times*.
- GLAESER, E. (2011): *Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier*, Penguin Press, New York NY.
- HANSON, V. D. (2015): “The Oldest Divide. With roots dating back to our Founding, America’s urban-rural split is wider than ever.” *City Journal*, Autumn 2015.
- (2017): “Trump and the American Divide. How a lifelong New Yorker became tribune of the rustics and deplorables.” *City Journal*.
- HERBST, C. AND J. LUCIO (2014): “Happy in the Hood? The Impact of Residential Segregation on Self-Reported Happiness,” *IZA Discussion Paper*.
- HIRSCHI, T. AND M. GOTTFREDSON (1993): “Commentary: Testing the general theory of crime,” *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 30, 47–54.
- KLENIEWSKI, N. AND A. THOMAS (2010): *Cities, change, and conflict*, Nelson Education.
- KOTKIN, J. (2013): “Richard Florida concedes the limits of the creative class.” *The Dailybeast*.
- KRAUS, M. W., P. K. PIFF, AND D. KELTNER (2009): “Social class, sense of control, and social explanation.” *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 97, 992.
- KUNSTLER, J. H. (2012): *The geography of nowhere*, Simon and Schuster, New York NY.
- LEDERBOGEN, F., P. KIRSCH, L. HADDAD, F. STREIT, H. TOST, P. SCHUCH, S. WUST, J. C. PRUESSNER, M. RIETSCHER, M. DEUSCHLE, AND A. MEYER-LINDENBERG (2011): “City living and urban upbringing affect neural social stress processing in humans,” *Nature*, 474.
- LEVY, L. AND A. N. HERZOG (1974): “Effects of population density and crowding on health and social adaptation in the Netherlands,” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 228–240.

- LIPTON, M. ET AL. (1977): *Why poor people stay poor: a study of urban bias in world development*, London: Canberra: Temple Smith; Australian National University Press.
- LUTTMER, E. (2001): “Group loyalty and the taste for redistribution,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 109, 500–528.
- MARYANSKI, A. AND J. H. TURNER (1992): *The social cage: Human nature and the evolution of society*, Stanford University Press.
- MCPHERSON, M., L. SMITH-LOVIN, AND J. M. COOK (2001): “Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks,” *Annual Review of Sociology*, 415–444.
- MELGAR, N., M. ROSSI, AND T. W. SMITH (2013): “Individual attitudes toward others, misanthropy analysis in a cross-country perspective,” *American journal of economics and sociology*, 72, 222–241.
- MEYER, W. B. (2013): *The Environmental Advantages of Cities: Countering Commonsense Antiurbanism*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- MILGRAM, S. (1970): “The experience of living in cities,” *Science*, 167, 1461–1468.
- MISRA, T. (2015): “New York City Apartments Are Getting Even More Crowded,” *City Lab*.
- MORRISON, P. S. AND M. WECKROTH (2017): “Human values, subjective well-being and the metropolitan region,” *Regional Studies*, 1–13.
- NETTLER, G. (1957): “A measure of alienation,” *American Sociological Review*, 22, 670–677.
- NIETZSCHE, F. W. AND G. PARKES (2005): *Thus spoke Zarathustra: A book for everyone and nobody*, Oxford University Press, New York NY.
- OKULICZ-KOZARYN, A. (2015a): “Are we happier among our own race?” *Unpublished*.
- (2015b): *Happiness and Place. Why Life is Better Outside of the City.*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York NY.
- (2016): “Unhappy metropolis (when American city is too big),” *Cities*.

- (2018): “No Urban Malaise for Millennials,” *Regional Studies*.
- OKULICZ-KOZARYN, A., O. HOLMES IV, AND D. R. AVERY (2014): “The Subjective Well-Being Political Paradox: Happy Welfare States and Unhappy Liberals.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 1300–1308.
- OKULICZ-KOZARYN, A. AND J. M. MAZELIS (2016): “Urbanism and Happiness: A Test of Wirth’s Theory on Urban Life,” *Urban Studies*.
- OKULICZ-KOZARYN, A. AND R. R. VALENTE (2017): “The Unconscious Size Fetish: Glorification and Desire of the City,” in *Psychoanalysis and the Global*, ed. by I. Kapoor, University of Nebraska Press.
- O’SULLIVAN, A. (2009): *Urban economics*, McGraw-Hill.
- PALISI, B. AND F. CANNING (1983): “Urbanism and Social Psychological Well-Being: A Cross-Cultural Test of Three Theories,” *Sociological Quarterly*, 24, 527–543.
- PAPER, W., M. AVENUE, G. JAROSSE, P. Z. LOBATON, M. BRAUN, AND I. AFFAIRS (1999): “National bureau of economic research 50,” *International Affairs*.
- PARK, R. E. (1915): “The city: Suggestions for the investigation of human behavior in the city environment,” *The American Journal of Sociology*, 20, 577–612.
- PARK, R. E., E. W. BURGESS, AND R. D. MAC KENZIE ([1925] 1984): *The city*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL.
- PECK, J. (2016): “Economic Rationality Meets Celebrity Urbanology: Exploring Edward Glaeser’s City,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 40, 1–30.
- PILE, S. (2005a): *Real cities: modernity, space and the phantasmagorias of city life*, Sage, Beverly Hills CA.
- (2005b): “Spectral Cities: Where the Repressed Returns and Other Short Stories,” in *Habitus: A sense of place*, ed. by J. Hillier and E. Rooksby, Ashgate Aldershot.
- PILE, S., C. BROOK, AND G. MOONEY (1999): “Unruly cities,” *Order/disorder*.

