

# Immorality and Dishonesty: More Urban than Rural

Adam Okulicz-Kozaryn\*

Rutgers - Camden and Vistula University

Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> November, 2020 10:47

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

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), and 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.

city makes one not just blasé and indifferent, but also creates aversion, strangeness, repulsion, and indeed often results in hatred and conflict.

urbanism negatively affects quality of nearly all social relationships: e.g., fear, revoltion, and distrust ((Park, Simmel, wirth cited in) Wilson 1985).

cities are consumerist and materialistic—eg urbanites try to classify others in terms of visible evidence such as dress (Wilson 1985).

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 or

(Amin 2006, 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?

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,

---

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

I thank XXX. All mistakes are mine.

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).

Thrift (2005): "misanthropy is a natural condition of cities, one which cannot be avoided and will not go away" (p. 140).

Capitalism works best at high density (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015) when agglomeration economies are possible, but high density also 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).

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).

city intensifies vice, crime, and also intensifies conspicuous consumption: urban etiquette, sophistication, manners and finish (Park, Veblen)

"With urbanization comes disharmony" (The Dalai Lama)<sup>1</sup>

The faults of the state governments are insignificant compared

"The city, in short, shows the good and evil in human nature in excess" (Park et al. [1925] 1984, p. 46).

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

cite that classic sociology about vice!!! yeah i admit that i couldn't fully agree thgem saying cities cause deviance, vice etc! but clearly this is what results show strongly!!

"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)

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>2</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

and from city book or misanthropy/trust paper: summary: transitoriness, etc

"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) 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, . 3), or cancer

This study was inspired by Joye et al. (2020), who found that dishonesty, corruption is higher in urban areas. A recent survey found that a third of people define success by their possessions (cited in Joye et al. 2020).

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

---

<sup>1</sup>Cited in Martinson (2000, p. 247).

<sup>2</sup>Also see Burgess (1926), eg "Introduction."

# 1 misc maybe mv somewhere and add to other papers now written

City is where rat race and money chase is concentrated. Urbanites tend to work longer (Rosenthal and Strange 2002, 2003, 2008, Snowden 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). 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).

Humans are not inherently and purely selfish, as economists argue, rather selfishness results from commodity fetishism (Marx [1867] 2010), and again, fetishism is highest in cities.

Materialism and over-consumption doesn't 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).

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). REPHRASE: The quest for possessions, money, image and status can be a costly endeavor; it is associated with lower levels of wellbeing, and known to lead to increased compulsive consumption, depression, anxiety and risky health behavior (Dittmar et al. 2014, Kasser 2016).

## 2 Data and Model

The biggest challenge is in choice of measures of greed, vice etc; not there is a standard set of measures

There are multiple correlates of greed: 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.

## 3 Results

so the results show for honest anomia<sup>1</sup> and anomia<sup>3</sup> 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	-0.04	-0.03	-0.01
2.5-10k	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.06
10-50k	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	-0.01
uninc med	-0.05	-0.05	-0.04	-0.06	-0.03	-0.05
uninc lrg	0.10*	0.09+	0.10*	0.08	0.09	0.03
med sub	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.08	0.06
lrg sub	0.12***	0.14***	0.11**	0.11**	0.10*	0.05
50-250k	0.07+	0.10*	0.07	0.10*	0.13*	0.12+
gt 250k	0.20***	0.23***	0.20***	0.22***	0.21***	0.16**
subjective class identification		0.00		-0.00	0.02	0.02
family income in \$1986, millions			0.15	-0.22	0.64	0.25
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					-0.06	-0.09
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.11**
jewish						0.14
none						0.13*
other						0.18
constant	1.94***	1.89***	1.88***	1.78***	2.21***	2.14***
N	8059	6491	7483	6050	3899	3039

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

**Table 1: honest**

	b1	b2a	b2b	b3	b4	b5
country	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
lt 2.5k	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.03
2.5-10k	0.07*	0.09**	0.11***	0.13***	0.13***	0.09*
10-50k	0.07*	0.07+	0.09**	0.08*	0.07+	0.06
uninc med	0.00	0.02	0.06*	0.07*	0.09*	0.11**
uninc lrg	0.03	0.04	0.12***	0.11**	0.12***	0.09*
med sub	0.00	0.03	0.07*	0.07+	0.07+	0.09*
lrg sub	0.04	0.05+	0.12***	0.12***	0.13***	0.12***
50-250k	0.03	0.05+	0.08**	0.09**	0.09**	0.09*
gt 250k	0.09***	0.11***	0.15***	0.16***	0.12***	0.11**
subjective class identification		-0.04***		0.02+	0.02	0.02
family income in \$1986, millions			-1.33***	-1.40***	-1.09**	-0.87*
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+	-0.02
white					-0.23***	-0.25***
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.00
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.06**
jewish						0.16**
none						0.03
other						0.03
constant	0.29***	0.38***	0.72***	0.65***	0.65***	0.61***
N	4463	3694	4120	3410	3395	2578

