Unhappy Metros: Panel Evidence

Wednesday 30th March, 2022   05:36

We study the effect of urbanicity (metro v nonmetro) on life satisfaction, or Subjective WellBeing (SWB). The literature agrees that residents of metropolitan areas tend to be less satisfied with their lives than residents of smaller settlements in the developed world. But the existing evidence is cross-sectional only. This is the first study using longitudinal dataset to test the "unhappy metro" hypothesis. Using the 2009-2019 US Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), we find support for the cross-sectional findings: metros are less happy than nonmetros. The effect size is substantial, the negative effect of metro v nonmetro is equivalent to the effect of one's health deteriorating about a third from "fair" to "poor." Given extremely large scale of urbanization, projected 6b of people from 1950 to 2050, the combined effect of urbanicity on human wellbeing is large.

For over 95% of our evolutionary history, humans have lived without cities as hunter-gatherers usually in small bands of 50-80 people (Maryanski and Turner 1992). In 1800 a mere 1.7% of the world population lived in cities larger than 100k (Davis 1955). Humans have not evolved to live in settlements of millions of inhabitants at high densities, such as cities. Human nature is unlike that of ants or bees: by one estimate we're 90% chimp and only 10% bee (Haidt 2012).

Urbanism is not just built environment, it is a way of life (Wirth 1938). Urbanism affects humans in multiple and profound ways, indeed urbanism is arguably the most significant disruption of human habitat in our species history (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015). World is urbanizing at an astonishing pace–urban population is projected to increase from .75b in 1950 in to 6.75b in 2050 (`https://population.un.org/wup`)–6 billion urbanites more over just 100 years.

At the same time, an agreement has emerged that in addition to the traditional development measures such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Human Development Index (HDI), it is useful to measure human development as Subjective WellBeing (SWB) (Stiglitz et al. 2009, Diener 2009). Hence, the present study estimating the effect of urbanicity on SWB.

There are multiple studies finding lowest happiness in largest cities (e.g., Gurin et al. 1960, Campbell et al. 1976, Senior 2006, Office for National Statistics 2011, Chatterji 2013, Lu et al. 2015, Lenzi and Perucca 2016, Morrison 2015, Morrison and Weckroth 2017, Okulicz-Kozaryn and Valente 2021, Lenzi and Perucca 2021). Yet all studies to date are cross-sectional–longitudinal evidence is missing. Rehdanz and Maddison (2008) uses a German panel dataset (GSOEP), properly defining urban rural gradient with multiple cutoffs including at several hundred thousand, but without panel modeling techniques such as fixed or random effects.

Few studies about the effect of place on SWB using panel data do not actually test the urban unhappiness hypothesis. White et al. (2013b) and White et al. (2013a) use British Household Panel Study (BHPS) but test green space (such as gardens, parks, and proximity to coast), not size of a place. Similarly, Alcock et al. (2014) is a panel study (BHPS) but also examining green space, not size of a place.

Hoogerbrugge and Burger (2021) also using BHPS test green space effect, not urbanism. The size of a place cutoff is at 10,000 or 3,000 people for Scotland. Hence, much of the places above the cutoff, such as large villages and

small towns are not really "urban." They are lacking defining features of urbanness: size, density, and heterogeneity Wirth (1938). The build environment in villages or small towns lacks tall buildings, urban transit, airports, etc. Way of life in such places is not urban either–cities are shallow, transitory, superficial, and conspicuous (Tönnies [1887] 2002, Park 1915, Wirth 1938, White and White 1977). Urbanicity, ideally, should be measured as a gradient, but if a binary cutoff is necessary, it should be at several hundred thousand (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2016), not at 3 or 10 thousand as in Hoogerbrugge and Burger (2021).

1 Data and model

We use the 2009-2019 US Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) from `psidonline.isr.umich.edu`. We cannot use earlier waves because the SWB question started in 2009. We use the family files and only retain the reference person following Brown and Gathergood (2019).

The SWB question reads: "Please think about your life as a whole. How satisfied are you with it? Are you completely satisfied, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied?" on scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high).