- POSTMES, T. AND N. R. BRANSCOMBE (2002): “Influence of long-term racial environmental composition on subjective well-being in African Americans.” *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 83, 735.
- PUTNAM, R. (2007): “E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century,” *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30, 137–174.
- RAMSDEN, E. (2009): “The urban animal: population density and social pathology in rodents and humans,” *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 87, 82–82.
- RAY, J. J. (1981): “Conservatism and misanthropy,” *Political Psychology*, 3, 158–172.
- REGOECZI, W. C. (2008): “Crowding in context: an examination of the differential responses of men and women to high-density living environments,” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 49, 254–268.
- RICHARDSON, H. W. (1972): “Optimality in city size, systems of cities and urban policy: a sceptic’s view,” *Urban Studies*, 9, 29–48.
- RODGERS, W. L. (1982): “Density, crowding, and satisfaction with the residential environment,” *Social Indicators Research*, 10, 75–102.
- RODRÍGUEZ-POSE, A. AND V. VON BERLEPSCH (2019): “Does population diversity matter for economic development in the very long term? Historic migration, diversity and county wealth in the US,” *European Journal of Population*, 35, 873–911.
- ROSENBERG, M. (1956): “Misanthropy and political ideology,” *American Sociological Review*, 21, 690–695.
- ROSENTHAL, S. S. AND W. C. STRANGE (2002): “The urban rat race,” *Syracuse University Working*.
- SCHILKE, O., M. REIMANN, AND K. S. COOK (2015): “Power decreases trust in social exchange,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112, 12950–12955.
- SCHUETZ, J. (2019): “Cost, crowding, or commuting? Housing stress on the middle class,” *Brookings*.

- SIMMEL, G. (1903): “The metropolis and mental life,” *The Urban Sociology Reader*, 23–31.
- SINGELL, L. D. (1974): “Optimum city size: Some thoughts on theory and policy,” *Land Economics*, 207–212.
- SMELSER, N. J. AND J. C. ALEXANDER (1999): *Diversity and its discontents: cultural conflict and common ground in contemporary American society*, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ.
- SMITH, J. A., M. MCPHERSON, AND L. SMITH-LOVIN (2014): “Social Distance in the United States Sex, Race, Religion, Age, and Education Homophily among Confidants, 1985 to 2004,” *American Sociological Review*, 79, 432–456.
- SMITH, T. W. (1997): “Factors relating to misanthropy in contemporary American society,” *Social Science Research*, 26, 170–196.
- SOLARI, C. D. (2019): “America’s Housing Is Getting More Crowded. How Will That Affect Children?” *Urban Institute*.
- SØRENSEN, J. F. (2014): “Rural–urban differences in life satisfaction: Evidence from the European Union,” *Regional Studies*, 48, 1451–1466.
- THRIFT, N. (2005): “But malice aforethought: cities and the natural history of hatred,” *Transactions of the institute of British Geographers*, 30, 133–150.
- TÖNNIES, F. ([1887] 2002): *Community and society*, DoverPublications.com, Mineola NY.
- VEENHOVEN, R. (1994): “How Satisfying is Rural Life?: Fact and Value,” in *Changing Values and Attitudes in Family Households with Rural Peer Groups, Social Networks, and Action Spaces: Implications of Institutional Transition in East and West for Value Formation and Transmission*, ed. by J. Cecora, Society for Agricultural Policy Research and Rural Sociology (FAA).
- VOGT YUAN, A. S. (2007): “Racial composition of neighborhood and emotional well-being,” *Sociological Spectrum*, 28, 105–129.
- WALTERS, G. D. AND M. DELISI (2013): “Antisocial cognition and crime continuity: Cognitive mediation of the past crime-future crime relationship,” *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41, 135–140.

