

Urban-Rural Happiness Gradient Theory: What Happiness Theories Tell Us About Urban Way Of Life.

Adam Okulicz-Kozaryn*
Rutgers-Camden

Draft: Sunday 23rd May, 2021

TODO: reread these theories!! and include happiness here

Abstract

We know that urbanites are less happy, yet we miss theory: we do not know why? what can be the mechanism? I integrate 5 major happiness theories: genes/set point, livability, comparisons/discrepancies (MDT; relative deprivation), and adaptation/adjustment (hedonic treadmill), and Carver's happiness as motivator to theorize about urban unhappiness.

KEYWORDS: UTILITY, CITIES, URBAN LIVING, URBANICITY, HAPPINESS THEORIES TODO add to bib as keyword charlotteBecky-CitySWB_Theory and tag

We know that urbanites are less happy: boilerplate on london, nyc, toronto etc; but theory is needed to explain why; economic theory clearly does not explain the phenomenon as it predicts higher SWB in cities as there is more money, utility, and supposedly rational people urbanize, but in terms of SWB they are worse off in cities

This study is a continuation of ~~BLIND FOR PEER REVIEW~~

Why cities? Because of productivity, economists tell us (e.g., O'Sullivan 2009). But we do not need more economic growth (Skidelsky and Skidelsky 2012, Joutsenvirta 2016, Kallis et al. 2012, Kallis 2011, Kasser 2003, Roberts 2011, Roberts and Clement 2007).

Why urbanization? Many motives, but Clearly economic opportunity is the key (Campbell 1981). people move to places for jobs cite economist, its in recent paper guess with lonnie and rubia THE ECONOMIST FROM MY EARLIER LIVABILITY PAPER also shows that economic opportunity is the key when people choose place to settle. After all, capitalism is all about money—swim or sink MARX HARVEY. It was also lure of city lights and excitement it promised (Campbell 1981), or psychoanalytically city fetish CITE MY RUBIA PAPER. People would probably satisfy rural if they could, but they were forced to cities by jobs (Campbell 1981), Today Americans prefer rural setting but close to city so that they have access to jobs and urban amenities FUGUIT x2 +that recent yougov poll from city book.

There are several major happiness theories that can explain relationship between objective quality of life or livability of a place and happiness. The key theory, and indeed, the one with this very name is Veenhoven's livability theory (Veenhoven 2014, 2000) TODO see also in ebin scerri 'livability index' and search qol keyword; TODO: put here boilerplate about other theories from earlier research guess from paper in transforming govtr and others; may even see my dissertation slides!!!

and there is a separate line of research showing that the bigger the city, the less happy it is—for a recent comprehensive summary see MY CITY BOOK. For instance: new york...as i began that recent papers about millenias: enumerate here these unhappy cities

1 The Happiness Literature

It became banality or cliché to say that happiness literature is “growing recently.” Many if not most studies begin by stating it. And there are many excellent reviews of the literature, and accordingly, this study does not aim to copy them. The most comprehensive,

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

I thank XXX. All mistakes are mine.

yet still incomplete is Ruut Veenhoven's World Database of Happiness (Veenhoven 1995). Instead, below, few relevant points will be made.

urban way of life increases chances, but not necessarily improves outcomes. Furthermore, it always increases relative deprivation CITE MICHALOS MDT: more people means more comparisons, and for happiness it is better to be a big fish in small pond (rural area). City stimulates but instead of fulfilment it increases desires and needs (CITE HEDONIC TREADMILL)—see my disst slides guess BRICKMAN.

people look upwards when making comparisons: wealthier people impose negative external effect on poorer people but not vice versa (Frey and Stutzer 2002)

Relative deprivation: similar to older findings by Dale (1980) (cited in Sirgy 2002, p. 103): found indicators of objective well-being are especially high in urban areas, whereas subjective well-being seems larger in less-populated areas. The author explains that people compare themselves with others who are much richer and, therefore, feel much poorer, while those living in less urban areas do not compare themselves with others as much.

Neighbors act as negatives—rich neighbors make us unhappy—the denser the area, everything else equal, the more neighbors and more negatives; also quote from Marx about house and mansion next to it from quotes.org and AJS recent paper by Firebaugh I guess per comparisons—like Luttmer; and add to Firebaugh in Eib: see Madsen book ch10—also by Firebaugh on the same thing!

