# Lay People's Views on a Mobile Society:

## Is it Desirable or Undesirable for a Society to Become Mobile?

Tomotaka Okuyama Yuri Miyamoto Atsuki Ito Rei Akaishi Michiko Ueda

# Introduction

Researchers have proposed that interpersonal and intergroup mobility (hereinafter "mobility")<sup>(1)</sup>—the extent to which people move between relationships, groups/organizations, and locations—is a significant socioecological determinant that impacts our psychological processes [1–3]. Such mobility offers individuals the chance to meet new people and broadens their potential career options and other activities. While there is a wealth of research documenting the positive aspects of mobility, studies focusing on its negative sides, which may lead to undesirable psychological outcomes, are relatively sparse. Additionally, beyond the objective consequences of mobility, it remains unclear how lay people perceive it. Consequently, the primary question is: do lay people view mobility as desirable or undesirable?

Prior research has indicated that mobility is associated with numerous beneficial psychological outcomes [e.g., 4–7], such as elevated self-esteem [4], diminished levels of loneliness [5,6], and heightened engagement in close relationships [7]. However, despite the limited number of studies, certain findings suggest that increased mobility may also carry unfavorable consequences, including smaller social networks [8], increased aggression [9], and a decrease in overall well-being [10].

While these studies suggest that the degree of mobility can influence various important psychological outcomes, little is known about people's attitudes toward mobility. Understanding whether people perceive mobility as desirable or undesirable is vital, as these attitudes could potentially affect their willingness to participate in behaviors that could either enhance or diminish mobility [11]. Furthermore, these attitudes could dictate whether the experience of mobility results in improved or deteriorated stress responses [12] and mental health outcomes [13], making them highly consequential.

However, to our knowledge, no study has examined the prevailing views that people hold about mobility. Previous research has primarily focused on the measured levels of mobility and its impact on psychological outcomes. However, as mentioned above, it is crucial to inspect how people perceive mobility separately from the psychological outcomes. Additionally, the potential variations in views concerning the desirability of mobility within a population have been largely overlooked. This could mean that some individuals may view mobility positively while others negatively. For example, individuals embedded in closed and stable personal networks might see the potential relationship changes, which are associated with a highly mobile society, as disruptive. Therefore, it is valuable to explore the diversity of views on mobility within the population in a real-world context and investigate the reasons behind the preferences or aversions.

In this research, we aim to bridge the knowledge gap by investigating the extent to which individuals in Japan perceive mobility as desirable or undesirable, using a large sample of the population from the country. We focused on Japan because it offers a unique socioecological context characterized by low mobility [4]. Yet, it faces a pressing need to increase mobility due to globalization [14,15]. As many non-WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic; [16]) societies are likely to experience similar tensions, comprehending how people living in such socioecological contexts view mobility is important.

In addition to exploring the degree to which people hold a desirable or undesirable view of mobility, we also investigated whether demographic and personality factors are associated with differing views on mobility. In particular, it is plausible that younger individuals have more opportunities to relocate for jobs or university enrollment. According to the Statistics Bureau of Japan [17], people in their twenties are the most likely to move within and between prefectures, suggesting that younger people may possess a more favorable view towards a mobile society compared to their older counterparts. Personality traits may also carry significance. As Oishi and Schimmack [10] showed, residential relocations during childhood were linked to decreased well-being in adulthood, specifically among those with low extroversion. Therefore, introverted individuals may associate mobility with negative outcomes, thus causing them to view it as undesirable.

We further investigated whether respondents' actual mobility (residential mobility) and their perceived mobility of those around them (relational mobility) are associated with their views on mobility. People may align their views of mobility with their own experiences of actual mobility, such as residential changes. Thus, those who have not moved or do not intend to move residences may find mobility undesirable. We also looked into whether people's views on mobility align with the level of mobility they perceive to exist amongst those around them (i.e., relational mobility). For instance, those in a socioecological environment where others have fewer opportunities to move might find mobility undesirable. Understanding these connections helps to clarify the characteristics of people who view a mobile society as undesirable.

