

Unhappy Metros: Panel Evidence

Adam Okulicz-Kozaryn*

Rutgers - Camden

Thursday 4th November, 2021 10:48

We study the effect of living in a metropolitan area on life satisfaction (subjective wellbeing). The literature agrees that inhabitants of metropolitan areas tend to be less satisfied with their lives than inhabitants of smaller settlements in the developed world. 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.

SUBJECTIVE WELLBEING (SWB), LIFE SATISFACTION, HAPPINESS, PSID, XXX TODO ADD TO EBIB AS KEYWORD PAPER-CODE-NAME AND TAG WITH EBIB KEYWORDS

Urbanism is not just a built environment, but 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 will explode from .75b in 1950 in to 6.75b in 2050 (<https://population.un.org/wup>)—6 billion people put in urban areas over just 100 years.

At the same time an agreement has emerged that aside from, or even instead of, traditional development measures such as GDP and HDI, it is useful to measure human development with Subjective Wellbeing measures (Stiglitz et al. 2009, Diener 2009).

The urban-rural happiness gradient states that happiness raises from its lowest in largest cities to highest in smallest places, little towns, villages, and open country. The evidence of urban-rural happiness gradient is overwhelming—urban unhappiness is common in the developed world (Okulicz-Kozaryn and Valente 2021).

Yet all studies to date are cross sectional and panel evidence is missing. Few studies that use panel data do not actually test the urban unhappiness hypothesis.

White et al. (2013b) and White et al. (2013a) use British panel (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 (BHPS) but also examining green space, not size of a place.

Hoogerbrugge and Burger (????)

using BHPS examines size of a place, but rather than testing urban unhappiness, again, tests open green space hypothesis. The size of a place cutoff is at 10,000 people or even 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 built environment in villages or small towns lacks tall buildings, urban transit, airports, etc. Way of life in such places is not urban, lacking shalowness transitoriness, etc The way of life lacks transitoriness, etc these words from city book.

cite when metropolis is too big and urban unhappiness is common—ideally it should be a gradient, and if necessarily a binary distinction then it is several hundred thousand, not 3 or 10 thousand as in Hoogerbrugge and Burger (????).

Rehdanz and Maddison (2008) uses a German panel dataset (GSOEP), properly defining urban rural happiness gradient with multiple cutoffs including at several hundred thousand, but without panel modelling techniques such as fixed or random effects.

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

I thank Gordon D. A. Brown for sharing STATA code. All mistakes are mine.

1 Data and model

We use 2009-2019 psid from `psidonline.isr.umich.edu`, the reason being that swb question only started in 2009. from the family files we only retain household reference person (or head as it used to be called). This is the same practice as in (Brown and Gathergood 0).

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).

and the key independent variable is metro as defined in table 1.

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.

Summary statistics are shown in Supplementary Online Material (SOM).

There are 3 vars that not only predict SWB, but also are likely to be confounded with metro: race, political views, and religiosity—yet, they are irrelevant in fixed effects model as they are constant over time.

panel structure description of metro variable is shown in the appendix yes one problem is that there is little variability in urb-rur controls are set in table ?? var_des in SOM

in controls we follow Brown and Gathergood (0)

it is important to control for employment status—it both predicts swb, especially unemployment has lasting negative effect on swb, and it also correlates with urbanicity as cities have more employment opportunities (e.g., O’Sullivan 2009).

boilerplate on linear models, no need for categorical dependent variable modeling, elaborate

a standard fixed effects model is given by:

$$SWB_{it} = \gamma METRO_{it} X_{it} \beta + \alpha_i + u_{it} \quad (1)$$

Where, $METRO_{it}$ is a metro dummy for person i at time t . γ is the main coefficient of interest. α_i ($i=1\dots n$) is the unknown intercept for each person (n person-specific intercepts). SWB is the dependent variable, where i = person and t = wave. X_{it} is a vector of control variables. β is the vector of coefficients for control variables. u_{it} is the error term.

A limitation of fixed effects model is that there are just 6 waves and there is limited variability across time and hence time-invariant variables cannot be estimated. metro which is not that often changed does change but not very often—discuss that des sta from som.

2 Results

by wave each cross section just have in app and refer briefly, and re; in body only fe

Table 2: FE 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					

nice size effect like a third or half of step in 1-5 hea, like going third or half way from poor health to fair health for instance

3 Conclusion and discussion

This is the first panel data investigation of metro-nonmetro happiness gap. The results confirm crosssectional evidence of urban unhappiness.

Future research can improve in a number of ways. Use finer classification than binary metro-nonmetro. As more waves become available, it will be possible to estimate SWB from moving across urbanicity.

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 otherwise
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 otherwise
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 otherwise
distress	The K-6 Non-Specific Psychological Distress Scale

3.2 Summary statistics

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

n = 10108
 T = 6

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

Freq.	Percent	Cum.	Pattern*
3179	31.45	31.45	111111
723	7.15	38.6011
672	6.65	45.251
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	
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	1.00

(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	1.0000	

3.3 Panel Structure of Metro Variable

xttab met

met	Overall		Between		Within
	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

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.
- BROWN, G. D. A. AND J. GATHERGOOD (0): "Consumption Changes, Not Income Changes, Predict Changes in Subjective Well-Being," *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 0, 1948550619835215.
- DIENER, E. (2009): *Well-being for public policy*, Oxford University Press, New York NY.
- HOOGERBRUGGE, M. AND M. BURGER (????): "Selective Migration and Urban-Rural Differences in Subjective Well-being: Evidence from the United Kingdom'," *Urban Studies*.
- 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 (2021): "Urban unhappiness is common," *Cities*, 103368.
- O'SULLIVAN, A. (2009): *Urban economics*, McGraw-Hill.
- REHDANZ, K. AND D. MADDISON (2008): "Local environmental quality and life-satisfaction in Germany," *Ecological economics*, 64, 787–797.
- 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.

- 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.