**The Association Between Objective And Subjective Socioeconomic Standing and
Subjective Well-Being: A Meta-Analytic Review**

Jacynth J. X. Tan

Singapore Management University

Michael W. Kraus

Yale University

Nichelle C. Carpenter

Rutgers University

Nancy E. Adler

University of California, San Francisco

In Press at *Psychological Bulletin*

Abstract

This meta-analysis tested if the links between socioeconomic standing (SES) and subjective well-being (SWB) differ by whether SES is assessed objectively or subjectively. The associations between measures of objective SES (i.e., income and educational attainment), subjective SES (i.e., the MacArthur ladder SES and perceived SES), and SWB (i.e., happiness and life satisfaction) were synthesized across 354 studies, totaling 2,352,095 participants. Overall, the objective SES and subjective SES measures were moderately associated ($r = .32$). The subjective SES-SWB association ($r = .22$) was larger than the objective SES-SWB association ($r = .16$). The income-SWB association ($r = .23$) was comparable to the ladder SES-SWB association ($r = .22$) but larger than the perceived SES-SWB association ($r = .196$). The education-SWB association ($r = .12$) was smaller than the associations with both measures of subjective SES. The subjective SES-SWB association was partially explained by common method variance. The subjective SES-SWB association, particularly with the ladder SES measure, also mediated the objective SES-SWB association. In moderation analyses, the objective SES-SWB associations strengthened as samples increased in wealth and population density. The subjective SES-SWB associations strengthened as samples increased in population density, decreased in income inequality and decreased in relative social mobility. The role of common method variance, social comparisons and other processes in explaining the SES-SWB links are discussed.

Keywords: social class, socioeconomic status, subjective well-being, meta-analysis

Public Significance Statement

The current meta-analysis finds that subjective well-being (SWB) has a stronger link to socioeconomic standing (SES) measured subjectively as relative rank than measured objectively as income or educational attainment. Common method variance, social comparisons, population density and social mobility potentially explain some of the differences in associations. Future research on the SES and SWB link at the micro-level should consider the role of these processes.

The Association Between Objective And Subjective Socioeconomic Standing and Subjective Well-Being: A Meta-Analytic Review

“Comparison is the death of joy.” – Mark Twain (n.d.)

The notion that having more money leads to greater happiness is a widely held lay belief. Although empirical research and reviews have challenged this notion, revealing a relatively weak link between one's personal socioeconomic standing (SES) and happiness, or more generally, subjective well-being (SWB; Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003; Howell & Howell, 2008), the exact nature of this link remains complex. For instance, the observed SES and SWB link appeared to vary depending on the level of aggregation: Analyses across countries yielded moderate to large associations, such that wealthier countries had much higher population level SWB ($r = .60$ to $.84$; Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995; Schyns, 1998; Veenhoven, 1991). However, analyses across individuals produced modest associations within moderately wealthy nations like China, India and Russia ($r = .10$ to $.36$; Howell & Howell, 2008), and small associations within wealthy nations like the United States, Australia and some European countries ($r = .06$ to $.15$; Diener & Oishi, 2000; Diener et al., 1993; Easterlin, 1995, 2001; Rojas, 2004). In the last meta-analysis examining the SES and SWB link on 54 economically developing countries (Howell & Howell, 2008), the strongest link was found among the less economically developed countries ($r = .28$) and less educated samples ($r = .36$), while the weakest link was found among the more economically developed countries ($r = .10$) and more educated samples ($r = .13$).

In the past two decades, the study of SES influences in health, clinical, and social psychology has offered a unique perspective on how SES defined in terms of one's social position or rank within the society, or subjective SES, can shape important life outcomes (Adler et al., 2000; Callan, Shead, & Olsen, 2011; Kraus, Piff, Mendoza-Denton, Rheinschmidt, &

Keltner, 2012; Kraus, Tan, & Tannenbaum, 2013). A large body of work in the health domain has shown that assessments of subjective SES are consistently and strongly linked to health-related outcomes, even after controlling for associations with objective SES assessments of income and educational attainment (Adler et al., 2000; Cohen et al., 2008; Cundiff & Matthews, 2017; Kraus et al., 2013). However, less is known about how subjective SES compares to objective SES in its links to SWB. This highlights a need to examine the objective and subjective SES associations with SWB, and to identify the psychological processes that may explain differences in their associations. To this end, we conducted a meta-analytic review that examined the associations between objective SES, subjective SES and SWB.

Empirical Traditions in the Study of SES and SWB

Subjective well-being (SWB) is broadly characterized by an individual's emotional experiences and cognitive judgments of both domain-specific satisfaction and global satisfaction with aspects of one's life (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). The study of the link between SES and SWB has spanned decades, with early research focusing on the simple positive association between levels of income and reports of happiness (Easterlin, 1974; Veenhoven, 1988). As studies ramped up their scope, the *Easterlin Paradox* received the most attention—the observation that the positive association between income and happiness was weak among wealthy countries, measured by their gross domestic product (Easterlin, 1974). This led to a large body of work that sought to account for the variation in the SES-SWB link.

In one early account, *Need Theory* (Diener & Lucas, 2000; Howell & Howell, 2008; Veenhoven, 1998) proposed that the SES-SWB association depends on whether an individual's basic needs, like food and shelter, have been fulfilled. This theory predicted that higher income increases happiness only in poorer countries because individuals can benefit from additional

income that fulfills their immediate basic needs, whereas the same additional income is less consequential for individuals in wealthy countries where their basic needs have already been fulfilled (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2002; Diener & Lucas, 2000). In support of this theory, several studies that compared the income and happiness associations across countries, including a meta-analysis conducted more than a decade ago (Howell & Howell, 2008), have shown that SWB was more strongly associated with income in poorer countries than in wealthier countries (e.g., Biswas-Diener & Diener, 2001; Camfield, Choudhury, & Devine, 2009; Diener, Oishi, & Lucas., 2003; Fuentes & Rojas, 2001; Kim, 1998; Royo and Velazco, 2006; Zavisca & Hout, 2005; although see, Diener et al., 2013).

A second account of the paradox highlights the role of comparative processes, which led to the *Relativity Hypothesis*. The comparative process that has received the most attention is that of social comparisons of one's SES level relative to that of others (Easterlin, 1974, 2001; Stutzer, 2004; Diener et al., 1993; Graham, 2005). In essence, people care more about how much they have compared to others, or their relative SES, than simply how much they have absolutely. Therefore, the relativity hypothesis posited that relative SES would be more strongly linked to SWB than absolute SES. Most studies have tested this hypothesis by comparing the relative income and SWB association to the absolute income and SWB association. In these studies, relative income levels were derived from objective income measures, such as log income or the computed difference between one's current income level and the mean community income level (Clark, Frijters, & Shields, 2008; Clark & Oswald, 1998; Cheung & Lucas, 2015; Diener et al., 1993; Diener et al., 2013; Kahneman & Deaton, 2010; McBride, 2001). However, an inconsistent picture has emerged from these studies, with some supporting the hypothesis by finding a stronger association between relative income and SWB compared to absolute income

and SWB (e.g., Diener et al., 1993; Stutzer, 2004), but not others (e.g., Diener et al., 2013; Diener et al., 1999; Diener & Fujita, 1997; Hagerty, 2000).

This collection of past research examining the relative income and SWB link suffers from two key limitations. The first pertains to the conceptual validity of the relative income measures. Although log income effects on SWB suggest a diminishing marginal utility of additional income for SWB at higher income levels (Easterlin, 1974; Easterlin & Sawangfa, 2010), it is unclear if this is indeed due to stronger social comparative effects among the rich or due to self-comparisons to the past or future aspirations (Diener et al., 1993). As well, mean income levels within a community used to compute relative difference scores is a crude measure of the local socioeconomic context for comparison, which assumes that people uniformly compare themselves to the same mean, despite the fact that people live and work in socioeconomically (and racially) stratified environments that can deviate from this mean (e.g., Reeves, 2017). Therefore, these relative income measures derived from objective measures are only indirect assessments of the social comparisons that people actually make.

The second limitation relates to the narrow focus on objective measures of SES to understand the SES and SWB link. Although objective SES measures of one's income level or educational attainment assess key material resources that fulfill important needs, they may not capture the full range of psychological processes that underlie one's SES that can affect SWB. This assertion is supported by a recent view in the psychological study of SES, which posits that an individual's SES identity is often shaped by the broader situational or social context that a person is in, giving rise to subjective meaning in one's SES experience and identity (Destin, Richeson, & Rheinschmidt-Same, 2017). Importantly, such subjective meaning can impact self-perceptions, self-worth, as well as SWB (Fisher, O'Donnell, & Oyserman, 2017), beyond the

objective markers of SES. Hence, a complete understanding of the SES and SWB relationship also requires understanding the role of subjective meaning in one's SES identity, which we contend is more likely captured by measures of subjective SES.

Objective and Subjective Assessments of SES

SES can be defined both objectively and subjectively (Adler et al., 2000; Kraus et al., 2012). Objective SES defines one's status in terms of the absolute level of material resources that one possesses, commonly indexed by one's income level (e.g., Diener, Sandvik, Seidlitz, & Diener, 1993; Howell & Howell, 2008), educational attainment (e.g., Witter, Okun, Stock, & Haring, 1984), or some combination of these indices (e.g., Haring, Stock, & Okun, 1984; Pinquart & Sörensen, 2000). These measures are considered objective because they involve factual reports of life circumstances that can be reported with limited top-down psychological influences such as personality and mood. These measures have been the primary focus of the literature on the SES and SWB relationship.

On the other hand, subjective SES defines status based on one's *perception* of their own socioeconomic position or rank within a society. The most common measures of subjective SES are the single-item measure of perceived SES category or the single-item MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status (SSS), both of which assess relative rank. The perceived SES measure typically asks about one's identification with a social class position in society, such as "lower (working) class", "middle class", or "upper-class". The MacArthur SSS measure (ladder SES hereafter), depicts individuals at all levels of society within their country using a ten-rung ladder, with the highest rung representing those with the most money, most education and the most respected jobs, and the lowest rung representing those with the least money, least education and the least respected jobs. Individuals are asked to place themselves on the ladder, relative to

others in their country. Both the perceived SES and ladder SES measures are subjective because in making those ratings, individuals apply their own understanding about how SES is defined and ranked, based on what is most meaningful or relevant to them within their societal context.

The objective and subjective measures of SES tend to be significantly but not perfectly correlated (Adler & Stewart, 2007; Kraus et al., 2012), with their reported associations in the range of 0.30 to 0.60. Their moderate correlations can be attributed to a few reasons. First, although objective levels of income, educational attainment and occupational prestige are commonly (or even explicitly, in the case of the ladder SES measure) referred to in forming judgments of one's SES, individuals may still differ in the criteria they consider to be most critical or relevant to one's SES (Adler & Stewart, 2007). For some, income may be the strongest determinant of one's socioeconomic rank, whereas for others, it may be educational attainment. Second, the same objective criteria can also be given different qualitative assessments that lead to different judgments of rank (Adler & Stewart, 2007). For instance, individuals with a college degree from an elite institution are likely to place themselves higher on the SES ladder or identify as upper-class than those with a college degree from a less funded school. Third, as individuals often ascribe subjective meaning to their current objective SES that may be shaped by their own situational or broader social context (Destin et al., 2017), this unique meaning is likely to be captured by subjective SES and not by objective SES. In other words, the same objective SES level can take on a different meaning depending on whether a person is moving upward or downward in SES, or where the person lies relative to an ideal self, social norms, or surrounding people. A final reason is that as subjective measures are evaluative, they are susceptible to top-down influences such as transient moods, or personal beliefs and

characteristics unrelated to SES. This can cause subjective measures to cohere less with objective indicators that are immune to these influences.

Subjective SES and the Role of Social Comparison

Although it is widely acknowledged that objective SES and subjective SES are related but also distinct constructs (Adler & Stewart, 2007; Kraus et al., 2012), it remains unclear what exactly distinguishes subjective SES from objective SES. Drawing on existing SES research in psychological science, the current research sought to conceptualize subjective SES by formulating a working definition that clearly distinguishes it from objective SES.

A central process that has been theorized to underlie the subjective SES construct is that of social comparison, through which sorting and ranking are often achieved (Kraus et al., 2012). This view has been supported by a growing body of work suggesting that the experience of relative deprivation is largely rooted in social comparisons that individuals frequently and spontaneously make between their own SES and that of others (Buunk et al., 1990; Becker, Kraus, & Rheinschmidt-Same, 2017; Callen et al., 2011; Kraus et al., 2017). In experimental works that manipulate relative SES, upward and down social comparisons have also been employed to shift perceptions of one's subjective rank (e.g., Emery & Le, 2014; Jackson et al., 2016; Kraus, Horberg, Goetz, & Keltner, 2011; Kraus & Tan, 2015; Piff et al., 2012; Callan, Shead, & Olson, 2011; Brown-Iannuzzi, Lundberg, Kay, & Payne, 2014).

Drawing on these existing works, the current research conceptualized subjective SES as a rank-based judgment that is composed of two parts: The first taps into the objective level of material resources a person possesses (i.e., how much do I have?). This reflects the conceptual overlap between objective and subjective SES that gives rise to their moderate associations. The second part involves an evaluative judgment of where those objective resources would place a

person in rank within a specific context, which is derived mainly via the social comparison process (i.e., where do my resources place me in relation to others in this context?). Critically, this suggests that the engagement of social comparison in subjective SES judgments is what conceptually distinguishes it from objective SES.

The Relationships Between Subjective SES, Objective SES and SWB

Based on the proposed conceptualization of subjective SES, some hypotheses about the relationships between subjective SES, objective SES and SWB can be tested. First, if subjective SES uniquely captures social comparison processes while objective SES does not, one possible hypothesis is that subjective SES-SWB associations should be stronger than the objective SES-SWB associations.

Findings from several lines of work align with this first hypothesis. First, as reviewed earlier, evidence in support of the relativity hypothesis (Easterlin, 1974, 2001; Stutzer, 2004; Diener et al., 1993; Graham, 2005) suggests that subjective SES that is rooted in social comparison is likely to share a stronger relationship with SWB than objective SES. As well, from the pioneering works on the SES and health gradient, subjective SES measured by the ladder SES has been shown to predict physical health and self-rated health reliably, even after controlling for objective SES (Adler et al., 2000; Demakakos, Nazroo, Breeze, & Marmot, 2008; Kraus, Adler, & Chen, 2013; Operario, Adler, & Williams, 2004; Singh-Manoux, Adler, & Marmot, 2003; Singh-Manoux, Marmot, & Adler, 2005). Critically, the predictive strength of subjective SES was observed to be stronger than that of objective SES on a variety of health-related outcomes, such as heart rate, body fat distribution and stress-induced cortisol responses (Adler et al., 2000; Adler & Stewart, 2007; Cundiff & Matthews, 2017; Cundiff, Kamarck, & Manuck, 2016; Operario et al., 2004). In some of these studies, social comparison elicited by

subjective SES has been highlighted as a potential driver of the observed differences in predictive strength.

Emerging work from the study of SES and social cognition is also suggestive. Underlying this line of work is the idea that social class symbols and boundaries are often concrete and visible, signaled through the neighborhoods people live in, the schools that children attend (Bourdieu, 1979; Kraus & Keltner, 2009; Kraus, Tan, & Tannenbaum, 2013), the clothing worn by others (Kraus & Mendes, 2014), and even through brief speech (Kraus et al., 2019). Thus, in contexts where these social class signals may be transmitted rapidly and frequently in everyday social interactions (e.g., societies with high economic inequality), social comparisons of one's SES may be heightened and exacerbate socioeconomic disparities in important life outcomes (Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2017; Pickett & Wilkinson, 2015). In this vein, if subjective SES measures capture the degree of everyday social comparative experiences, subjective SES should expectedly drive stronger associations with SWB than would objective SES.

Finally, research on the self has shown that social comparisons can also heighten other comparative processes, such as self-comparisons to important personal standards (McIntyre & Eisenstadt, 2010). Because self-comparisons that evoke discrepancies between one's ideal and ought self can induce negative feelings about the self (Higgins, 1987; Michalos, 1985), heightened self-comparisons could also impact one's SWB (Diener, Lucas, & Oishi, 2000). Therefore, subjective SES assessments that capture social comparisons may activate, along with it, a constellation of perception that one is falling short of important or relevant standards, making one's SES "loom even larger" and more consequential on SWB than what is captured by objective SES measures.