Lastly, our goal was to understand why some individuals regard mobility as undesirable. We solicited respondents to share their reasons for such views. Despite prior theoretical discussions on the negative aspects of mobility (e.g., [18]), empirical understanding of these undesirable mobility aspects remains limited. While certain researchers [5] have empirically evaluated these undesirable aspects, no study has examined potential reasons for some individuals' adverse views toward a mobile society. By scrutinizing these reasons, we aimed to provide policy implications ensuring that certain individuals are not marginalized as society grows increasingly mobile.

## Method

In December 2021, we conducted an anonymous online survey of the Japanese adult population. We commissioned the Survey Research Center, a commercial survey company, to administer a set of demographic screening questions to over 10,000 respondents from its commercial web panel. The final

sample was selected to reflect the general Japanese population in terms of residential area, sex, and age distribution.

The final sample only included respondents who provided complete answers to all survey questions; thus, there are no missing values in the dataset. The Ethics Committee of RIKEN approved the survey (IRB approval number W2021-020). The survey participants were informed of the study's purpose before their participation, provided explicit written consent to participate, and had the option to withdraw from the survey at any time.

In addition to the measures described below, the survey included other questions, but these questions were intended for a separate project, and thus not included in the current analysis. Our final sample consisted of 1,848 respondents.

#### Measures

### Demographic Information

We gathered basic demographic information, including sex and age. A dummy variable was established for the "Female" category, making the "Male" selection the baseline category in the following analysis. The respondents' ages were also collected through the survey company.

*Ruralness Index*: To assess the level of ruralness, we asked respondents to identify whether they live in 1 = a metropolitan area, 2 = an urban area, 3 = a relatively urban area, 4 = neither, 5 = a relatively rural area, or 6 = a rural area. This scale was adapted from a measure of ruralness (versus urbaneness), originally developed for use in Japan [21].

*Income*: We inquired about their annual household income level in the past year (1 = below 2,000,000 yen, up to 6 = 10,000,000 yen and above). The choices given were utilized as-is for the analysis, with higher numbers representing higher levels of household income. As of December 2021, the exchange rate was 1 JPY = 0.0087 USD.

### Personality Measure

We measured extroversion using a scale developed by Namikawa and colleagues [20]. Respondents indicated their agreement with five statements on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Example statements included "I am talkative" and "I am sociable". This scale demonstrated high internal consistency with Cronbach's  $\alpha$  equaling .87. We averaged responses to the five questions to calculate the extroversion score, where higher scores signify a more extroverted personality.

### Mobility Information

We assessed respondents' views on mobility as well as the level of mobility, including both relational and residential mobility.

*Views on Mobility*: Respondents were solicited for their views on societal mobility through an openended format. They were asked the following question: "Do you think it is desirable or undesirable that a society (i.e., relationships or places people belong) becomes mobile? Please provide your answer as well as reasons for your answer in 1–3 sentences.". *Mobility Measures: Relational and Residential Mobility*: We assessed both relational mobility and residential mobility as measures of mobility. The relational mobility scale [4,19] measures the degree to which society provides opportunities to cultivate new relationships and sever old relationships. To gather the data, respondents were asked to consider people in their immediate circles, such as friends, colleagues, and neighbors. They then had to rate the applicability of each statement to these individuals (e.g., "They have many chances to get to know other people"). The responses could range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The scale showed acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .63$ ).

Moreover, to assess respondents' residential mobility, they were asked about the number of years they had resided in their current neighborhood (*Residential length*). They had to select from options categorized by the number of years ranging from 1 ("less than a year") to 6 ("20 years or more"). Higher scores on this scale indicate lower residential mobility.

As a further measure of residential mobility, we inquired about the likelihood of their moving within the next 12 months (*Future move*). Participants were given five choices, which ranged from "very low possibility" (1) to "very high possibility" (5). Higher results on this measure signify higher residential mobility.