The most conspicuous consumption or waste¹ tends to take place in metropolitan areas (cities and their extension, suburbs)—for some examples of urban conspicuousness see Frank (2012). GOOGLE on conspicuous consumption and urbanicity [it's in one of the 2 recent papers] Small town, villages and open country is less wasteful—there are fewer people to impress there (though some wealthy people may prefer wasting money there, too).

Veenhoven (2000) distinguishes between opportunities for good life “life chances” or means and good life itself “life results” or ends: it may appear that if not life results are better in cities, surely life chances are, after all there is much freedom and opportunities in cities. There are. but again, there is also more competition, taller hierarchies, more relative deprivation, more aspirations, and so forth, and they potentially cancel out and outweigh city benefits. Like with salaries and housing costs—you may make couple dozen percents more but housing costs couple hundredths percents more.

so guess in this sec also copy boilerplate from pub pol paper on 3 theories of happiness

Becky is paying off faster her trailer housing with 7-eleven minimum wage than does Charlotte pay off her Manhattan penthouse with Wall Street salary, and she has huge debt at Columbia University too

cite that CityLab article about broke New Yorkers

draw heavily on my book—I already have some graphs there of place size and happiness—also search it for relative deprivation and aspirations!

Humans are unwilling and unable to make absolute judgements, rather they constantly draw comparisons from their environment (Frey et al. 2008) Higher aspirations reduce wellbeing (Frey et al. 2008) And cities induce higher aspirations MY CITY BOOK AND CHAPTER FOR ILAN They key finding is that people look upward not downward when making comparisons (Frey et al. 2008) Hence cities induce positional concerns as income ladders are tallest in cities—and it is better to be a big fish in small pond (town) than small fish in a big pond (city)—Davis I guess take from my disst slides!

Table 1 enumerates key predictors of SWB and their relationship to urbanicity, SWB, and resulting urban SWB. Relative deprivation (Michalos 1985) simply means that we compare to others, and one's SWB depends on these comparisons Bob Frank, MDT, Luttmer (Frey and Stutzer 2002)

gene set point: boilerplate about nature/chimp, bees evolution/biophilia

TODO: briefly describe each of them!

¹VEBLEN 2 books used these terms interchangeably: the key feature of conspicuousness is waste—wasting something so that it can be shown that one is rich enough to do so

As it should be clear from table 1, urbanites are clearly more relatively deprived and have higher aspirations or are more on a hedonic treadmill, and are clearly in unnatural evolutionary setting, and arguably livability is lower in cities—all these indicate lower SWB in cities. Perhaps, the only two major good things about cities are experience achievement and freedom.

Surely, more urban amenities in urban areas (airports, hospitals, museums, etc), but fewer non-urban amenities, notably nature. pollutions: grey tex; air, noise, light, information etc

Of course, table is incomplete. There are many more key predictors of SWB that are omitted. Many are rather country level than urban-rural such as quality governance HELLIWELL, etc. Many are unlikely to differ much in urban-rural continuum such as physical health. Also, person-level only is considered—for instance, while cities are most polluted per capita, they pollute least per capita MEYER BOOK.

livability: cite swbLivability

Freedom: surely cities bestow great deal of freedom on a person TOENNIES, “city air if free” etc; but is it perhaps forgotten that cities also enslave: urban finish and manners, and visual recognition, etc FROM CITY BOOK

experience/achievement: surely more in cities, indeed so much that one has cognitive overload SIMMEL LEDERBORGEN; so definitely greater quantity, but arguably lower quality at least in many respects. for instance one definitely achieves greater monetary achievement, but also cost of living is higher; one achieves higher position in society, but also hierarchies are taller, etc; so the key point is that the only unambiguously positive thing about cities is more money: higher incomes, more jobs, more economic opportunities. Rightly so economists rave about cities (Glaeser 2011), but it needs to be remembered that economists are narrow minded and only care about economic matters, i.e. money. BOILERPLATE FROM EARLIER ON ECONS DISCONNECTED AND DOMINATING Everything else is either ambiguous or clearly negative for cities

status is higher but also hierarchies are taller and more competition etc

TODO: add carver and genes guess another table first just with 5 theories what they predict; and then another table like one below with stuff

	urbanicity and resulting urban SWB
no relative deprivation	-
no hedonic treadmill/low aspirations	-
evolutionary adaptation/biophilia/nature	-
lack of pollutions	-
affordability/ low cost of living	-
social capital	?-
livability	?-
income/jobs/no unemployment	+
experience/achievement	?+
freedom	?+
amenities	?+
status	?+

