# Materialism and Immorality: More Urban than Rural

Adam Okulicz-Kozaryn\*
Rutgers - Camden and Vistula University

Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2020 14:18

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 conspicious consumtion 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 inherntly and purely selfish, as economists argue, rather selfishness results from commodity fetishism (Marx [1867] 2010), and fetishism is higest in cities. City intensifies conspicuous consumption: urban etiquette, sophistication, manners and finish (White and White 1977, p. 169)

City compunds 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 conspicious 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 visibl evidence such as dress (Wilson 1985). Marx observed that humans are alienated under capitalism (Freud et al. 1930, Struhl 2016, Byron 2016, Petrović 1963, whe 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 oppresive (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, furtherest peossbble 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 abot half of their wake time performing repetative task, it is against human nature **TODO** cite MARX as from rubia lonnie paper: wake in the morning go fisihning 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 recults show strongly!!

### 2 The Dark Side of Urbanness

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 citig 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>&</sup>lt;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 'labirynth' 'nightmare, or 'jungle' (Knox and Pinch 2014), or cancer (White and White 1977).

## 3 Urbanness and Materialism, Immorality/

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 materialism is higher in urban areas.

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

And yet is urbanelites 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 materialsim): 1) again absence of materialism amplifying urban environemnt, 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 oppositeof 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).

Then one may ask what is the relationship between materialism and immorality? It appears positive, materialism is commonly considered immoral. FOr instance, the Bible states that "For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, for which some have strayed from the faith in their greediness, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." Timothy 6:10. A Confucius successor saw the root of all evil in selfishness (Hirst 1934, p. 332):

The source of disorder in a State lies in the lack of mutual love.... A thief loves his own family, but because he has not a similar love for the families of others, he proceeds to steal from their homes to add to his own .... Rulers of States love their own territory, but having no love for other States, they proceed to attack them in order to increase their own possessions. What is the remedy for this state of things? . . . If we were to regard the property of others as we regard our own, who should steal? If we were to have the same regard for the territory and people of another State as we have for our own, who would conduct aggressive warfare? . . . If we were to have the same regard for others as we have for ourselves, who would do anyone an injustice

Benjamin Franklin, who wrote on moral perfection, includes frugality, temperance, and moderation in his list of virtues.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2&</sup>quot; Benjamin Franklin on Moral Perfection"—Practical advice on obtaining a perfectly moral bearing. From his autobiography. https://www.ftrain.com/franklin\_improving\_self

## 4 Data and Model

We use the US General Social Survey (GSS) gss.norc.org 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 immporality, 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 usin similar variables CITE and the set of predictors was TODO add region or south at least

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

GSS lists many morality measures: PUNSIN, BLKWHITE, ROTAPPLE, PERMORAL, GODRIGHT, SOCRIGHT, PERRIGHT, LESSPAIN. But we do not use several because morality is confounded with religiosity: PUNSIN "r agrees that sinners must be punished," GODRIGHT "god's laws should decide right and wrong," PERRIGHT "conscience should decide right and wrong." And also, we do not use another two as they may confound with secularism: SOCRIGHT "society's laws should decide right and wrong," LESSPAIN "feel deep sense of resp for reducing pain"

Table 1: Variable definitions.

name	description
materialism	
next to health, money is most	"Now I'm going to read you several more statements. Some people agree with a statement,
important	others disagree. As I read each one, tell me whether you more or less agree with it, or more or
	less disagree." "A. Next to health, money is the most important thing in life" 0='disagree',
	1='agree'
no right and wrong ways to	"Now I'm going to read you several more statements. Some people agree with a statement,
make money	others disagree. As I read each one, tell me whether you more or less agree with it, or more
	or less disagree." "C. To make money, there are no right and wrong ways any more, only
	easy and hard ways" 0='disagree', 1='agree'
hrsmoney: more and more	"Think of the number of hours you work and the money you earn in your main job, including
	any regular overtime. If you had only one of these three choices, which of the following would
	you prefer?" 1='Work longer hours and earn more money', 0='Work the same number of
	hours and earn the same money' OR 'Work fewer hours and earn less money'
job just a way of earning	"Thinking of work in general, please circle one number for each statement below to show
money, no more	how much you agree or disagree with each." "A. A job is just a way of earning money - no
	more" 1='disagree strongly' to 5='agree strongly'
immorality	
honest least desirable	"A. Which three qualities listed on this card would you say are the most desirable for a child
	to have? B. Which one of these three is the most desirable of all? C. All of the qualities
	listed on this card may be desirable, but could you tell me which three you consider least
	important? D. And which one of these three is least important of all?" "3. That he is
	honest" 1='1 most desirable' to 5='1 least desirable'
r agrees that morality a per-	"Please consider the following statements and tell me whether you agree strongly, agree
sonal matter	somewhat, disagree somewhat or disagree strongly with each statement." "D. Morality is a
	personal matter and society should not force everyone to follow one standard" 1='disagree
	strongly' to 4='agree strongly'
r disagrees immoral person cor-	"Please consider the following statements and tell me whether you agree strongly, agree
rupts society	somewhat, disagree somewhat or disagree strongly with each statement" "C. Immoral actions
	by one person can corrupt society in general." 1='agree strongly' to 4='disagree strongly'
r agrees right/wrong not	"Please consider the following statements and tell me whether you agree strongly, agree
black/white, but grey	somewhat, disagree somewhat or disagree strongly with each statement." "B. Right and
	wrong are not usually a simple matter of black and white; there are many shades of gray"
	1='disagree strongly' to 4='agree strongly'

and these of immorality: so there are these measures of materialism:

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

There are multiple corrlates 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 sclass 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 meachinism 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

Table 2: 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 Irg	0.00	0.02	0.08*	0.08*	0.08*	0.07+
med sub	0.01	0.04	0.07+	0.07+	+80.0	0.10*
Irg 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 + 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001: robust	4463	3694	4120	3410	3395	2573

+ 0.10 std err

Table 3: 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 Irg	-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
Irg 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			0.03	0.02	-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					-0.10	0.01
how often r attends religious services						-0.01***
protestant						0.00
catholic						0.09***
jewish						0.13*
none						0.13
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		3022	4049	3332	2229	2554

Table 4: no right and wrong ways to make money

	.11	-10-	d2b	-12	-14	.IF
	d1 0.00	d2a 0.00	0.00	d3 0.00	d4 0.00	d5 0.00
country						
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 Irg	-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+
Irg 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	-0.14	-0.12
			-0.10	-0.11*	-0.20**	-0.12
w. sou. central	-0.10+	-0.11+				
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					-0.01	-0.03
how often r attends religious services						-0.05***
						0.00
protestant						
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. wal-ust	3203	0220	.020	.000		.0.0

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

Table 5: 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 Irg	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***	-0.17+ -0.22*	-0.13
mountain	-0.12+	-0.29	-0.10	-0.10	-0.22	-0.13
pacific	-0.12+ -0.13*	-0.11 -0.12+	-0.10	-0.10 -0.11+	-0.07	-0.05
	-0.13	0.08***	-0.11	0.02	0.02	0.03
subjective class identification		0.08****	1 20***			
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+
iewish						-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
ortnodox-christian christian						0.10
						0.01
native american inter-nondenominational						-0.15
	0 50***	0.24***	2 24***	0.01***	1 70***	1.90***
constant	2.53***	2.34***	2.24***	2.21***	1.72***	
N	8323	8278	7361	7337	4822	4702

Table 6: r disagrees 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+	0.04	0.06
10-50k	0.03	0.11+	0.07	0.07	0.04	0.00
uninc med	-0.03	0.03	0.00	0.02	-0.04	-0.07
uninc fried	-0.06	0.04	0.00	0.05	0.01	-0.02
med sub	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.05
Irg sub	0.01	0.03	0.05 0.07+	0.10*	0.05	0.03
50-250k	0.01	0.07	0.07+	0.10	0.05	0.03
			0.06			
gt 250k	0.08*	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			0.02	0.01	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					-0.01	-0.02
white					-0.02	-0.02
think of self as liberal or conservative					-0.11	0.02*
						-0.01
how often r attends religious services						0.00
protestant						
catholic						0.04
jewish						0.20*
none						-0.01 -0.03
other 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
14						

Table 7: hrsmoney: more and more

and the second s	g1 0.00	g2a 0.00	g2b 0.00	g3 0.00	g4 0.00	g5 0.00
country						
t 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
.0-50k	0.04	0.04	-0.02	-0.02	-0.04	-0.07
ininc med	0.03	0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0.03	0.02
ininc Irg	0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02
ned sub	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.00	-0.00	-0.02
rg 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
t 250k	0.10*	0.09*	0.03	0.03	-0.00	-0.04
iew england	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
niddle atlantic	-0.08	-0.08	-0.07	-0.08	-0.06	-0.03
. nor. central	-0.14**	-0.14**	-0.10*	-0.11*	-0.07	-0.00
v. nor. central	-0.12*	-0.12*	-0.12*	-0.12*	-0.09	-0.02
outh atlantic	-0.27***	-0.26***	-0.26***	-0.12	-0.22***	-0.12+
. sou. central	-0.36***	-0.36***	-0.35***	-0.36***	-0.40***	-0.12 <del>+</del> -0.24**
	-0.28***	-0.28***	-0.28***	-0.28***	-0.31***	-0.24*
v. sou. central						
nountain	-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*
ubjective class identification		0.04**		-0.00	-0.01	-0.00
amily income in \$1986, millions			-0.31	-0.27	0.23	0.10
ighest year of school completed			0.03***	0.03***	0.04***	0.04***
ige					-0.00	0.00
ige squared					0.00	0.00
nale					-0.06*	-0.09***
narried					-0.11***	-0.05
number of persons in household					-0.01	-0.00
nealth					-0.02	-0.00
vhite					0.00	-0.01
hink of self as liberal or conservative					0.00	-0.08***
now often r attends religious services						-0.05***
rotestant						0.00
atholic						0.11***
						0.11**
ewish						
one						0.00
ther						-0.01
uddhism						0.14
induism						0.18
ther eastern						0.27
noslem/islam						0.11
rthodox-christian						-0.18
hristian						0.07
ative american						-0.03
nter-nondenominational						-0.04
onstant	3.31***	3.22***	2.97***	2.98***	3.11***	3.31***
Olistalit	8311	8267				4687