### Data Analysis

## Manual Classification of Desirability

The responses to the open-ended question on the desirability of mobility were classified into one of four groups: "desirable", "undesirable", "both/depends", and "unknown/unsure." First, when responses included the word, "desirable", or mentioned positive consequences of becoming a mobile society, such as "economy will be revitalized", these responses were classified as "desirable". Second, when responses included the word, "undesirable", or referred to negative consequences of becoming a mobile society, such as "it will take a lot of time to build a new relationship with others", these answers were classified as "undesirable". Third, when responses mentioned both positive and negative consequences or said it depends on something, such as "it depends on age" or "it depends on individuals", these statements were categorized as "both/depends". Finally, when responses included "I don't know" or respondents did not understand the meaning of the question, such as "I don't understand what 'mobile' means", these responses were categorized as "unknown/unsure".

### Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis

After categorizing all responses, we examined whether demographic and personality factors, as well as mobility variables, predict the likelihood that respondents perceive mobility to be undesirable (versus desirable). Specifically, we conducted a multinomial logistic regression where the dependent variable was the perception of a mobile society (i.e., desirable, undesirable, both/depends, and unknown/unsure; with desirable as the reference). In the first model, individual characteristics (i.e., female dummy, ruralness income level, age, and extroversion) were entered as predictors. In the second model, we additionally included variables related to mobility (i.e., relational mobility, residential length, and future move). We also sought to understand the nature of undesirable aspects of mobility by coding the open-ended responses. All

data analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 28.0.

#### Manual Classification of the Reasons for Perceiving Mobility as Undesirable

To scrutinize the reasons why some people perceive mobility as undesirable, the first and second authors initially reviewed half of the responses to identify common themes. Subsequently, the first author and an undergraduate research assistant independently coded all responses. Firstly, responses mentioning the importance of long-lasting relationships or the difficulties in building new friendships were classified under "stable relationships". Secondly, responses referring to life stability or the negative aspects of changeable lifestyles were categorized as "stable life". Thirdly, when respondents emphasized the importance of local community, such as commitment or identity, we grouped these responses into "commitment to local communities". Lastly, responses mentioning other topics, like COVID-19, were slotted into "others", while responses offering no reasons were classified under "no reason". The intercoder agreement stood at 81.4%. Any discrepancies in coding decisions were resolved through discussion between the coders.

## Results

The sample characteristics' descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. Precisely, half of the respondents were female (n = 924), and the other half were male (n = 924).

		•			
	Min	Max	М	SD	α
Demographics					
Ruralness	1.00	6.00	3.29	1.46	_
Income	1.00	6.00	3.08	1.48	_
Age	20.00	79.00	45.61	18.07	_
Extroversion	1.00	7.00	3.75	1.05	0.63
Mobility variables					
Relational Mobility	1.33	6.00	3.53	0.50	0.87
Residential Length	1.00	6.00	4.82	1.54	_
Future Move	1.00	5.00	2.09	1.35	_

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

*Note:* N = 1,848

### Did People Perceive Mobility to be Desirable or Undesirable?

Of 1,848 respondents, 960 (51.9%) viewed social mobility as desirable, for example, "Desirable. Because you get to meet new people." In contrast, 226 (12.2%) respondents regarded it undesirable, such as, "Undesirable. Because it will destroy the relationships that have been built." A further 127 (6.9%) of them considered it to be "both desirable and undesirable" or stated that its desirability "depends" on the context or situation, for instance, "It depends." The remaining 535 (29.0%) respondents provided "unknown/ unsure" responses such as, "I don't know." The top panel of Fig 1 presents the percentage distribution of responses in each of these four categories.



Fig 1. Perceived desirability vs undesirability of mobile society (A) and reasons of undesirability (B).

🗆 unstable relationships 🖾 unstable lives 📓 lower commitment 🖾 others 🖾 no reason

(A). *Perceived Desirability vs. Undesirability.* The top bar chart shows the respondents' views on whether mobility is desirable or undesirable. The dark grey bar represents the percentage of respondents who perceive mobility as desirable. The striped bar indicates the percentage of respondents who view mobility as undesirable. The dotted bar represents respondents who believe mobility's desirability depends on other factors or both desirable and undesirable elements. The lightly speckled bar at the end shows the percentage of respondents who are unsure or do not know if mobility is desirable or not.