- WEAVER, C. N. (2006): “Trust in people among Hispanic Americans,” *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 1160–1172.
- WEBB, S. D. (1975): “The meaning, measurement and interchangeability of density and crowding indices,” *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 11, 60–62.
- WEINBERG, N. (2011): “How Can Cities be Preemptive and Effective in Preventing Overcrowding?” *Datasmart-Harvard*.
- WELCH, M., D. SIKKINK, AND M. LOVELAND (2007): “The radius of trust: Religion, social embeddedness and trust in strangers,” *Social Forces*, 86, 23–46.
- WHITE, M. G. AND L. WHITE (1977): *The intellectual versus the city: from Thomas Jefferson to Frank Lloyd Wright*, Oxford University Press, Oxford UK.
- WILSON, T. C. (1985): “Urbanism, misanthropy and subcultural processes.” *The Social Science Journal*.
- WIRTH, L. (1938): “Urbanism as a Way of Life,” *American Journal of Sociology*, 44, 1–24.
- WUENSCH, K. L., K. W. JENKINS, AND G. M. POTEAT (2002): “Misanthropy, idealism and attitudes towards animals,” *Anthrozoös*, 15, 139–149.

SOM-R (Supplementary Online Material-for Review)

Below we show basic descriptive statistics and then additional regression results.

Table 4: Variable definitions.

name	description
misanthropy	(misanthropy scale)
trust	"Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?"
people fair or try to take advantage	"Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?"
people are helpful	"Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves? (HELPFUL)"
srcbelt	SRC BELTCODE (see appendix for details)
xnorcsiz	EXPANDED N.O.R.C. SIZE CODE (see appendix for details)
size of place in 1000s	SIZE "Size of Place in thousands-A 4-digit number which provides actual size of place of interview."
family income in \$1986, millions	Income variables (INCOME72 , INCOME , INCOME77 , INCOME82 , INCOME86 , INCOME91 , INCOME98 , INCOME06) are recoded in six-digit numbers and converted to 1986 dollars. The collapsed numbers above are for convenience of display only. Since this variable is based on categorical data, income is not continuous, but based on categorical mid-points and imputations. For details see GSS Methodological Report No. 64.
protestant	"What is your religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion?"
catholic	"What is your religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion?"
conservative	"We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm going to show you a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal—point 1—to extremely conservative— point 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale?" "SLGHTLY CONSERVATIVE" or "CONSERVATIVE" or "EXTRMLY CONSERVATIVE"
liberal	"We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. I'm going to show you a seven-point scale on which the political views that people might hold are arranged from extremely liberal—point 1—to extremely conservative— point 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale?" "SLGHTLY LIBERAL" or "LIBERAL" or "EXTRMLY LIBERAL"
marital status	"What is your religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion?"
unemployed	"Last week were you working full time, part time, going to school, keeping house, or what?" "Unemployed, laid off, looking for work"
age	age of respondent
highest year of school completed	HIGHEST YEAR OF SCHOOL COMPLETED A. "What is the highest grade in elementary school or high school that (you/your father/ your mother/your [husband/wife]) finished, and got credit for? " CODE EXACT GRADE.; B. IF FINISHED 9th-12th GRADE OR DK*: "Did (you/he/she) ever get a high school diploma or a GED certificate?" [SEE D BELOW.]; C. "Did (you/he/she) complete one or more years of college for credit—not including schooling such as business college, technical or vocational school?" IF YES: "How many years did (you/he/she) complete?"




Figure 3: Variables' distribution.




Figure 4: Variables' distribution.




Figure 5: Variables' distribution.




Figure 6: Variables' distribution.

In the body of the paper we have plotted results from simple specification a3a from Table 5, but note that more elaborate specifications with more variables and dummied out time are similar.

Table 5: OLS regressions of misanthropy. Beta (fully standardized) coefficients reported. All models include year dummies.

