SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

In response to questions about whether there could be differences in outcomes across rural and urban contexts we provide models of wellbeing outcomes for urban and rural respondents separately. These models test for possible influences from housing and infrastructure situations between urban and rural China. Specifically, we test for whether or not different factors may have different impacts across urban and rural communities.

At a broad level there are only modest differences in the explanatory variables across rural and urban contexts although there are some notable differences which we identify below. That said, the most important finding that social capital/cohesion variables are significant in both urban and rural contexts is supported with the disaggregated models. However, having relatives nearby is significant for urban respondents but not for rural respondents, where extended family connections may be common.

The disaggregation does point to variation in some of the contextual variables as was suggested by the reviewers. For the 2017 data, primary schools are important for rural satisfaction but not for urban residents, while hospitals were important for urban residents by not rural residents. While we cannot be certain, anecdotal evidence suggests that in rural China, poor hospital quality leads rural residents to access the better hospitals in urban areas. Thus, the local hospital is not viewed as important. Primary schools matter for rural residents because access without travelling is a positive factor in their sense of wellbeing. In urban areas it is relatively easy to go to schools near their homes and distance is not an issue. For urban residents it is not the quantity, the number of schools which is our variable, which matters, rather it is the quality. What the parents care about is the schools' quality, and so they will attempt to get their children into key schools.

The tidiness measure, a response available in 2015 only was, as we might expect, important for urban residents but not for rural residents. We can see this as a reflection of how Chinese residents feel about their urban, and of course crowded environment.

Socially, the measure of living with parents is significant and negative in 2017 but not significant in 2015. When we unpack the analysis and examine the coefficients for urban and rural, “the living with parents” variable is significant, and negative, but only for the urban respondents. This clearly demonstrates the modernization process and different norms between urban and rural China as living with parents may still be a prevalent norm in rural China while in cities, it is increasingly rare and a hindrance for subjective wellbeing. City size plays a role for urban residents as we would expect but only in the most recent survey. The tables which break out the sequence of explanatory variables (in the main text) show that subjective wellbeing is primarily influenced by social cohesion and demographic variables. Infrastructure and locality play roles but with much less power.

We note in the main text that there is a changing relationship with the dummy variable for rural respondents in the total models. That variable is not significant in 2015 but changes to positive and significant in 2017. Rural residents report positive happiness in 2017. The

disaggregated models for urban and rural respondents show that rural respondents have positive and significant responses to infrastructure which continues for primary schools in 2017. These results may reflect the policy focus of the newly launched government anti-poverty program in rural China and the redistribution of resources to rural areas.

We include measures of city size (large, medium, small) corresponding approximately to the City Tier structure in China, for both urban and rural models. This is appropriate because National Bureau Statistics (China) reports that even though the urbanization rates are very high for the large cities (for example, approximately 87 percent for Beijing and Shanghai) there are still significant numbers of rural residents in these city regions. In actuality the city measures are not significant in the models.

Overall, unpacking the response to address possible variations across the rural- urban context does add modestly to the explanations, however, the outcomes are not especially variable by locality.

Table S1: Ordered Logit Coefficients for 2017 urban and rural models of Subjective Wellbeing

	(1) Urban China	(2) Rural China
Social Capital		
Fairness (5 pt scale)	0.216*** (0.029)	0.162*** (0.040)
Secure (5 pt scale)	0.891*** (0.030)	0.757*** (0.046)
Community active	0.253*** (0.043)	0.143** (0.059)
Demographics		
Log income	0.055*** (0.013)	0.069*** (0.021)
Log asset	0.078*** (0.014)	0.037* (0.021)
Log debt	-0.020*** (0.004)	-0.018*** (0.006)
Head age	-0.079*** (0.008)	-0.051*** (0.014)
Headage^2	0.001*** (0.000)	0.001*** (0.000)
Health	0.358*** (0.023)	0.275*** (0.031)
Education years	-0.028*** (0.005)	-0.002 (0.009)
Live w/parents	-0.151*** (0.057)	-0.147* (0.079)
Male	-0.226*** (0.038)	-0.160** (0.064)
Head married	0.425*** (0.056)	0.450*** (0.094)
Employed	0.017 (0.045)	0.017 (0.068)
In own home	0.083 (0.056)	0.005 (0.133)
Infrastructure & Locality		
Primary school availability	0.287 (0.299)	0.640** (0.309)
Hospital availability	3.561** (1.429)	-0.396 (0.979)
Ln. greenspace/parks	0.043 (0.026)	0.005 (0.035)
City (large)	-0.240** (0.095)	-0.117 (0.197)
City (medium)	-0.051 (0.056)	0.079 (0.078)
City (small)	Omitted	Omitted
N	11314	4462
pseudo R^2	0.092	0.070

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S2: Ordered Logit Coefficients for 2015 urban and rural models of Subjective Wellbeing

	(1) Urban China	(2) Rural China
Social Capital		
Fairness (5 pt scale)	0.256*** (0.023)	0.266*** (0.033)
Secure (5 pt scale)	0.349*** (0.028)	0.294*** (0.042)
Relative near (y/n)	0.071*** (0.019)	0.032 (0.028)
Community active (y/n)	0.103** (0.050)	0.164** (0.070)
Demographics		
Log income	0.017* (0.010)	0.046*** (0.014)
Log asset	0.126*** (0.014)	0.107*** (0.021)
Log debt	-0.017*** (0.004)	-0.023*** (0.006)
Head age	-0.074*** (0.010)	-0.062*** (0.016)
Headage^2	0.001*** (0.000)	0.001*** (0.000)
Health	0.542*** (0.028)	0.450*** (0.038)
Education years	-0.008 (0.066)	-0.133 (0.082)
Live w/parents	0.011* (0.006)	0.015 (0.010)
Male	-0.313*** (0.044)	-0.151** (0.072)
Head married	0.695*** (0.066)	0.512*** (0.106)
Employed	-0.170*** (0.052)	-0.120 (0.080)
In own home	0.040 (0.059)	-0.118 (0.156)
Infrastructure & Locality		
Primary school availability	0.518* (0.309)	0.786** (0.352)
Hospital availability	-0.352 (1.350)	2.969*** (0.912)
Ln. greenspace/parks	-0.015 (0.038)	0.206*** (0.052)
Tidiness	0.073*** (0.022)	0.043 (0.037)
City (large)	0.038 (0.142)	-0.519 (0.445)
City (medium)	0.080 (0.069)	-0.087 (0.089)
City (small)	Omitted	Omitted
N	8723	4016
pseudo R^2	0.081	0.065

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$