(B). *Reasons for Undesirability*. The lower bar chart examines the reasons stated by respondents who perceive mobility as undesirable. The bar patterns align with different reasons. From left to right: The first bar signifies the proportion citing 'unstable relationships' as a reason for finding mobility undesirable. The second bar represents those who mention 'unstable lives'. The third bar signifies the proportion of respondents worried about a 'lower commitment to a local community.' The fourth bar corresponds to respondents who identified 'other' reasons for finding mobility undesirable. The fifth bar reveals the percentage of respondents who refrained from specifying a reason for viewing mobility as undesirable.

#### Who Perceived Mobility to be Undesirable (Versus Desirable)?

We next examined the reasons behind the "undesirable" perceptions of mobility. We ran multinomial logistic regression analyses, with the participants' views on mobile society (i.e., desirable, undesirable, both/depends, and unknown/unsure) as the dependent variable. We coded "desirable" as the reference. Table 2 presents the statistics for the "undesirable" perception of mobility. The statistics for "both/depends" and "unknown/unsure" perceptions of mobility can be found in the supplementary materials (S1 and S2 Table).

In the first model, older age (B = 0.016, SE = 0.004, Wald = 14.232, p < .001, Exp(B) = 1.016) and lower extroversion (B = -0.316, SE = 0.075, Wald = 17.865, p < .001, Exp(B) = 0.729) were associated with

DV: Undesirable			Model 1				Model 2				
	В	SE	Wald	р	Exp(B)	В	SE	Wald	р	Exp(B)	
Intercept	-1.309	0.475	7.592	.006	_	-1.105	0.760	2.117	.146	_	
Female	0.092	0.151	0.396	.543	1.096	0.071	0.152	0.217	.641	1.073	
Ruralness	0.034	0.052	0.440	.507	1.035	0.020	0.052	0.142	.706	1.020	
Income	0.013	0.052	0.060	.807	1.013	-0.007	0.052	0.020	.887	0.993	
Age	0.016	0.004	14.232	<.001	1.016	0.007	0.005	1.986	.159	1.007	
Extroversion	-0.316	0.075	17.865	<.001	0.729	-0.293	0.078	14.195	<.001	0.746	
Relational Mobility						-0.087	0.159	0.296	.587	0.917	
ResMob1 (Residential Length)						0.160	0.060	7.157	.007	1.173	
ResMob2 (Future Move)						-0.106	0.066	2.600	.107	0.899	

Table 2. Individual and socio-ecological predictors of the undesirable (vs. desirable) perception of mobility.

*Note:* N = 1,848. This table presents the results for undesirable (vs. desirable) view of mobility. Significant associations are indicated in bold. The results for both/depends (vs. desirable) responses and unknown/unsure (vs. desirable) responses can be found in supplementarymaterials (S1 and S2 Table).

a higher likelihood of perceiving mobility as undesirable rather than desirable (Model 1 in Table 2).

In the second model, we included mobility variables. This is because people's perceptions of mobility as desirable or undesirable might depend not only on their demographic and personality traits but also on socioecological factors (i.e., the residential mobility and relational mobility of the society in which they live). Therefore, Model 2 is distinguished from Model 1 by incorporating all mobility variables. The results showed that lower extroversion (B = -0.293, SE = 0.078, Wald = 14.195, p < .001, Exp(B) = 0.746) and longer residential length (B = 0.160, SE = 0.060, Wald = 7.157, p = .007, Exp(B) = 1.173) were associated with a higher likelihood of considering mobility variables. This is likely because residential mobility partly mediated the relationship between age and the perceived undesirability of mobile society. Namely, age was significantly associated with residential length (B = 0.036, SE = 0.002, p < .001; S3 Table), which in turn predicted perceived undesirability (Model 2 in Table 2).

## How Did People Explain Perception of Mobility as Undesirable?

We analyzed open-ended descriptions of the reasons behind their responses, provided by respondents who reported that a mobile society was undesirable (n = 226). Panel B of Fig 1 demonstrates the percentage of five primary reasons for perceiving the mobile society to be undesirable. Results showed that 31.9% pertained to the disruption of "stable relationships" (e.g., "it will destroy the relationships that have been built"), 25.7% cited disruption of "stable lives" (e.g., "it's hard to get used to being in a new environment and it's stressful"), and 2.7% mentioned the reduced "commitment to the local community" (e.g., "it will diminish community interaction"). Additionally, 19.5% pertained to "other reasons" (e.g., COVID), and 20.4% provided "no reason".