The key independent variable is the metro dummy variable as defined in table 1. Summary statistics of all variables are in Supplementary Online Material (SOM).

metro	beale rural-urban code	description
1	1	Metro: Counties in metro areas of 1 million population or more
1	2	Metro: Counties in metro areas of 250,000 to 1 million population
1	3	Metro: Counties in metro areas of fewer than 250,000 population
0	4	Nonmetro: Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metro area
0	5	Nonmetro: Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metro area
0	6	Nonmetro: Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area
0	7	Nonmetro: Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area
0	8	Nonmetro: Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, adjacent to a metro area
0	9	Nonmetro: Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, not adjacent to a metro area

Table 1: Metro variable: Metropolitan/Non-metropolitan Indicator. This indicator is derived from the 2013 Beale-Ross Rural-Urban Continuum Codes published by USDA based on matches to the FIPS state and county codes: 1. Metropolitan area (Beale-Ross Code ER775923= 1-3); 0. Non-metropolitan area (Beale-Ross Code ER775923= 4-9). Each county in the U.S. is assigned one of the 9 codes.

We control for a usual set of SWB predictors following Okulicz-Kozaryn and Valente (2018). In addition, following Brown and Gathergood (2019) we control for distress.

There are three variables that not only predict SWB, but also are likely to be confounded with metro: race, political views, and religiosity–yet, as they are mostly constant over short period of time such as that considered here, they are irrelevant in fixed effects model. Race is definitely almost always constant over time, and while political views and religiosity do change, they rarely change much over just several years as studied here. Furthermore, there are no measures of political views in PSID.

The US is a geographically diverse country with a multitude of regional differences that may affect the results, notably urban areas differ in their character greatly depending on the region, and hence, we include state dummies. Following Brown and Gathergood (2019) we also add year dummies.

We use a standard Fixed Effects model. Although linear models assume cardinality of the outcome variable, and SWB measures are technically ordinal, cardinality can be assumed. Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters (2004) has shown that linear model results are substantially the same as those from discrete models (and linear models are the default method in happiness research (Blanchflower and Oswald 2011)). Aside from practical estimation, even

theoretically, while there is still debate about the cardinality of SWB, there are strong arguments to treat it as cardinal (Ng 1996, 1997, 2011).

A standard fixed effects model is given by:

$$SWB_{it} = \gamma METRO_{it} X_{it} \beta + \alpha_i + u_{it} \tag{1}$$

Where, $METRO_{it}$ is a metro dummy for person i at time t. γ is the main coefficient of interest on the metro dummy. α_i (i=1...n) is the unknown intercept for each person (n person-specific intercepts). SWB is the dependent variable, where i = person and t = wave (2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019). X_{it} is a vector of control variables as listed in the Supplementary Online Material. β is the vector of coefficients for control variables. u_{it} is the error term. In Supplementary Online Material (SOM), we also present Random Effects, 2015 and 2015-2019 pooled OLS results–estimates on metro are stronger in these models, and hence, Fixed Effects results presented here are conservative estimates.

2 Results

Fixed effects regressions of `SWB` on `metro` are in table 2. Regression coefficient on `metro` is not significant without controlling for predictors of `SWB` in model a1. But addition of even most basic `SWB` predictors in model a2 makes `metro` negative at -.04 and statistically significant at .1 level of significance. This is an important finding: metro-nonmetro happiness gap only emerges after controlling for `SWB` predictors. Addition of further controls in a3 attenuates `metro` coefficient only slightly down to -.03. Addition of control for distress in model a4 and further addition of state and year dummies in a5 yields the same estimate as only controlling for basic `SWB` predictors in a2 at -.04.

Table 2: Fixed Effects regressions of SWB.

	a1	a2	a3	a4	a5
metro	0.01	-0.04*	-0.03*	-0.04**	-0.04*
age		0.02***	0.02***	0.01***	0.00
age sq		-0.00**	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
last year total family income		0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00
unemployed		-0.18***	-0.18***	-0.16***	-0.16***
male		0.27	0.21	0.07	0.08
health		0.13***	0.13***	0.10***	0.10***
kids			-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
college			-0.08*	-0.07	-0.07
married			0.18***	0.17***	0.17***
family unit size			0.04***	0.03***	0.03***
distress				-0.05***	-0.05***
constant	3.71***	2.37***	2.45***	2.90***	3.60***
state and year dummies	no	no	no	no	yes
N	37567	37489	36285	36142	36142

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

3 Conclusion and Discussion

Urbanism affects humans in multiple and profound ways (Wirth 1938), indeed urbanism is arguably the most significant disruption of human habitat in our species history (Okulicz-Kozaryn 2015). In addition to the traditional development measures such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Human Development Index (HDI), it is useful

to measure human development as Subjective WellBeing (SWB) (Stiglitz et al. 2009, Diener 2009). In the present study, we have focused on this important intersection of urbanicity and SWB.