Subjective SES-SWB Association and Common Method Variance

Although the above analysis suggests that social comparison processes captured by subjective SES measures would predict a stronger subjective SES-SWB association than objective SES-SWB association, another equally plausible explanation is that of common method variance. Common method variance refers to the association between two constructs that is due to measurement similarity rather than due to the conceptual relationship between the constructs (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). As noted earlier, subjective SES measures are susceptible to top-down influences such as transient moods, personality, or response bias, all of which may have little to do with actual perceptions of rank (Adler & Stewart, 2007). Furthermore, SWB measures are also subjective and share similar susceptibility to top-down influences as subjective SES. From this perspective, the subjective SES-SWB association may also be inflated by shared top-down influences on both subjective measures.

Prior work has addressed this issue to some degree by accounting for some of the possible top-down influences methodologically. Accounting for response bias, one study found unique influences of the ladder SES on physiological indicators of health and mortality, such as BMI, heart rate and cortisol response, beyond influences on self-rated health (e.g., Adler et al., 2000). A longitudinal study also found that the ladder SES significantly predicted self-rated health three years later, controlling for self-rated health at baseline to account for shared variances in subjective ratings (Singh-Manoux et al., 2005). Again, this suggested that the ladder SES influences were not simply attributable to response bias. With respect to mood influences, studies have found that subjective SES influences on self-rated health persisted after controlling for negative affect (Adler et al., 2000; Operario, Adler, & Williams, 2004). In one study that sought to account for mood influences experimentally, subjective SES ratings did not shift with

mood manipulations (Kraus, Adler, & Chen, 2013). Nonetheless, similar investigations have not been conducted with other possible top-down influences.

Given the plausibility that the subjective SES-SWB association may reflect common method variance, its contribution to the subjective SES-SWB association was also examined in the current investigation. Specifically, the subjective SES-SWB association was also examined controlling for their associations with other subjective measures that may capture top-down influences or response bias.

The Indirect Influence of Objective SES on SWB via Subjective SES

The conceptual overlap with objective SES highlighted in the current subjective SES conceptualization also suggests that subjective SES rank judgments may draw on knowledge about the objective level of material resources that one currently possesses. This predicts a possible pathway where objective SES may indirectly influence SWB by partially informing subjective SES judgments. To examine this pathway, a second hypothesis tested in the current investigation was that subjective SES judgments would partially mediate the objective SES-SWB relationship.

The idea that subjective SES judgments draw on one's objective SES has been used to explain the moderate association between objective SES and the subjective ladder SES measure (Adler & Stewart, 2007). This is intuitive given that the instructions in the ladder SES measure explicitly asks one to consider levels of income, education and occupation when making the rank judgment. What is less clear is whether in subjective SES measures that have less explicit instructions, such as in the perceived SES measure, individuals would also draw on objective SES in the same way. Therefore, in testing this second hypothesis, the mediating role of the

ladder SES and perceived SES in the objective SES-SWB relationship were examined separately.

Moderators of the SES and SWB Associations

To provide further tests of the role of social comparison in explaining the subjective SES-SWB link, the current research also examined if the SES-SWB associations would vary as a function of moderators linked to the social comparison process. In this regard, four moderators were examined—the wealth of countries, cultural orientation, income inequality and population density. Although past research indicates that social comparisons are often located in micro interactions between individuals (e.g., Buunk et al., 1990; Kraus et al., 2013; Norton, 2013), these macro variables were regarded as proxies that reflect how much social comparison is prioritized or salient within a context. The general prediction was that the subjective SES-SWB association should be stronger in contexts where social comparison is prioritized or more salient. To explore other comparative processes, such as self or past comparisons, social mobility as a moderator was also examined.

Wealth of countries. The wealth of countries has been linked to whether the fulfillment of subsistence needs or comparison needs is a priority for SWB. As highlighted earlier, Need Theory posited that absolute material resources that are essential for fulfilling basic subsistence needs should have a stronger impact on the SWB of those in poorer countries than in wealthier countries (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2002; Diener & Lucas, 2002; Møller & Schlemmer, 1983; Veenhooven, 1991). From this perspective, we predicted that in the current analysis, the objective SES-SWB associations should increase as the wealth of countries decreases. In contrast, the relativity hypothesis posited that individuals in wealthier countries are instead more concerned about whether they are doing better than others, and therefore engage in more social

comparisons that impact their SWB (Easterlin, 1974; 1995; 2001). Although the positive relationships between log income and SWB found in past research (e.g., Diener et al., 2013; Easterlin & Sawangfa, 2010) suggest that additional objective resources have a weaker impact on SWB at higher income levels, it is unclear if these patterns also reflect increasing social comparison needs at higher income levels. If indeed social comparison is more important for SWB at higher income levels, we predicted that in the current analysis, the subjective SES-SWB associations should increase as the wealth of countries increases.

Cultural orientation. Compared to individualists, collectivists tend to refer to others within their group when defining the self or judging their personal outcomes (Baldwin & Mussweiler, 2018; Markus & Kitayama, 2010), and are also more sensitive to upward and downward social comparisons (Kemmelmeyer & Oyserman, 2001). These patterns suggest that social comparison may be more salient in collectivistic than in individualistic cultures, and leads to the possible prediction would be that the subjective SES-SWB associations in the current analysis should increase with samples characterized by stronger collectivism. On the other hand, the objective SES-SWB associations may not vary with the cultural orientation of the samples.

However, an alternate view is that in collectivistic cultures, subjective SES is seen as non-normative as it stems from an individual's perception of SES, while objective SES is considered to be a shared public benchmark of SES that is more normative (Leung & Cohen, 2011; Wirtz & Scollon, 2012). From this perspective, objectively defined SES may be more important for collectivists' SWB than subjectively perceived SES (Curhan et al., 2014). Supporting this view, a cross-cultural study of US and Japanese participants revealed that objective SES showed a stronger link to the SWB of Japanese compared to the SWB of US participants, whereas subjective SES showed a stronger link to the SWB of US participants than

to the SWB Japanese participants (Curhan et al., 2014). This perspective suggests an alternative prediction that as samples increase in levels of collectivism, the objective SES-SWB associations should increase, while the subjective SES-SWB associations should decrease. We examined both sets of competing predictions in the current analysis.

Income inequality. Greater income inequality has been linked to poorer health and well-being (Oishi, Kesebir, & Diener, 2011; Pickett & Wilkinson, 2015). One explanation is that inequality increases the salience of negative social comparisons that motivate poor decisions and worsen life outcomes (Cheung & Lucas, 2016; Kondo, Subramanian, Kawachi, Takeda, & Yamagata, 2008; Payne, Brown-Iannuzzi, & Hannay, 2017). Consistent with this notion, in one study that examined the associations between relative income and SWB from 2,425 counties in the United States, the relative income and SWB associations in counties with higher income inequality were found to be about 10 times stronger than in counties with lower income inequality (Cheung & Lucas, 2016). If negative social comparisons are indeed heightened under high income inequality, in the same vein, we predicted that in the subjective SES-SWB associations would increase as income inequality in the samples increases, while a similar but weaker pattern may be observed with the objective SES-SWB associations.

Population density. Higher population density has also been linked to lower SWB (Helliwell, Shiple, & Barrington-Leigh, 2019; Winters & Li, 2016), due to higher levels of environmental stress from pollution and congestion, and higher levels of psychological stress from greater competition for resources in more densely populated areas (Berry & Okulicz-Kozaryn, 2011; Lederbogen et al., 2011). In particular, as competition for limited resources increases under higher population density, the ability to attain resources is likely to become more important for one's SWB. Therefore, we predicted that both the objective SES-SWB associations

and subjective SES-SWB associations should increase as population density increases. Furthermore, as competitive attitudes and behaviors have been linked to heightened social comparison (Garcia, Tor, & Schiff, 2013), we also predicted that the moderating effect of population density may be stronger for the subjective SES-SWB associations than for the objective SES-SWB associations.

Social mobility. Social mobility broadly refers to the likelihood of moving up or down in one's socioeconomic status in society (Narayan et al., 2018). Absolute social mobility, which captures upward mobility, has been linked to higher SWB (Chan, 2018; Clark & D'Angelo, 2010; Nikolaev & Burns, 2014). One explanation is that high upward mobility highlights how much one has improved from their parents' SES, and this past comparison increases the impact of one's current SES on SWB (Clark & D'Angelo, 2010; Nikolaev & Burns, 2014). Another explanation is that upward mobility worsens SWB among lower SES individuals by increasing the disconnect between their identity shaped by their low SES backgrounds and the new status identity they would have to navigate when moving up, creating status uncertainty (Destin & Debrosse, 2017). Both of these explanations suggest that high upward mobility is likely to exacerbate current SES differences in SWB. Therefore, we predicted that both objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB associations would increase with samples characterized by higher absolute or upward social mobility.

Relative mobility, on the other hand, is indexed by how much a person's educational attainment is linked to that of their parents. Importantly, while a low association between a person's education attainment and that of his or her parents reflects high relative mobility, it is unclear if the low association is driven primarily by upward mobility, downward mobility or both. Given this ambiguity, we reasoned that current SES would be weakly linked to SWB under

high relative mobility. In contrast, as low relative mobility is indexed by a high association between one's current SES and that of their parents, it suggests a relatively stable current SES, which should be more strongly linked to SWB. Therefore, we predicted that both the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB associations should increase with lower relative social mobility. Finally, as both types of social mobility have not been theoretically or empirically linked to social comparisons, we did not expect the objective and subjective SES-SWB links to differ in how much they would vary with social mobility.

The Present Research

The current research had several goals. The first goal was to extend past reviews of the SES-SWB relationship by examining the SWB associations with both objective SES and subjective SES. To this end, we conducted a meta-analytic review of the relationships between objective SES, subjective SES and SWB, with three r effect sizes estimated: the objective SES-subjective SES r , the objective SES-SWB r , and the subjective SES-SWB r . With these estimates, the second goal was to test two key hypotheses based on our proposed conceptualization of subjective SES. The first hypothesis was that the subjective SES-SWB r effect size should be larger than objective SES-SWB r effect size, based on the social comparison process theorized to underlie subjective SES. In our meta-analytic review, we also included the associations of subjective SES and SWB with other variables that may be influenced by positive response bias (i.e., positive affect, optimism, and self-esteem), wherever available. This enabled us to examine the influence of common method variance, by comparing the subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes with and without controlling for sources of positive response biases. The second hypothesis was that if subjective SES judgments are in part informed by objective SES assessments, objective SES may exert an indirect influence on SWB

with subjective SES as a mediator. As a final goal, we sought to further investigate the role of social comparison and other comparative processes by examining if the SES-SWB associations may vary with moderators linked to these processes.

The current meta-analysis of the SES and SWB associations focused on studies that examined life satisfaction and happiness—the global cognitive component of SWB. This choice was guided by past research finding that the cognitive evaluation of SWB often elicits a focus on the quality of one's material circumstances (Howell & Howell, 2008; Kahneman, Krueger, Schkade, Schwarz, & Stone, 2004). For instance, income is often more consistently associated with the cognitive evaluations of SWB in general (Diener et al., 2013), while the affective aspect of SWB relates more to transient emotions with less stable associations with income (Lee, Kim, & Shin, 1982). These studies suggest that the overall relationship between SES and SWB may be more reliably captured by the cognitive component of SWB.

Method

Review and Inclusion Criteria

A literature search was conducted on *PsychInfo*, *Google Scholar*, and *Dissertation Abstracts International* using the following keywords: (social class OR socioeconomic status OR social status OR social rank OR social class rank or rank OR income OR education) AND (subjective wellbeing OR life satisfaction OR happiness OR positive affect OR negative affect) for all reports available by July 2018. Additionally, manual searches were conducted from *Social Indicators Research*, *Journal of Happiness Studies* and the *MacArthur Research Network on SES & Health*. These searches were also supplemented by examining the reference sections of past meta-analyses and review papers on the topic of subjective well-being. Finally, requests for unpublished, dissertation, under-review and in press data were sent to the e-mail list of the

Society for Personality and Social Psychology and individual researchers. Altogether, the search yielded 1072 potentially eligible records. These articles were then screened for inclusion in the current meta-analysis based on the following inclusion criteria:

1. Studies involving objective SES were included as long as they reported using any standard objective measures, i.e., income, education and occupation. Studies were also included if they stated that demographic information was collected, without any specific reference to the type of SES measure available.
2. Studies involving subjective SES were included if they were assessed using the MacArthur SSS scale, self-reports of one's own perceived SES as lower-, middle-, or upper-class, or comparisons of one's material resources relative to any comparison target (e.g., local community, co-workers, friends).
3. Studies were included if SWB was assessed as life satisfaction (single- and multiple-item), happiness (single- and multiple-item), positive affect and negative affect (from PANAS and Affect Balance Scale).
4. Studies were included if they reported zero-order bivariate associations between SES and SWB directly, or if the associations can be computed from summary tables or descriptive statistics.
5. If a study was eligible but did not report the appropriate statistics, original authors of the study were contacted directly to obtain usable data. Out of the 209 authors contacted, 55 of them provided the requested data, 14 indicated that they were unable to provide the data due to expired access to databases or datasets lost over the years. The remaining authors did not respond to repeated requests.

Based on a further examination of the potentially eligible reports, 503 reports met inclusion criteria 1 to 3. Of these articles, 354 studies (3% unpublished) met all inclusion criteria and were used in this meta-analysis, which provided 589 independent samples. Figure 1 shows the flow diagram of information on the search procedure. These samples included a total N of 2,352,095 ($M = 4456$, $SD = 76223$). The age range of the samples was 12-108 years ($M = 43.13$, $SD = 9.58$). Samples that reported gender proportions had an average of 55.6% females ($SD = 10.2\%$). For samples that reported education levels, an average of 47.8% ($SD = 12.5\%$) had less than high school education, 35.9% ($SD = 15.6$) completed high school, and 27% ($SD = 21.1\%$) had college degrees and above.

Coding for General Study Characteristics

The following general study characteristics were coded: (a) sample cohort year, (b) publication source (journal article, unpublished data, dissertation, conference paper), (c) country where the study was conducted, (d) sampling technique (nationally representative, convenient sample, stratified random sampling), (e) type of objective SES assessment (income, education, occupation), (f) type of subjective SES assessment (MacArthur SSS Scale, perceived SES, social comparisons of SES), (g) type of SWB assessment (single item, multiple item).

For the income assessment, the median, mean, standard deviation and range of absolute income were recorded whenever available. For the education assessment, the composition of educational attainment (less than high school, completed high school, college and above) by percentage, as well as the mean and standard deviation of the number of years of education were recorded if reported in the study. Available demographic information such as mean age, gender composition by percentage, and ethnicity by percentage were also coded. All this information

was obtained directly from the Method section of the studies, table of descriptive statistics provided in the articles, or authors who responded to e-mail requests.

Coding for Moderators

The following moderators were coded: (a) wealth of country, (b) cultural orientation, (c) level of income inequality of the country, (d) population density, and (e) social mobility.

The criteria used to code for each moderator were as follows: wealth of country was coded using the gross national income (GNI) per capita of the country in purchasing power parity (PPP) international dollars which the data of the sample was collected, at the time of sampling, provided by the World Bank classification. Cultural orientation was coded using Hofstede's National Culture measure (Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Each sample was scored on individualism based on their country of origin on a scale of 100, with higher scores indicating that the country is higher in individualism and lower scores indicating that the country is higher in collectivism.

Three indices were used to assess the level of income inequality: the GINI, 90/10 ratio and 90/50 ratio. The GINI index was obtained from the World Bank estimate, which assessed income distribution on a score of 0 to 100, with 0 being perfect equality and 100 being perfect inequality. The 90/10 and 90/50 ratios were obtained from the OECD Income Distribution Database. The 90/10 assessed the ratio of income earned by those at the 90th percentile to the 10th percentile, while the 90/50 ratio assessed the income earned by those at the 90th percentile to the 50th or median percentile. Although all of these indices assess income inequality, the ratio indices focus on how much income is concentrated at the top or how "top-heavy" the income distribution is, whereas the GINI focuses on how much income distributions deviate from perfect equality. As the GINI is highly sensitivity to outliers (Maio, 2007) and the same GINI can often

be represented by very different income distributions (Bellù & Liberati, 2006), including the 90/10 and 90/50 ratios allows for more specific types of unequal distributions to be examined.