## Discussion

In this study, we explored views on a mobile society within a diverse set of Japanese respondents, segmented by age, region, and sex (male, female). We discovered that slightly more than half of the respondents (51.9%) deemed mobility to be desirable. At the same time, a notable proportion of participants (12.2%) found mobility to be undesirable, thus demonstrating mixed opinions on mobility and emphasizing its complex effect on society. The individual characteristics of those who rated mobility as undesirable included being older and less extroverted compared to counterparts who saw mobility as desirable. Furthermore, when examining the variable of residential mobility, individuals who had lived in the same residence for an extended period were more prone to view mobility as undesirable.

While older individuals were more inclined to view mobility as undesirable, this age-related impact on perceived undesirability was no longer significant in the second model that incorporated the residential mobility variable. This indicates that residential mobility might partially mediate the effect of age. Young people often have abundant opportunities to change residences for reasons such as attending college, starting new careers, or establishing families [17]. In contrast, older individuals' lives tend to be more stable, making high mobility and its associated potential for disruptions more likely to be viewed as undesirable. It is also possible that older adults find mobility less desirable because they prefer low-arousal positive emotions (e.g., calm) instead of high-arousal positive emotions (e.g., excitement) [22]. Older adults tend to gain more happiness from ordinary, frequent experiences than from rare, extraordinary experiences [23]. Therefore, a society with low mobility would be more conducive to a lifestyle focused on low arousal positive emotions and ordinary experiences, prompting older adults to view mobility as unfavorable. Furthermore, individuals who have resided in the same region for an extended period, hence experiencing low residential mobility, also appeared more likely to view mobility as undesirable. This could be because people's opinions on mobility often reflect their actual mobility experiences; those who have experienced less change may see fewer advantages in frequent relocations.

The content analysis revealed major concerns as to why some individuals perceive mobility as undesirable, mainly because of its potential to disrupt (1) stable relationships, (2) stable lifestyles, and (3) local communities. These findings suggest that the drawbacks of a mobile society stem from disruptions in stability, in both the interpersonal (e.g., relationships) and personal domains (e.g., lifestyle).

Regarding the impact of personality factors on negative views of mobility, the finding that less extroverted individuals tend to perceive mobility negatively aligns with past studies on the significant link between actual mobility and adverse psychological outcomes for less extroverted individuals [10]. Typically, extroverted people are more skilled at creating new friendships and broadening their social networks. As a result, they might reap more benefits from a mobile society. Conversely, a mobile society may present more challenges for less extroverted individuals. Their less outgoing nature could hinder the quick establishment of new relationships, potentially leading to feelings of isolation or stress when faced with relocation or adapting to fresh social settings. This could cause mobility to appear more disadvantageous for less extroverted individuals, reinforcing their perception of it as undesirable.

Although the present study provides novel findings, there are some limitations. Firstly, this study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, a period when people were frequently advised to stay at home. As a result, it is plausible that these circumstances may have swayed participants to perceive mobility unfavorably. In fact, some responses from those who viewed a mobile society as undesirable cited the COVID-19 pandemic with concerns such as, "It is better not to move so as not to spread the COVID-19 virus". On the flip side, the limited mobility during the pandemic could have potentially intensified a longing for greater mobility.

Another methodological limitation involves the order of survey questions. The question concerning mobility desirability was posed immediately after the relational mobility scale, which discusses the appealing aspects of mobility. This placement might have prompted participants to concentrate more on the desirable facets of mobility. Therefore, future studies should account for these external factors and the influence of survey procedures to secure a more balanced perspective on the desirable/undesirable aspects of mobility.