This is the first panel data investigation of metro-nonmetro SWB gap. The results confirm cross-sectional evidence of urban unhappiness. Time invariant person-level characteristics, such as personality traits do matter–the metro unhappiness disadvantage is only about half in fixed effects model v single-year or pooled data (estimates are in Supplementary Online Material (SOM)). While the estimate of -.04 on 1-5 SWB scale may seem small, such effect size is not irrelevant. Even a finding of no effect would be counterintuitive amid current pro-urbanism (Glaeser 2011, Glaeser et al. 2016, Burger et al. 2020). Regression coefficients on `metro` are not significant without controlling for predictors of SWB, so it is important to adjust the metro non-metro happiness gap with happiness predictors, unlike in Burger et al. (2020).[1]

About 50% of human traits are genetically determined (Ridley 2000), including happiness (Lykken and Tellegen 1996, Brooks 2013). Then person level characteristics such as health and unemployment matter, and only small proportion of SWB variation is due to environmental factors such as urbanness. Health is one of the most important predictors of SWB (Pavot and Diener 2008, Gerdtham and Johannesson 2001). In full model, a5, the coefficient on 5-step `health` is .10, hence, for instance, the negative effect of metro at -.04 is equivalent to the effect of one's health deteriorating at least a third or about half way from "fair" to "poor."

Urban population is projected to increase by 6 billion, from .75b in 1950 in to 6.75b in 2050 (`https://population.un.org/wup`). Even an apparently small effect of -.04 on 1-5 SWB scale, but multiplied by billions of humans urbanized, results in remarkable human unhappiness. For instance, given an urbanization of 1m of people, the unhappiness effect is equivalent to 40k people falling on SWB from "very satisfied" to "somewhat satisfied," or 10k people falling 4 steps from "very satisfied" to "not at all satisfied."

References

ALCOCK, I., M. P. WHITE, B. W. WHEELER, L. E. FLEMING, AND M. H. DEPLEDGE (2014): "Longitudinal effects on mental health of moving to greener and less green urban areas," *Environmental science & technology*, 48, 1247–1255.

BERRY, B. J. AND A. OKULICZ-KOZARYN (2011): "An Urban-Rural Happiness Gradient," *Urban Geography*, 32, 871–883.

BLANCHFLOWER, D. G. AND A. J. OSWALD (2011): "International happiness: A new view on the measure of performance," *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25, 6–22.

BROOKS, A. C. (2013): "Formula for Happiness," *The New York Times*.

BROWN, G. D. A. AND J. GATHERGOOD (2019): "Consumption Changes, Not Income Changes, Predict Changes in Subjective Well-Being," *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 0, 1948550619835215.

BURGER, M. J., P. S. MORRISON, M. HENDRIKS, AND M. M. HOOGERBRUGGE (2020): "Urban-Rural Happiness Differentials across the World," *World Happiness Report*.

---

[1]Burger et al. (2020) also uses faulty Gallup data as elaborated in Okulicz-Kozaryn and Valente (2021)–in general, one should avoid Gallup happiness data–Gallup charges $30,000 for access (per one year), clearly "happiness industry," not happiness research Davies (2015).

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*.

DAVIES, W. (2015): *The Happiness Industry: How the Government and Big Business Sold us Well-Being*, Verso Books.

DAVIS, K. (1955): "The origin and growth of urbanization in the world," *American Journal of Sociology*, 429–437.

DIENER, E. (2009): *Well-being for public policy*, Oxford University Press, New York NY.

FERRER-i-CARBONELL, A. AND P. FRIJTERS (2004): "How Important is Methodology for the Estimates of the Determinants of Happiness?" *Economic Journal*, 114, 641–659.

GERDTHAM, U.-G. AND M. JOHANNESSON (2001): "The relationship between happiness, health, and socio-economic factors: results based on Swedish microdata," *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 30, 553–557.

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. D. GOTTLIEB, AND O. ZIV (2016): "Unhappy Cities," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 34, S129–S182.

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.

HOOGERBRUGGE, M. AND M. BURGER (2021): "Selective Migration and Urban-Rural Differences in Subjective Well-being: Evidence from the United Kingdom'," *Urban Studies*.

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*.