Table 1: Urbanicity and urban swb: expected relationships. Rows show key predictors of greater SWB. And expected signs shown: whether there will be more (+) or less (-) of given factor in larger places, and accordingly whether there should be more or less SWB in larger places according to each key predictor of SWB. “?” Denotes unclear relationship, and “?+” means probably positive, and “?-” means probably negative.

the mechanism is that cities do not seem to kill positive affect but increase negative affect: eg restless bored upset lonely depressed (Campbell 1981) also a finding recently confirmed in MY CITIES 2016 paper when metropolis is too big. especially there is ahrp urban-rural divide in evaluation of neighborhood and community (Campbell 1981)

an interesting finding is that urbanities find life frustrating and they think they weren't able to achieve their full share of happiness (Campbell 1981) this suggests that they either have higher aspirations or lower achievement or both; but given extreme opportunity found in cities (Tönnies [1887] 2002, Milgram 1970, Fischer 1995, Glaeser 2011, O'Sullivan 2009), it is rather aspirations; glaser in Glaeser et al. (2016) also suggests that citing the fable of the bees:

To be happy is to be pleas'd, and the less Notion a Man has of a better way of Living, the more content he'll be with his own ... the greater a Man's Knowledge and Experience is in the World, the more exquisite the Delicacy of his Taste, and the more consummate Judge he is of things in general, certainly the more difficult it will be to please him. ... But when a Man enjoys himself, Laughs and Sings, and in his Gesture and Behaviour shews me all the tokens of Content and Satisfaction, I pronounce him happy, and have nothing to do with his Wit or Capacity.[.]

ask'd where I thought it was most probable that Men might enjoy true Happiness, I would prefer a small peaceable Society, in which Men, neither envy'd nor esteem'd by Neighbours, should be contented to live upon the Natural Product of the Spot they inhabit, to a vast Multitude abounding in Wealth and Power,

Large cities are most economic and accordingly economists rave about them GLAESER TRIUMPH, and perhaps a rational fool (Sen 1977), homo oeconomicus could be happy there only if he existed outside of delusional mind of an economist. But they have lost something human something that smaller places still retain (Campbell 1981). Humans, or any other animal for that matter have not evolved to live in cities—it will take evolutionary time, thousands of years before we do. CITE from my book just search 'evol' and glue from this paper 'evol'

aspirations and comparisons are critical to explaining city misery

(Campbell et al. 1976) aspirations do adjust to reality, and there is no other place on earth with more opportunity, inequality and hierarchy than city (Tönnies [1887] 2002, Milgram 1970, Fischer 1995, Glaeser 2011, O'Sullivan 2009, Campbell 1981).

assume we have sophisticated classy new yorker Charlotte. Charlotte wears Lois Voittoin drives lexus, studies finance at Columbia University and works as a hedge fund at Wall Street, and she dreams to be a first female president of the united states.

here pictured by famous rural woman and famous urban women Allie Mae Burroughs rural Hale County, Alabama

and ivanka trump of new york city america's largest city

TODO: have a ton of these generic faces here from city book and there were many i did not use—they should be there commented out

in choice of pictures i also wanted to show urban pride, glamor, v rural hopelessness and plainness and resulting (false!) expectation of urban happiness and rural unhappiness.

and we have plain middle class plain Alabamian, Becky. Becky works at 7-Eleven rides a bike, and studies at community college, and dreams to work in at assembly line in General Motors factory.

so sure Charlotte has fuller life: more experience and achievement than rural Becky; and more experience or achievement, hence perhaps more happiness

but she is more relatively deprived seeing Trumps of new york, than her alabamian friend seeing other middle class texans in her village, so perhaps she is less happy

perhaps the key, new yorker has arguably greater aspirations, she wants to make millions, be famous etc; texan is more moderate; hence new yorker is less happy It is more difficult for charlotte to become the president of united states than for becky to work at Ford factory. and we know, according to aspiration-level theory (Frey et al. 2008) that happiness = experience or achievement - expectations or aspirations furthermore, adjustment to income is more complete than in other domains, notably social (Frey et al. 2008), hence higher income in cities doesn't have lasting boost on happiness

and have these faces from city book: copy paste; i guess there are more commented out!

cite that article on rpo new yorkers balducci or cechhini or sth AND ANOTHER ONE ON TORONTO ETC FROM THAT ONE OF THE 2 RECENT PAPERS AROUND don't forget amin and thrift


urbanism is not just buildings, it is a way of life (WIRTH), and it is not a good way of life

We know that intrinsic motives increase wellbeing more than extrinsic MY TRANSFORMING GOVT PUB POL paper and (Frey et al. 2008); and there are several specific intrinsic aspects (Frey et al. 2008, p. 129):

Figure 1: Rural v Urban way of life.

