

# Author's response

May 13, 2020

## Contents

1	Response to Editor	1
2	Response to Reviewer #1	2

## 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-sidedness! 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 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 do with the fact that the research on misanthropy and urbanicity is dated. This is 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 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.

There is a strong need to justify the choice of literature and discuss any limitations arising from the date in which the work reviewed is published.

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.

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 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 there.

Also please note that 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 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!

In addition, diversity can have a highly positive impact on both economic performance (e.g. see recent work by Viola von Berlepsch and Andres Rodriguez-Pose) and by extension to well-being and trust (especially if there is a melting pot process). It would be interesting to consider such work in contrast to the statements in the paper about links between heterogeneity and anomie and deviance!

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.

And there is also a need to properly engage with literature and evidence suggesting a different story (there is very limited discussion of such literature mostly in a footnote) especially when using expressions such as American intellectuals almost universally expressed ambivalence... In this context, it is also interesting to consider the context in which a lot of the work of scholars the authors cite was conceived and produced (e.g. Socrates also lived in a city!).

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 buried in footnotes)

Per 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.

On a more technical level, I would expect more elaboration and justification regarding missing observations (e.g. it is pointed out that Political ideology, subjective wellbeing (SWB) and health controls were postponed till model 4 because there are many missing observations.).

We discuss the limitation of the dataset we use, unfortunately with surveys, there's always nonresponse 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 the text. TODO ADAM - Do we need to explain more? Not sure what s/he wants to know on a technical level??

Also, when discussing the results, it would be interesting to offer a more critical reflection of the trends and whether cities that are or have become more socially cohesive are also more likely to have higher levels of trust (and overall lower levels of misanthropy as defined by the authors) and whether it is factors such as income and wealth inequality that are associated with trust rather than urban/rural divisions. To that end there is interesting work by social epidemiologists which is highly relevant as well as recent literature on the geographies of discontent (with some studies suggesting that discontent may be higher in rural areas and this may be particularly relevant to the US , the study area of the paper).

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.

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)

Overall, I strongly feel that there is a need to reconsider the title of the paper and the overall message (given the points and concerns I express above) and revise the paper accordingly (also discussing the results in more detail and in support of the arguments made if this is possible)

TODO ADAM: again emphasize trend of increasing misanthropy 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 anti'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*.