Two indices of social mobility—absolute mobility and relative mobility—were coded for each sample based on the country’s intergenerational social mobility index of cohorts between 1940 to 1989 provided by the World Bank (Narayan et al., 2018). Absolute mobility was assessed by the proportion of individuals sampled who attained an educational level that was higher than their parents. A higher proportion reflected higher absolute mobility. Relative mobility was assessed by the index of intergenerational persistence, obtained from the coefficient of sampled individuals’ years of education regressed on the parents’ years of education. A smaller coefficient reflected higher relative mobility. The cohort year of each sample was estimated by subtracting the mean age of the sample from the year in which the study was conducted (i.e., the time of sampling). Finally, population density for each sample was coded also using data provided by the World Bank based on the time of sampling.

All moderators were coded as continuous variables. All study characteristics and moderators were coded independently by the first author and two trained research assistants. The agreement for all the variables was generally good. For the categorical variables, an average of $\kappa = .90$ ($\kappa_{\text{range}} = .88$ to $.92$) was obtained. For the continuous variables, we obtained an average of $r = .94$ ($\kappa_{\text{range}} = .92$ to $.95$). In cases of discrepancies in coding, the discrepancies were resolved by further examination of the studies and coming to an agreement about the coding.

Effect Size Calculation

After coding for all study characteristics and moderators, the r effect size for the SES-SWB relation for each sample was computed from the retrieved zero-order bivariate correlations using the Fisher’s z transformation (e.g., Hedges & Olkin, 1985). In general, positive effect sizes

indicate that higher SES is associated with greater SWB, when SWB was assessed as life satisfaction and happiness. Table 1 shows all the effect size estimates, sample characteristics and moderators that were coded. The percentage of studies by region and country are presented in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

Unit of Analysis

The primary unit of analysis for the overall effect size estimation was the independent sample. For the objective SES-SWB association, some samples reported either the income-SWB association or the education-SWB association, or both. In samples that reported associations with both income and education, an average of their effect sizes within that sample was computed. As such, samples that reported one association had only one effect size (i.e., income-SWB r or education-SWB r), while samples that reported two associations with income and education had three effect sizes (i.e., the income-SWB r , education-SWB r and their averaged r). In the meta-analysis of the objective SES-SWB association, we estimated three overall effect sizes from the independent samples—an income-SWB r from samples with income measured ($k = 335$), an education-SWB r from samples with education measured ($k = 561$), and an overall objective SES-SWB r from all samples ($k = 586$). The overall objective SES-SWB r was estimated with one effect size from each independent sample, and in samples where two effect sizes were reported, their averaged effect sizes were used for the estimation.

Similarly, for the subjective SES-SWB association, some samples reported either the ladder SES-SWB association or the perceived SES-SWB association, or both. In samples that reported associations with both the ladder SES and perceived SES, an average of their effect sizes within that sample was computed. As such, samples that reported one association had only one effect size (i.e., ladder SES-SWB r or perceived SES-SWB r), while samples that reported

two associations with the ladder SES and perceived SES had three effect sizes (i.e., ladder SES-SWB r , perceived SES-SWB r and their averaged r). In the meta-analysis of the subjective SES-SWB association, we estimated three overall effect sizes from the independent samples—a ladder-SWB r from samples with the ladder SES measured ($k = 389$), a perceived SES-SWB r from samples with perceived SES measured ($k = 299$), and an overall subjective SES-SWB r from all samples ($k = 477$). The overall subjective SES-SWB r was estimated based on one effect size from each independent sample, and in samples where two effect sizes were reported, their averaged effect sizes were used for the estimation.

As a significant number of study samples reported both objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB associations within the same sample ($k = 440$), the correlations between the objective SES and subjective SES measures were available in these cases. As such, the overall effect sizes of the objective SES and subjective SES associations were also estimated. Samples that reported only one objective SES (e.g., income) and one subjective SES measure (e.g., ladder SES) had only one objective SES-subjective SES effect size (e.g., income-ladder SES r). Samples that reported more than one objective SES or subjective SES measure had more than one effect size computed: the correlations between each measure of objective SES and subjective SES, and also their averaged effect sizes. For example, if a sample reported income, education and ladder SES, this resulted in three effect sizes—the income-ladder SES r , education-ladder SES r , and their averaged r .

Data Analysis

To estimate the overall objective SES-subjective SES r effect size, the Bare-Bones analysis was used, following the procedure outlined by Schmidt & Hunter (2015). To estimate the overall objective SES-SWB r effect size and the overall subjective SES-SWB r effect size,

two sets of analyses were used—the Bare-Bones analysis (Schmidt & Hunter, 2015) and the random-effects multivariate meta-analysis using the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) approach (Cheung, 2015). As noted earlier, the current set of studies included samples that reported both objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB correlations within the same sample. Since objective SES and subjective SES are related constructs, the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes obtained from the same study sample are correlated and therefore, dependent. The Bare-Bones analysis was used for effect size estimation and homogeneity tests using all samples, ignoring the dependence between the effect sizes in some of the samples. On the other hand, the random-effects multivariate meta-analysis was used for effect size estimation and homogeneity tests, taking into account the dependence of the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes obtained from the same samples. In this latter approach, the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes were concurrently estimated as latent variables under the SEM framework, using their known sampling covariance (i.e., the objective SES and subjective SES correlations) as the covariance of the measurement errors. The benefit of this approach is that the “true” objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes can be estimated with the measurement error linked to both SES measures removed. This analysis was conducted with the meta-analytic software package metaSEM (Cheung, 2015b) in R.

All analyses were conducted using the random-effects analysis. This choice is appropriate given that the studies included in this meta-analysis were obtained from a range of cross-cultural and international samples with varying study characteristics, and study population parameters are likely to be variable across these studies. A fixed-effects analyses, on the other hand, would render the current findings more susceptible to Type-I error than the random-effects analyses

(Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009; Cheung, 2015; Hunter & Schmidt, 2000). To evaluate the first hypothesis that subjective SES-SWB association is larger than the objective SES-SWB association, we directly compared the objective SES-SWB and the subjective SES-SWB r effect size estimates. To evaluate the second hypothesis that the objective SES and SWB relationship is mediated by subjective SES, we conducted path analyses using the obtained meta-analytic effect sizes, following procedures outlined by Hagger, Chan, Protogerou, & Chatzisarantis (2016).

For the moderator tests, two sets of analyses were also conducted. The first set of analyses used meta-regression to examine the influence of moderators on the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes independently. This was conducted in R using the meta-analytic software metafor, version 1.9-8 (Viechtbauer, 2015). The second set of analyses employed the mixed-effects multivariate analysis, an extension of the random-effects multivariate analysis using the SEM approach described earlier, which enabled moderators to be examined on both the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes concurrently. This was conducted in R with the meta-analytic software package metaSEM (Cheung, 2015b).

Results

The Overall Effect Size of the Objective SES and Subjective SES Associations

The overall mean weighted effect size ($k = 432$) was .323 with 95% CI [.314, .332]. The mean weighted effect sizes for the individual measures of objective SES and subjective SES were as follows: The income-ladder SES r ($k = 141$) was .331 with 95% CI [.311, .350], the education-ladder SES r ($k = 360$) was .325 with 95% CI [.313, .336], the income-perceived SES r ($k = 66$) was .262 with 95% CI [.240, .284], and the education-perceived SES r ($k = 272$) was .334 with 95% CI [.322, .346]. With the exception of the income-perceived SES r , all of the

estimates of the objective SES and subjective SES associations were consistent with the moderate effect sizes that have been documented in past works (Cundiff & Matthews, 2017; Kraus et al., 2012). The r effect sizes reported here are depicted in the forest plot in Figure 2.

The Overall Effect Size of the SES and SWB Associations

Non-dependence of effect sizes assumed. Using the Bare-Bones analysis (Schmidt & Hunter, 2015), the overall mean weighted objective SES-SWB r ($k = 586$) obtained was .161, with 95% CI [.155, .168]. After correcting for measurement unreliability in SWB, the objective SES-SWB r was .163, with 95% CI [.156, .169]. The income-SWB r ($k = 335$) was .225, with 95% CI [.215, .235], and after correcting for measurement unreliability was .234, with 95% CI [.224, .245]. The education-SWB r ($k = 561$) was .119, with 95% CI [.113, .124], and after correcting for measurement unreliability was .122, with 95% CI [.117, .127]. In sum, the objective indices of SES were positively and significantly associated with SWB.

Also using Bare-Bones analysis, the overall mean weighted subjective SES-SWB r ($k = 447$) obtained was .212, with 95% CI [.203, .221]. After correcting for measurement unreliability in SWB, the subjective SES-SWB r was .217, with 95% CI [.216, .218]. The ladder SES-SWB r ($k = 389$) was .219 with 95% CI [.209, .230], and after correcting for measurement unreliability was .220, with 95% CI [.209, .231]. The perceived SES-SWB r ($k = 299$) was .195 with 95% CI [.184, .205], and after correcting for measurement unreliability was .196, with 95% CI [.186, .207]. Together, these estimates illustrate that the indices of subjective SES were also positively and significantly associated with SWB.

All r effect sizes reported in this analysis are presented in Table 4, and are also depicted in the forest plot in Figure 2.

Dependence of effect sizes assumed. A random-effects multivariate meta-analysis using the SEM approach (Cheung, 2015) was used to estimate the objective SES-SWB r and subjective SES-SWB r concurrently. In this analysis, the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes were modeled as latent variables with their known sampling covariance matrix of the effect sizes imposed as the covariance matrix of the measurement errors. The sampling covariance matrix comprised of the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect size variances and their sampling covariances, calculated using the correlation between the objective SES and subjective SES measures provided in each sample (see Cheung, 2015 for details on computations).

First, the analysis showed that the test of homogeneity of effect sizes was significant, $Q(df = 879) = 10287.53, p < .001$. Additionally, the I^2 for objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes were 0.870 and .934 respectively. These suggest significant heterogeneity among the effect sizes, and the random effects model is indeed more appropriate for analyzing these samples. Importantly, the objective SES-SWB r estimated was .109, with 95% CI [.102, .116], and the subjective SES-SWB r estimated was .209, with 95% CI [.200, .218]. To better control for overall Type I error with dependent effect sizes, the significance of both effect sizes was tested simultaneously by comparing a model with these observed effect sizes to a random-effects model with both effect sizes fixed at zero (Cheung, 2015). This model comparison yielded a significant likelihood-ratio statistic, $\Delta\chi^2(df = 878) = 759.84, p < .001$, indicating that both objective SES and subjective SES r effect sizes were significantly different from zero. In other words, when simultaneously assessed, objective SES and subjective SES were also positively and significantly associated with SWB.

Using the same analysis, the following pairs of effect sizes were also concurrently estimated—the income-SWB r and ladder SES-SWB r , the income-SWB r and the perceived SES-SWB r , the education-SWB r and ladder SES-SWB r , as well as the education-SWB r and the perceived SES-SWB r . The results of all of the analyses, with the test of homogeneity of effect sizes, I^2 , and the test of significance of effect sizes are reported in Table 5. The significant likelihood-ratio tests of all of the dependent effect sizes estimated within their random-effects models were significantly different from zero, $\Delta\chi^2(df = 2) > 200$. Again, regardless of the type of objective and subjective SES measures that were concurrently examined, all of the SES measures were positively and significantly associated with SWB.

We note a significant difference in the objective SES effects sizes estimated from the Bare-Bones analysis ($r = .163$) and from the multivariate random-effects analysis ($r = .109$). This difference is, in part, due to the difference in samples that were included in both analyses. Specifically, only a subset of samples with both objective SES and subjective SES effect sizes reported from the same sample could be examined in the multivariate random-effects analysis due to the need to model sampling covariances of the dependent effect sizes. To account for the possibility that this subset of studies that examined both types of SES was inherently different from studies that examined only one type of SES, we tested if the effect sizes differed between studies that assessed both types of SES versus only one type of SES. No significant differences between effect sizes were observed in this comparison for the objective SES-SWB r , $Q(df = 1) = .041$, $p = .84$, as well as for the subjective SES-SWB r , $Q(df = 1) = .053$, $p = .82$. Therefore, the subset of studies examined using the multivariate analysis is comparable to the broader set of studies examined using the Bare-Bones analysis.

In summary, the various measures of objective SES and subjective SES were positively and significantly associated with SWB, regardless of whether the dependence of their effect sizes were assumed.

Tests of Inclusion Bias

Several tests of inclusion bias were also conducted to ascertain potential threats to the validity of the overall meta-analytic effect sizes. First, the distribution of effect sizes in the samples was analyzed using the funnel plot. The funnel plot assesses whether the overall effect size estimate in the meta-analysis may be potentially inflated due to the lack of inclusion of studies where the null hypothesis was not rejected. To create the funnel plot, the standard errors were plotted in descending order against the obtained r effect sizes. A symmetric distribution of effect sizes in the funnel plot suggests that the effect size estimate is likely to be less biased.

Figure 3 represents the distribution of all effect sizes with objective SES, while Figure 4 represents the distribution of all effect sizes with subjective SES across all samples. As most of the samples included were relatively large, most effect sizes were distributed around the upper regions across all of the funnel plots.

To formally test the funnel plot asymmetry, two additional tests were conducted. The first test was the rank correlation test, or Kendall's tau b , which computes a non-parametric correlation of effect sizes and their standard errors (Begg & Mazumdar, 1994). A significant correlation produced from this test would suggest the likelihood of inclusion bias in our samples. For all the effect sizes with objective SES, the rank correlation was $r = -.028$, $p = .36$. For all the effect sizes with subjective SES, the rank correlation was $r = -.064$, $p = .16$. Similarly, the Egger's regression test (Egger, Smith, Schneider, & Minder, 1997a) revealed no evidence of

funnel plot asymmetry for the effect sizes with objective SES, $z = .409$, $p = .68$, and subjective SES, $z = -.361$, $p = .72$.

To supplement this inference with other formal tests, the trim-and-fill analysis was also conducted. The trim-and-fill analysis identifies and removes studies causing the funnel plot asymmetry, and then replaces the removed studies with effect sizes around the “true center” of the trimmed funnel plot. This analysis also estimates the missing number of studies that would correct for bias in the sample. Based on this analysis, no missing studies were estimated for the effect sizes with objective SES, while 49 missing studies were estimated for the effect sizes with subjective SES. In the case of subjective SES effect sizes, with the additional studies added, the new overall effect size estimate for overall effect size estimate was .247, with 95% CI [.230, .265], $z = 28.10$, $p < .001$. It is worth noting that this newly estimated effect size after accounting for the missing studies was larger than the original and remained significantly different from zero, suggesting a possible underestimation of the subjective SES-SWB effect size. Importantly, with or without the additional studies, the overall effect was still present.

Finally, sensitivity analyses were conducted to examine the potential impact of study characteristics, namely published versus unpublished studies, the type of publication outlet, type of dataset on the effect size estimates. If the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes are relatively unaffected by these study characteristics, it would suggest that the effect sizes obtained in this meta-analysis are robust to bias. Given the low numbers of unpublished studies included in the current samples, we compared the effect sizes obtained published versus unpublished studies to determine if the current results may be affected by publication bias. With objective SES, the effect size obtained from unpublished studies ($k = 15$) was 0.183 with 95% CI [0.140, 0.227], while the effect size obtained from published studies ($k = 371$) was 0.161 with

95% CI [0.155, 0.168]. With subjective SES, the effect size obtained from unpublished studies ($k = 7$) was 0.262 with 95% CI [0.219, 0.305], while the effect size obtained from published studies ($k = 270$) was 0.211 with 95% CI [0.202, 0.220]. Within each SES measure, the 95% CIs overlapped, suggesting that the effect size estimates were likely not affected by publication bias.