	a4c2	a3a	b4c2	c4c2
-2k	0.00			
2-4k	10.92**			
4-8k	1.52			
8-14k	8.44*			
14-24k	12.92***			
24-41k	5.52			
41-79k	14.73***			
79-192k	4.02			
192-618k	15.40***			
618k-	13.37***			
year	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***
-2k \times year	0.00			
2-4k \times year	-0.01**			
4-8k \times year	-0.00			
8-14k \times year	-0.00*			
14-24k \times year	-0.01***			
24-41k \times year	-0.00			
41-79k \times year	-0.01***			
79-192k \times year	-0.00			
192-618k \times year	-0.01***			
618k- \times year	-0.01***			
subjective class identification	-0.10***	-0.11***	-0.10***	-0.10***
family income in \$1986, millions	-1.12***	-1.73***	-1.12***	-1.18***
protestant	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01
catholic	-0.03	-0.03***	-0.03*	-0.03*
unemployed	0.01	0.04*	0.01	0.01
age	-0.02***	-0.01***	-0.02***	-0.02***
age squared	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
highest year of school completed	-0.05***	-0.06***	-0.05***	-0.05***
male	0.07***	0.05***	0.07***	0.07***
married	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
widowed	-0.01	0.06***	-0.01	-0.02
divorced	0.04*	0.09***	0.03*	0.03*
separated	0.10***	0.17***	0.10***	0.10***
never married	-0.03*	0.02**	-0.03*	-0.04**
afraid to walk at night in neighborhood	0.15***		0.15***	0.14***
conservative	0.01		0.01	0.01
liberal	-0.03**		-0.03**	-0.04**
born in the U.S.	-0.05**		-0.05**	-0.04*
SWB	-0.17***		-0.17***	-0.17***
South	0.14***	0.15***	0.14***	0.14***
small		0.00		
med		4.56***		
big		9.42***		
small \times year		0.00		
med \times year		-0.00***		
big \times year		-0.00***		
country			0.00	
lt 2.5k			-5.13	
2.5-10k			-3.52	
10-50k			3.05	
uninc med			0.76	
uninc lrg			11.72**	
med sub			10.94**	
lrg sub			10.78***	
50-250k			7.95*	
gt 250k			13.20***	
country \times year			0.00	
lt 2.5k \times year			0.00	
2.5-10k \times year			0.00	
10-50k \times year			-0.00	
uninc med \times year			-0.00	
uninc lrg \times year			-0.01**	
med sub \times year			-0.01**	
lrg sub \times year			-0.01***	
50-250k \times year			-0.00*	
gt 250k \times year			-0.01***	
small rur				0.00
small urb		36		14.15***
13-100 sub				15.26***
1-12 sub				16.36***
13-100 msa				19.40***
1-12 msa				20.60***
small rur \times year				0.00
small urb \times year				-0.01***
13-100 sub \times year				-0.01***
1-12 sub \times year				-0.01***
13-100 msa \times year				-0.01***

In Table 6 the results show that while whites are in general less misanthropic than minorities, they are more misanthropic in larger places, thus confirming Wilson (1985). Note, the column names correspond with earlier tables. In a4c1 we interact urbanicity with the white household dummy—indeed we find confirmation for Wilson (1985)—clearly whites experience more misanthropy in urban areas. Wilson (1985) explains this pattern using Fischer’s subcultural theory.

Table 6: OLS regressions of misanthropy. All models include year dummies. Size deciles (base: <2k). Srcbelt (base: small rur). Xnorsiz (base: <2.5k, but not country).

	a4c1	b4c1	c4c1
-2k	0.00		
2-4k	-0.12		
4-8k	-0.14**		
8-14k	-0.13**		
14-24k	-0.20***		
24-41k	-0.10		
41-79k	-0.11*		
79-192k	-0.18***		
192-618k	-0.14***		
618k-	-0.11*		
white household	-0.40***	-0.23***	-0.34***
-2k × white household	0.00		
2-4k × white household	0.17**		
4-8k × white household	0.19***		
8-14k × white household	0.21***		
14-24k × white household	0.26***		
24-41k × white household	0.16**		
41-79k × white household	0.13*		
79-192k × white household	0.19***		
192-618k × white household	0.17***		
618k- × white household	0.18***		
subjective class identification	-0.10***	-0.10***	-0.10***
family income in \$1986, millions	-0.97***	-1.01***	-1.04***
protestant	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01
catholic	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
unemployed	0.01	0.01	0.01
age	-0.02***	-0.02***	-0.02***
age squared	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
highest year of school completed	-0.05***	-0.05***	-0.05***
male	0.07***	0.07***	0.07***
married	0.00	0.00	0.00
widowed	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02
divorced	0.04*	0.04*	0.04*
separated	0.07**	0.07**	0.07*
never married	-0.06***	-0.05***	-0.06***
afraid to walk at night in neighborhood	0.14***	0.15***	0.14***
conservative	0.02	0.02	0.02
liberal	-0.04***	-0.04***	-0.04***
born in the U.S.	-0.01	-0.00	0.00
SWB	-0.16***	-0.16***	-0.16***
South	0.12***	0.12***	0.12***
country		0.00	
lt 2.5k		0.08	
2.5-10k		-0.01	
10-50k		-0.03	
uninc med		-0.10	
uninc lrg		-0.09	
med sub		-0.10	
lrg sub		-0.01	
50-250k		-0.07	
gt 250k		-0.04	
country × white household		0.00	
lt 2.5k × white household		-0.21**	
2.5-10k × white household		-0.06	
10-50k × white household		-0.02	
uninc med × white household		0.06	
uninc lrg × white household	38	0.04	
med sub × white household		0.09	
lrg sub × white household		-0.01	
50-250k × white household		-0.03	
gt 250k × white household		0.00	
small rur			0.00