 Table 8: r agrees right/wrong not black/white

country t 2.5k 2.5-10k 10-50k uninc med	0.00 0.24*	0.00 0.27*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2.5-10k L0-50k		0.07*				
L0-50k			0.14	0.21+	0.37**	0.29*
	0.13	0.21*	0.10	0.24*	0.39***	0.39**
ining med	-0.01	0.06	0.04	0.12	0.12	0.12
	-0.03	0.00	0.08	0.14	0.15	0.12
uninc Irg	-0.06	0.11	0.14+	0.25*	0.28*	0.27*
ned sub	0.02	0.13	0.11	0.22*	0.29**	0.25*
rg 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
niddle 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
v. 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
v. sou. central	0.20*	0.10	0.15+	0.10	0.04	0.04
nountain	-0.25**	-0.22*	-0.24**	-0.23*	-0.26*	-0.23+
pacific	-0.23	-0.16+	-0.10	-0.12	-0.16	-0.14
subjective class identification	-0.13	-0.33***	-0.10	-0.15***	-0.12**	-0.09*
amily income in \$1986, millions		-0.55	-4.07***	-3.39***	-2.90**	-3.43***
nighest year of school completed			-0.10***	-0.10***	-0.09***	-0.08***
age			-0.10	-0.10	0.00	-0.00
age squared					-0.00	0.00
nale					0.07+	0.07
narried					-0.05	-0.06
number of persons in household					0.02	0.03+
nealth					-0.04	-0.03
white					-0.43***	-0.46***
think of self as liberal or conservative					-0.43	0.01
now often r attends religious services						-0.01
orotestant						0.00
catholic						0.03
ewish						-0.15
none						-0.13
other						-0.00
ouddhism						-0.59***
ninduism						-0.28
other eastern						-0.04
noslem/islam						-0.44
orthodox-christian						-0.35
christian						0.01
native american						-0.03
nter-nondenominational						-0.03
	2.48***	3.27***	3.83***	4.10***	4.28***	-0.26 4.19***
constant N	5567	4040	4958	3657	2781	2644

Table 9: job is just a way to earn money

TODO: out of 8¿¿¿ 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>3</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 the final most oversaturated model

TODO drop freaking relig and region dummies from reg and say i control for them go again quickly thru dofile

### 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 supplemetary material as opposed to see appendix!

<sup>&</sup>lt;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.

# 7 Appendix

std err

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*	+80.0	0.10*	0.11+	0.03
13-100 msa	0.06+	0.10*	0.05	+80.0	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

Table 10: 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 + 0.10 * 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001; robust	4463	3694	4120	3410	3395	2573

Table 11: 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

 $\textbf{Table 12:} \ \ \text{no right and wrong ways to make money}$ 

	14					
	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

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

Table 13: 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	0.15	0.08***	0.10	0.03	0.02	0.03
family income in \$1986, millions		0.00	1.44***	1.30**	1.06+	0.95+
highest year of school completed			0.02***	0.02***	0.02***	0.02***
age			0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02***
					-0.00**	-0.00**
age squared male					0.04	0.01
married					-0.11**	-0.06+
					-0.11	-0.00+ -0.00
number of persons in household health					0.03	0.04*
white					0.03	0.04*
					0.10	-0.08***
think of self as liberal or conservative						
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

std err

Table 14: r disagrees 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 15: 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	+80.0	+80.0	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	0.10	0.04*	0.10	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
family income in \$1986, millions		0.04	-0.41	-0.36	0.24	0.12
highest year of school completed			0.03***	0.03***	0.04***	0.12
			0.03	0.03	-0.00	0.04
age					0.00	0.00
age squared male					-0.06*	-0.09***
married					-0.11***	-0.05
					-0.11	-0.05
number of persons in household health					-0.01	-0.00
white					0.00	-0.00
					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***
iewish						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

std err

Table 16: 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	-0.13	-0.06	0.22**	0.15+	0.02	0.01
13-100 msa	-0.04	-0.05	0.12+	0.13+ 0.13+	-0.06	-0.06
1-12 msa	0.14+	0.05	0.12+	0.15+	-0.03	-0.00
new england	0.14+	0.00	0.24	0.19	0.00	0.00
middle atlantic	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01
e. nor. central	-0.06	-0.12	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02 -0.16+	-0.01
		-0.12	-0.09	-0.13 -0.17+	-0.10+ -0.23*	-0.14 -0.20+
w. nor. central	-0.16+					
south atlantic	0.04 0.01	0.07 -0.01	0.04	0.03 -0.13	0.01	0.02
e. sou. central			-0.11		-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				•••		

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

Table 17: 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.
- HIRST, E. (1934): "The categorical imperative and the Golden Rule," Philosophy, 9, 328-335.

- 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.
- VEBLEN, 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.