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Geographically varying associations between personality and life satisfaction in the London metropolitan area
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Where in Britain would you be happiest?

Answer ten questions to get your personality traits

Discover the place in Britain predicted to improve your life satisfaction

No question or postcode data are stored by the BBC – all calculations take place on your computer

Table 2. Selected sociodemographic and personality correlates of regression slopes of personality scores predicting life satisfaction in different postcode districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population structure</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Older people (65+)</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Couple households with children</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Lone-parent households</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility rate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality rate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Christian religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment &amp; Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean house price</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Domestic Buildings</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Domestic Gardens</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-Domestic Buildings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Greenspaces</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout Borough election</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total crime rate</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income rank</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlations are reported as $r \times 100$. All correlations with absolute value $\geq 14$ are statistically significant (n=216 postcode districts) and only these are shown.

E=Extraversion, S=Emotional stability (low Neuroticism), A=Agreeableness, C=Conscientiousness, O=Openness to Experience
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Flow of cognitive capital across rural and urban United States
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Adolescence to adulthood

![Graph showing cognitive ability percentile over SMSA at follow-up, with data points for Rural, Suburban, Urban, and Central city areas, not adjusted for socioeconomic status.](image-url)
GENETIC CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION IN GREAT BRITAIN
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Problem of social selection

\[ y_{it} = B_0 + B_W(x_{it} - x_{i.}) + B_B(x_{i.}) + \varepsilon_{it} \]

- Within-individual (variation across time)
- Between-individuals (average residence across time)
Figure 1. Associations between neighborhood (NH) disadvantage and outcome variables based on between-person (dark bars), total (light bars), and within-person (dark gray bars) regressions using 10 annual repeated measurements of neighborhood disadvantage and outcomes (112,503 person-observations from 20,012 unique persons), Household, Income, and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey, 2001–2010. The shaded bars illustrate the magnitude of regression coefficients (linear regression coefficients for continuous outcomes and logit odds ratios for dichotomous outcomes). All differences between within-person and between-person regression coefficients were statistically significant ($P < 0.05$). See Web Table 1 for statistical details. Bars, 95% confidence intervals.
Figure 1. Associations between neighborhood (NH) disadvantage and outcome variables based on between-person (dark bars), total (light bars), and within-person (dark gray bars) regressions using 10 annual repeated measurements of neighborhood disadvantage and outcomes (112,503 person-observations from 20,012 unique persons), Household, Income, and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey, 2001–2010. The shaded bars illustrate the magnitude of regression coefficients (linear regression coefficients for continuous outcomes and logit odds ratios for dichotomous outcomes). All differences between within-person and between-person regression coefficients were statistically significant ($P < 0.05$). See Web Table 1 for statistical details. Bars, 95% confidence intervals.

Are Neighborhood Health Associations Causal? A 10-Year Prospective Cohort Study With Repeated Measurements
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Figure 1  Associations between neighbourhood deprivation and health outcomes for between-individuals, total and within-individual regressions. Bars represent the magnitude of linear regression coefficients per 20 units of multiple deprivation index (for self-reported health and psychological distress), logged Poisson regression coefficients per 20 units of multiple deprivation index (for the count variables of illnesses), and logit ORs per 5 units of multiple deprivation index (for disliking the neighbourhood and wanting to move). Error bars are 95% CIs. N=up to 137 884 person-observations from 17 001 unique individuals between years 1991 and 2009. See online supplementary table S2 for numerical details.

Does neighbourhood deprivation cause poor health? Within-individual analysis of movers in a prospective cohort study
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So what about social causation and neighborhood influences?

Environment as ‘Brain Training’: A review of geographical and physical environmental influences on cognitive ageing
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Ageing and Urbanization: Can Cities be Designed to Foster Active Ageing?
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Successful aging
- No physical disabilities or limitations
- Good mental health
- Good cognitive functioning
- Social activity and engagement
Longitudinal data from 27 European countries
N=60,000 to 100,000 participants
Five study waves between 2004 and 2015

Measures:
* Physical capability
  - Grip strength
  - Activities of Daily Living (ADL)
* Psychological functioning
  - Cognitive ability
  - Depression
* Social activity
  - Loneliness
  - Participation in activities
Physical capability
Cross-sectional differences between “Rural area” (to the left) vs “Big city” (to the right)
Psychological functioning
Cross-sectional differences between “Rural area” (to the left) vs “Big city” (to the right)
Social activity
Cross-sectional differences between “Rural area” (to the left) vs “Big city” (to the right)
Physical capability
Longitudinal trajectories for Rural area, Suburban/town, and Big city

Grip strength

Instrumental activities of daily living

-SHARE-
Psychological functioning
Longitudinal trajectories for Rural area, Suburban/town, and Big city

Interaction not stat significant
Social activity
Longitudinal trajectories for Rural area, Suburban/town, and Big city
Urban living seems to favor successful aging more than rural living

* Open questions:
  - Country-specific aging trajectories?
  - Are these trajectories truly causal?