——— (2021): "Not too close, not too far: Urbanisation and life satisfaction along the urban hierarchy," *Urban Studies*, 58, 2742–2757.

LU, C., G. SCHELLENBERG, F. HOU, AND J. F. HELLIWELL (2015): "How's Life in the City? Life Satisfaction Across Census Metropolitan Areas and Economic Regions in Canada," *Economic Insights*, 11-626-X.

LYKKEN, D. AND A. TELLEGEN (1996): "Happiness is a Stochastic Phenomenon," *Psychological Science*, 7, 186–189.

MARYANSKI, A. AND J. H. TURNER (1992): *The social cage: Human nature and the evolution of society*, Stanford University Press.

MORRISON, P. (2015): "Capturing effects of cities on subjective wellbeing," *European Regional Science Association Conference, Lisbon*.

MORRISON, P. S. AND M. WECKROTH (2017): "Human values, subjective well-being and the metropolitan region," *Regional Studies*, 1–13.

NG, Y.-K. (1996): "Happiness surveys: Some comparability issues and an exploratory survey based on just perceivable increments," *Social Indicators Research*, 38, 1–27.

——— (1997): "A case for happiness, cardinalism, and interpersonal comparability," *The Economic Journal*, 107, 1848–1858.

——— (2011): "Happiness is absolute, universal, ultimate, unidimensional, cardinally measurable and interpersonally comparable: A basis for the environmentally responsible Happy Nation Index," Tech. rep., Monash University, Department of Economics.

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.

——— (2016): "Unhappy metropolis (when American city is too big)," *Cities*.

OKULICZ-KOZARYN, A. AND R. R. VALENTE (2018): "No Urban Malaise for Millennials," *Regional Studies*.

——— (2021): "Urban unhappiness is common," *Cities*, 103368.

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.

PAVOT, W. AND E. DIENER (2008): "The satisfaction with life scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction," *The journal of positive psychology*, 3, 137–152.

REHDANZ, K. AND D. MADDISON (2008): "Local environmental quality and life-satisfaction in Germany," *Ecological economics*, 64, 787–797.

RIDLEY, M. (2000): *Genome*, Harper and Collins.

SENIOR, J. (2006): "Some Dark Thoughts on Happiness," *New York Magazine*.

STIGLITZ, J., A. SEN, AND J. FITOUSSI (2009): "Report by the Commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress," *Available at www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr.*

TÖNNIES, F. ([1887] 2002): *Community and society*, DoverPublications.com, Mineola 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.

WHITE, M. P., I. ALCOCK, B. W. WHEELER, AND M. H. DEPLEDGE (2013a): "Coastal proximity, health and well-being: Results from a longitudinal panel survey," *Health & Place*.

——— (2013b): "Would You Be Happier Living in a Greener Urban Area? A Fixed-Effects Analysis of Panel Data," *Psychological science*, 24, 920–928.

WIRTH, L. (1938): "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology*, 44, 1–24.

Supplementary Online Material (SOM)

[note: this section will NOT be a part of the final version of the manuscript, but will be available online instead]

3.1 Variables' Definitions

Table 3: Variable definitions.

name	description
swb	"Please think about your life as a whole. How satisfied are you with it? Are you completely satisfied, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied?" 1 (lo) - 5 (hi)
metro	"Metropolitan/Non-metropolitan Indicator. This indicator is derived from the 2013 Beale-Ross Rural-Urban Continuum Codes published by USDA based on matches to the FIPS state and county codes." 1 Metropolitan area (Beale-Ross Code ER775923= 1-3) 0 Non-metropolitan area (Beale-Ross Code ER775923= 4-9)
age	age
age sq	age squared
last year total family income	last year total family income
unemployed	EMPLOYMENT STATUS-1ST MENTION; We would like to know about what you do – are you working now, looking for work, retired, keeping house, a student, or what?–FIRST MENTION; 1="Looking for work, unemployed", 0 otherwhise
male	gender
health	"Now I have a few questions about your health. Would you say your health in general is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?" 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)
kids	"Number of Persons Now in the FU Under 18 Years of Age"
college	"Did (you/he/she) attend college?" 1='yes', 0='no'
married	"Are you married, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never been married?" 1='married'; 0 otherwhise
family unit size	Number of Persons in FU at the Time of the Interview
white	"What is (your/his/her) race? (Are you/Is [he/she]) white, black, American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander?–FIRST MENTION" 1='white', 0 otherwhise
distress	The K-6 Non-Specific Psychological Distress Scale

