

# Immorality and Dishonesty: More Urban than Rural

Adam Okulicz-Kozaryn\*

Rutgers - Camden and Vistula University

Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> November, 2020 23:26

URBANISM, URBANNESS, CITIES, URBAN-RURAL, DEVIANCE, MORALITY, CORRUPTION, GREED, MONEY, LOVE OF MONEY

“With urbanization comes disharmony” The Dalai Lama

The hallmarks of capitalism, industrialization and commercialization, are closely linked with urbanization (e.g., O'Sullivan 2009, Glaeser 2011). It is in the city where capitalism is most full-blown and felt most (Simmel 1903, Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015). Capitalism works best at high density when agglomeration economies are possible (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015).

City is where rat race and money chase is concentrated. Urbanites tend to work longer (Rosenthal and Strange 2002, 2003, 2008, Snowdon 2015) 'lunch is for wimps' (another quote from the movie Wall Street).

City is where consumption is concentrated (Glaeser et al. 2001, Currid-Halkett et al. 2019, Joye et al. 2020), consumption and in particular luxury or conspicuous consumption is centered in the very center of the city (Rabiei-Dastjerdi et al. 2020), there is commodity fetishism (Pierce and Hankins 2019), indeed city itself is a fetish Okulicz-Kozaryn and Valente (2017). Humans are not inherently and purely selfish, as economists argue, rather selfishness results from commodity fetishism (Marx [1867] 2010), and fetishism is highest in cities. City intensifies conspicuous consumption: urban etiquette, sophistication, manners and finish (White and White 1977, p. 169)

City compounds materialism—one mechanism is built environment—corporate buildings, shops, advertisements—they signal success is wealth and material possessions (Joye et al. 2020). Visual and social comparisons are more likely in urban areas as there are more people and more stimuli there; likewise, use of social media is higher in urban areas (Perrin 2015), and both visual and social comparisons in real life and on social media can make people seek status through money, material possessions, and conspicuous consumption (Taylor and Strutton 2016, Joye et al. 2020).

## 1 Theory

Already in 1938 Wirth (1938, p. 1) observed that in a city “the pecuniary nexus tends to displace personal relations”, and “the urban world puts a premium on visual recognition” (p. 14)—we know that urbanites more extrinsic and focused on success than rural folks (Morrison and Weckroth 2017).

“Personal disorganization, mental breakdown, suicide, delinquency, crime, corruption, and disorder might be expected under these circumstances to be more prevalent in the urban than in the rural community.” (Wirth 1938, p. 23)

City intensifies materialism, consumerism, vice, crime, indifference, strangeness, aversion, repulsion, and indeed often results in hatred and conflict (Simmel 1903, Wirth 1938, Thrift 2005, Amin 2006, Veblen 2005, Park 1915, Park et al. [1925] 1984, Tönnies [1887] 2002, White and White 1977, Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015). Urbanism negatively affects quality of nearly all social relationships:

---

\*EMAIL: adam.okulicz.kozaryn@gmail.com

I thank XXX. All mistakes are mine.

e.g., fear, revulsion, and distrust (Wilson 1985). Cities are consumerist and materialistic—e.g., urbanites try to classify others in terms of visible evidence such as dress (Wilson 1985). Marx observed that humans are alienated under capitalism (Freud et al. 1930, Struhl 2016, Byron 2016, Petrović 1963, Wheeler 2015), and so humans are most alienated in cities, where capitalism is felt most: “urbanism makes alienation tangible” (Vaneigem 1997, p. 127). Urbanism is not only aggressive, but also oppressive (Vaneigem 1997). Some striking examples are seen where urbanism is currently most rife, in China (Yang 2013). Not only industrialization, but also postindustrialization has produced more alienation (Choi 2016). While there is much evidence of urbanism-alienation link, calls for more research (Parker 1978) have been largely unanswered.

City overstimulates human brain Simmel (1903), to the point where it is neurologically unhealthy Lederbogen et al. (2011). Reactions of an urbanite to stimuli are rational/economic, furthestest possible from one true self.

Human density forces differentiation and specialization as already observed by Darwin and Durkheim (Wirth 1938, p. 15). City not only enables, but what is often missed, forces differentiation and specialization, because that's the only way high density can be supported.<sup>1</sup> And humans as most other animals have not evolved to spend about half of their wake time performing repetitive task, it is against human nature **TODO** cite MARX as from rubia lonnie paper: wake in the morning go fishing etc

In sum, the classic sociological urban literature is extremely critical about cities. The authors must admit that we could not fully agree with them saying cities cause deviance, vice etc! but clearly this is what results show strongly!!

## 2 The Dark Side of Urbanity

Greatest cities are clearly the most competitive, aggressive, and dominant places—think of New York City, Chicago, London, Shanghai, etc. It is no wonder that aggressiveness and city are closely linked as remarked in a classic observation of city life (Burgess 1926, p. 82):

If a metropolite would “get ahead” he usually must become “aggressive,” but aggressiveness on the part of one person or of a group is often an invasion of the status of other persons or groups. Hence social-distance reactions are kept in turmoil.

High density increases aggressiveness in many forms, including violence and crime (Bettencourt et al. 2010, Bettencourt and West 2010, Bettencourt et al. 2007). Also, people toil longer hours in cities (Rosenthal and Strange 2008, 2003, 2002). Other animals suffer at high densities, too. Rats, for instance, become more stressed, aggressive, and kill each other (Calhoun 1962). Some species like ants and bees do thrive at high densities, but human nature is unlike that of bees: by one estimate we're 90% chimp and only 10% bee (Haidt 2012).

Thrift (2005) proposes that misanthropy is a natural condition of cities. And his critique of urbanicity is worth citing in full (Thrift 2005, p. 134):

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).

Amin (2006, p. 1011) summarizes well the dark side of urbanicity and is worth quoting as well:

---

<sup>1</sup>Also see Burgess (1926), eg “Introduction.”

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 symbolize 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

Steve Pile in his colorful writings about cities, for example, often invokes urban folklore characters that prey on humans in cities (e.g., vampires, werewolves, ghosts) (Pile 2005a,b, Pile et al. 1999). It is for a reason that at least in Western thinking there is much antiurbanism and city is referred to as 'labyrinth' 'nightmare, or 'jungle' (Knox and Pinch 2014), or cancer (White and White 1977).