For the analysis with type of publication outlet, we compared the effect sizes obtained from studies published in peer-reviewed journals versus from studies that were not (i.e., dissertation, working papers, unpublished studies). With objective SES, the effect size obtained from studies published in peer-reviewed journals ($k = 248$) was 0.171 with 95% CI [0.153, 0.190], while the effect size obtained from studies not published in peer-reviewed journals ($k = 31$) was 0.152 with 95% CI [0.125, 0.179]. With subjective SES, the effect size obtained from studies published in peer-reviewed journals ($k = 59$) was 0.222 with 95% CI [0.194, 0.250], while the effect size obtained from studies not published in peer-reviewed journals ($k = 14$) was 0.256 with 95% CI [0.212, 0.300]. Within each SES measure, the 95% CIs overlapped, suggesting that the effect size estimates were not affected by the type of publication outlet.

For the analysis with the type of dataset, we compared the effect sizes obtained from studies that used publicly available datasets (e.g., World Values Survey, GSS, ISSP, MIDUS) versus studies that did not use publicly available datasets. With objective SES, the effect size obtained from studies that used publicly available datasets ($k = 203$) was 0.164 with 95% CI [0.155, 0.171], while the effect size obtained from non-publicly available datasets ($k = 114$) was 0.177 with 95% CI [0.138, 0.216]. With subjective SES, the effect size obtained from studies that used publicly available datasets ($k = 114$) was 0.202 with 95% CI [0.187, 0.217], while the effect size obtained from non-publicly available datasets ($k = 46$) was 0.217 with 95% CI [0.176, 0.260]. Again, within each measure, the 95% CIs overlapped, suggesting that the effect size

estimates were not affected by the type of dataset. The results from all three sensitivity analyses provide evidence that the effect sizes obtained in this meta-analysis were robust to bias.

Hypothesis 1: Is the Subjective SES-SWB Association Larger than the Objective SES-SWB Association?

To test this hypothesis, the estimated objective SES-SWB and the subjective SES-SWB r s were compared along with their reported 95% confidence intervals. Non-overlapping 95% confidence intervals between the effect sizes compared suggest a significant difference. This comparison was done in both sets of analyses where the non-dependence and dependence of their effect sizes were assumed.

Non-dependence of effect sizes assumed. The comparisons between the objective SES-SWB and the subjective SES-SWB r s, along with their reported 95% confidence intervals, are presented in the forest plot in Figure 2. Accordingly, a few key observations can be made. First, as hypothesized, the overall subjective SES-SWB r of .217 was significantly larger than the overall objective SES-SWB r of .163. However, some nuances emerged when the effect sizes were examined separately by income and education for measures of objective SES, and by ladder SES and perceived SES for measures of subjective SES. Within measures of objective SES, the income-SWB r of 0.234 was significantly larger than the education-SWB r of 0.122. Within measures of subjective SES, the ladder SES-SWB r of .217 was also significantly larger than the perceived SES-SWB r of 0.196. When each of these objective SES and subjective SES effect sizes were compared, the following patterns were observed: while the education-SWB r remained significantly smaller than both the ladder SES-SWB r and perceived SES-SWB r as hypothesized, the income-SWB r did not differ significantly from the ladder SES-SWB r , and was even significantly larger than the perceived SES-SWB r . Therefore, in this analysis, our first

hypothesis was supported only when objective SES was assessed with education, but not supported when objective SES was assessed with income.

Dependence of effect sizes assumed. A similar comparison was made between the objective SES-SWB and the subjective SES-SWB *rs* estimated in the multivariate SEM analyses that accounted for their dependence. From the effect sizes reported in Table 5, the subjective SES-SWB *rs* were consistently larger than the objective SES-SWB *rs* in all of the models, even when objective SES was assessed as income. Critically, in all of the comparisons, none of the 95% confidence intervals overlapped, suggesting that the subjective SES-SWB *rs* were also significantly larger than the objective SES-SWB *rs*. Nonetheless, the size of differences varied depending on the type of objective SES measure. Specifically, the subjective SES-SWB *rs* were about twice as large as the education-SWB *rs*, but this difference between subjective SES-SWB *rs* and the income-SWB *rs* was reduced to about 1.3 times. Therefore, the results in this analysis were consistent with the first hypothesis.

The role of common method variance. To examine the possible contribution of common method variance in explaining the larger subjective SES-SWB association, we estimated the subjective SES-SWB effect sizes controlling for their associations with variables linked to positive response bias or general “positivity”, such as positive affect, optimism, and self-esteem (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The associations necessary for this analysis were available in a small subset of studies ($k = 12$). In these studies, the subjective SES-SWB *r* effect size was .310 with 95% CI [0.271, 0.348], the subjective SES-positivity *r* effect size was .164 with 95% CI [0.089, 0.240], and the SWB-positivity *r* effect size was .410 with 95% CI [0.332, 0.480]. After controlling for the associations with general “positivity” using meta-regression, the subjective SES-SWB *r* effect size decreased to .250, with 95% CI [.237, .262], although it was

still significantly different from zero. In other words, the subjective SES-SWB appeared to be partially but not fully explained by positivity bias. Furthermore, this reduced subjective SES-SWB r estimate was still significantly larger than the objective SES-SWB r estimate from the Bare-Bones analysis. Nonetheless, we note that the number of cases used in this analysis is small, and there may be other constructs which subjective SES and SWB are strongly associated with that contribute to common method variance but were not assessed in these studies (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Therefore, this result should be interpreted with caution.

Inferring causality from the SES-SWB association. Although there were significant differences observed in how strongly objective and subjective SES relate to SWB, these effects are still correlational, and do not necessarily suggest a stronger causal effect of subjective SES than objective SES on SWB. It is still plausible that people who were happier and more satisfied with life in general were more likely to inflate their subjective SES ratings rather than their reports of income and educational attainment, which are factual and more immune to biases. Given this directionality issue, studies that examine these associations longitudinally provide stronger evidence for the association between the constructs.

In a subset of studies available that assessed the SES-SWB association longitudinally, we estimated their objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes. For these studies, the objective SES-SWB r ($k = 27$) was .112, with 95% CI [.072, .153], whereas the subjective SES-SWB r ($k = 5$) was .235, with 95% CI [.133, .334]. Although the subjective SES-SWB r was larger than that of the objective SES-SWB r , the limited number of longitudinal studies available for estimating the subjective SES-SWB r resulted in a large confidence interval that overlapped with that of the objective SES-SWB r . Therefore, the directionality of the association could not

be completely ascertained, so the effect sizes obtained in the current analyses should be interpreted in the light of this limitation.

Hypothesis 2: Does Subjective SES Mediate the Objective SES-SWB Association?

To test the possibility that the objective SES and SWB association is mediated by subjective SES, meta-analytic path analyses were conducted (Hagger et al., 2016). Three models as shown in Figure 5 were tested: The overall subjective SES mediating the objective SES-SWB path (Figure 5a), the ladder SES mediating the income-SWB and education-SWB paths (Figure 5b), and the perceived SES mediating the income-SWB and education-SWB paths (Figure 5c). Each path model was tested by first constructing a meta-analytic matrix of correlations among all the variables in the path model using the r effect sizes estimated earlier, and then using the matrix as input for the meta-analytic path analyses using the MPlus version 8 analysis package (Muthén and Muthén, 2012).

Following Hagger et al. (2016), the models were estimated using a maximum likelihood estimation method. Confidence intervals and fit indices were examined to evaluate the mediation models. The following measures of fit were examined to evaluate the model fit: Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), comparative fit index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). A good fit typically produces TLI and CFI values of around .95 or more, RMSEA values of .06 or less, and SRMR values of .08 or less (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Overall subjective SES as mediator. For the model testing the overall subjective SES as a mediator of the objective SES-SWB relationship, path analyses revealed a significant direct effect of overall objective SES on overall subjective SES, $b = .323$ [.321, .325], $SE = .001$, $p < .001$, and a significant direct effect of subjective SES on SWB, $b = .217$ [.215, .219], $SE = .001$,

$p < .001$. Importantly, the indirect effect of objective SES on SWB mediated by subjective SES was also significant, $b = .070$ [.069, .071], $SE = .0001$, $p < .001$. The fit indices of this model produced the following fit values, $TLI = .819$, $CFI = .94$, $RMSEA = .101$, $SRMR = .038$, suggesting a marginal model fit.

Ladder SES as mediator. For the model testing the ladder SES as a mediator of the income-SWB and education-SWB relationship, path analyses revealed a significant direct effect of income on ladder SES, $b = .251$ [.247, .254], $SE = .002$, $p < .001$, a significant direct effect of education on ladder SES, $b = .242$ [.238, .245], $SE = .002$, $p < .001$, and a significant direct effect of ladder SES on SWB, $b = .220$ [.216, .224], $SE = .002$, $p < .001$. Critically, there was also a significant indirect effect of income on SWB mediated by ladder SES, $b = .055$ [.054, .056], $SE = .001$, $p < .001$, and a significant indirect effect of education on SWB mediated by ladder SES, $b = .053$ [.052, .054], $SE = .001$, $p < .001$. The fit indices of this model produced the following fit values, $TLI = .934$, $CFI = .974$, $RMSEA = .054$, $SRMR = .023$, suggesting a good model fit.

Perceived SES as mediator. For the model testing perceived SES as a mediator of the income-SWB and education-SWB relationship, path analyses revealed a significant direct effect of income on perceived SES, $b = .251$ [.247, .254], $SE = .002$, $p < .001$, a significant direct effect of education on perceived SES, $b = .242$ [.238, .245], $SE = .002$, $p < .001$, and a significant direct effect of perceived SES on SWB, $b = .220$ [.216, .224], $SE = .002$, $p < .001$. Once again, there was also a significant indirect effect of income on SWB mediated by perceived SES, $b = .055$ [.054, .056], $SE = .001$, $p < .001$, and a significant indirect effect of education on SWB mediated by perceived SES, $b = .053$ [.052, .054], $SE = .001$, $p < .001$. However, the fit indices of this model produced the following fit values, $TLI = .831$, $CFI = .577$, $RMSEA = .138$, $SRMR = .060$, which suggested a fairly poor model fit.

Based on these three models evaluated, there is some evidence that the relationship between objective SES and SWB is in part explained by subjective SES, particularly when it is assessed using the ladder SES.

Moderators of the SES-SWB Effect Sizes

Two sets of moderator analyses were conducted to examine if the SES-SWB r effect sizes would vary as a function of variables linked to social comparison and other processes. As before, the first set of analyses assumed that the objective and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes were non-dependent and tested the effect of moderators on each type of effect size using random effects meta-regression. The second set of analyses accounted for the dependence of the objective and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes and tested the effect of moderators on both types of effect sizes simultaneously using mixed-effects multivariate analysis.

All moderators were examined as continuous variables to preserve the range of information available in the data and to control for Type-I error rates. Both sets of analyses tested if the slope of the moderators significantly predicted the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes. All moderators were mean-centered. Table 6 presents the correlations between all of the moderators examined in the current samples. For each moderator, we reported results from the meta-regression first, followed by the results from the mixed-effects multivariate analysis.

Wealth of countries. Based on Need Theory, the objective SES-SWB was predicted to be stronger in less wealthy countries. Consistent with this prediction, results from the meta-regression revealed that the objective SES-SWB r significantly increased as country's wealth decreased, $b = -.011$, 95% CI $[-.018, -.004]$, $z = -2.95$, $p = .003$. The same patterns were observed when objective SES was assessed as income, $b = -.018$, 95% CI $[-.032, -.004]$, $z = -2.51$, $p =$

.012, or education, $b = -.018$, 95% CI $[-.023, -.009]$, $z = -4.51$, $p < .001$. In the mixed-effects multivariate analysis, this similar pattern emerged for the education-SWB r when it was tested concurrently with the ladder SES, $b = -.017$, 95% CI $[-.026, -.009]$, $z = -2.28$, $p = .023$, or tested concurrently with perceived SES, $b = -.015$, 95% CI $[-.027, -.004]$, $z = -2.68$, $p = .007$. However, in this analysis, the income-SWB r did not vary significantly with the wealth of countries when tested concurrently with the ladder SES, $b = -.011$, 95% CI $[-.036, .015]$, $z = -0.82$, $p = .41$, and increased as country's wealth increased when tested concurrently with perceived SES, $b = .015$, 95% CI $[-.0007, .030]$, $z = 1.97$, $p = .049$. Taken together, Need Theory was fully supported in the meta-regression analyses, but only partially supported in the mixed-effects analysis with the education-SWB r .

Social comparison needs predicted that the subjective SES-SWB r should increase with increasing wealth of countries. In the meta-regression analyses, subjective SES-SWB r did not vary with the wealth of countries, $b = -.005$, 95% CI $[-.015, .005]$, $z = -0.94$, $p = .35$, and neither did the ladder SES-SWB r , $b = -.003$, 95% CI $[-.015, .008]$, $z = -0.58$, $p = .56$. In addition, the perceived SES-SWB r unexpectedly decreased with higher wealth of countries, $b = -.017$, 95% CI $[-.028, -.006]$, $z = -3.00$, $p = .003$. In the mixed-effects multivariate analysis, while the ladder SES-SWB r did not increase significantly with the wealth of countries when tested concurrently with income, $b = .012$, 95% CI $[-.019, .043]$, $z = 0.78$, $p = .44$, it increased significantly when tested concurrently with education, $b = .027$, 95% CI $[-.0008, .054]$, $z = 2.02$, $p = .043$, consistent with the prediction. On the other hand, perceived SES-SWB r showed unexpected significant decreases as wealth of countries increased, in both instances when it was tested concurrently with income, $b = -.015$, 95% CI $[-.027, -.004]$, $z = -2.68$, $p = .007$, and with education, $b = -.015$, 95% CI $[-.027, -.004]$, $z = -2.68$, $p = .007$. Overall, the prediction that comparison needs are

prioritized in wealthier countries appeared to be supported only when subjective SES was assessed using the ladder SES and when tested concurrently with education^{1,2}. The results from the mixed-effects analyses are presented in the graphs in Figure 6.

Cultural orientation. This analysis examined the competing hypotheses about whether the subjective SES-SWB association would increase with collectivism based on the social comparison perspective (Baldwin & Mussweiler, 2018), or decrease with collectivism based on normative standards perspective (Curhan et al., 2014). Lower scores indicated stronger collectivism and higher scores indicated stronger individualism. In the meta-regression analyses, none of the subjective SES-SWB effect sizes varied by cultural orientation. In the mixed-effects

¹ As another test of whether social comparison needs are stronger for SWB in richer countries, we examined if the wealth of countries moderated the mediating effect of subjective SES on the objective SES-SWB association. We conducted subgroup analyses by testing subjective SES as a mediator of objective SES-SWB at low GNI versus high GNI.

The subgroup analyses revealed a significant indirect effect of objective SES on SWB via subjective SES at low GNI, $b = .070$ [0.070, 0.072], $SE = .0001$, $p < .001$, with the following fit values, TLI = .952, CFI = .984, RMSEA = .052, SRMR = .019, suggesting a good model fit. Similarly, the indirect effect of objective SES on SWB via subjective SES at high GNI was also significant, $b = .064$ [0.065, 0.066], $SE = .0001$, $p < .001$, with the following fit values, TLI = .924, CFI = .975, RMSEA = .052, SRMR = .023, suggesting a slightly lower but still fairly good model fit. Importantly, the indirect effect at low GNI was significantly larger than the indirect effect at high GNI, as suggested by the non-overlapping confidence intervals of their estimates. In other words, the social comparison effect of objective SES was stronger in less wealthy countries, contrary to Easterlin's (1974) hypothesis.

² We also examined Easterlin's (1974) social comparison needs hypothesis among the rich at the level of the sample, by testing if subjective SES matters more for SWB above or below a certain threshold of objective SES. We applied a mean-max normalization on income and education level across samples where such information. Using meta-regression, we tested if normalized income and normalized education would each moderate the subjective SES-SWB association, ladder SES-SWB association and perceived SES-SWB association. We found that only normalized income significantly moderated the ladder SES-SWB association ($k = 122$), $b = -0.65$, $SE = 0.31$, $z = -2.09$, $p = .037$, such that the ladder SES-SWB association decreased as income increased. In other words, at lower levels of income, relative SES matters more for SWB than at higher levels of income. Again, this was opposite to Easterlin's hypothesis, suggesting that social comparisons may matter more at lower levels of income.

multivariate analyses, only when tested concurrently with education, the ladder SES-SWB r decreased non-significantly with stronger collectivism, $b = .028$, 95% CI $[-.005, -.060]$, $z = 1.67$, $p = .095$. None of the other effect sizes examined concurrently with the income or education varied significantly with cultural orientation³. In other words, there was no strong support for either of the competing hypotheses.