3.2 Summary statistics

```
    id:  2, 3, ..., 14365                          n =      10108
    yr:  2009, 2011, ..., 2019                     T =          6
         Delta(yr) = 1 unit
         Span(yr)  = 11 periods
         (id*yr uniquely identifies each observation)

Distribution of T_i:    min      5%     25%      50%      75%     95%      max
                          1       1       2        4        6       6        6

    Freq.   Percent    Cum. |  Pattern*
  -------------------------+----------
    3179      31.45    31.45 |  111111
     723       7.15    38.60 |  ....11
     672       6.65    45.25 |  .....1
     548       5.42    50.67 |  ...111
     505       5.00    55.67 |  ..1111
     502       4.97    60.64 |  1.....
     481       4.76    65.39 |  .11111
     480       4.75    70.14 |  111...
     450       4.45    74.59 |  11....
    2568      25.41   100.00 |  (other patterns)
  -------------------------+----------
```

```
     10108     100.00          | XXXXXX
    ------------------------------------
 *Each column represents 2 periods.


 Variable        |       Mean    Std. Dev.        Min        Max |   Observations
 ----------------+--------------------------------------------------+---------------
 swb   overall |  3.718723    .8759134          1          5 |   N =    37767
       between |              .7136601          1          5 |   n =    10091
       within  |              .5603667   .5187227   6.552056 |   T-bar = 3.74264
               |                                               |
 met   overall |  .7801749    .4141335          0          1 |   N =    37730
       between |               .385049          0          1 |   n =    10073
       within  |              .1878218  -.0531584   1.613508 |   T-bar = 3.74566
               |                                               |
 age   overall |  44.85923    16.82858         16         99 |   N =    37928
       between |              17.23457         17         99 |   n =    10107
       within  |              2.911229   37.19257   51.60923 |   T-bar = 3.75265
               |                                               |
 age2  overall |  2295.544    1698.311        256       9801 |   N =    37928
       between |              1728.178        289       9801 |   n =    10107
       within  |              285.6776   1268.044   3368.044 |   T-bar = 3.75265
               |                                               |
 inc   overall |  61242.84    81095.25          0    3316000 |   N =    37912
       between |              66126.72          0    1883797 |   n =    10108
       within  |              39658.52  -937554.6    2052160 |   T-bar = 3.75069
               |                                               |
 une   overall |  .0907629    .2872754          0          1 |   N =    37923
       between |              .2197753          0          1 |   n =    10108
       within  |              .2116276  -.7425705   .9240962 |   T-bar = 3.75178
               |                                               |
 male  overall |  .5491432    .4975856          0          1 |   N =    37930
       between |              .4994373          0          1 |   n =    10108
       within  |              .0058544  -.2508568   1.049143 |   T-bar = 3.75247
               |                                               |
 hea   overall |  3.436374    1.046857          1          5 |   N =    37862
       between |               .92175          1          5 |   n =    10100
       within  |              .5731675   .4363742   6.603041 |   T-bar = 3.74871
               |                                               |
 kid   overall |  .6846296    1.119852          0         11 |   N =    37930
       between |              1.061457          0         11 |   n =    10108
       within  |              .4720193  -3.148704    5.18463 |   T-bar = 3.75247
               |                                               |
 col   overall |  .6264205    .4837605          0          1 |   N =    36608
       between |              .4803487          0          1 |   n =     9674
       within  |              .0744979  -.2069129   1.459754 |   T-bar = 3.78416
               |                                               |
 mar   overall |  .2802942    .4491489          0          1 |   N =    37928
       between |               .412416          0          1 |   n =    10107
       within  |              .1586708  -.5530391   1.113628 |   T-bar = 3.75265
               |                                               |
 nFU   overall |  2.281413    1.412387          1         14 |   N =    37930
       between |              1.317328          1         13 |   n =    10108
       within  |               .615575  -3.468587   8.081413 |   T-bar = 3.75247
               |                                               |
 whi   overall |  .5256386    .4993489          0          1 |   N =    37697
       between |              .4985538          0          1 |   n =    10038
       within  |              .0213918  -.2743614   1.192305 |   T-bar = 3.75543
               |                                               |
 k     overall |  3.608904    4.151942          0         24 |   N =    37689
       between |              3.629813          0         24 |   n =    10083
       within  |              2.339743  -10.05776    22.6089 |   T-bar = 3.73788

 (obs=5.00  ,55  8.00  )

             |    swb     met     age    age2     inc     une    male     hea     kid     col     mar     nFU     whi
 ------------+-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
        swb |   1.00
        met |  -0.08    1.00
        age |   0.09   -0.05    1.00
       age2 |   0.09   -0.06    0.98    1.00
        inc |   0.13    0.06    0.10    0.06    1.00
        une |  -0.12    0.02   -0.19   -0.18   -0.13    1.00
       male |   0.09   -0.06   -0.01   -0.03    0.29   -0.02    1.00
        hea |   0.27    0.02   -0.24   -0.23    0.20   -0.01    0.15    1.00
        kid |  -0.01    0.02   -0.29   -0.30    0.01    0.09   -0.10    0.05    1.00
        col |   0.04    0.08   -0.08   -0.09    0.24   -0.12    0.06    0.17   -0.04    1.00
        mar |   0.20   -0.06    0.17    0.14    0.43   -0.12    0.55    0.13    0.10    0.14    1.00
        nFU |   0.04    0.01   -0.16   -0.19    0.16    0.05    0.08    0.06    0.86   -0.03    0.35    1.00
        whi |   0.09   -0.19    0.16    0.17    0.26   -0.16    0.26    0.12   -0.16    0.19    0.29   -0.09    1.00
```