### 3 Urbanness and Immorality/Dishonesty

Most of the earlier cited literature is decades old, mostly theoretical and qualitative—there are no modern quantitative studies on the topic except one.

This study was inspired by Joye et al. (2020), who found that dishonesty, corruption is higher in urban areas.

as per mechanism: Joye et al. (2020)—it is exposure to nature that is the mechanism and there is much more nature in smallest places v everything else than at any other step

And yet is urbanites who often feel more moral or righteous (Haidt 2012)

Clearly, the opposite of large and dense city is nature (wilderness)—the more built environment, the less nature, sure there are parks, and some nature, but in general this holds that the more city, the less nature Okulicz-Kozaryn (2015). As per (Joye et al. 2020), there are three mechanisms that make nature cause less materialism (and by extension cities cause more materialism): 1) again absence of materialism amplifying urban environment, 2) as nature makes people happy, “it provides an antidote to insecurities and worries about meeting one’s psychological and physical needs, known to drive materialism” (Joye et al. 2020, p. 5), 3) nature makes one value self-transcendent values such as altruism, and self-transcendent values are opposite of self-enhancement values to which materialism belongs—“nature exposure might suppress materialistic inclinations by activating self-transcendent values, such as altruism” and “nature decreases extrinsic aspirations (including the desire for wealth) through increased nature relatedness and autonomy” (Joye et al. 2020, p. 5).

### 4 Data and Model

We use the US General Social Survey (GSS) [gss.norc.umd.edu](http://gss.norc.umd.edu) cumulative file 1972-2018. The GSS is collected face-to-face and is nationally representative. Since 1994, the GSS is collected every other year (earlier, it was mostly annually).

The biggest challenge is in choice of measures of immorality, dishonesty etc; not there is a standard set of measures. Likewise, there is not an agreed model, or set of predictors. we have found only one study (a master’s thesis) that modeled morality using similar variables CITE and the set of predictors was TODO add region or south at least

we followed 3 DV from master thesis and in addition identified 5 more for a total of 8

TODO put here List of all variables is in ??, the first panel shows our outcome variables, measures of measures of immorality/dishonesty, the control variables are in the second panel. Urbanicity is measured as:

There are multiple correlates of immorality/dishonesty: age, religiosity, political orientation, and social class (e.g., Clerke et al. 2018). Notably higher social class predicts unethical behavior (Piff et al. 2012). And higher social class is likely to be more urban than rural, and hence urbanicity and social class may confound.

## 5 Results

so the results show for honest anomia1 and anomia3 that largest cities are the worst; not so for other measures, but all other measures are mostly higher in non-rural areas; therefore the conclusion is that while there is some indication that the largest places are the worst; overall conclusion is that in general urban v rural are worse; that makes sense as per Joye et al. (2020)—it is exposure to nature that is the mechanism and there is much more nature in smallest places v everything else than at any other step

note that for all measures except one—do say which one! it is positive and significant for some urban areas at least in earlier specs; for no measure it is ever negative and significant

	a1	a2a	a2b	a3	a4	a5
country	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
lt 2.5k	-0.04	-0.02	-0.05	-0.03	-0.03	-0.00
2.5-10k	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.05
10-50k	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-0.01
uninc med	-0.08+	-0.09+	-0.07	-0.08+	-0.06	-0.07
uninc lrg	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.01
med sub	0.02	-0.00	0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.02
lrg sub	0.08*	0.09*	0.07+	0.08*	0.06	0.03
50-250k	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.09
gt 250k	0.16***	0.19***	0.16***	0.18***	0.16**	0.14*
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	0.05	-0.01	0.06	0.01	-0.09	-0.05
e. nor. central	-0.04	-0.08	-0.03	-0.06	-0.16*	-0.10
w. nor. central	-0.10+	-0.16*	-0.07	-0.13+	-0.14	-0.07
south atlantic	-0.12*	-0.15*	-0.10+	-0.11+	-0.22**	-0.13
e. sou. central	-0.09	-0.11	-0.08	-0.09	-0.19*	-0.08
w. sou. central	-0.01	-0.03	0.01	-0.01	-0.08	-0.04
mountain	-0.02	-0.05	-0.01	-0.04	-0.11	-0.05
pacific	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.12	-0.09
subjective class identification		0.00		0.00	0.02	0.03
family income in \$1986, millions			0.02	-0.34	0.53	0.14
highest year of school completed			0.00	0.01*	0.01	0.01+
age					-0.01**	-0.01*
age squared					0.00*	0.00*
male					0.07**	0.07*
married					-0.01	-0.00
number of persons in household					-0.00	0.00
health					-0.03+	-0.03+
white					-0.07	-0.11+
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.00
how often r attends religious services						-0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.10*
jewish						0.11
none						0.09
other						0.17
constant	2.01***	1.99***	1.95***	1.86***	2.41***	2.26***
N	8059	6491	7483	6050	3899	3032
+ 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust std err						

**Table 1:** honest least desirable

	b1	b2a	b2b	b3	b4	b5
country	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
lt 2.5k	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.04
2.5-10k	0.06+	0.09*	0.10**	0.11**	0.11**	0.09*
10-50k	0.07*	0.07*	0.09**	0.09*	0.07*	0.07+
uninc med	-0.00	0.02	0.05	0.06+	0.07*	0.10*
uninc lrg	0.00	0.02	0.08*	0.08*	0.08*	0.07+
med sub	0.01	0.04	0.07+	0.07+	0.08+	0.10*
lrg sub	0.04	0.06*	0.12***	0.12***	0.12***	0.12***
50-250k	0.05	0.07*	0.09**	0.10**	0.09**	0.09*
gt 250k	0.09***	0.12***	0.14***	0.15***	0.11***	0.10**
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.05
e. nor. central	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	-0.00
w. nor. central	-0.05	-0.06	-0.07	-0.08	-0.07	-0.05
south atlantic	-0.00	-0.00	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.01
e. sou. central	-0.08+	-0.09+	-0.10*	-0.11*	-0.11*	-0.07
w. sou. central	-0.08+	-0.09*	-0.08+	-0.09*	-0.06	-0.02
mountain	-0.09+	-0.08	-0.09*	-0.08	-0.06	-0.06
pacific	-0.06	-0.08+	-0.06	-0.07	-0.06	-0.05
subjective class identification		-0.04***		0.02+	0.02	0.03
family income in \$1986, millions			-1.48***	-1.56***	-1.25***	-1.08*
highest year of school completed			-0.04***	-0.04***	-0.03***	-0.03***
age					0.00	0.00
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					0.02	0.03
married					0.03+	0.04+
number of persons in household					-0.00	-0.00
health					-0.02+	-0.01
white					-0.23***	-0.25***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.00
how often r attends religious services						-0.02***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.06*
jewish						0.11+
none						-0.01
other						0.01
constant	0.32***	0.41***	0.76***	0.68***	0.69***	0.64***
N	4463	3694	4120	3410	3395	2573