+ 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	0.02	-0.01	0.04	0.05	0.05
2.5-10k	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.04
10-50k	0.04	0.07+	0.05+	0.07*	0.07*	0.05
uninc med	-0.03	-0.02	0.01	0.02	0.03	-0.01
uninc lrg	-0.05	-0.01	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.02
med sub	-0.07*	-0.03	-0.03	0.01	0.02	-0.01
lrg sub	-0.04	-0.01	0.03	0.05+	0.05+	0.01
50-250k	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.06*	0.06*	0.06
gt 250k	0.01	0.02	0.04+	0.05+	0.03	-0.02
subjective class identification		-0.07***		-0.02	-0.01	-0.01
family income in \$1986, millions			-1.40***	-1.12***	-0.82*	-0.63
highest year of school completed			-0.03***	-0.03***	-0.03***	-0.03***
age					-0.00	-0.01+
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					0.05***	0.06***
married					0.01	0.02
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01+
health					-0.03***	-0.03**
white					-0.10***	-0.14***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.09***
jewish						0.17**
none						0.08*
other						0.04
constant	0.27***	0.40***	0.58***	0.59***	0.87***	0.87***
N	4376	3622	4049	3352	3339	2538
+ 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	-0.07	-0.08	-0.11	-0.12	-0.03	-0.03
2.5-10k	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.08
10-50k	-0.04	-0.04	-0.05	-0.05	-0.03	-0.06
uninc med	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06	-0.06	-0.08	-0.07
uninc lrg	-0.08+	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.09	-0.08
med sub	-0.04	-0.03	-0.04	-0.03	-0.09	-0.09
lrg sub	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04
50-250k	-0.05	-0.04	-0.06	-0.06	-0.08	-0.09+
gt 250k	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.00	-0.04
subjective class identification		-0.04**		-0.02	-0.00	-0.00
family income in \$1986, millions			-0.40	-0.30	-0.63	-0.62
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***	0.08**
married					-0.12***	-0.07*
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01
health					-0.00	-0.00
white					-0.00	0.00
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.08***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.02
jewish						0.21*
none						0.14***
other						0.02
buddhism						0.31*
hinduism						-0.48
other eastern						0.26
moslem/islam						-0.12
orthodox-christian						-0.46
christian						-0.01
native american						0.39
inter-nondenominational						0.03
constant	3.03***	3.13***	3.19***	3.22***	3.38***	3.70***
N	8269	8226	7329	7305	4797	4678
+ 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	0.11	0.11	0.07	0.07	0.17	0.18
2.5-10k	0.12*	0.13*	0.13*	0.14*	0.10	0.10
10-50k	0.14**	0.14*	0.10+	0.10+	0.12+	0.10
uninc med	0.17***	0.14**	0.12*	0.12*	0.14*	0.15*
uninc lrg	0.15**	0.12*	0.11*	0.11*	0.09	0.12+
med sub	0.15**	0.14**	0.15**	0.15**	0.12+	0.12+
lrg sub	0.19***	0.17***	0.16***	0.15***	0.17**	0.14**
50-250k	0.09*	0.08*	0.07+	0.07+	0.05	0.04
gt 250k	0.13**	0.12**	0.13**	0.13**	0.14*	0.11+
subjective class identification		0.08***		0.02	0.01	0.02
family income in \$1986, millions			1.50***	1.40**	1.19*	1.09*
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	0.03
married					-0.11***	-0.08*
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.00
health					0.03	0.03+
white					0.11**	0.13***
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.09***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.07*
jewish						-0.03
none						0.22***
other						0.41***
buddhism						0.10
hinduism						0.03
other eastern						-0.51*
moslem/islam						-0.25
orthodox-christian						0.11
christian						0.03
native american						0.36
inter-nondenominational						-0.15
constant	2.34***	2.15***	2.07***	2.04***	1.60***	1.81***
N	8323	8278	7361	7337	4822	4704
+ 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	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.08	0.04	0.02
2.5-10k	0.10*	0.11+	0.10*	0.11+	0.08	0.07
10-50k	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.03
uninc med	-0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	-0.03	-0.04
uninc lrg	-0.05	0.06	0.03	0.08	0.03	0.00
med sub	0.01	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.07
lrg sub	0.01	0.08+	0.07*	0.11*	0.06	0.05
50-250k	0.03	0.08+	0.06	0.09+	0.03	0.02
gt 250k	0.08*	0.11*	0.10**	0.11*	0.05	0.04
subjective class identification		-0.11***		-0.05**	-0.05*	-0.06**
family income in \$1986, millions			-2.32***	-2.31***	-1.53***	-1.43**
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	-0.03
white					-0.12***	-0.12***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.02+
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.03
jewish						0.20*
none						0.00
other						-0.03
buddhism						0.07
hinduism						-0.16
other eastern						-0.20***
moslem/islam						-0.10
orthodox-christian						0.54***
christian						-0.05
native american						-0.19**
inter-nondenominational						-0.21
constant	0.30***	0.52***	0.60***	0.62***	0.88***	0.82***
N	3495	2481	3195	2309	1758	1696
+ 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust std err						