8

```
        k |   -0.37    -0.00    -0.12    -0.12    -0.17     0.12    -0.14    -0.30     0.04    -0.10    -0.18    -0.02    -0.09
```

(obs=6,294)

```
            |     swb      met      age     age2      inc      une     male      hea      kid      col      mar      nFU      whi
------------+------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
        swb |   1.0000
        met |  -0.0233   1.0000
        age |   0.0701  -0.0482   1.0000
       age2 |   0.0704  -0.0482   0.9850   1.0000
        inc |   0.1675   0.0793   0.0604   0.0308   1.0000
        une |  -0.0931   0.0118  -0.1420  -0.1345  -0.1376   1.0000
       male |   0.0619  -0.0174  -0.0316  -0.0407   0.2897  -0.0217   1.0000
        hea |   0.3035   0.0486  -0.1854  -0.1776   0.2135  -0.0393   0.1189   1.0000
        kid |   0.0501  -0.0036  -0.2768  -0.2929   0.0566   0.0246  -0.0676   0.0553   1.0000
        col |  -0.0072   0.1033  -0.0532  -0.0633   0.2552  -0.1330   0.0317   0.1209  -0.0449   1.0000
        mar |   0.2059  -0.0181   0.1509   0.1293   0.4559  -0.1102   0.5009   0.1282   0.1246   0.1368   1.0000
        nFU |   0.1095  -0.0064  -0.1650  -0.1919   0.2014  -0.0005   0.0708   0.0593   0.8656  -0.0266   0.3526   1.0000
        whi |   0.0585  -0.1388   0.1392   0.1496   0.2572  -0.1132   0.2024   0.0756  -0.0782   0.1494   0.2623  -0.0181   1.0000
          k |  -0.3863  -0.0110  -0.1877  -0.1813  -0.1506   0.1098  -0.1076  -0.3022   0.0164  -0.0556  -0.1855  -0.0381  -0.0161
```

3.3 Panel Structure of Metro Variable

xttab met

```
                 Overall              Between          Within
     met |    Freq.   Percent      Freq.   Percent     Percent
---------+-------------------------------------------------------
 Inap.:  |     8294     21.98       2947     29.26       77.39
Metropol |    29436     78.02       8362     83.01       93.19
---------+-------------------------------------------------------
   Total |    37730    100.00      11309    112.27       89.07
                           (n = 10073)
```

xtsum met

```
Variable         |      Mean   Std. Dev.       Min        Max |    Observations
-----------------+--------------------------------------------+----------------
met      overall |  .7801749   .4141335         0          1 |    N =   37730
         between |             .385049          0          1 |    n =   10073
         within  |             .1878218  -.0531584   1.613508 | T-bar = 3.74566
```