+ 0.10 \* 0.05 \*\* 0.01 \*\*\* 0.001; robust  
std err

**Table 2:** next to health, money is most important

	c1	c2a	c2b	c3	c4	c5
country	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
lt 2.5k	-0.03	0.03	-0.01	0.04	0.05	0.06
2.5-10k	-0.02	0.02	-0.00	0.03	0.04	0.04
10-50k	0.05	0.07*	0.06+	0.07*	0.07*	0.06
uninc med	-0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	-0.00
uninc lrg	-0.06+	-0.02	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.01
med sub	-0.07*	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00
lrg sub	-0.03	0.00	0.03	0.05+	0.04	0.02
50-250k	-0.00	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.05
gt 250k	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.05+	0.02	-0.02
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	-0.02	-0.05	-0.01	-0.04	-0.04	-0.01
e. nor. central	-0.06+	-0.08*	-0.05	-0.07	-0.06	-0.04
w. nor. central	-0.03	-0.06	-0.04	-0.07	-0.07	-0.06
south atlantic	-0.03	-0.05	-0.05	-0.07	-0.08+	-0.04
e. sou. central	-0.17***	-0.19***	-0.18***	-0.20***	-0.20***	-0.15**
w. sou. central	-0.09*	-0.09*	-0.08*	-0.08+	-0.08+	-0.02
mountain	-0.07	-0.10*	-0.07	-0.10+	-0.08	-0.04
pacific	-0.12**	-0.15***	-0.11**	-0.13**	-0.13**	-0.11*
subjective class identification		-0.07***		-0.02	-0.01	-0.01
family income in \$1986, millions			-1.52***	-1.26***	-0.96**	-0.83*
highest year of school completed			-0.03***	-0.02***	-0.03***	-0.03***
age					-0.00	-0.01+
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					0.06***	0.06***
married					0.01	0.02
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01
health					-0.03***	-0.03**
white					-0.10***	-0.15***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.01
how often r attends religious services						-0.01***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.09***
jewish						0.13*
none						0.04
other						0.03
constant	0.33***	0.47***	0.65***	0.67***	0.96***	0.95***
N	4376	3622	4049	3352	3339	2534

+ 0.10 \* 0.05 \*\* 0.01 \*\*\* 0.001; robust  
std err

**Table 3:** no right and wrong ways to make money

	d1	d2a	d2b	d3	d4	d5
country	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
lt 2.5k	-0.11	-0.11	-0.15	-0.15+	-0.05	-0.04
2.5-10k	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.09	-0.07
10-50k	-0.05	-0.04	-0.05	-0.05	-0.04	-0.06
uninc med	-0.08+	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.10	-0.08
uninc lrg	-0.08+	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.10+	-0.10+
med sub	-0.05	-0.04	-0.05	-0.04	-0.11+	-0.11+
lrg sub	-0.05	-0.04	-0.06	-0.06	-0.05	-0.05
50-250k	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07+	-0.07+	-0.09+	-0.08
gt 250k	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	-0.01	-0.03
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	-0.07	-0.08	-0.06	-0.06	-0.11	-0.08
e. nor. central	-0.09	-0.09	-0.08	-0.08	-0.14*	-0.10
w. nor. central	-0.02	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.10	-0.05
south atlantic	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08	-0.14*	-0.08
e. sou. central	-0.10	-0.11+	-0.10	-0.11	-0.24**	-0.12
w. sou. central	-0.10+	-0.11+	-0.12*	-0.12*	-0.20**	-0.10
mountain	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08	-0.17*	-0.13
pacific	-0.00	-0.01	-0.00	-0.00	-0.09	-0.09
subjective class identification		-0.04**		-0.02	-0.00	0.01
family income in \$1986, millions			-0.49	-0.39	-0.75	-0.83
highest year of school completed			-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.01	-0.01+
age					-0.00	-0.00
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					0.10***	0.06*
married					-0.11***	-0.04
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01
health					-0.00	0.01
white					-0.01	-0.03
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.07***
how often r attends religious services						-0.05***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.00
jewish						0.14
none						-0.01
other						-0.03
buddhism						0.21
hinduism						-0.59+
other eastern						0.14
moslem/islam						-0.12
orthodox-christian						-0.49
christian						-0.04
native american						0.41*
inter-nondenominational						0.01
constant	3.10***	3.21***	3.28***	3.30***	3.55***	3.84***
N	8269	8226	7329	7305	4797	4676

+ 0.10 \* 0.05 \*\* 0.01 \*\*\* 0.001; robust  
std err

**Table 4:** r agrees that morality a personal matter

	e1	e2a	e2b	e3	e4	e5
country	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
lt 2.5k	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.14	0.18
2.5-10k	0.10	0.11+	0.11+	0.11+	0.08	0.10
10-50k	0.13*	0.12*	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.09
uninc med	0.13**	0.10*	0.09+	0.08	0.11	0.13+
uninc lrg	0.15**	0.13*	0.11*	0.10+	0.08	0.10
med sub	0.13*	0.12*	0.13*	0.13*	0.09	0.10
lrg sub	0.17***	0.14***	0.13**	0.13**	0.13*	0.13*
50-250k	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.03
gt 250k	0.11**	0.11*	0.12*	0.12*	0.11+	0.10+
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	-0.18**	-0.17**	-0.13+	-0.13*	-0.07	-0.05
e. nor. central	-0.10	-0.09	-0.08	-0.08	-0.03	-0.00
w. nor. central	-0.13+	-0.12+	-0.10	-0.10	-0.06	-0.02
south atlantic	-0.22***	-0.20***	-0.17**	-0.17**	-0.10	-0.03
e. sou. central	-0.25***	-0.23***	-0.24**	-0.24**	-0.17+	-0.04
w. sou. central	-0.29***	-0.29***	-0.25***	-0.26***	-0.22*	-0.13
mountain	-0.12+	-0.11	-0.10	-0.10	-0.07	-0.03
pacific	-0.13*	-0.12+	-0.11	-0.11+	-0.03	-0.05
subjective class identification		0.08***		0.02	0.02	0.03
family income in \$1986, millions			1.38***	1.27**	1.06+	0.93+
highest year of school completed			0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***
age					0.01**	0.02***
age squared					-0.00**	-0.00**
male					0.04	0.01
married					-0.11**	-0.06+
number of persons in household					-0.01	0.00
health					0.03	0.04*
white					0.10**	0.09*
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.08***
how often r attends religious services						-0.04***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.07+
jewish						-0.07
none						0.10*
other						0.35**
buddhism						0.02
hinduism						-0.05
other eastern						-0.60*
moslem/islam						-0.26
orthodox-christian						0.10
christian						0.01
native american						0.35
inter-nondenominational						-0.15
constant	2.53***	2.34***	2.24***	2.21***	1.72***	1.90***
N	8323	8278	7361	7337	4822	4702
+ 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust std err						