The normative standards perspective also predicted that the objective SES-SWB association would increase with stronger collectivism. Meta-regression analyses revealed that the income-SWB r did not vary by cultural orientation, $b = -.004$, 95% CI $[-.022, .013]$, $z = -0.46$, $p = .65$, although the education-SWB r did increase with stronger collectivism, $b = -.018$, 95% CI $[-.029, -.007]$, $z = -3.22$, $p = .001$, consistent with the prediction. In the mixed-effects multivariate analyses, the education-SWB r also increased with stronger collectivism when concurrently tested with ladder SES, $b = -.019$, 95% CI $[-.034, -.0042]$, $z = -2.50$, $p = .012$, but increased non-significantly when concurrently tested with perceived SES, $b = -.014$, 95% CI $[-.029, .001]$, $z = -1.81$, $p = .070$. On the other hand, the patterns with income-SWB r were mixed. When examined concurrently with ladder SES, the income-SWB r decreased non-significantly with stronger collectivism, $b = -.027$, 95% CI $[-.056, .0027]$, $z = -1.78$, $p = .075$. However, when examined concurrently with perceived SES, the income-SWB r decreased significantly with stronger collectivism, $b = .039$, 95% CI $[-.017, .061]$, $z = 3.47$, $p < .001$.

Taken together, the current analyses did not provide support for the social comparison hypothesis, but provided partial support for the normative standards perspective. Specifically, objective SES assessed as education appeared to matter more for SWB in more collectivistic than

³ Given the strong association between cultural orientation and wealth of countries in the current studies, $r(373) = .56$, $p < .001$, we also tested the moderating effect of cultural orientation controlling for country wealth. This analysis did not change the pattern of results.

individualistic cultures. The results from the mixed-effects analyses are presented in the graphs in Figure 7.

Income inequality. Based on the social comparison account, the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes were expected to increase with higher income inequality, with a stronger pattern for the subjective SES-SWB effect size. This was tested with income inequality assessed as the GINI, 90/10 ratio and 90/50 ratio. Using the GINI, the meta-regression analysis revealed non-significant patterns with the overall objective SES-SWB r , $b = -.042$, 95% CI $[-.087, .003]$, $z = -1.82$, $p = .069$. income-SWB r , $b = -.023$, 95% CI $[-.098, .051]$, $z = -0.61$, $p = .54$, and education-SWB r , $b = -.017$, 95% CI $[-.063, .029]$, $z = -0.72$, $p = .47$. However, the overall subjective SES-SWB r unexpectedly decreased as the GINI increased, $b = -.072$, 95% CI $[-.136, -.007]$, $z = -2.17$, $p = .030$. The same pattern was also observed with the ladder SES-SWB r , $b = -.13$, 95% CI $[-.200, -.058]$, $z = -3.54$, $p < .001$, but not with perceived SES-SWB r , $b = -.034$, 95% CI $[-.111, .044]$, $z = -0.86$, $p = .39$. These patterns were all contrary to prediction.

In the mixed-effects multivariate analysis, non-significant patterns were again observed for objective SES-SWB r tested concurrently with subjective SES-SWB r , $b = -.044$, 95% CI $[-.093, .005]$, $z = -1.76$, $p = .078$, income-SWB r tested concurrently with ladder SES, $b = -.019$, 95% CI $[-.110, .072]$, $z = -0.41$, $p = .68$, or concurrently with perceived SES, $b = -.012$, 95% CI $[-.184, .161]$, $z = -0.14$, $p = .89$, and education-SWB r tested concurrently with ladder SES, $b = -.035$, 95% CI $[-.088, .017]$, $z = -1.31$, $p = .19$, or concurrently with perceived SES, $b = -.034$, 95% CI $[-.103, .036]$, $z = -0.95$, $p = .34$. Similar to the meta-regression analyses, the subjective SES-SWB r decreased as the GINI increased when tested concurrently with objective SES-SWB r , $b = -.108$, 95% CI $[-.173, -.044]$, $z = -3.29$, $p < .001$. The same unexpected pattern was observed with perceived SES-SWB r concurrently examined with the income, $b = -.090$, 95% CI

$[-.170, -.011]$, $z = -2.23$, $p = .026$, and with education, $b = -.091$, 95% CI $[-.170, -.012]$, $z = -2.25$, $p = .024$. The patterns for the ladder SES-SWB r were non-significant, both when examined concurrently with income, $b = -.027$, 95% CI $[-.136, .081]$, $z = -0.49$, $p = .62$, and with education, $b = -.079$, 95% CI $[-.018, .018]$, $z = -1.60$, $p = .11$. The results from the mixed-effects multivariate analyses are presented in the graphs in Figure 8.

With respect to the 90/10 and the 90/50 ratios, no significant moderating patterns were observed across the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes, as well as across the meta-regression and mixed-effects multivariate analyses. In sum, the predictions for income inequality were not supported. Instead, when income inequality was assessed as the GINI, subjective SES appeared to matter less for SWB as income inequality increased—an unexpected pattern that appeared somewhat consistently.

Population density. Increased social comparison due to greater competition in higher density environments was expected to strengthen the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes, with a stronger pattern observed with subjective SES. In the meta-regression analyses, the objective SES-SWB r increased with higher population density, $b = .0066$, 95% CI $[-.0002, .012]$, $z = 2.69$, $p = .007$. The same pattern was also observed for the income-SWB r , $b = .0078$, 95% CI $[-.0004, .015]$, $z = 2.07$, $p = .038$, and the education-SWB r , $b = .0060$, 95% CI $[-.001, .011]$, $z = 2.37$, $p = .018$. In addition, the effect sizes also increased with higher population density for the subjective SES-SWB r , $b = .012$, 95% CI $[-.0046, .018]$, $z = 3.30$, $p < .001$, and the perceived SES-SWB r , $b = .013$, 95% CI $[-.0051, .021]$, $z = 3.20$, $p = .001$, although the pattern for the ladder SES-SWB r was non-significant, $b = .008$, 95% CI $[-.005, .016]$, $z = 1.83$, $p = .067$. In addition, with the exception of the ladder SES-SWB r , the moderating patterns were

stronger for the subjective SES-SWB effect sizes than the objective SES-SWB effect sizes.

These patterns were largely consistent with predictions.

Results from the mixed-effects multivariate analyses were similar. The objective SES-SWB effect size examined concurrently with the subjective SES-SWB effect size increased with population density, $b = .008$, 95% CI [.003, .013], $z = 2.91$, $p = .004$. This was also the case for income-SWB r when concurrently examined with ladder SES, $b = .017$, 95% CI [.006, .028], $z = 2.47$, $p = .014$, for education-SWB r when concurrently examined with ladder SES, $b = .007$, 95% CI [.001, .014], $z = 2.34$, $p = .019$, and for education when concurrently examined with perceived SES, $b = .010$, 95% CI [.003, .017], $z = 2.90$, $p = .004$. As well, perceived SES-SWB r also increased with population density when concurrently examined with income, $b = .011$, 95% CI [.003, .020], $z = 2.68$, $p = .007$, and with education, $b = .011$, 95% CI [.003, .020], $z = 2.67$, $p = .008$. However, the pattern with ladder SES-SWB r was non-significant, whether it was concurrently examined with income, $b = .004$, 95% CI [-.009, .018], $z = 0.63$, $p = .53$, or with education, $b = .003$, 95% CI [-.009, .015], $z = 0.53$, $p = .60$.

Overall, these findings mostly aligned with the notion that social comparison is more salient when population density high, which strengthens the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes. A stronger pattern with the subjective SES-SWB effect size compared to the objective SES-SWB effect size was also observed in the meta-regression analyses, although not in the mixed-effects multivariate analyses. The results from the mixed-effects multivariate analyses are presented in the graphs in Figure 9.

Social mobility. For absolute social mobility, both the objective SES-SWB r and the subjective SES-SWB r were expected to increase with higher absolute mobility. In the meta-regression analyses, the objective SES-SWB r did not vary with absolute mobility, $b = -.009$,

95% CI [-.029, .012], $z = -0.81$, $p = .42$. This was also the case with the income-SWB r , $b = -.012$, 95% CI [-.040, .016], $z = -0.83$, $p = .41$, and the education-SWB r , $b = .0003$, 95% CI [-.022, .021], $z = -0.023$, $p = .98$. Similarly, non-significant patterns were also observed with the subjective SES-SWB r , $b = -.005$, 95% CI [-.039, .029], $z = -0.29$, $p = .77$, the ladder SES-SWB r , $b = -.014$, 95% CI [-.052, .024], $z = -0.72$, $p = .47$, and the perceived SES-SWB r , $b = -.002$, 95% CI [-.042, .039], $z = -0.91$, $p = .36$.

In the mixed-effects multivariate analyses, absolute mobility also did not moderate the objective SES-SWB r tested concurrently with subjective SES, $b = -.010$, 95% CI [-.035, .016], $z = -0.74$, $p = .46$, income-SWB r tested concurrently with ladder SES, $b = -.029$, 95% CI [-.080, .022], $z = -1.13$, $p = .26$, and concurrently with perceived SES, $b = -.024$, 95% CI [-.084, .037], $z = -0.77$, $p = .44$, as well as education-SWB r tested concurrently with ladder SES, $b = -.008$, 95% CI [-.037, .020], $z = -0.57$, $p = .57$, and concurrently with perceived SES, $b = -.015$, 95% CI [-.047, .016], $z = -0.94$, $p = .35$. Similar non-significant patterns were also observed with the subjective SES-SWB r tested concurrently with objective SES, $b = -.012$, 95% CI [-.046, .023], $z = -0.66$, $p = .51$, the ladder SES-SWB r tested concurrently with income, $b = -.048$, 95% CI [-.109, .013], $z = -1.55$, $p = .12$, although in one exception, the ladder SES-SWB r tested concurrently with the education-SWB r decreased as absolute social mobility increased, $b = -.064$, 95% CI [-.117, -.011], $z = -2.35$, $p = .019$. In other words, with greater upward mobility, subjective SES mattered less for SWB. Absolute mobility also did not moderate the perceived SES-SWB r tested concurrently with income, $b = -.003$, 95% CI [-.044, .037], $z = -0.15$, $p = .88$, and concurrently with education, $b = -.003$, 95% CI [-.043, .038], $z = -0.14$, $p = .89$. Overall, there was no support for the moderating role of absolute social mobility. The results from the mixed-effects multivariate analyses are presented in the graphs in Figure 10.

For relative social mobility, the prediction was that the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB r effect sizes should increase as relative social mobility decreases. For the objective SES-SWB r effect sizes, the meta-regression analyses revealed patterns largely consistent with the prediction. Specifically, the objective SES-SWB r strengthened with as relative social mobility decreased, $b = -.028$, 95% CI $[-.046, .011]$, $z = -3.17$, $p = .002$, with a similar non-significant pattern was observed for income-SWB r , $b = -.029$, 95% CI $[-.058, .001]$, $z = -1.89$, $p = .059$, and the same significant pattern observed for the education-SWB r , $b = -.036$, 95% CI $[-.054, .018]$, $z = -2.35$, $p = .019$. However, none of the subjective SES-SWB effect sizes varied with relative social mobility, whether it was the subjective SES-SWB r , $b = .012$, 95% CI $[-.013, .037]$, $z = 0.92$, $p = .36$, the ladder SES-SWB r , $b = .013$, 95% CI $[-.015, .041]$, $z = 0.93$, $p = .35$, or the perceived SES-SWB r , $b = .007$, 95% CI $[-.022, .037]$, $z = 0.49$, $p = .62$.

Results were largely similar in the mixed-effects analysis. The objective SES-SWB r concurrently assessed with the subjective SES strengthened as relative social mobility decreased, $b = -.026$, 95% CI $[-.045, -.007]$, $z = -2.73$, $p = .006$, as did the education-SWB r assessed concurrently with the ladder SES, $b = -.033$, 95% CI $[-.053, -.012]$, $z = -3.14$, $p = .002$, or assessed concurrently with perceived SES r , $b = -.034$, 95% CI $[-.057, -.012]$, $z = -2.99$, $p = .003$. The income-SWB r , however, did not vary with relative social mobility, whether it was assessed concurrently with the ladder SES, $b = -.020$, 95% CI $[-.063, .022]$, $z = -0.95$, $p = .34$, or with perceived SES, $b = -.035$, 95% CI $[-.081, .012]$, $z = -1.46$, $p = .14$. As well, none of the subjective SES-SWB effect sizes examined concurrently with the objective SES-SWB effect sizes varied with relative social mobility. Again, this null pattern held across subjective SES-SWB r examined concurrently with objective SES, $b = .010$, 95% CI $[-.016, .035]$, $z = 0.75$, $p = .45$, ladder SES-SWB r examined concurrently with income, $b = .006$, 95% CI $[-.045, .058]$, $z =$

0.25, $p = .80$, and with education, $b = .018$, 95% CI $[-.026, .062]$, $z = 0.82$, $p = .41$, as well as perceived SES-SWB r examined concurrently with income, $b = .004$, 95% CI $[-.026, .033]$, $z = 0.26$, $p = .79$, and with education, $b = .004$, 95% CI $[-.025, .034]$, $z = 0.28$, $p = .78$. The results from the mixed-effects multivariate analyses are presented in the graphs in Figure 11.

In summary, absolute social mobility had little influence on both the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes. Nonetheless, relative social mobility moderated the objective SES-SWB effect size as predicted, but not the subjective SES-SWB effect size. In other words, there is some support for the idea that objective SES is a more stable predictor of SWB under low relative mobility than under high relative mobility.

The full results of the moderator analyses using random effects meta-regression are presented in Table 7, and the results from the mixed-effects multivariate analyses are presented in Table 8. A summary of the all the patterns observed combined across both sets of analyses are also presented in Table 9.

Experimental Manipulations of Subjective Ladder SES Ratings

Although we found earlier that the subjective SES-SWB association remained significant after controlling for positivity bias, we noted that the analysis did not account for other possible top-down influences. To provide another source of evidence that social comparative processes are involved in subjective SES assessments, we drew on experimental work that have sought to manipulate subjective SES perceptions directly by inducing social comparison or other psychological states. We conducted another set of review on these studies and examined the effect the different manipulations on subjective SES judgments, focusing on the ladder SES ratings as the bulk of the experimental works have been on this measure.

We conducted a literature search on PsycINFO and Google Scholar using the search terms “subjective social status”, “MacArthur”, “ladder”, “experiment”, “manipulation”. The search yielded 998 search results. A review of the abstracts and method section of empirical articles narrowed the results to 29 relevant articles. We further inspected the articles for data required for effect size calculation (i.e., sample size, means, standard deviations and test statistics) and contacted authors via email if any required data were not reported in the articles. Eventually, this resulted in 22 articles with usable data. The final sample consisted of 26 studies or independent samples, with 51 effect sizes extracted. Table 10 presents the studies included and their effect sizes.

Most of the studies reviewed utilized the social comparison manipulation ($k = 21$) to shift ladder ratings. In particular, the most common comparison manipulation used was the social ladder comparison, which instructed participants to picture where they stood on the MacArthur ladder by comparing themselves to people at the very bottom or very top of the ladder to elicit high or low relative SES respectively (e.g., Kraus et al., 2010). Two studies induced comparison using a feedback paradigm that informed participants where they stood relative to other participants based on their performance on a prior task. These enabled us to directly examine if induced social comparisons influence ladder SES judgments. Amongst the very limited number of studies available that examined other ways of shifting the ladder ratings, three studies used money primes. Only one study used a negative mood prime, so no meta-analytic effect size was estimated for this manipulation.