3.4 Single Year And Pooled Results V FE Results

Table 4: Regressions of SWB: FE v OLS 2015

	c1-FE	c1-2015	c2-FE	c2-2015	c3-FE	c3-2015	c4-FE	c4-2015	c5-FE	c5-2015
metro	0.01	-0.11***	-0.04*	-0.12***	-0.03*	-0.10***	-0.04**	-0.09***	-0.04*	-0.08***
age			0.02***	-0.00	0.02***	-0.01**	0.01***	-0.01***	0.00	-0.01***
age sq			-0.00**	0.00**	-0.00	0.00***	-0.00	0.00***	-0.00	0.00***
last year total family income			0.00*	0.00***	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00*
unemployed			-0.18***	-0.23***	-0.18***	-0.24***	-0.16***	-0.18***	-0.16***	-0.18***
male			0.27	0.08***	0.21	-0.05*	0.07	-0.06**	0.08	-0.06**
health			0.13***	0.26***	0.13***	0.26***	0.10***	0.18***	0.10***	0.18***
kids					-0.01	-0.04*	-0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-0.03
college					-0.08*	-0.12***	-0.07	-0.13***	-0.07	-0.13***
married					0.18***	0.28***	0.17***	0.24***	0.17***	0.24***
family unit size					0.04***	0.06***	0.03***	0.05***	0.03***	0.05***
distress							-0.05***	-0.06***	-0.05***	-0.06***
constant	3.71***	3.82***	2.37***	2.80***	2.45***	2.93***	2.90***	3.63***	3.60***	3.74***
state and year dummies	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	yes
N	37567	6256	37489	6250	36285	6092	36142	6068	36142	6068

*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$; robust std err (OLS)

Table 5: Regressions of SWB: FE v OLS Pooled 2015-2019.

	d1-FE	d1-09-19	d2-FE	d2-09-19	d3-FE	d3-09-19	d4-FE	d4-09-19	d5-FE	d5-09-19
metro	0.01	-0.08***	-0.04*	-0.09***	-0.03*	-0.07***	-0.04**	-0.08***	-0.04*	-0.08***
age			0.02***	-0.00	0.02***	-0.01***	0.01***	-0.01***	0.00	-0.01***
age sq			-0.00**	0.00***	-0.00	0.00***	-0.00	0.00***	-0.00	0.00***
last year total family income			0.00*	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00***
unemployed			-0.18***	-0.25***	-0.18***	-0.25***	-0.16***	-0.20***	-0.16***	-0.20***
male			0.27	0.05***	0.21	-0.08***	0.07	-0.11***	0.08	-0.10***
health			0.13***	0.25***	0.13***	0.25***	0.10***	0.17***	0.10***	0.17***
kids					-0.01	-0.03***	-0.01	-0.02***	-0.01	-0.02***
college					-0.08*	-0.10***	-0.07	-0.11***	-0.07	-0.11***
married					0.18***	0.29***	0.17***	0.26***	0.17***	0.26***
family unit size					0.04***	0.04***	0.03***	0.04***	0.03***	0.04***
distress							-0.05***	-0.06***	-0.05***	-0.06***
constant	3.71***	3.78***	2.37***	2.77***	2.45***	2.91***	2.90***	3.60***	3.60***	3.66***
state and year dummies	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	yes
N	37567	37567	37489	37489	36285	36285	36142	36142	36142	36142

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1; robust std err (OLS)

3.5 Random Effects

Table 6: RE regressions of SWB.

	b1	b2	b3	b4	b5
metro	-0.04***	-0.05***	-0.04***	-0.05***	-0.06***
age		0.00	-0.01***	-0.01***	-0.01***
age sq		0.00***	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
last year total family income		0.00***	0.00***	0.00***	0.00***
unemployed		-0.22***	-0.22***	-0.19***	-0.19***
male		0.07***	-0.05***	-0.08***	-0.08***
health		0.19***	0.19***	0.14***	0.14***
kids			-0.02**	-0.02**	-0.02**
college			-0.06***	-0.08***	-0.08***
married			0.27***	0.24***	0.25***
family unit size			0.04***	0.04***	0.04***
distress				-0.05***	-0.05***
constant	3.74***	2.92***	3.03***	3.59***	3.68***
state and year dummies	no	no	no	no	yes
N	37567	37489	36285	36142	36142

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

3.6 Limitations and Future Research

Future research can improve in a number of ways. Metro-nonmetro binary measure of urbanicity is limited–urbanicity is a gradient (Berry and Okulicz-Kozaryn 2011), not a dichotomy. Future research could use finer classification than binary metro-nonmetro. We have only had 6 waves of data, as more waves become available, future research can arrive at more robust results. It will be also possible to estimate SWB from moving across urbanicity.