Table 5: r agrees immoral person corrupts society

	f1	f2a	f2b	f3	f4	f5
country	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
lt 2.5k	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.08	0.04	0.01
2.5-10k	0.11*	0.11+	0.11*	0.11+	0.08	0.06
10-50k	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.04	0.03
uninc med	-0.03	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.04	-0.07
uninc lrg	-0.06	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.01	-0.02
med sub	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.05
lrg sub	0.01	0.07	0.07+	0.10*	0.05	0.03
50-250k	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.02	0.00
gt 250k	0.08*	0.10*	0.10**	0.10*	0.05	0.03
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	0.05	0.10*	0.04	0.08+	0.09+	0.09
e. nor. central	0.02	0.06	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.04
w. nor. central	-0.03	0.03	-0.07	-0.02	0.01	0.02
south atlantic	0.07+	0.11*	0.06	0.09+	0.07	0.09+
e. sou. central	0.08	0.09+	0.04	0.04	0.09	0.10
w. sou. central	0.09*	0.12*	0.05	0.09+	0.06	0.06
mountain	-0.02	-0.01	-0.05	-0.04	-0.00	-0.01
pacific	0.02	0.06	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.07
subjective class identification		-0.10***		-0.05**	-0.05*	-0.06*
family income in \$1986, millions			-2.34***	-2.31***	-1.55***	-1.56***
highest year of school completed			-0.02***	-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.01**
age					0.00	0.00
age squared					-0.00	-0.00
male					0.11***	0.09***
married					-0.07**	-0.08**
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01
health					-0.02	-0.02
white					-0.11***	-0.11***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.02*
how often r attends religious services						-0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.04
jewish						0.20*
none						-0.01
other						-0.03
buddhism						0.08
hinduism						-0.17
other eastern						-0.17*
moslem/islam						-0.11
orthodox-christian						0.62***
christian						-0.04
native american						-0.14+
inter-nondenominational						-0.20
constant	0.26***	0.46***	0.57***	0.58***	0.82***	0.76***
N	3495	2481	3195	2309	1758	1688

+ 0.10 \* 0.05 \*\* 0.01 \*\*\* 0.001; robust  
std err

**Table 6:** hrsmoney: more and more



	g1	g2a	g2b	g3	g4	g5
country	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
lt 2.5k	-0.05	-0.06	-0.04	-0.05	-0.03	-0.04
2.5-10k	0.02	0.02	-0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.00
10-50k	0.04	0.04	-0.02	-0.02	-0.04	-0.07
uninc med	0.03	0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0.03	0.02
uninc lrg	0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02
med sub	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.00	-0.00	-0.02
lrg sub	0.11**	0.10*	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.02
50-250k	0.07+	0.06	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.01
gt 250k	0.10*	0.09*	0.03	0.03	-0.00	-0.04
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	-0.08	-0.08	-0.07	-0.08	-0.06	-0.03
e. nor. central	-0.14**	-0.14**	-0.10*	-0.11*	-0.07	-0.00
w. nor. central	-0.12*	-0.12*	-0.12*	-0.12*	-0.09	-0.02
south atlantic	-0.27***	-0.26***	-0.26***	-0.27***	-0.22***	-0.12+
e. sou. central	-0.36***	-0.36***	-0.35***	-0.36***	-0.40***	-0.24**
w. sou. central	-0.28***	-0.28***	-0.28***	-0.28***	-0.31***	-0.17*
mountain	-0.18**	-0.18**	-0.17**	-0.18**	-0.15*	-0.07
pacific	-0.18***	-0.18***	-0.16**	-0.17**	-0.16*	-0.15*
subjective class identification		0.04**		-0.00	-0.01	-0.00
family income in \$1986, millions			-0.31	-0.27	0.23	0.10
highest year of school completed			0.03***	0.03***	0.04***	0.04***
age					-0.00	0.00
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					-0.06*	-0.09***
married					-0.11***	-0.05
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.00
health					-0.02	-0.00
white					0.00	-0.01
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.08***
how often r attends religious services						-0.05***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.11***
jewish						0.17*
none						0.00
other						-0.01
buddhism						0.14
hinduism						0.18
other eastern						0.27
moslem/islam						0.11
orthodox-christian						-0.18
christian						0.07
native american						-0.03
inter-nondenominational						-0.04
constant	3.31***	3.22***	2.97***	2.98***	3.11***	3.31***
N	8311	8267	7351	7327	4808	4687