(a) "Becky, a rural woman." Allie Mae Burroughs from rural Hale County, Alabama from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Farm_Security_Administration#/media/File:Allie_Mae_Burroughs_print.jpg. Public Domain.

(b) "Charlotte, an urban woman." Ivanka Trump from New York City from https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Ivanka_Trump_in_2011.jpg. Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 2.0 Generic license.



- the need for relatedness: individuals desire to feel connected to others by love and affection, in particular by having family and freinds and by being in a social setting: we know that city isolates MY city book but also frees TOENNIES and may connect within subgroups FISHER SUBCULTURAL THEORY
- need for competence: individuals want to control the environment and want to experience theselves as capable and effective : more difficult to control in city and more comparisons again better be small pond; on the other jand easier to find maycthing sibgroup THEIRY SUBCULTURSL THEORY
- the desire for autonomy: individuals value the experience of being in charge of their actions and being causal: again perhaps easier to be in chage in subrgoup that matches FISHER SUBCULTURAL THEIRY and citi si more free TOENNIES, but more difficult to bein chage in bigger environemnt and taller hioerarchy; and city is in many wasy less cuasal URBAN FINISH ETIQUITEER CITE FROM MY BOOK, and othe other hand city bettwe accepts nonconformists TOENNIES

2 4 qualities of life

TODO: mover short relevant pieces to swbLivability

have 4 qualities from (Veenhoven 2000) table and inside say urban or rural!

and that another table from recent one

life chances: are greater in cities! but not necessarily life results! livability of environment: urban if consumerism; rural if good life;

mercer inner appreciation of life: deinety rural; swb

	outer qualities	inner qualities
life chances	livability of environment [Mercer index, population size]	life-ability of the person [N/A]
life results	utility of life [NA]	appreciation of life [place satisfaction, life satisfaction]

Table 2: Veenhoven's four qualities of life. Measures used in present study in brackets

life ability of person can be urban per subsultural urb they: everyone can find sth, urban air is free; yet life ability is

external utility of life: urban & rural depending how one understands it

livability can be also called (objective) quality of life, welfare 'level of living' or habitability

utility of life or good life or meaning of life; again do not need opera houses or large intl airports

personal capacities or life-ability, capability or life potential: can be in some ways enhanced, say motivating effect of urban competition or housing prices or diminished: they can also depress a person as opposed to motivate. and city is unhealthy for human brain LEDERBORG; Veenhoven (2000) considers absence of mental defects and 'normal' level of functioning as key for life-ability; on the other hand two other ingredients, autonomy and self actualization are likely to be better in cities.

brock p18 cited in Veenhoven (2000): considers important for best life: degree to which life fits the individual preferences, which should be greatest cities

Veenhoven (2000) enumerated some items under livability umbrella: moderate climate (South European cities should be livable), clean air (smaller cities should be livable), freedom (the larger the city, the more freedom TOENNIE), equality and brother (the larger the city, the more inequality), wealth, arts and education (Western cities are richer, and larger cities have more arts and education) (Veenhoven 2000). Yet, fragmented city, can be quite cohesive with its neighborhoods as per subcultural urban theory (FISHER).

Cities are heterogeneous by definition (WIRTH), especially large multicultural cities like London and Paris are clearly fragmented, and social fragmentation is for Veenhoven the reverse of livability; diversity or heterogeneity should result in fragmentation per homophily theory (CITE FROM BRFSS SEG)

appreciation of life is subjective: asw, lts, happiness

livability is environmental chances (Veenhoven 2000)

consumerism leads to misery: that Kasser book!