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


In sum, 5 out of 6 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>3</sup>

<sup>3</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.

## 4 Conclusion and Discussion

what the results can mean practically. they shed light on why there is lower trust and happiness in the cities—given immoral and unethical nature of cities, no wonder trust is loer in the city—cant't trust urbanites;

**Figure 1:** The graphs are from Okulicz-Kozaryn (2015), data from American General Social Survey smoothened with 9-yr moving average (4 lagged terms, current term, and 4 forward terms).



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

## 5 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	0.04	0.06+	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.06
13-100 sub	0.12***	0.12**	0.11**	0.10*	0.07	0.06
1-12 sub	0.13***	0.15***	0.11**	0.12**	0.14*	0.05
13-100 msa	0.10**	0.14***	0.08*	0.12**	0.09+	0.06
1-12 msa	0.33***	0.35***	0.33***	0.35***	0.29***	0.26***
subjective class identification		0.00		0.00	0.02	0.03
family income in \$1986, millions			0.13	-0.28	0.61	0.12
highest year of school completed			0.00	0.01**	0.01	0.01+
age					-0.02**	-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					-0.06	-0.09
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.11**
jewish						0.13
none						0.12+
other						0.15
constant	1.93***	1.87***	1.87***	1.76***	2.22***	2.13***
N	8059	6491	7483	6050	3899	3039

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

**Table 7:** honest

	b1	b2a	b2b	b3	b4	b5
small rur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
small urb	0.00	0.01	0.05*	0.04+	0.05*	0.06*
13-100 sub	0.05*	0.07*	0.12***	0.12***	0.13***	0.14***
1-12 sub	0.04	0.04	0.13***	0.13***	0.13***	0.12***
13-100 msa	0.01	0.02	0.06*	0.05+	0.04	0.04
1-12 msa	0.15***	0.18***	0.20***	0.23***	0.19***	0.18***
subjective class identification		-0.04**		0.03+	0.02	0.02
family income in \$1986, millions			-1.46***	-1.56***	-1.27***	-1.06*
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					-0.01	-0.01
white					-0.21***	-0.22***
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.00
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.05*
jewish						0.12*
none						0.02
other						-0.00
constant	0.30***	0.40***	0.74***	0.67***	0.64***	0.60***
N	4463	3694	4120	3410	3395	2578

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

**Table 8:** 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***	0.08***	0.08***	0.05*
13-100 sub	0.02	0.05+	0.07**	0.09**	0.08**	0.06+
1-12 sub	0.01	0.02	0.08**	0.08**	0.08**	0.03
13-100 msa	0.01	0.02	0.04+	0.04+	0.03	0.01
1-12 msa	0.07**	0.06*	0.10***	0.09**	0.06*	-0.04
subjective class identification		-0.07***		-0.02+	-0.01	-0.01
family income in \$1986, millions			-1.53***	-1.26***	-0.96**	-0.76+
highest year of school completed			-0.03***	-0.03***	-0.03***	-0.03***
age					-0.00	-0.01+
age squared					0.00	0.00
male					0.05***	0.06***
married					0.01	0.02
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01+
health					-0.03***	-0.03**
white					-0.11***	-0.15***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.01
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.09***
jewish						0.17**
none						0.08*
other						0.04
constant	0.23***	0.38***	0.55***	0.57***	0.86***	0.88***
N	4376	3622	4049	3352	3339	2538