+ 0.10 \* 0.05 \*\* 0.01 \*\*\* 0.001; robust  
std err

Table 7: r agrees right/wrong not black/white

	i1	i2a	i2b	i3	i4	i5
country	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
lt 2.5k	0.24*	0.27*	0.14	0.21+	0.37**	0.29*
2.5-10k	0.13	0.21*	0.10	0.24*	0.39***	0.39**
10-50k	-0.01	0.06	0.04	0.12	0.12	0.12
uninc med	-0.03	0.00	0.08	0.14	0.15	0.12
uninc lrg	-0.06	0.11	0.14+	0.25*	0.28*	0.27*
med sub	0.02	0.13	0.11	0.22*	0.29**	0.25*
lrg sub	0.04	0.13	0.21**	0.26**	0.25*	0.21*
50-250k	0.08	0.13	0.17*	0.26**	0.26*	0.25*
gt 250k	0.17*	0.21*	0.26***	0.33***	0.25*	0.22*
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	0.03	0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.04	-0.03
e. nor. central	-0.08	-0.14	-0.12	-0.16+	-0.17+	-0.14
w. nor. central	-0.19*	-0.17+	-0.25**	-0.21*	-0.25*	-0.22+
south atlantic	0.03	0.05	0.00	-0.00	-0.01	0.00
e. sou. central	-0.03	-0.02	-0.15	-0.16	-0.16	-0.15
w. sou. central	0.20*	0.10	0.15+	0.08	0.04	0.04
mountain	-0.25**	-0.22*	-0.24**	-0.23*	-0.26*	-0.23+
pacific	-0.13	-0.16+	-0.10	-0.12	-0.16	-0.14
subjective class identification		-0.33***		-0.15***	-0.12**	-0.09*
family income in \$1986, millions			-4.07***	-3.39***	-2.90**	-3.43***
highest year of school completed			-0.10***	-0.10***	-0.09***	-0.08***
age					0.00	-0.00
age squared					-0.00	0.00
male					0.07+	0.07
married					-0.05	-0.06
number of persons in household					0.02	0.03+
health					-0.04	-0.03
white					-0.43***	-0.46***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.01
how often r attends religious services						-0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.03
jewish						-0.15
none						-0.03
other						-0.00
buddhism						-0.59***
hinduism						-0.28
other eastern						-0.04
moslem/islam						-0.44
orthodox-christian						-0.35
christian						0.01
native american						-0.03
inter-nondenominational						-0.28
constant	2.48***	3.27***	3.83***	4.10***	4.28***	4.19***
N	5567	4040	4958	3657	2781	2644

+ 0.10 \* 0.05 \*\* 0.01 \*\*\* 0.001; robust  
std err

**Table 8:** job is just a way to earn money

TODO: out of 8  $\chi^2$  In sum, X out of X measures indicate at least positive relationship between corruption/wickedness and urbanicity, the sixth measure r agrees that morality a personal matter shows no relationship<sup>2</sup>

do say in abs and conclusion that in 7/8 measures some evidence of immorality/dishonesty in cities and in 4/8 even in oversaturated models

## 6 Conclusion and Discussion

What the results can mean practically. they shed light on why there is lower trust and happiness in the cities (Gurin et al. 1960, Campbell et al. 1976, Berry and Okulicz-Kozaryn 2011, Okulicz-Kozaryn and Mazelis 2016, Senior 2006, Office for National Statistics 2011, Chatterji 2013, Morrison 2015, Lenzi and Perucca 2016, Morrison 2011, Okulicz-Kozaryn and Valente 2020)—given immoral and unethical nature of cities, no wonder trust is loer in the city—cant't trust urbanites.

Materialism and over-consumption, which are centered in cities, do not lead to happiness, but unhappiness (Dittmar et al. 2014, Kasser 2003, Schmuck et al. 2000, Kasser and Ryan 1993), and consumption creates pollution and climate change (Leonard 2010, Pachauri et al. 2014).

TODO: have separate som-r.tex as opposed to having it below; and in paper say see supplementary material as opposed to see appendix!

<sup>2</sup>Appendix show results using alternative measure of urbanicity, rank of msa, results are similar but weaker arguably due to lower precision of that measure of urbanicity.

## 7 Appendix

results using alternative measure of urbanicity, rank of msa, results are similar but weaker arguably due to lower precision of that measure of urbanicity

	a1	a2a	a2b	a3	a4	a5
small rur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
small urb	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.03
13-100 sub	0.08*	0.08*	0.07+	0.07	0.04	0.03
1-12 sub	0.09*	0.11*	0.08+	0.10*	0.11+	0.03
13-100 msa	0.06+	0.10*	0.05	0.08+	0.04	0.03
1-12 msa	0.28***	0.31***	0.29***	0.31***	0.25***	0.24***
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	0.02	-0.02	0.04	-0.01	-0.11	-0.09
e. nor. central	-0.05	-0.08	-0.04	-0.07	-0.17*	-0.13
w. nor. central	-0.10+	-0.15*	-0.08	-0.13+	-0.14	-0.08
south atlantic	-0.12*	-0.14*	-0.11*	-0.11+	-0.23**	-0.15+
e. sou. central	-0.07	-0.09	-0.06	-0.07	-0.18*	-0.10
w. sou. central	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.03	-0.04	-0.03
mountain	0.02	-0.00	0.02	0.01	-0.07	-0.04
pacific	-0.04	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-0.14+	-0.12
subjective class identification		0.00		0.01	0.02	0.03
family income in \$1986, millions			0.01	-0.39	0.50	0.01
highest year of school completed			0.00	0.01*	0.01	0.01+
age					-0.01**	-0.01*
age squared					0.00*	0.00*
male					0.07**	0.07*
married					-0.01	-0.00
number of persons in household					-0.00	0.00
health					-0.03+	-0.03
white					-0.08	-0.10+
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.01
how often r attends religious services						-0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.10*
jewish						0.10
none						0.09
other						0.15
constant	2.00***	1.96***	1.94***	1.84***	2.41***	2.28***
N	8059	6491	7483	6050	3899	3032
+ 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust std err						

**Table 9:** honest least desirable

	b1	b2a	b2b	b3	b4	b5
small rur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
small urb	0.00	0.00	0.04*	0.03	0.04+	0.05+
13-100 sub	0.05+	0.07*	0.11***	0.11***	0.12***	0.13***
1-12 sub	0.05	0.05	0.12***	0.12***	0.12***	0.11**
13-100 msa	0.03	0.03	0.06*	0.06*	0.04	0.04
1-12 msa	0.14***	0.18***	0.18***	0.20***	0.16***	0.16***
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.01
e. nor. central	-0.03	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02
w. nor. central	-0.04	-0.06	-0.05	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06
south atlantic	0.00	-0.00	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.03
e. sou. central	-0.06	-0.08	-0.08+	-0.10*	-0.10*	-0.07
w. sou. central	-0.05	-0.07	-0.05	-0.06	-0.04	-0.02
mountain	-0.06	-0.06	-0.08+	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06
pacific	-0.08*	-0.10*	-0.07+	-0.09*	-0.08+	-0.07
subjective class identification		-0.04***		0.02+	0.02	0.02
family income in \$1986, millions			-1.60***	-1.71***	-1.40***	-1.26**
highest year of school completed			-0.04***	-0.04***	-0.03***	-0.03***
age					0.00	0.00
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					0.02	0.03+
married					0.04*	0.04+
number of persons in household					-0.00	-0.00
health					-0.02+	-0.01
white					-0.21***	-0.23***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.00
how often r attends religious services						-0.02***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.05*
jewish						0.08
none						-0.03
other						-0.02
constant	0.33***	0.43***	0.77***	0.71***	0.69***	0.65***
N	4463	3694	4120	3410	3395	2573
+ 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust std err						