(Veenhoven 2000) says most inclusive is swb+lexp; swb lower in urb; lexp if anything also lower in urb: pollutions, stress, and unhealthy to brain (Lederborg et al. 2011).

urban way of life increases chances, but not necessarily improves outcomes. Furthermore, it always increases relative deprivation CITE MICHALOS MDT: more people means more comparisons, and for happiness it is better to be a big fish in small pond (rural area). City stimulates but instead of fulfillment it increases desires and needs (CITE HEDONIC TREADMILL)—see my disst slides guess BRICKMAN.

in fact urbanicity decreases likelihood of achieving top, however defined: top, by definition is far away, income, power, and other hierarchy ladders are taller and there is more competition. and livability can be conceptualized as one's position in society (Veenhoven 2000). and indeed there is much deprivation and exclusion across various cities, and deprivation and exclusion are livability antonyms for Veenhoven (Veenhoven 2000).

3 consumerism, Conspicuous consumption and urbanism

cross-add from the latest paper

veblen ...grep my tex and org and copy here

consumerism leads to misery: that Kasser book!

there is clearly a dichotomy here: urban splendor v rural plainness; indeed the greatest divide is urban-rural (HANSON).

cities are fake: urban manners urban polish urban etiquette v rural plain real TODO see those words i have in book maybe even commented out there

and show many many pictures of faces—again just copy past here there were some commented out

4 Classic sociological urban theory

just copy boilerplate here

5 The urban Misery

Urban literature cliché is that now, for the first time in history of our species, more than half of us live in cities, and the proportions is rising—quickly give numbers from table from my last article.

Likewise, there is a large urban literature, but also largely separate from happiness literature. It is important to connect the two literatures, because the urban literature tends to claim, usually implicitly, sometimes explicitly, that cities improve quality of life and happiness. However, it is not so. We already know from many studies CITE that people are less happy in cities at least in developed countries. If quality of life is defined as production, consumption, or amenities, then by tautology, cities have greater quality of life. Such definition is problematic however. Moreover it is arbitrary. If measures of quality of life predict lower subjective wellbeing, then, they are probably wrong measures.

Human flourishing does not require urban amenities, such as opera houses, large airports, large museums, etc. They are neither necessary nor sufficient for human flourishing. And quality of life can be defined as “necessary conditions for happiness” (McCall cited in Veenhoven 2000, p. 2).

On the other hand, many attributes of cities, always do harm people. pollutions: cities are always the most polluted areas on earth in terms of: air, noise, light, and information (billboards, and various marketing) pollutions. crowding: by definition: the denser the more crowded. Some animals did evolve to be piled upon each other: bees, ants, and bacteria among them; humans are different, more like wolves or sheep—we evolved to live in packs or bands—as hunters gatherers we lived in packs or bands of 50-100 people, not in cities that are measured in hundreds thousands of people, and not in densities of 25,846/sq km (Manhattan), which is 105 people per acre. Imagine a larger soccer field (2.7 acre) and 22 people on it (2 teams of 11 players)—pretty livable density; Manhattan has 281 people on it. Of course it is only manageable thanks to towers and underground (subway) facilities.

Housing affordability is arguably a big part of livability of quality of life, and arguably more important than amenities like opera houses that you arguably pay for. According to trulia https://www.trulia.com/real_estate/New_York-New_York/market-trends/ sq ft in mahattan median is about 1,500. Sure you make more, but not much more. Manhattan median household income is 66,739 http://www.slate.com/articles/business/moneybox/2014/01/new_york_city_census_data_manhattan_and_brooklyn_are_much_poorer_than_you.html . If you live in the middle of nowhere, say in beeville tx, you make almost 2x less, 36,989 www.bestplaces.net/economy/city/texas/beeville. but sq ft median price is about 50\$ <http://www.topix.com/real-estate/city/beeville-tx> So you make 2x more, but housing is 30x more expensive! Surely, Beeville does not boast opera house or international airport, but are those worth 30x more in housing price? of course, not.

Since to economist:

$$QOL \approx \text{size of a place} \quad (1)$$

Surely you would think, they must be more sophisticated than that! That it is not just \$; Well hell here is one paper by economist doing exactly that estimating economic way QOL—see table:

But then it is commute, the most miserable thing a human can do cite that science article i have on experiment .com by kahnehan.

