Urban—rural differences in successful aging

GEOGRAPHICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Exploring the Interaction of Environment and Behavior

> EDITED BY Peter J. Rentfrow

Research Report

Temperament and Migration Patterns in Finland

Markus Jokela,¹ Marko Elovainio,² Mika Kivimäki,³ and Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen¹



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Research in Personality

RESEARCH IN

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jrp

Brief Report

Personality predicts migration within and between U.S. states

Markus Jokela

Department of Psychology, University of Helsinki, Siltavuorenpenger 20D, P.O. Box 9, FIN-00014, Helsinki, Finland



Divided We Stand: Three Psychological Regions of the United States and Their Political, Economic, Social, and Health Correlates

Peter J. Rentfrow University of Cambridge

Samuel D. Gosling University of Texas at Austin

Markus Jokela University of Helsinki David J. Stillwell and Michal Kosinski University of Cambridge

Jeff Potter Atof Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts





Geographically varying associations between personality and life satisfaction in the London metropolitan area

Markus Jokela^{a,b,1}, Wiebke Bleidorn^{c,d}, Michael E. Lamb^b, Samuel D. Gosling^e, and Peter J. Rentfrow^b



Regional Personality Differences in Great Britain

Peter J. Rentfrow¹*, Markus Jokela², Michael E. Lamb¹

SIERRA MAD





Geographically varying associations between personality and life satisfaction in the London metropolitan area

Markus Jokela,^{1,2} Wiebke Bleidorn,^{3,4} Michael E. Lamb,² Samuel D. Gosling⁵, Peter J. Rentfrow²

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



Geographically varying associations between personality and life satisfaction in the London metropolitan area

Markus Jokela,^{1,2} Wiebke Bleidorn,^{3,4} Michael E. Lamb,² Samuel D. Gosling⁵, Peter J. Rentfrow²



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

	E	S	Α	С	0
Population structure					
% Older people (65+)			annes der	-23	-27
% Couple households with children			24		-35
% Lone-parent households				25	
Fertility rate			24		
Mortality rate			Success	19	gammag
Population density					33
% Christian religion					-25
% White ethnic background			-17	-14	-22
					Towns
Physical environment & Housing					
Mean house price			-22	-17	19
% Domestic Buildings					25
% Domestic Gardens			14		-21
% Non-Domestic Buildings			Trenan-R		27
% Greenspaces					-22
Social indicators					
Turnout Borough election				-22	-17
Total crime rate					15
Income rank				-22	-17
Employment rate rank				-23	-20
Note: Correlations are reported as r * statistically significant (n=216 postcod	100. All corre e districts) a	elations wi nd only th	th absolute va	alue ≥ 14 a n.	re
E=Extraversion, S=Emotional stability C=Conscientiousness, O=Openness to	(low Neurot o Experience	icism), A=/ e	Agreeablenes	s,	

Flow of cognitive capital across rural and urban United States Markus Jokela*

Adolescence to adulthood



GENETIC CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION IN GREAT BRITAIN

Abdel Abdellaoui^{1,*}, David Hugh-Jones², Kathryn E. Kemper³, Yan Holtz³, Michel G. Nivard⁴, Laura Veul¹, Loic Yengo³, Brendan P. Zietsch⁵, Timothy M. Frayling⁶, Naomi Wray^{3,7}, Jian Yang^{3,7}, Karin J.H. Verweij¹, Peter M. Visscher^{3,7,*}





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

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.



Markus Jokela*



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**

Markus Jokela*



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

Markus Jokela^{1,2}

So what about social causation and neighborhood influences?

Review

Environment as 'Brain Training': A review of geographical and physical environmental influences on cognitive ageing

Marica Cassarino^{a,*}, Annalisa Setti^{a,b}



Ageing and Urbanization: Can Cities be Designed to Foster Active Ageing?

> John R Beard, MBBS, PhD¹ Charles Petitot, MD, MPH¹

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







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?