**Table 10:** next to health, money is most important

	c1	c2a	c2b	c3	c4	c5
small rur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
small urb	0.05**	0.06**	0.07***	0.07***	0.07***	0.04+
13-100 sub	0.02	0.05+	0.07**	0.09**	0.08**	0.05+
1-12 sub	0.02	0.03	0.08**	0.08**	0.07*	0.03
13-100 msa	0.03	0.03	0.05*	0.04+	0.03	0.01
1-12 msa	0.07**	0.06*	0.09**	0.08**	0.05	-0.04
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	-0.02	-0.05	-0.01	-0.04	-0.04	-0.02
e. nor. central	-0.04	-0.06	-0.04	-0.06	-0.05	-0.04
w. nor. central	-0.01	-0.04	-0.02	-0.06	-0.06	-0.05
south atlantic	-0.00	-0.03	-0.03	-0.05	-0.07+	-0.04
e. sou. central	-0.14***	-0.16***	-0.16***	-0.18***	-0.19***	-0.16**
w. sou. central	-0.06	-0.07	-0.05	-0.06	-0.06	-0.03
mountain	-0.05	-0.09+	-0.05	-0.09+	-0.08	-0.05
pacific	-0.11**	-0.13***	-0.10**	-0.12**	-0.12**	-0.11*
subjective class identification		-0.07***		-0.02+	-0.01	-0.01
family income in \$1986, millions			-1.64***	-1.39***	-1.08**	-0.95*
highest year of school completed			-0.03***	-0.02***	-0.03***	-0.02***
age					-0.00	-0.01+
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					0.06***	0.06***
married					0.01	0.02
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01
health					-0.03***	-0.03**
white					-0.11***	-0.16***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.01
how often r attends religious services						-0.01***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.09***
jewish						0.13*
none						0.04
other						0.03
constant	0.26***	0.43***	0.60***	0.64***	0.94***	0.95***
N	4376	3622	4049	3352	3339	2534

+ 0.10 \* 0.05 \*\* 0.01 \*\*\* 0.001; robust  
std err

Table 11: no right and wrong ways to make money

	d1	d2a	d2b	d3	d4	d5
small rur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
small urb	0.00	0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02
13-100 sub	-0.02	-0.00	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.03
1-12 sub	0.00	0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.03
13-100 msa	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.02	-0.03	-0.05
1-12 msa	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.01
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	-0.06	-0.07	-0.05	-0.05	-0.10	-0.08
e. nor. central	-0.08	-0.08	-0.07	-0.06	-0.13+	-0.09
w. nor. central	-0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.07	-0.03
south atlantic	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.13+	-0.07
e. sou. central	-0.08	-0.09	-0.08	-0.08	-0.21*	-0.10
w. sou. central	-0.08	-0.09	-0.10+	-0.11+	-0.18*	-0.08
mountain	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.16*	-0.12
pacific	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.06	-0.06
subjective class identification		-0.05**		-0.02	-0.00	0.01
family income in \$1986, millions			-0.50	-0.39	-0.74	-0.81
highest year of school completed			-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.01	-0.01+
age					-0.01	-0.00
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					0.10***	0.06*
married					-0.11***	-0.04
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01
health					-0.00	0.01
white					-0.01	-0.04
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.07***
how often r attends religious services						-0.05***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.00
jewish						0.15
none						-0.00
other						-0.03
buddhism						0.21
hinduism						-0.58+
other eastern						0.15
moslem/islam						-0.11
orthodox-christian						-0.49
christian						-0.04
native american						0.39*
inter-nondenominational						-0.00
constant	3.03***	3.15***	3.23***	3.25***	3.49***	3.81***
N	8269	8226	7329	7305	4797	4676

+ 0.10 \* 0.05 \*\* 0.01 \*\*\* 0.001; robust  
std err

Table 12: r agrees that morality a personal matter

	e1	e2a	e2b	e3	e4	e5
small rur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
small urb	0.02	0.01	-0.00	-0.00	-0.02	-0.04
13-100 sub	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.02	-0.00
1-12 sub	0.13**	0.10*	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.07
13-100 msa	0.06	0.05	0.01	0.01	-0.00	-0.04
1-12 msa	-0.01	-0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.02	-0.03
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	-0.16**	-0.15*	-0.11+	-0.12+	-0.05	-0.04
e. nor. central	-0.10	-0.08	-0.07	-0.07	-0.03	0.00
w. nor. central	-0.13+	-0.12+	-0.09	-0.10	-0.05	-0.02
south atlantic	-0.21***	-0.20***	-0.16**	-0.16**	-0.10	-0.02
e. sou. central	-0.26***	-0.25***	-0.24**	-0.24**	-0.16+	-0.02
w. sou. central	-0.30***	-0.29***	-0.25***	-0.26***	-0.22*	-0.13
mountain	-0.10	-0.09	-0.08	-0.08	-0.04	-0.00
pacific	-0.13*	-0.11+	-0.10	-0.10	-0.01	-0.03
subjective class identification		0.08***		0.03	0.02	0.03
family income in \$1986, millions			1.44***	1.30**	1.06+	0.95+
highest year of school completed			0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***
age					0.01**	0.02***
age squared					-0.00**	-0.00**
male					0.04	0.01
married					-0.11**	-0.06+
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.00
health					0.03	0.04*
white					0.10**	0.09*
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.08***
how often r attends religious services						-0.04***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.07*
jewish						-0.06
none						0.10*
other						0.35**
buddhism						0.03
hinduism						-0.05
other eastern						-0.56*
moslem/islam						-0.24
orthodox-christian						0.09
christian						0.01
native american						0.36
inter-nondenominational						-0.15
constant	2.59***	2.39***	2.30***	2.27***	1.79***	1.99***
N	8323	8278	7361	7337	4822	4702
+ 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust std err						