The effect size examined here was the standardized mean difference or Cohen’s d , which was always computed by subtracting the mean of the low relative SES group or the control group from the mean of the high relative SES group. If a study only had a low relative SES group and a

control group, d was computed by subtracting the mean of the low relative SES group from the control group. As such, a positive d would indicate that the manipulation meant to induce higher relative SES produced a higher rating on the ladder SES measure than the manipulation meant to induce a lower relative SES. The effect size estimates and tests of homogeneity were conducted using a random-effects model with restricted maximum likelihood estimation. All analyses reported here were conducted in R using metafor (Viechtbauer, 2015).

Social comparison manipulation. Experimentally activating status comparisons with those at the very top and those at the very bottom was found to significantly shift participants' ladder ratings in the expected direction (low relative SES vs. high relative SES; $k = 19$), $d = .416$ [0.348, 0.484]. However, with respect to a control condition where comparisons were not specifically induced, ladder ratings did not shift significantly when status comparisons with those at the very top (low relative SES vs. control; $k = 4$), $d = -.124$ [-0.307, 0.059], or those at the very bottom (high relative SES vs. control; $k = 2$), $d = .011$ [-0.229, 0.250], were specifically activated. It should be noted, however, that these findings with respect to controls were based on an extremely small number of cases as most studies did not employ a control group.

We conducted bias tests to evaluate potential threats to the validity of the estimated effect sizes from the subset of studies that manipulated comparisons to the very top and very bottom, without a control group ($k = 19$). A funnel plot of the standard errors in descending order against the effect sizes are depicted in Figure 12. To test for funnel plot asymmetry, we conducted the Kendall's tau rank correlation, $r = -.076$, $p = .68$, and the Egger's regression test, $z = .50$, $p = .62$. Both tests were non-significant, suggesting that inclusion bias is unlikely. Additionally, a trim-and-fill analysis estimated five missing studies on the left. With these studies added, the new effect size estimate was .333, with 95% CI [.272, .393], $z = 10.73$, $p < .001$. Although this effect

size was attenuated, it remained significantly different from zero. In other words, with or without the missing studies, the overall effect of this social ladder manipulation was still present.

We also conducted a sensitivity analysis to examine the robustness of effect sizes to differences in study characteristics. Because only two of the 19 cases were unpublished, we could not reliably examine differences between published and unpublished effect sizes, and therefore cannot definitively rule out publication bias. Nonetheless, we examined whether the effect sizes differed by studies published by the original lab group that created the social ladder comparison manipulation versus studies published by other lab groups. The effect size obtained from studies published by the original lab ($k = 8$) was 0.504 with 95% CI [0.409, 0.600], while the effect size obtained from studies published by other labs ($k = 11$) was 0.323 with 95% CI [0.226, 0.421]. Although the effect size estimated from the original lab was larger compared to the other labs, the 95% CIs of both estimates overlapped, suggesting that the effect size estimates did not differ significantly by lab groups. Taken together with the other bias test results, the effect sizes obtained for this particular social ladder manipulation appeared relatively robust.

Money prime. Based on the small number of samples, money primes that induced perceptions of scarcity vs. abundance of money did not significantly shift ladder ratings ($k = 4$), $d = .028$ [-0.081, 0.138]. However, money primes that induced scarcity relative to a neutral control did significantly shift ladder ratings ($k = 4$), $d = -.168$ [-0.277, -0.059]. Money primes that induced abundance relative to a neutral control also significantly shifted ladder ratings, but in an opposite and unexpected direction ($k = 15$), $d = -.089$ [-0.145, -0.032].

Although meta-analytic effect size estimation was not possible for the single study that employed a negative mood prime (Kraus et al., 2013), the effect sizes estimated within the study revealed that none of the negative mood inductions significantly affected the ladder SES ratings:

sadness versus shame induction, $d = 0.0053$ [-0.272, 0.283]; neutral versus shame induction, $d = 0.0263$ [-0.251, 0.304]; neutral versus sadness induction, $d = 0.0221$ [-0.255, 0.299]. Overall, these findings provide some evidence that the ladder SES ratings are, in part, influenced by social comparison, particularly when the comparisons are made with respect to the extreme ends of socioeconomic standing. Nevertheless, as most of the available research on experimental manipulations of ladder ratings were limited to the social comparison manipulation, the question remains as to whether other variables (e.g., self-esteem, optimism) may have similar influences. Providing more experimental evidence for the psychosocial determinants of the ladder rating would be an important area for future work.

Qualitative Analysis of Criteria Used for the Subjective Ladder SES Ratings

In one previous study ($n = 60$), participants were asked in an interview about the criteria they used to rate the ladder SES and their open-ended responses were systematically coded (Adler & Stewart, 2007). An analysis of their responses showed that over 90% reported material wealth compared to 62% who mentioned education.

We conducted a similar qualitative analysis on our own existing datasets that asked participants to rate themselves on the SES ladder, followed by an open-ended response question that asked them what they thought about when they rated the ladder ($n = 3590$). These datasets included three college samples and four MTurk samples. Two research assistants coded the open-ended responses. In this much larger sample, we found that 57.2% mentioned income and material wealth (often mentioned together) compared to 27.2% that mentioned education, and 23.3% that mentioned occupation. Similar to the findings from the original study (Adler & Stewart, 2007), we found that among the typical indicators of objective SES, income was used more than education in making relative SES judgments.

Importantly, we additionally coded for whether participants explicitly mentioned engaging in social comparisons when rating the ladder SES. We also coded for other categories of information that may reflect top-down influences, namely emotions, self-worth, opportunities, health, and sense of control. From the coded responses, 40.2% mentioned social comparison (e.g., “I thought about the amount of money others made”, “I was thinking about my current income level in comparison to the area I live”). The other categories were mentioned by less than 10% of the participants. Specifically, 9.1% mentioned emotions (e.g., “I feel terrible”, “I feel fortunate”, “very grateful”), 4.0% mentioned opportunities (e.g., “access to opportunities”, “educational opportunities”, “opportunities in life”), and 2.0% mentioned health (e.g., my health state at the moment”, “my physical health is not well”), 1.8% mentioned self-worth (e.g., “my achievements”, “I don’t see myself very highly”, “low self-esteem), and 1.1% mentioned sense of control (e.g., “circumstances beyond my control”, “the amount of freedom I am”, “circumstances people are born into”).

Overall, these exploratory qualitative analyses suggest that the ladder SES more commonly activated thoughts about income and material wealth, educational attainment, occupation, and importantly, social comparisons. The other potential “top-down” influences such as emotions, self-worth, and sense of control were activated to a much lesser degree.

Discussion

In this meta-analysis, we examined the associations between objective SES, subjective SES and SWB in 357 studies that spanned 103 countries. Drawing on current theories of SES in the psychological sciences (Kraus et al., 2011; 2012; Callan et al., 2011), we conceptualized subjective SES as a rank-based judgment that taps on one’s level of objective resources, and

involves the engagement of social comparisons to form an overall evaluation of where one stands within the social context. Based on this conceptualization, we tested two hypotheses.

First, based on the social comparison process theorized to underlie subjective SES, we hypothesized that the subjective SES-SWB association would be larger than the objective SES-SWB association. At the aggregate, the hypothesis was supported, with the subjective SES-SWB r of .217 larger than the objective SES-SWB r of .163. However, when the SES measures were examined separately, only the education-SWB r of .122 remained smaller than the both the ladder SES-SWB r of .220 and perceived SES-SWB r of .196. This is consistent with past finding that the education and SWB association is positive but small (Witter, Okun, Stock, & Haring, 1984). On the other hand, the income-SWB r of .234 was comparable to the ladder SES-SWB r but larger than the perceived SES-SWB r . In other words, in this analysis, the hypothesis held mainly with objective SES assessed as education, but not as income. Second, we hypothesized that if subjective SES judgments in part draw on objective resource levels, subjective SES should partially mediate the association between objective SES and SWB. Path analyses revealed significant indirect influences of objective SES on SWB via subjective SES, particularly when subjective SES was assessed as the ladder SES. Therefore, the second hypothesis was mainly supported with subjective SES assessed as the ladder SES.

The Role of Common Method Variance

The current meta-analysis also examined the role of common method variance in explaining the subjective SES-SWB association on a subset of studies. The analysis revealed a decrease in the subjective SES-SWB r from .310 to .250 after controlling for general positivity bias. Importantly, this reduced effect size was still substantive, suggesting that positivity or response bias did not fully explain the subjective SES-SWB association.

This finding corroborates with a recent meta-analysis that examined the associations between objective SES, subjective SES and health (Cundiff & Matthews, 2017). In that analysis, a significant partial association between subjective SES and objective biological health measures controlled for objective SES ($r = .018$) was found, suggesting that the influence of subjective SES on health existed beyond common method variance. Although in our analysis we did not address the issue of common method variance in the same way, since no objective measures of SWB exist, our observed subjective SES-SWB estimate controlled for general positivity and reporting biases is consistent with this recent meta-analysis on the link between subjective SES and health. In other words, both meta-analyses provided converging evidence for the unique contribution of subjective SES beyond method variances on outcomes that relate more broadly to overall well-being.

Nonetheless, we do not take the current findings to suggest that common method variance is unimportant in explaining the subjective SES-SWB association. The decrease in effect size from .310 to .250 observed does indicate that a good portion of the subjective SES-SWB association is explained by common method variance. In the broader literature on the effects of social class, the relative influences of objective and subjective SES have often been distinguished, with the dominant view that subjective SES has distinctive and sometimes, even more powerful influences on several psychological outcomes than objective SES (e.g., Singh-Manoux, Marmot, & Adler, 2005; Brown-Iannuzzi, Lundberg, Kay, & Payne, 2014). However, our findings suggest that the influence of common method variance could bias the true estimate of associations with subjective SES, and potentially change the interpretation of the relative contribution of subjective SES versus objective SES to psychological outcomes that are often subjectively assessed. Therefore, we believe that more attention should be paid to the role of

common method variance when examining the influences of subjective SES on other subjectively assessed outcomes by accounting for common method variance in the study design and analyses. For instance, analyses examining the influence of subjective SES should, as a standard, account for covariates such as affect, optimism, self-esteem, or other potentially biasing constructs, besides demonstrating its incremental validity beyond objective SES. This is particularly important if the research also intends to compare the relative influences of objective and subjective SES on the subjectively assessed outcomes.

We also note that in addressing the common method variance issue by controlling for or partialing out general positivity influences in the current and also in the recent health meta-analysis, an inherent assumption made is that affect does not play a role in subjective SES influences on SWB or health. However, it has also been argued that affect may well be part of process of subjective SES influences, by capturing the stressful aspects of social interactions from social comparisons (Cundiff, Kamarck, & Manuck, 2016; Cundiff & Smith, 2017). Although this is beyond the scope of the current investigation, we believe that elucidating the role of affective processes in subjective SES judgments is an important area of future research that will enrich our understanding of what subjective SES judgments capture.

The Role of Comparison Processes

Macro-level moderators theoretically linked to social comparison were tested for their influences on the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes, namely the wealth of countries, cultural orientation, income inequality, and population density. Among these moderators, only population density produced patterns that were consistent with the social comparison process. Specifically, the findings supported the notion that in high population density environments where social comparisons are heightened due to competition for resources,

the ability to attain high levels of resources is important for SWB. The remaining moderator tests, however, yielded largely mixed or inconsistent findings.

While the hypothesis based on Need Theory that the objective SES-SWB association should be stronger in less wealthy countries was mainly supported, the hypothesis that social comparison needs are stronger in wealthier countries was largely unsupported, given that the subjective SES-SWB association did not strengthen with increasing wealth of countries. The subjective SES-SWB association also did not vary with cultural orientation, contrary to the social comparison hypothesis (Baldwin & Mussweiler, 2018). Nonetheless, the education-SWB r increased with stronger collectivism, partially supporting the idea that the SWB of collectivists is more dependent on objective SES that are considered shared norms of success (Curhan et al., 2014). Income inequality did not significantly increase the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB associations as well, regardless of how income inequality was assessed. Instead, the subjective SES-SWB association decreased as GINI increased fairly consistently, contrary to the view that inequality should heighten negative social comparisons and strengthen the effects of relative SES (Cheung & Lucas, 2016).

We consider a few explanations for this unexpected pattern observed with income inequality. A recent work that examined the income inequality and health relationship using panel data found that the negative impact of income inequality was supported in models that controlled for confounds, while an unexpected positive impact of income inequality was found when the models that did not account for confounds (Kragten & Rözer, 2017). In the current samples, as the GINI and 90/10 ratios shared significant associations with the other moderators, we considered the possibility that confounds may have masked our actual results. To examine this possibility, we ran further meta-regression analyses that tested for the effect of inequality on

the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB effect sizes, controlling for all of the other moderators. However, while all of the non-significant patterns remained, the previously significant negative effect of the GINI on subjective SES-SWB r became non-significant.

Another possible explanation is that the impact of income inequality depends on specific conditions or contextual factors, as suggested by the fairly mixed literature on the effects of income inequality. In fact, a number of research have found positive links between income inequality and SWB (Berg & Veenhoven, 2010; Clark, 2003; Haller & Hadler 2006; Rözer and Kraaykamp 2012; Senik, 2002), or no associations at all (Alesina, DiTella, & MacCulloch, 2004; Bjørnskov, Dreher, & Fischer, 2007; Fahey & Smith, 2004; Senik, 2004; Berg & Veenhoven, 2010). Several contexts in which income inequality may produce positive effects on SWB have been discussed. For instance, if inequality was a result of positive economic reforms (Eggers, Gaddy, & Graham, 2006), or if inequality led to redistribution of income through greater public spending, SWB is likely to increase (Boustan, Ferreira, Winkler, & Zolt, 2013; Chetty et al., 2016). Some recent evidence also suggests that people may be more accepting or tolerant of income inequality if the economic system is perceived as fair (Shariff, Wiwad, & Akinin, 2016; Starmans, Sheskin, & Bloom, 2017), which could dampen the negative impact of inequality. As the current samples lack information about government spending, income redistribution, or perceptions of fairness of the economic system, we could not test these explanations. However, we believe that these are important factors to consider in future studies of inequality effects.

Relatedly, social mobility has also been suggested to dampen the negative impact of income inequality. Because mobility beliefs help to maintain aspirations of moving up, individuals may be less affected by current levels of inequality as long as social mobility is high (Bjørnskov, Dreher, Fischer, & Schnellenbach, 2010; Senik, 2002). We tested this mitigating

role of social mobility by examining the interaction between income inequality and social mobility on both of the SES-SWB effect sizes. Interestingly, we found significant interactions between income inequality assessed by the 90/10 ratio and relative social mobility on the education-SWB effect size, $b = -0.27$, $SE = 0.11$, $z = -2.47$, $p = .013$, and on the ladder SES-SWB effect size, $b = -0.29$, $SE = 0.11$, $z = -2.58$, $p = .001$. The pattern of interaction on education-SWB was as such: When relative social mobility was low, higher “top-heavy” inequality decreased the education-SWB association, $t(78) = 7.61$, $p < .001$. When relative social mobility was high, levels of “top-heavy” inequality did not affect the education-SWB association, $t(78) = 0.51$, $p = .61$. A similar pattern was observed with the ladder SES-SWB association, such that higher “top-heavy” inequality decreased the ladder SES-SWB association when relative social mobility was low, $t(63) = 10.44$, $p < .001$, but did not significantly affect the ladder SES-SWB association when relative social mobility was high, $t(63) = 1.94$, $p = .06$. We note that these findings are only preliminary, but nonetheless, we believe that the idea that social mobility reduces the negative impact of income inequality deserves further investigation in future inequality research.

Overall, although the moderator analyses did not provide consistent support for the idea that the subjective SES-SWB associations should strengthen with social comparison processes at the macro-level, it is possible that these processes happen more locally than the analyses in this meta-analysis are poised to capture. That is, social comparison happens at the level of local interactions between people in the context of their networks of social relationships. At the meta-analytic level, macro-level variables, particularly income inequality, may only weakly tap into these micro level comparisons (Kraus et al., 2013; Norton, 2013). In this vein, future work could examine the role of these moderators more locally, such as at the regional or municipal level.

Future research could also capitalize on new methods that monitor social comparison that people engage in from moment to moment contexts to provide the most direct test of the relativity hypothesis. These micro contexts may best capture variation in associations between SES and SWB due to social comparisons.