MSA Population	QOL	QOL Rank
MSA, Pop > 5 Million	.027	1
MSA, Pop 1.5–4.9 Million	-.001	2
MSA, Pop 0.5–1.4 Million	-.011	3
MSA, Pop < 0.5 Million	-.011	4
Non-MSA areas	-0.023	5

Table 3: economist estimate of QOL! from TABLE 1: WAGE, HOUSING-COST, AND QUALITY-OF-LIFE DIFFERENTIALS, 2000 from Albouy (2008). The striking thing is that the greatest jump in QOL is for largest cities from -.001 to .027 while we know that it is actually the greatest drop! The most misery happens for the largest places MY CITIES 2016 paper, so again economists got it opposite.

Hence, I argue, cities are inherently broken: the greatest and densest cities, like London, NYC, Shanghai etc are always unaffordable, and hence infested by capitalist elite of hedge fund managers and the like, who killed whatever character city might have had (Zukin). The only affordable cities are those that are broken like Detroit, Camden, etc, and nobody wants to live there.

As one of my friends remarked “you don’t live in NYC, NYC lives you” (unless you are a capitalist)—this means that you are a tiny cog in a huge capitalistic machine that will wear you down and suck up your life (my chapter for Ilan book).

Hence, the greater the city, the lower the SWB QOL, despite that you will see them high on lists of best places to live like Mercer. Avoid them, if you want to be happy.

Fundamentally humans, neither any other animals, evolved to live in cities. Cities are unnatural: full of glass, steel, concrete, asphalt and other artificial materials.

In particular urban economists view cities as desirable development—they grow hence they must be good, economists tell us. Glaeser etc

Peck (2016) is a good critique of Glaeser’s urban triumphalism, aka celebrity-urbanology or guru-urbanism. Indeed, as Peck argues, Glaeser is colonizing the city with economic rationality/utility maximization. And urbanization in general is alike to colonization, where most large cities win, and smaller places lose (Rossi 2020).

Peck (2016, p. 2) describes well Glaeser’s celebrity-urbanology:

He makes it his business to adopt controversial and attention-grabbing positions, combining uplifting celebrations of urban life, as the pinnacle of human achievement, with the dispensation of sober(ing) advice on the economically conditioned—not preordained—policy options available to cities today.

To unpack it, there are 3 parts: 1) grab attention celebrating city triumph as the pinnacle of human achievement, 2) credit economic principles of productivity and utility maximization for the city’s triumph, 3) apply more of ideological (rather than scientific) libertarian neoliberal free market laissez-faire economic axioms if there is any problem with the city.

central place theory

— you: maybe some urban like urban geog or urb affairs review etc; or just sir! or josh! visit Meyer in Colgate now when wrapping this up! heck send to Glaeser —

that higher house prices are a revealed signal of higher quality of life, other things constant, because humans will move toward the areas they find attractive, which, in turn, drives up housing prices OSWALD WU SCIENCE: One reason that most popular places are least happy is as follows (Oswald 2009):

We have been asked a lot whether we expected that states like New York and California would do so badly in the happiness ranking. Having visited and lived in various parts of the US, I am only a little surprised. Many people think these states would be marvellous places to live in. The problem is that if too many individuals think that way, they move into those states, and the resulting congestion and house prices make it a non-fulfilling prophecy. In a way, it is like the stock market. If everyone thinks it would be great to buy stock X, that stock is generally already overvalued. Bargains in life are usually found outside the spotlight. It seems that exactly the same is true of the best places to live.

6 the rural bliss

from nature chapter of my book: thoreau etc

7 Discussion

to economist utility is about income and consumption or power, dominance and status, not happiness, and accordingly economists advise people to maximize income and consumption, not happiness (Becker and Rayo 2008). status increase utility (Heffetz and Frank 2008)? i guess check if thats what they say, and cities in cease status MY CITY BOOK and ILAN FETISH, and so they should increase utility too

Benjamin and Heffetz (p 2107 2012) "in settings where one alternative involves higher income or more money, our survey respondents are systematically more likely to choose the money alternative than they are likely to predict it will yield higher SWB," which in English means that people are greedy and prefer money to happiness.