Table 13: r agrees immoral person corrupts society

	f1	f2a	f2b	f3	f4	f5
small rur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
small urb	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.05
13-100 sub	-0.01	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04
1-12 sub	-0.02	0.03	0.06	0.08+	0.07	0.05
13-100 msa	0.06+	0.07	0.08*	0.07+	0.07	0.06
1-12 msa	0.06	0.06	0.08*	0.07	0.05	0.04
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	0.06	0.11*	0.05	0.09+	0.09+	0.09+
e. nor. central	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.05
w. nor. central	-0.01	0.05	-0.05	0.01	0.03	0.03
south atlantic	0.07+	0.12**	0.07	0.10*	0.07	0.09+
e. sou. central	0.08	0.10+	0.04	0.06	0.10	0.11+
w. sou. central	0.11*	0.13**	0.07+	0.11*	0.08	0.08
mountain	-0.00	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.00
pacific	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.07
subjective class identification		-0.11***		-0.05**	-0.05*	-0.06**
family income in \$1986, millions			-2.41***	-2.37***	-1.58***	-1.58***
highest year of school completed			-0.02***	-0.01**	-0.01**	-0.01**
age					0.00	0.00
age squared					-0.00	-0.00
male					0.11***	0.10***
married					-0.07*	-0.08**
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01
health					-0.02	-0.02
white					-0.10***	-0.11***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.02*
how often r attends religious services						-0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.04
jewish						0.19*
none						-0.01
other						-0.03
buddhism						0.09
hinduism						-0.18
other eastern						-0.16*
moslem/islam						-0.11
orthodox-christian						0.59***
christian						-0.03
native american						-0.11
inter-nondenominational						-0.20
constant	0.27***	0.48***	0.58***	0.59***	0.81***	0.74***
N	3495	2481	3195	2309	1758	1688
+ 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust std err						

Table 14: hrsmoney: more and more

	g1	g2a	g2b	g3	g4	g5
small rur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
small urb	0.08*	0.07*	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.00
13-100 sub	0.09*	0.08*	0.05	0.05	0.01	-0.02
1-12 sub	0.18***	0.17***	0.13**	0.14**	0.07	0.03
13-100 msa	0.18***	0.18***	0.14**	0.15***	0.08	0.04
1-12 msa	0.08+	0.08+	0.03	0.03	-0.06	-0.11+
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	-0.06	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07	-0.05	-0.02
e. nor. central	-0.13**	-0.13**	-0.10*	-0.11*	-0.08	-0.01
w. nor. central	-0.10+	-0.10+	-0.09	-0.10+	-0.09	-0.03
south atlantic	-0.26***	-0.26***	-0.27***	-0.27***	-0.24***	-0.14*
e. sou. central	-0.36***	-0.36***	-0.35***	-0.36***	-0.41***	-0.25**
w. sou. central	-0.28***	-0.27***	-0.27***	-0.28***	-0.32***	-0.18*
mountain	-0.17**	-0.16**	-0.16**	-0.17**	-0.16*	-0.08
pacific	-0.18***	-0.18***	-0.16**	-0.17***	-0.17*	-0.16*
subjective class identification		0.04*		-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
family income in \$1986, millions			-0.41	-0.36	0.24	0.12
highest year of school completed			0.03***	0.03***	0.04***	0.04***
age					-0.00	0.00
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					-0.06*	-0.09***
married					-0.11***	-0.05
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.00
health					-0.02	-0.00
white					0.00	-0.01
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.08***
how often r attends religious services						-0.05***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.11***
jewish						0.19**
none						-0.00
other						-0.01
buddhism						0.12
hinduism						0.16
other eastern						0.27
moslem/islam						0.11
orthodox-christian						-0.17
christian						0.07
native american						0.01
inter-nondenominational						-0.04
constant	3.27***	3.18***	2.93***	2.93***	3.09***	3.31***
N	8311	8267	7351	7327	4808	4687
+ 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust std err						

Table 15: r agrees right/wrong not black/white

	i1	i2a	i2b	i3	i4	i5
small rur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
small urb	-0.11*	-0.16**	0.00	-0.04	-0.09	-0.09
13-100 sub	-0.15*	-0.17*	0.06	0.01	-0.09	-0.10
1-12 sub	-0.04	-0.06	0.22**	0.15+	0.02	0.01
13-100 msa	-0.04	-0.05	0.12+	0.13+	-0.06	-0.06
1-12 msa	0.14+	0.05	0.24**	0.19*	-0.03	-0.03
new england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	0.02	0.04	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01
e. nor. central	-0.06	-0.12	-0.09	-0.13	-0.16+	-0.14
w. nor. central	-0.16+	-0.15	-0.20*	-0.17+	-0.23*	-0.20+
south atlantic	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.02
e. sou. central	0.01	-0.01	-0.11	-0.13	-0.16	-0.15
w. sou. central	0.21*	0.11	0.18*	0.11	0.04	0.04
mountain	-0.19*	-0.18+	-0.19*	-0.18+	-0.24*	-0.21+
pacific	-0.09	-0.14	-0.06	-0.09	-0.13	-0.11
subjective class identification		-0.33***		-0.15***	-0.12**	-0.09*
family income in \$1986, millions			-4.20***	-3.46***	-2.99***	-3.53***
highest year of school completed			-0.10***	-0.10***	-0.09***	-0.08***
age					0.00	-0.00
age squared					-0.00	0.00
male					0.07+	0.07
married					-0.05	-0.06
number of persons in household					0.02	0.03
health					-0.03	-0.03
white					-0.43***	-0.46***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.01
how often r attends religious services						-0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.04
jewish						-0.15
none						-0.03
other						0.01
buddhism						-0.57**
hinduism						-0.32
other eastern						-0.14
moslem/islam						-0.43
orthodox-christian						-0.33
christian						-0.02
native american						-0.31*
inter-nondenominational						-0.27
constant	2.59***	3.48***	3.87***	4.25***	4.56***	4.44***
N	5567	4040	4958	3657	2781	2644
+ 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust std err						

Table 16: job is just a way to earn money

## References

(2015): *LinkedIn Pulse*.

AMIN, A. (2006): "The good city," *Urban studies*, 43, 1009–1023.

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.

BURGESS, E. W. (1926): *The urban community: selected papers from the proceedings of the American Sociological Society, 1925*, vol. 4, The University of Chicago press, Chicago IL.

BYRON, C. (2016): "Essence and Alienation: Marx's Theory of Human Nature," *Science & Society*, 80, 375–394.

CALHOUN, J. B. (1962): "Population density and social pathology," *Scientific American*.