Although the macro-level moderators did not appear to affect subjective SES in ways predicted by social comparison, the meta-analysis of experimental manipulations of the ladder SES ratings showed that direct inductions of social comparisons were successful in shifting subjective SES judgments. In contrast, the effect of other manipulations such as money and mood primes on subjective SES judgments based on very limited studies were unclear. In addition, our qualitative analysis of open-ended response to what the ladder SES measure capture also revealed that people quite often engaged in social comparisons, on top of thinking about their income, wealth or education. These more directed tests and measures of the social comparison process do provide evidence that subjective SES judgments involve social comparison processes. Importantly, these findings suggest that experimental inductions of social comparisons may be a fruitful avenue for investigating the causal effects of subjective SES on SWB, as well as on other outcomes of interest.

Finally, beyond the main focus on social comparison processes, our moderator analyses also suggested the important potential role of social mobility—that is, the differential rates of mobility shift social comparison targets and provide for differential associations between SES and SWB. Whether this pattern increases the magnitude of SES and SWB associations or heightens feelings of uncertainty and societal stability is another interesting topic of future research (Destin & DeBrosse, 2017).

Limitations and Future Directions

The current meta-analysis is not without limitations, so the findings and conclusions of this meta-analysis should be considered in the light of these limitations. The first relates to interpreting the correlational effect sizes estimated in the current research. Although SES is often thought of as preceding SWB in the causal chain, this could not be completely ascertained in the current research. Future research that focus on experimental work or meta-analyses of studies that manipulate subjective SES, possibly by inducing social comparisons, would be useful to determine the directionality between the SES and SWB variables.

Despite efforts to be inclusive in the search for articles to be screened and included in this meta-analysis, the tests of publication bias suggested that some selection bias might be present in the samples that assessed subjective SES. One possible reason is the lack of unpublished data in the current samples, resulting in a number of studies may have been unintentionally omitted. Although efforts have been made to reach out to researchers through various medium for unpublished data, the goal of including such data was limited by the low response rates. Additionally, a large number of articles that qualified for inclusion did not report raw correlations for the SES and SWB relation. As with the responses to requests for unpublished data, responses to requests for missing correlations were also low.

Another limitation pertains to incomplete information on moderators for a handful of samples. This was particularly an issue for the measures of income inequality and social mobility, because information on these indices was not available for some of the countries and cohorts. As a result, the moderator analyses could not be conducted on all of the available samples, and the samples examined for each moderator analysis were not always the same. It is

also possible that other moderators that might have influenced objective and subjective SES associations with SWB were unidentified and not examined in this analysis.

The current meta-analysis only focused on income and education as indices of objective SES, and did not examine the role of wealth for SWB. Compared to income, wealth is arguably a more stable source of SES and may show more reliable associations with SWB. However, the meta-analysis is limited by the availability of studies that examine wealth and SWB.

Furthermore, due to various possible sources of wealth (e.g., income, asset, investments, savings, debt), and that wealth could also be inherited (e.g., old money versus new money), it is more difficult to assess wealth accurately compared to reports of household and personal income. Nonetheless, the question of how wealth may relate to subjective SES and affect SWB is certainly an important future area for investigation.

Finally, some research in the US have suggested racial differences in the predictive utility of subjective SES on important outcomes. In particular, subjective SES appears to be a weaker predictor of health of people from racial minority versus majority backgrounds (Adler et al., 2008; Cundiff & Matthews, 2017). With respect to White versus Black populations, the meaning and significance of subjective SES is likely to change as a function of the addition of a racial hierarchy in society, potentially shaping differential meaning of societal status and its relationship to economic factors like income and education (Cohen et al., 2017; Cundiff & Matthews, 2017; Patillo, 1999). However, due to the lack of racial diversity in many of the samples in the literature, including the ones reviewed in the current research, the ability to systematically test possible racial differences in how subjective SES is defined remains an important challenge to be addressed by future research.

Conclusion

Across many modern societies, money and resources continue to be prioritized as an important means to happiness. The current meta-analysis reaffirmed the notion that money and resources, whether objectively reported or subjectively perceived, is significantly linked to SWB. The tests of macro-level moderators of the objective SES-SWB and subjective SES-SWB associations also provided preliminary evidence for the processes that may undergird the objective and subjective SES associations with SWB. These moderators should be further examined at a more local level to provide stronger and more direct tests of the underlying processes. Overall, the current research hopes to motivate and guide future work in SWB research towards greater attention to the role of the distinct aspects of SES, and to generate novel insights on the psychological determinants and processes that underlie the successful pursuit of the good life.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.

- *Aboalshamat, K., Hou, X.-Y., & Strodl, E. (2015). Psychological well-being status among medical and dental students in Makkah, Saudi Arabia: a cross-sectional study. *Medical Teacher, 37 Suppl 1*, S75–81. <http://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2015.1006612>
- Adler, N. E., Boyce, T., Chesney, M. A., Cohen, S., Folkman, S., Kahn, R. L., & Syme, S. L. (1994). Socioeconomic status and health. The challenge of the gradient. *The American Psychologist, 49*(1), 15–24.
- *Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women. *Health Psychology, 19*(6), 586–592.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.19.6.586>
- Adler, N. E. & Stewart, J. (2007). The MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status. In Psychosocial Research Notebook. Retrieved July 11, 2019, from <http://www.macses.ucsf.edu/research/psychosocial/subjective.php>
- *Ali, M. (2006). Impact of acculturation, ethnic identity, religiosity, and individual difference variables on the subjective well-being of Pakistani Muslims in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Southern Illinois University Carbondale.
- *Amit, K., & Litwin, H. (2010). The Subjective Well-Being of Immigrants Aged 50 and Older in Israel. *Social Indicators Research, 98*(1), 89–104. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9519-5>

*Anderson, C., Kraus, M. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Keltner, D. (2012). The local-ladder effect: social status and subjective well-being. *Psychological Science*, 23(7), 764–771.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611434537>

*Ariyabuddhiphongs, V., & Jaiwong, D. (2010). Observance of the Buddhist Five Precepts, Subjective Wealth, and Happiness among Buddhists in Bangkok, Thailand. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 32(3), 327–344. <http://doi.org/10.1163/157361210X533274>

Becker, J. C., Kraus, M. W., & Rheinschmidt-Same, M. (2017). Cultural expressions of social class and their implications for group-related beliefs and behaviors. *Journal of Social Issues*, 73(1), 158–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12209>

*Baldassare, M., Rosenfield, S., & Rook, K. (1984). The types of social relations predicting elderly well-being. *Research on Aging*, 6(4), 549–559.

Baldwin, M., & Mussweiler, T. (2018). The culture of social comparison. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(39), E9067–E9074.

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721555115>

*Bedin, L. M., & Sarriera, J. C. (2014). A comparative study of the subjective well-being of parents and adolescents considering gender, age and social class. *Social Indicators Research*, 120(1), 79–95. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0589-7>

Begg, C. B., & Mazumdar, M. (1994). Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics*, 50, 1088–1101.

*Bellani, L., & D'Ambrosio, C. (2011). Deprivation, Social Exclusion and Subjective Well-Being. *Social Indicators Research*, 104(1), 67–86.

Bellù, L. G., and Liberati, P. (2006), 'Describing Income Inequality: Theil Index and Entropy Class Indexes', *Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations*.

- *Bennett, D. A., Buchman, A. S., Boyle, P. A., Barnes, L. L., Wilson, R. S., & Schneider, J. A. (2018). Religious Orders Study and Rush Memory and Aging Project. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease: JAD*, 64(s1), S161–S189. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-179939>
- *Benyamini, Y., Leventhal, H., & Leventhal, E. A. E. A. (2004a). Self-rated oral health as an independent predictor of self-rated general health, self-esteem and life satisfaction. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 59(5), 1109–1116. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2003.12.021>
- *Benyamini, Y., Leventhal, H., & Leventhal, E. A. E. A. (2004b). Self-rated oral health as an independent predictor of self-rated general health, self-esteem and life satisfaction. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 59(5), 1109–1116. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2003.12.021>
- Berg, M. C., & Veenhoven, R. (2010). Income inequality and happiness in 119 nations. In search for an optimum that does not appear to exist. Retrieved December 8, 2017, from <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/43236>
- Berry, B. J. L., & Okulicz-Kozaryn, A. (2011). An urban-rural happiness gradient. *Urban Geography*, 32(6), 871–883. <https://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.32.6.871>
- *Binder, M., & Coad, A. (2011). From Average Joe's happiness to Miserable Jane and Cheerful John: using quantile regressions to analyze the full subjective well-being distribution. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 79(3), 275–290. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2011.02.005>
- *Biswas-Diener, R., & Diener, E. (2001). Making the Best of a Bad Situation: Satisfaction in the Slums of Calcutta. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(3), 329–352. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010905029386>

- Bjørnskov, C., Dreher, A., & Fischer, J. A. V. (2008). Cross-country determinants of life satisfaction: Exploring different determinants across groups in society. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 30(1), 119–173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00355-007-0225-4>
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009). *Introduction to meta-analysis*. Chichester, UK: Wiley
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Boustan, L., Ferreira, F., Winkler, H., & Zolt, E. M. (2013). The effect of rising income inequality on taxation and public expenditures: Evidence from U.S. Municipalities and school districts, 1970-2000. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(4), 1291–1302. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00332
- *Boyce, C. J., Brown, G. D. A., & Moore, S. C. (2010). Money and happiness: rank of income, not income, affects life satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 21(4), 471–475. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610362671>
- *Boyce, C. J., Wood, A. M., & Powdthavee, N. (2012). Is Personality Fixed? Personality Changes as Much as “Variable” Economic Factors and More Strongly Predicts Changes to Life Satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research*, 111(1), 287–305. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0006-z>
- *Bratten, J. M. (2001). Marital status, gender, and determinants of subjective well-being. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Oregon State University.
- Brown-Iannuzzi, J. L., Lundberg, K. B., Kay, A. C., & Payne, B. K. (2015). Subjective status shapes political preferences. *Psychological Science*, 26(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614553947>

- Buunk, B. P., Collins, R. L., Taylor, S. E., VanYperen, N. W., & Dakof, G. A. (1990). The affective consequences of social comparison: Either direction has its ups and downs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1238–1249.
- Callan, M. J., Shead, N. W., & Olson, J. M. (2011). Personal relative deprivation, delay discounting, and gambling. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(5), 955–973. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024778>
- Camfield, L., Choudhury, K., & Devine, J. (2007). Well-being, Happiness and Why Relationships Matter: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(1), 71–91. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-007-9062-5>
- *Camfield, L., Guillen-Royo, M., & Velazco, J. (2009). Does Needs Satisfaction Matter for Psychological and Subjective Wellbeing in Developing Countries: A Mixed-Methods Illustration from Bangladesh and Thailand. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 11(4), 497–516. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-009-9154-5>
- *Chang, W.-C. (2012). Climbing up the Social Ladders: Identity, Relative Income, and Subjective Well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 113(1), 513–535. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0108-7>
- Chan, T. W. (2018). Social mobility and the well-being of individuals. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 69(1), 183–206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12285>
- *Chan, G. W. L., Ungvari, G. S., Shek, D. T. L., & Leung Dagger, J. J. P. (2003). Hospital and community-based care for patients with chronic schizophrenia in Hong Kong--quality of life and its correlates. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 38(4), 196–203. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-003-0616-5>

- *Chappel, A. M., Suldo, S. M., & Ogg, J. A. (2012). Associations Between Adolescents' Family Stressors and Life Satisfaction. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(1), 76–84.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9687-9>
- Chetty, R., Stepner, M., Abraham, S., Lin, S., Scuderi, B., Turner, N., ... Cutler, D. (2016). The association between income and life expectancy in the United States, 2001-2014. *JAMA*, 315(16), 1750–1766. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.4226>
- Cheung, M. W. L. (2015). *Meta-Analysis: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach*. Wiley & Sons.
- Cheung, F., & Lucas, R. E. (2016). Income inequality is associated with stronger social comparison effects: The effect of relative income on life satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110(2), 332–341.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000059>
- Cheung, M. W. L. (2015). {metaSEM}: An R Package for Meta-Analysis using Structural Equation Modeling. *Frontiers in Psychology* 5, 1521. URL
<http://journal.frontiersin.org/Journal/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01521/abstract> DOI
10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01521
- *Chindarkar, N. (2012). Is Subjective Well-Being of Concern to Potential Migrants from Latin America? *Social Indicators Research*, 115(1), 159–182. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0213-7>
- Clark, A.E., & D'Angelo, E. (2010). Upward social mobility, well-being and political preferences: Evidence from the BHPS. *CEP Discussion Paper 1252*, Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics.

Clark, A. E., Frijters, P., & Shields, M. A. (2008). Relative Income, Happiness, and Utility: An Explanation for the Easterlin Paradox and Other Puzzles. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 46(1), 95–144.

Clark, A. E., & Oswald, A. J. (1998). Comparison-concave utility and following behaviour in social and economic settings. *Journal of Public Economics*, 70(1), 133–155.
[http://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727\(98\)00064-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(98)00064-4)

Cohen, S., Alper, C. M., Doyle, W. J., Adler, N., Treanor, J. J., & Turner, R. B. (2008). Objective and subjective socioeconomic status and susceptibility to the common cold. *Health Psychology: Official Journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association*, 27(2), 268–274. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.27.2.268>

Cohen, D., Shin, F., Lu, X., Ondish, P., & Kraus, M. W. (2017). Defining social class across time and between groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43, 1530–1545.

Cornman, J. C., Goldman, N., Collins, A. L., Gleib, D. A., Hurng, B.-S., & Weinstein, M. (2012). Do Adults Adjust their Socioeconomic Status Identity in Later Life?. *Ageing and Society*, 32(4), 616–633. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X11000432>

*Correa-Velez, I., Gifford, S. M., & Barnett, A. G. (2010). Longing to belong: social inclusion and wellbeing among youth with refugee backgrounds in the first three years in Melbourne, Australia. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 71(8), 1399–1408.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.07.018>

*Cramm, J. M., Møller, V., & Nieboer, A. P. (2010). Improving subjective well-being of the poor in the Eastern Cape. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 15(7), 1012–1019.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/1359105310367833>

- *Cramm, J. M., Møller, V., & Nieboer, A. P. (2011). Individual- and Neighbourhood-Level Indicators of Subjective Well-Being in a Small and Poor Eastern Cape Township: The Effect of Health, Social Capital, Marital Status, and Income. *Social Indicators Research*, 105(3), 581–593. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9790-0>
- *Curhan, K. B., Levine, C. S., Markus, H. R., Kitayama, S., Park, J., Karasawa, M., Kawakami, N., Love, G. D., Coe, C. L., Miyamoto, Y., & Ryff, C. D. (2014). Subjective and Objective Hierarchies and Their Relations to Psychological Well-Being: A U.S/Japan Comparison. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5(8), 855–864. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1948550614538461>
- Cundiff, J. M., & Matthews, K. A. (2017). Is subjective social status a unique correlate of physical health? A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology*, 36(12), 1109–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000534>
- Cundiff, J. M., Kamarck, T. W., & Manuck, S. B. (2016). Daily interpersonal experience partially explains the association between social rank and physical health. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 50(6), 854–861. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-016-9811-y>
- *D'Ambrosio, C., & Frick, J. R. (2006). Income Satisfaction and Relative Deprivation: An Empirical Link. *Social Indicators Research*, 81(3), 497–519. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-006-0020-0>
- *Davis, L., & Wu, S. (2013). Social Comparisons and Life Satisfaction Across Racial and Ethnic Groups: The Effects of Status, Information and Solidarity. *Social Indicators Research*, 117(3), 849–869. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0367-y>

- Demakakos, P., Nazroo, J., Breeze, E., & Marmot, M. (2008). Socioeconomic status and health: the role of subjective social status. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 67(2), 330–340. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.03.038>
- Destin, M., & Debrosse, R. (2017). Upward social mobility and identity. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 18, 99–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.08.006>
- Destin, M., Rheinschmidt-Same, M., & Richeson, J. A. (2017). Status-based identity: A conceptual approach integrating the social psychological study of socioeconomic status and identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(2), 270–289.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542–575.
- Diener, E., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2002). Will Money Increase Subjective Well-Being? *Social Indicators Research*, 57(2), 119–169. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014411319119>
- Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 851–864.
- Diener, E., & Lucas, R. E. (2000). Explaining Differences in Societal Levels of Happiness: Relative Standards, Need Fulfillment, Culture, and Evaluation Theory. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1(1), 41–78. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010076127199>
- Diener, E., & Oishi, S. (2000). Money and happiness: Income and subjective well-being across nations. *Culture and Subjective Well-Being*, 185–218.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 403–425. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145056>
- *Diener, E., Ng, W., Harter, J., & Arora, R. (2010). Wealth and happiness across the world: material prosperity predicts life evaluation, whereas psychosocial prosperity predicts

positive feeling. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(1), 52–61.