Moreover, while this study covered a broad range of respondents throughout Japan, it was exclusively focused on a country known for its low relational mobility [4] and island-like geographical characteristics. These features can hinder the ease of moving in and out compared to landlocked nations. Such factors might bias respondent's perspectives in Japan towards the negative aspects of a mobile society. Conversely,

as people tend to favor what they lack over what they have [24], it is plausible that the Japanese, experiencing lower mobility, may be particularly prone to show a preference for mobility and perceive its positive aspects. Future studies should consider the variations of people's viewpoints on mobility in diverse countries and determine if societal elements such as relational mobility, immigration rates, and economic conditions can account for the disparities between these perceptions in different countries.

This study explores mobility in Japan, exposing the nuanced perceptions and impacts of mobility. The findings indicate a divide where over half of the participants see it positively, while a notable proportion perceives it negatively. This negative sentiment is especially prevalent among older, less extroverted individuals, and those with lower residential mobility. These insights carry policy implications given societal trends towards greater mobility, which could adversely affect mental health (e.g., well-being, loneliness) for those who find mobility undesirable. By taking steps to ensure stable lives, foster enduring relationships, and preserve the integrity of local communities, the negative effects of increased mobility may be mitigated. Beyond Japan, the study suggests broader implications, indicating a global need for sophisticated strategies to manage the multifaceted impacts of mobility on modern societies.

#### **Author Note**

MU and YM was funded by the Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST) RISTEX program (grant number JPMJRX21K1; https://www.jst.go.jp/ristex/en/funding/solve-koritsu/index.html). The RIKEN Center for Brain Science (CBS)—Toyota Collaboration Center (BTCC) (LP3009219), and the RIKEN Presidential Grant for Covid-19 Research (https://www.riken.jp/en/covid-19-rd/) funded RA. The funders did not play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

This study obtained the approval of the Ethics Committee of RIKEN (IRB approval number: W2021-020). The participants provided explicit written consent to participate in the study. We have no conflict of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Tomotaka Okuyama, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Hitotsubashi University, 2-1 Naka, Tokyo 186-8601, Japan. Email: sd241005@g.hit-u. ac.jp

#### Notes

(1) In the field of socioecological psychology, two types of mobility have been extensively examined over the past two decades: residential mobility and relational mobility [1-3]. Residential mobility refers to the extent to which people actually change their residence, while relational mobility refers to the extent to which people perceive that those around them have opportunities to form new relationships and end old ones. Since the current research aims to explore lay people's views on mobility, which likely encompass both types as well as other forms of mobility (e.g., job mobility), we adopted a term, "interpersonal and intergroup mobility", as an inclusive definition of the concept of mobility.

References

- Yamagishi T, Yamagishi M. Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. Motivation and Emotion, 1994;18:129–166. doi: 10.1007/BF02249397
- [2] Oishi S, Schug J, Yuki M, Axt J. The psychology of residential and relational mobilities. In M. J. Gelfand, C. Y. Chiu, & Y. Y. Hong (Eds.), Handbook of advances in culture and psychology, 2015;5: 221–272. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- [3] Yuki M, Schug J. Psychological consequences of relational mobility. Current Opinion in Psychology, 2020;32:129–132. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.07.029
- [4] Thomson R, Yuki M, Talhelm T, Schug J, Kito M, Ayanian AH, Visserman ML. Relational mobility predicts social behaviors in 39 countries and is tied to historical farming and threat. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2018;115:7521–7526. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1713191115
- [5] Heu LC, Hansen N, van Zomeren M. Resolving the cultural loneliness paradox of choice: The role of cultural norms about individual choice regarding relationships in explaining loneliness in four European countries. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2021;38:2053–2072. doi: 10.1177/02654075211002663
- [6] Badman RP, Nordström R, Ueda M, Akaishi R. Perceptions of social rigidity predict loneliness across the Japanese population. Scientific Reports, 2022;12:16073. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-20561-5
- [7] Kito M, Yuki M, Thomson R. Relational mobility and close relationships: a socioecological approach to explain crosscultural differences. Personal Relationships, 2017;24:114–130. doi: 10.1111/pere.12174
- [8] Maya-Jariego I, Holgado D. Living in the metropolitan area. Correlation of interurban mobility with the structural cohesion of personal networks and the originative sense of community. Psychosocial Intervention, 2015;24:185–190. doi: 10.1016/j.psi.2015.09.001
- [9] Haynie DL, South SJ. Residential mobility and adolescent violence. Social Forces, 2005;84:361–374. doi: 10.1353/ sof.2005.0104
- [10] Oishi S, Schimmack U. Residential mobility, well-being, and mortality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2010;98:980–994. doi: 10.1037/a0019389
- [11] Ajzen I, Fishbein M. Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. 1980, Pearson.
- [12] Lazarus RS, Folkman S. Stress, appraisal, and coping. 1984, Springer.
- [13] Crum AJ, Salovey P, Achor S. Rethinking stress: The role of mindsets in determining the stress response. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2013;104:716–733. doi: 10.1037/a0031201
- [14] Yamagishi T. Anshin-Shakai kara Shinrai-Shakai he. 1999, Chuko Shinsho. (In Japanese)
- [15] Yamagishi T. In Search of a Foundation for an Open Society. In: Trust. The Science of the Mind. 2011, Springer, Tokyo. doi: 10.1007/978-4-431-53936-0 8
- [16] Henrich J, Heine SJ, Norenzayan. The weirdest people in the world?. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 2010;33:61–83.
  doi: 10.1017/S0140525X0999152X
- [17] Statistics Bureau of Japan. Internal Migration in 2022, Annual Report. 2022, Retrieved from https://www.stat.go.jp/english/data/idou/3.html (Last access: 11/05/2024)
- [18] Packard VO. A nation of strangers. 1972, New York: David McKay.
- [19] Yuki M, Schug J, Horikawa H, Takemura K, Sato K, Yokota K, Kamaya K. Development of a scale to measure perceptions of relational mobility in society. CERSS Working Paper 75. 2007, Hokkaido: Center for Experimental