CAMPBELL, A., P. E. CONVERSE, AND W. L. RODGERS (1976): *The quality of American life: perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York NY.

CHATTERJI, A. (2013): "London is the Unhappiest Place to Live in Britain," *International Business Times*.

CHOI, B.-D. (2016): "Urban alienation and the just city," *Journal of the Korean association of regional geographers*, 22, 576–598.

CLERKE, A. S., M. BROWN, C. FORCHUK, AND L. CAMPBELL (2018): "Association between social class, greed, and unethical behaviour: A replication study," *Collabra: Psychology*, 4.

CURRID-HALKETT, E., H. LEE, AND G. D. PAINTER (2019): "Veblen goods and urban distinction: The economic geography of conspicuous consumption," *Journal of Regional Science*, 59, 83–117.

DITTMAR, H., R. BOND, M. HURST, AND T. KASSER (2014): "The relationship between materialism and personal well-being: A meta-analysis," *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 107, 879.

FREUD, S., J. RIVIERE, AND J. STRACHEY (1930): *Civilization and its discontents*, Hogarth Press London.

GLAESER, E. (2011): *Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier*, Penguin Press, New York NY.

GLAESER, E. L., J. KOLKO, AND A. SAIZ (2001): "Consumer city," *Journal of economic geography*, 1, 27–50.

GURIN, G., J. VEROFF, AND S. FELD (1960): *Americans view their mental health: A nationwide interview survey*, Basic Books, New York NY.

HAIDT, J. (2012): *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*, Vintage.

JOYE, Y., J. W. BOLDERDIJK, M. A. KÖSTER, AND P. K. PIFF (2020): "A diminishment of desire: Exposure to nature relative to urban environments dampens materialism," *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 54, 126783.

- KASSER, T. (2003): *The high price of materialism*, MIT press.
- KASSER, T. AND R. RYAN (1993): "A dark side of the American dream: correlates of financial success as a central life aspiration." *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 65, 410.
- KNOX, P. AND S. PINCH (2014): *Urban social geography: an introduction*, Routledge.
- LEDERBOGEN, F., P. KIRSCH, L. HADDAD, F. STREIT, H. TOST, P. SCHUCH, S. WUST, J. C. PRUESSNER, M. RIETSCHEL, M. DEUSCHLE, AND A. MEYER-LINDENBERG (2011): "City living and urban upbringing affect neural social stress processing in humans," *Nature*, 474.
- LENZI, C. AND G. PERUCCA (2016): "The Easterlin paradox and the urban-rural divide in life satisfaction: Evidence from Romania," *Unpublished*; <http://www.grupposervizioambiente.it>.
- LEONARD, A. (2010): *The story of stuff: How our obsession with stuff is trashing the planet, our communities, and our health-and a vision for change*, Simon and Schuster.
- MARX, K. ([1867] 2010): *Capital*, vol. 1, <http://www.marxists.org>.
- MORRISON, P. (2015): "Capturing effects of cities on subjective wellbeing," *European Regional Science Association Conference, Lisbon*.
- MORRISON, P. S. (2011): "Local expressions of subjective well-being: The New Zealand experience," *Regional studies*, 45, 1039–1058.
- MORRISON, P. S. AND M. WECKROTH (2017): "Human values, subjective well-being and the metropolitan region," *Regional Studies*, 1–13.
- OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS (2011): "Analysis of Experimental Subjective Well-being Data from the Annual Population Survey," *The National Archives*.
- 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*.
- OKULICZ-KOZARYN, A. AND R. VALENTE (2020): "The perennial dissatisfaction of urban upbringing," *Cities*.
- 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.
- PACHAURI, R. K., M. ALLEN, V. BARROS, J. BROOME, W. CRAMER, R. CHRIST, J. CHURCH, L. CLARKE, Q. DAHE, P. DASGUPTA, ET AL. (2014): *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, IPCC.
- 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.
- PARKER, J. H. (1978): "The urbanism-alienation hypothesis: a critique," *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 239–244.



- PERRIN, A. (2015): "Social media usage," *Pew research center*, 52–68.
- PETROVIĆ, G. (1963): "Marx's Theory of Alienation," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 23, 419–426.
- PIERCE, J. AND K. B. HANKINS (2019): "The City as "Dissonant" Fetish: Urban (Re) production, Gentrification, and the Conceptual Limits of Commodity Fetishism," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 109, 1529–1540.
- PIFF, P. K., D. M. STANCATO, S. CÔTÉ, R. MENDOZA-DENTON, AND D. KELTNER (2012): "Higher social class predicts increased unethical behavior," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109, 4086–4091.
- 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*.
- RABIEI-DASTJERDI, H., G. MCARDLE, AND A. BALLATORE (2020): "Urban Consumption Patterns: OpenStreetMap Quality for Social Science Research." in *GISTAM*, 278–285.
- ROSENTHAL, S. S. AND W. C. STRANGE (2002): "The urban rat race," *Syracuse University Working*.
- (2003): "Agglomeration, Labor Supply, and the Urban Rat Race," *Center for Policy Research Working Paper*.
- (2008): "Agglomeration and hours worked," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90, 105–118.
- SCHMUCK, P., T. KASSER, AND R. M. RYAN (2000): "Intrinsic and extrinsic goals: Their structure and relationship to well-being in German and US college students," *Social Indicators Research*, 50, 225–241.
- SENIOR, J. (2006): "Some Dark Thoughts on Happiness," *New York Magazine*.
- SIMMEL, G. (1903): "The metropolis and mental life," *The Urban Sociology Reader*, 23–31.
- SNOWDON, C. (2015): "Selfishness, greed and capitalism. Debunking myths about the free market." *IEA*.
- STRUHL, K. J. (2016): "Marx and human nature: The historical, the trans-historical, and human flourishing," *Science & Society*, 80, 78–104.
- TAYLOR, D. G. AND D. STRUTTON (2016): "Does Facebook usage lead to conspicuous consumption?" *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*.
- 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.
- VANEIGEM, R. (1997): "Comments against urbanism," *October*, 79, 123–128.
- VEBLER, T. (2005): *The theory of the leisure class; an economic study of institutions*, Aakar Books, New York NY.
- 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.

YANG, D. Y.-R. (2013): "A tale of Foxconn city: Urban village, migrant workers and alienated urbanism," in *Rural Migrants in Urban China*, Routledge, 171–187.