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

**Table 9:** 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	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02
1-12 sub	0.01	0.02	-0.00	-0.00	-0.01	-0.02
13-100 msa	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.03	-0.02	-0.05
1-12 msa	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.01
subjective class identification		-0.04**		-0.02	-0.01	-0.00
family income in \$1986, millions			-0.42	-0.31	-0.63	-0.60
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***	0.08**
married					-0.12***	-0.07*
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01
health					-0.00	-0.00
white					-0.00	0.00
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.08***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.02
jewish						0.21*
none						0.14***
other						0.02
buddhism						0.32*
hinduism						-0.47
other eastern						0.27
moslem/islam						-0.12
orthodox-christian						-0.47
christian						-0.01
native american						0.36
inter-nondenominational						0.01
constant	2.98***	3.08***	3.16***	3.19***	3.35***	3.67***
N	8269	8226	7329	7305	4797	4678

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

Table 10: 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	0.03	0.02	-0.00	-0.00	-0.02	-0.03
13-100 sub	0.08*	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.02
1-12 sub	0.14**	0.11*	0.08+	0.07	0.11+	0.08
13-100 msa	0.06	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.03
1-12 msa	0.01	-0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00	-0.03
subjective class identification		0.09***		0.03	0.01	0.02
family income in \$1986, millions			1.55***	1.43***	1.19*	1.13*
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	0.03
married					-0.11***	-0.08*
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.00
health					0.03+	0.04+
white					0.11**	0.13***
think of self as liberal or conservative						-0.09***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.08*
jewish						-0.02
none						0.22***
other						0.41***
buddhism						0.11
hinduism						0.04
other eastern						-0.48+
moslem/islam						-0.22
orthodox-christian						0.11
christian						0.03
native american						0.38
inter-nondenominational						-0.15
constant	2.43***	2.23***	2.15***	2.11***	1.70***	1.91***
N	8323	8278	7361	7337	4822	4704

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

Table 11: 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	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04
13-100 sub	-0.01	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04
1-12 sub	-0.01	0.03	0.06+	0.09*	0.08	0.07
13-100 msa	0.06+	0.05	0.08*	0.06	0.06	0.06
1-12 msa	0.06+	0.07	0.09*	0.09+	0.06	0.05
subjective class identification		-0.11***		-0.05**	-0.05*	-0.06**
family income in \$1986, millions			-2.38***	-2.38***	-1.57***	-1.47**
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*	-0.07**
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.01
health					-0.02	-0.02
white					-0.11***	-0.12***
think of self as liberal or conservative						0.02+
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.03
jewish						0.19*
none						0.00
other						-0.04
buddhism						0.08
hinduism						-0.17
other eastern						-0.19***
moslem/islam						-0.11
orthodox-christian						0.51***
christian						-0.04
native american						-0.17**
inter-nondenominational						-0.20
constant	0.32***	0.57***	0.62***	0.67***	0.89***	0.81***
N	3495	2481	3195	2309	1758	1696

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

**Table 12:** hrsmoney: more and more

## References

- AMIN, A. (2006): "The good city," *Urban studies*, 43, 1009–1023.
- 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.
- CALHOUN, J. B. (1962): "Population density and social pathology." *Scientific American*.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- (2016): "Materialistic values and goals," *Annual review of psychology*, 67, 489–514.
- 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.
- 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.
- MARTINSON, T. (2000): *American dreamscape: The pursuit of happiness in postwar suburbia*, Carroll & Graf Pub.
- MARX, K. ([1867] 2010): *Capital*, vol. 1, <http://www.marxists.org>.
- MORRISON, P. S. AND M. WECKROTH (2017): "Human values, subjective well-being and the metropolitan region," *Regional Studies*, 1–13.
- OKULICZ-KOZARYN, A. (2015): *Happiness and Place. Why Life is Better Outside of the City.*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York NY.
- 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., E. W. BURGESS, AND R. D. MAC KENZIE ([1925] 1984): *The city*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL.
- PERRIN, A. (2015): "Social media usage," *Pew research center*, 52–68.
- 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.
- 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*.
- 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.
- 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.