Research in Social Sciences, Hokkaido University.

- [20] Namikawa T, Tani I, Wakita T, Kumagai R, Nakane A, Noguchi H. Development of a short form of the Japanese Big-Five Scale, and a test of its reliability and validity. The Japanese Journal of Psychology, 2012;83:91–99. (in Japanese) doi: 10.4992/jjpsy.83.91
- [21] Miyazaki G, Saeki D, Yada N, Ikegami T. The effects of living in urban environments on residents' life satisfaction: Findings from two online surveys using a multifaceted urban living environment scale. The Japanese Journal of Psychology, 2018;89:50–60. (in Japanese) doi: 10.4992/jjpsy.89.16074
- [22] Scheibe S, English T, Tsai JL, Carstensen LL. Striving to feel good: Ideal affect, actual affect, and their correspondence across adulthood. Psychology and Aging, 2013;28:160–171. doi: 10.1037/a0030561
- [23] Bhattacharjee A, Mogilner C.. Happiness from ordinary and extraordinary experiences. Journal of Consumer Research, 2014;41:1–17. doi: 10.1086/674724
- [24] Peng K, Nisbett RE, Wong NYC. Validity problems comparing values across cultures and possible solutions. Psychological Methods, 1997;2:329–344. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.2.4.329

奥山 智天(一橋大学大学院社会学研究科博士後期課程)
 宮本 百合(一橋大学大学院社会学研究科教授)
 伊藤 篤希(大阪大学大学院人間科学研究科助教)
 赤石 れい(理化学研究所脳神経科学研究センターユニットリーダー)
 上田 路子(シラキュース大学マックスウェルスクール准教授)

## **Supplementary Materials**

S1 Table. Full results of multinomial logistic regression analysis in model 1 (without mobility variables)