the bottomline: cities do provide a lot but we pay price in happiness like florida said in june 2016 citylab describing my research and as stupid glaeser argues in his unhappy cities in jole and as i was hinting (city_book?): sure new yorkers have greater experience in nyc than people in beaville, but they adjust, are on treadmill and ever want more never being fully satisfied, and actually end up depressed—again show new yorker life in taznania and she would recover from her depression; but also in absolute terms! life is so expensive in city and so polluted (light, air, sound, info, etc) that you are objectively worse off than in small place!! and all those amenities—airport, university, hospital, clothes, etc—who needs that crap—we should pollute less, consume less; the only good thing is that you are free in city that can easier find people like you, your own ingroup—well hell the two are related!!! freedom and ingroup!!! guess that's what fischer meant in his sociocultural theory of city life—may ask joanie

8 Conclusion

References

- ALBOUY, D. (2008): "Are big cities bad places to live? Estimating quality of life across metropolitan areas," Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- BECKER, G. AND L. RAYO (2008): "Comment on 'Economic Growth and Subjective Well-Being: Reassessing the Easterlin Paradox' by Betsey Stevenson and Justin Wolfers," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 88–95.
- BENJAMIN, D. J. AND O. HEFFETZ (2012): "What do you think would make you happier? What do you think you would choose?" *The American economic review*, 102, 2083–2110.
- CAMPBELL, A. (1981): *The sense of well-being in America: Recent patterns and trends*, McGraw-Hill Companies.
- 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.
- FISCHER, C. S. (1995): "The subcultural theory of urbanism: A twentieth-year assessment," *American Journal of Sociology*, 543–577.
- FRANK, R. (2012): *The Darwin economy: Liberty, competition, and the common good*, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ.
- FREY, B. S. AND A. STUTZER (2002): "What Can Economists Learn from Happiness Research?" *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40, 402–435.

- FREY, B. S. ET AL. (2008): "Happiness: A revolution in economics," *MIT Press Books*, 1.
- 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.
- HEFFETZ, O. AND R. H. FRANK (2008): "Preferences for status: Evidence and economic implications," *HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL ECONOMICS*, Jess Benhabib, Alberto Bisin, Matthew Jackson, eds, 1, 69–91.
- JOUTSENVIRTA, M. (2016): "A practice approach to the institutionalization of economic degrowth," *Ecological Economics*, 128, 23–32.
- KALLIS, G. (2011): "In defence of degrowth," *Ecological Economics*, 70, 873–880.
- KALLIS, G., C. KERSCHNER, AND J. MARTINEZ-ALIER (2012): "The economics of degrowth," *Ecological Economics*, 84, 172–180.
- KASSER, T. (2003): *The high price of materialism*, MIT press.
- 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.
- MICHALOS, A. (1985): "Multiple discrepancies theory (MDT)," *Social Indicators Research*, 16, 347–413.
- MILGRAM, S. (1970): "The experience of living in cities," *Science*, 167, 1461–1468.
- O'SULLIVAN, A. (2009): *Urban economics*, McGraw-Hill.
- OSWALD, A. J. (2009): "'Objective Confirmation of Subjective Measures of Human Wellbeing: Evidence from the USA', published in Science (online 17 December 2009) by AJ Oswald and S Wu," *warwick.ac.uk*.
- PECK, J. (2016): "Economic Rationality Meets Celebrity Urbanology: Exploring Edward Glaeser's City," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 40, 1–30.
- ROBERTS, J. A. (2011): *Shiny Objects: Why We Spend Money We Don't Have In Search Of Happiness We Can't Buy* Author: James A. Roberts, Publisher, HarperOne.
- ROBERTS, J. A. AND A. CLEMENT (2007): "Materialism and satisfaction with over-all quality of life and eight life domains," *Social Indicators Research*, 82, 79–92.
- ROSSI, U. (2020): "Fake friends: The illusionist revision of Western urbanology at the time of platform capitalism," *Urban Studies*, 57, 1105–1117.
- SEN, A. (1977): "Rational fools: A critique of the behavioral foundations of economic theory," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 6, 317–344.
- SIRGY, M. J. (2002): *The psychology of quality of life*, vol. 12, Springer.
- SKIDELSKY, E. AND R. SKIDELSKY (2012): *How much is enough?: money and the good life*, Penguin UK.
- TÖNNIES, F. ([1887] 2002): *Community and society*, DoverPublications.com, Mineola NY.

- VEENHOVEN, R. (1995): "World database of happiness," *Social Indicators Research*, 34, 299–313.
- (2000): "The four qualities of life," *Journal of happiness studies*, 1, 1–39.
- (2014): "Livability Theory," *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*, 3645–3647.