								95%	6 CI
Outcome	Predictor	В	S.E.	Wald	df	р	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Undesirable	Intercept	-1.309	0.475	7.592	1	0.006	—	_	_
	Female	0.092	0.151	0.369	1	0.543	1.096	0.815	1.475
	Ruralness	0.034	0.052	0.44	1	0.507	1.035	0.935	1.145
	Income	0.013	0.052	0.06	1	0.807	1.013	0.915	1.121
	Age	0.016	0.004	14.232	1	<.001	1.016	1.008	1.024
	Extroversion	-0.316	0.075	17.865	1	<.001	0.729	0.63	0.844
Both/Depends	Intercept	-3.148	0.626	25.266	1	<.001	—	_	_
	Female	0.084	0.193	0.192	1	0.661	1.088	0.746	1.587
	Ruralness	0.064	0.066	0.924	1	0.336	1.066	0.936	1.213
	Income	-0.002	0.066	0.001	1	0.981	0.998	0.877	1.137
	Age	0.021	0.005	14.866	1	<.001	1.021	1.01	1.032
	Extroversion	-0.05	0.093	0.282	1	0.595	0.952	0.792	1.143
Unknown/Unsure	Intercept	0.398	0.341	1.36	1	0.244	_	_	_
	Female	-0.09	0.11	0.665	1	0.415	0.914	0.737	1.134
	Ruralness	0.017	0.038	0.208	1	0.648	1.017	0.945	1.095
	Income	-0.029	0.038	0.594	1	0.441	0.971	0.902	1.046
	Age	0.003	0.003	0.737	1	0.391	1.003	0.997	1.009
	Extroversion	-0.25	0.054	21.502	1	<.001	0.779	0.701	0.866

Note. Reference category is Desirable.

								95% CI	
Outcome	Predictor	В	S.E.	Wald	df	р	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Undesirable	Intercept	-1.105	0.76	2.117	1	0.146	_	_	_
	Female	0.071	0.152	0.217	1	0.641	1.073	0.797	1.446
	Ruralness	0.02	0.052	0.142	1	0.706	1.02	0.921	1.129
	Income	-0.007	0.052	0.02	1	0.887	0.993	0.896	1.1
	Age	0.007	0.005	1.986	1	0.159	1.007	0.997	1.017
	Extroversion	-0.293	0.078	14.195	1	<.001	0.746	0.641	0.869
	Relational Mobility	-0.087	0.159	0.296	1	0.587	0.917	0.671	1.253
	Residential Length	0.16	0.06	7.157	1	0.007	1.173	1.044	1.319
	Future Move	-0.106	0.066	2.6	1	0.107	0.899	0.79	1.023
Both/Depends	Intercept	-3.739	0.978	14.613	1	<.001	_	_	_
	Female	0.051	0.193	0.07	1	0.792	1.052	0.72	1.537
	Ruralness	0.055	0.067	0.672	1	0.412	1.056	0.927	1.204
	Income	-0.023	0.067	0.123	1	0.726	0.977	0.857	1.114
	Age	0.011	0.006	3.264	1	0.071	1.011	0.999	1.024
	Extroversion	-0.065	0.097	0.44	1	0.507	0.937	0.774	1.135
	Relational Mobility	0.158	0.199	0.634	1	0.426	1.171	0.794	1.729
	Residential Length	0.181	0.08	5.198	1	0.023	1.199	1.026	1.401
	Future Move	-0.115	0.086	1.801	1	0.18	0.891	0.753	1.055
Unknown/Unsure	Intercept	0.52	0.547	0.905	1	0.341	_	_	_
	Female	-0.1	0.111	0.811	1	0.368	0.905	0.729	1.124
	Ruralness	0.008	0.038	0.043	1	0.835	1.008	0.936	1.086
	Income	-0.042	0.038	1.249	1	0.264	0.958	0.89	1.033
	Age	-0.001	0.004	0.127	1	0.722	0.999	0.992	1.006
	Extroversion	-0.223	0.056	15.748	1	<.001	0.8	0.716	0.893
	Relational Mobility	-0.16	0.117	1.874	1	0.171	0.852	0.678	1.071
	Residential Length	0.115	0.04	8.434	1	0.004	1.122	1.038	1.213
	Future Move	0.023	0.044	0.281	1	0.596	1.024	0.939	1.116

S2 Table. Full results of multinomial logistic regression analysis in model 2 (with mobility variables)

Note. Reference category is Desirable.

	-	-	-		-			
						95% CI		
Predictor	В	S.E.	β	t	р	Lower	Upper	
Intercept	3.186	0.088	_	36.198	<.001	3.013	3.358	
Age	0.036	0.002	0.422	19.987	<.001	0.032	0.039	

S3 Table. Regression results predicting residential length