<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0018066>

Diener, E., Sandvik, E., Seidlitz, L., & Diener, M. (1993). The relationship between income and subjective well-being: Relative or absolute? *Social Indicators Research*, 28(3), 195–223.

<http://doi.org/10.1007/BF01079018>

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 276–302.

<http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276>

Diener, E., Tay, L., & Oishi, S. (2013). Rising income and the subjective well-being of nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(2), 267–276.

<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0030487>

*Downing, H. (2012). *The Function of Just World Beliefs in Promoting Student Long-Term Academic Investment and Subjective Well-Being: The Moderating Effects of Social Status*. (Electronic Thesis or Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://etd.ohiolink.edu/>

*Easterbrook, M. J., Kuppens, T., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2015). The Education Effect: Higher Educational Qualifications are Robustly Associated with Beneficial Personal and Socio-political Outcomes. *Social Indicators Research*, 126(3), 1261–1298.

<http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-0946-1>

Easterlin, R. A. (1974). Does economic growth improve the human lot?: Some empirical evidence. *Nations and households in economic growth : essays in honor of Moses Abramovitz*.

- Easterlin, R. A. (1995). Will raising the incomes of all increase the happiness of all? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 27(1), 35–47. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2681\(95\)00003-B](http://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2681(95)00003-B)
- Easterlin, R. A. (2001). Income and Happiness: Towards a Unified Theory. *The Economic Journal*, 111(473), 465–484. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00646>
- Easterlin, R. A., & Sawangfa, O. (2010). Happiness and economic growth: Does the cross section predict time trends? Evidence from developing countries. In *International differences in well-being* (pp. 166–216). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199732739.003.0007>
- Egger, M., Davey Smith, G., Schneider, M., & Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)*, 315(7109), 629–634.
- Eggers, A., Gaddy, C. and Graham, C. (2006) Unemployment and wellbeing in Russia in the 1990's: Can society's suffering be individuals solace? *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 35, 209-242
- *Elgar, F. J., McKinnon, B., Torsheim, T., Schnohr, C. W., Mazur, J., Cavallo, F., & Currie, C. (2015). Patterns of Socioeconomic Inequality in Adolescent Health Differ According to the Measure of Socioeconomic Position. *Social Indicators Research*, 1–12. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-0994-6>
- Emery, L. F., & Le, B. (2014). Imagining the white picket fence: Social class, future plans, and romantic relationship quality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5(6), 653–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550614524449>
- *Eom, K. M. Unpublished dataset.

- *Estrada, F., & Arciniega, G. M. (2015). Positive Masculinity Among Latino Men and the Direct and Indirect Effects on Well-Being. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 43(3), 191–205. <http://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12014>
- *Faas, C. S. (2013). Predicting Socioeconomic Success and Mental Health Outcomes for Young Adults who Dropped out of College. Retrieved from <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/23934>
- Fahey, T., & Smyth, E. (2004). Do subjective indicators measure welfare? Evidence from 33 European societies. *European Societies*, 6(1), 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461669032000176297>
- *Fernandes, L., Mendes, A., & Teixeira, A. (2012). A Weighted Multidimensional Index of Child Well-Being Which Incorporates Children's Individual Perceptions. *Social Indicators Research*, 114(3), 803–829. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0174-x>
- Fisher, O., O'Donnell, S. C., & Oyserman, D. (2017). Social class and identity-based motivation. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 18, 61–66.
- *Flouri, E. (2004). Subjective Well-Being in Midlife: The Role of Involvement of and Closeness to Parents in Childhood. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 5(4), 335–358. <http://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOHS.0000048461.21694.92>
- *Francis-Sharnowski, M. A. (2009). Relationships among parent attachment, ego identity, life satisfaction and relationship closeness for male and female college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Wayne State University.
- *Freedman, V. A., Stafford, F., Schwarz, N., Conrad, F., & Cornman, J. C. (2012). Disability, participation, and subjective wellbeing among older couples. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 74(4), 588–596. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.10.018>

- Fuentes, N., & Rojas, M. (2001). Economic Theory and Subjective Well-being: Mexico. *Social Indicators Research*, 53(3), 289–314. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007189429153>
- Garcia, S. M., Tor, A., & Schiff, T. M. (2013). The psychology of competition: A social comparison perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(6), 634–650. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613504114>
- *Gianaros, P. J., Horenstein, J. A., Cohen, S., Matthews, K. A., Brown, S. M., Flory, J. D., ... Hariri, A. R. (2007). Perigenual anterior cingulate morphology covaries with perceived social standing. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 2(3), 161–173. <http://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsm013>
- Graham, C. (2005). Insights on development from the economics of happiness. *World Bank Research Observer*, 20, 201–231.
- *Graham, C., Eggers, A., & Sukhtankar, S. (2004). Does happiness pay? An exploration based on panel data from Russia. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 55, 319–342. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2003.09.002
- Graham, C., & Felton, A. (2006). Inequality and happiness: Insights from Latin America. *The Journal of Economic Inequality*, 4(1), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10888-005-9009-1>
- *Guardiola, J., & Guillen-Royo, M. (2014). Income, Unemployment, Higher Education and Wellbeing in Times of Economic Crisis: Evidence from Granada (Spain). *Social Indicators Research*, 120(2), 395–409. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0598-6>
- *Guo, M. (2014). Parental status and late-life well-being in rural China: the benefits of having multiple children. *Aging & Mental Health*, 18(1), 19–29. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2013.799117>

- *Haase, C. M., Tomasik, M. J., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2008). Premature Behavioral Autonomy. *European Psychologist, 13*(4), 255–266. <http://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.13.4.255>
- Hagerty, M. R. (2000). Social comparisons of income in one's community: Evidence from national surveys of income and happiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(4), 764–771. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.764>
- Hagger, M. S., Chan, D. K. C., Protogerou, C., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2016). Using meta-analytic path analysis to test theoretical predictions in health behavior: An illustration based on meta-analyses of the theory of planned behavior. *Preventive Medicine, 89*, 154–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.05.020>
- *Haller, M., & Hadler, M. (2006). How Social Relations and Structures can Produce Happiness and Unhappiness: An International Comparative Analysis. *Social Indicators Research, 75*(2), 169–216. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-6297-y>
- Haring, M. J., Stock, W. A., & Okun, M. A. (1984). A Research Synthesis of Gender and Social Class as Correlates of Subjective Well-Being. *Human Relations, 37*(8), 645–657. <http://doi.org/10.1177/001872678403700805>
- *Hart, T., Whyte, J., Polansky, M., Kersey-Matusiak, G., & Fidler-Sheppard, R. (2005). Community outcomes following traumatic brain injury: impact of race and preinjury status. *The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, 20*(2), 158–172.
- *Ha, S. E., & Kim, S. (2012). Personality and Subjective Well-Being: Evidence from South Korea. *Social Indicators Research, 111*(1), 341–359. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0009-9>
- *Hayo, B., & Seifert, W. (2003). Subjective economic well-being in Eastern Europe. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 24*(3), 329–348. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4870\(02\)00173-3](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4870(02)00173-3)

- *Headey, B., Hoehne, G., & Wagner, G. G. (2013). Does Religion Make You Healthier and Longer Lived? Evidence for Germany. *Social Indicators Research*, 119(3), 1335–1361. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0546-x>
- Hedges, L. V., Olkin, I., & Hedges, L. V. (Ed.) (1985). *Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis*. New York: Academic Press.
- Helliwell, J. F., Shiplett, H., & Barrington-Leigh, C. P. (2019). How happy are your neighbours? Variation in life satisfaction among 1200 Canadian neighbourhoods and communities. *PLOS ONE*, 14(1), e0210091. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210091>
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319>
- Hodge, R. W., & Donald J. T. (1968). Class identification in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 73, 535–547.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. SAGE.
- Howell, R. T., & Howell, C. J. (2008). The relation of economic status to subjective well-being in developing countries: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(4), 536–560. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.536>
- *Howell, C. J., Howell, R. T., & Schwabe, K. A. (2006). Does Wealth Enhance Life Satisfaction for People Who Are Materially Deprived? Exploring the Association among the “Orang Asli” of Peninsular Malaysia. *Social Indicators Research*, 76(3), 499–524.
- Hout, M. (2008). How class works: Objective and subjective aspects of class Since the 1970s. In *Social Class: How Does It Work* (Eds. A. Lareau and D. Conley, pp. 25–64). New York: Russell Sage Foundation

- *Hunter, M. S., Gupta, P., Papitsch-Clark, A., Bhugra, D., & Sturdee, D. (2008). Culture, country of residence and subjective well-being: a comparison of South Asian mid-aged women living in the UK, UK Caucasian women and women living in Delhi, India. *International Journal of Culture and Mental Health*, 1(1), 44–57.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/17542860802121000>
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2000). Fixed Effects vs. Random Effects Meta-Analysis Models: Implications for Cumulative Research Knowledge. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(4), 275–292. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00156>
- *Ip, P.-K., & Cheung, Y.-W. (2013). Probing Folk Happiness in Taiwan. *Social Indicators Research*, 117(3), 689–703. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0393-9>
- *ISSP Research Group (2013): International Social Survey Programme: Family and Changing Gender Roles III - ISSP 2002. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA3880 Data file Version 1.1.0, doi:10.4232/1.11564
- *ISSP Research Group (2015): International Social Survey Programme: Health and Health Care - ISSP 2011. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5800 Data file Version 3.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.12252
- *ISSP Research Group (2009): International Social Survey Programme: Leisure Time and Sports - ISSP 2007. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA4850. Data file Version 2.0.0, doi: 10.4232/1.10079
- *ISSP Research Group (1993): International Social Survey Programme: Religion I - ISSP 1991. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA2150 Data file Version 1.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.2150
- *ISSP Research Group (2000): International Social Survey Programme: Religion II - ISSP 1998. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA3190. Data file Version 1.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.3190

*ISSP Research Group (2012): International Social Survey Programme: Religion III - ISSP

2008. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA4950 Data file Version

2.2.0, doi:10.4232/1.11334

Jackman, M. R. (1979). The Subjective Meaning of Social Class Identification in the United

States. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 43(4), 443–462. <http://doi.org/10.1086/268543>

*Jetten, J., Haslam, S. A., & Barlow, F. K. (2012). Bringing Back the System: One Reason Why

Conservatives are Happier Than Liberals is That Higher Socioeconomic Status Gives

Them Access to More Group Memberships. *Social Psychological and Personality*

Science, 1948550612439721. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1948550612439721>

*Johnson, W., & Krueger, R. F. (2006). How money buys happiness: genetic and environmental

processes linking finances and life satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 90(4), 680–691. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.4.680>

*Jones, T. G., Rapport, L. J., Hanks, R. A., Lichtenberg, P. A., & Telmet, K. (2003). Cognitive

and Psychosocial Predictors of Subjective Well-Being in Urban Older Adults. *The*

Clinical Neuropsychologist, 17(1), 3–18. <http://doi.org/10.1076/clin.17.1.3.15626>

Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional

well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(38), 16489–16493.

<http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011492107>

Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D. A., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2004). A survey

method for characterizing daily life experience: the day reconstruction method. *Science*

(*New York, N.Y.*), 306(5702), 1776–1780. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1103572>

- *Kasser, T., & Sheldon, K. M. (2008). Time Affluence as a Path toward Personal Happiness and Ethical Business Practice: Empirical Evidence from Four Studies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(2), 243–255. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9696-1>
- Kawachi, I., & Kennedy, B. P. (1997). Health and social cohesion: why care about income inequality? *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)*, 314(7086), 1037–1040.
- *Kehn, D. J. (1995). Predictors of Elderly Happiness. *Activities, Adaptation & Aging*, 19(3), 11–30. http://doi.org/10.1300/J016v19n03_02
- Kemmelmeier, M., & Oyserman, D. (2001). The ups and downs of thinking about a successful other: Self-construals and the consequences of social comparisons. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31(3), 311–320. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.47>
- *Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: the empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 1007–1022.
- Kim, Y. H., Cohen, D., & Au, W. T. (2010). The jury and abjuration of my peers: The self in face and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 904–916. doi:10.1037/a0017936
- Kondo, N., Subramanian, S. V., Kawachi, I., Takeda, Y., & Yamagata, Z. (2008). Economic recession and health inequalities in Japan: analysis with a national sample, 1986-2001. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 62(10), 869–875. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2007.070334>
- *Körner, A., Silbereisen, R. K., & Cantner, U. (2012). Work-Related Demands Emanating from Social Change and Their Relation to Trait-Like and Occasion-Specific Aspects of

Subjective Well-Being. *Social Indicators Research*, 115(1), 203–222.

<http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0215-5>

Kragten, N., & Rözer, J. (2017). The income inequality hypothesis revisited: Assessing the hypothesis using four methodological approaches. *Social Indicators Research*, 131, 1015–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1283-8>

Kraus, M. W., Adler, N., & Chen, T.-W. D. (2013). Is the association of subjective SES and self-rated health confounded by negative mood? An experimental approach. *Health Psychology: Official Journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association*, 32(2), 138–145. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0027343>

Kraus, M. W., & Keltner, D. (2009). Signs of socioeconomic status: a thin-slicing approach. *Psychological Science*, 20(1), 99–106. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02251.x>

Kraus, M. W., & Mendes, W. B. (2014). Sartorial symbols of social class elicit class-consistent behavioral and physiological responses: A dyadic approach. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(6), 2330–2340. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000023>

Kraus, M. W., Park, J. W., & Tan, J. J. X. (2017). Signs of Social Class: The Experience of Economic Inequality in Everyday Life. *Perspectives on Psychological Science: A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, 12(3), 422–435.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616673192>

Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., & Keltner, D. (2009). Social class, sense of control, and social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(6), 992–1004.

<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0016357>

- Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., & Keltner, D. (2011). Social Class as Culture The Convergence of Resources and Rank in the Social Realm. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 246–250. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411414654>
- Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., Mendoza-Denton, R., Rheinschmidt, M. L., & Keltner, D. (2012). Social class, solipsism, and contextualism: how the rich are different from the poor. *Psychological Review*, 119(3), 546–572. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0028756>
- Kraus, M. W., Tan, J. J. X., & Tannenbaum, M. B. (2013). The social ladder: A rank-based perspective on social class. *Psychological Inquiry*, 24(2), 81–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2013.778803>
- Kristoffersen, I. (2018). Great expectations: Education and subjective wellbeing. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 66, 64–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2018.04.005>
- *Kuppens, T., Easterbrook, M. J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2015). Life at Both Ends of the Ladder Education-Based Identification and Its Association With Well-Being and Social Attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(9), 1260–1275. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215594122>
- *Kwate, N. O. A., & Goodman, M. S. (2014). An empirical analysis of White privilege, social position and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 116, 150–160. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.05.041>
- *Lang, F. R., & Heckhausen, J. (2001). Perceived control over development and subjective well-being: differential benefits across adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(3), 509–523.

- Lederbogen, F., Kirsch, P., Haddad, L., Streit, F., Tost, H., Schuch, P., ... Meyer-Lindenberg, A. (2011). City living and urban upbringing affect neural social stress processing in humans. *Nature*, 474(7352), 498–501. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10190>
- *Lee, J. J. (2009). A Pilot Study on the Living-Alone, Socio-Economically Deprived Older Chinese People's Self-Reported Successful Aging: A Case of Hongkong. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 4(4), 347–363. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-009-9085-7>
- Lee, H., Kim, K.-D., & Shin, D. C. (1982). Perceptions of quality of life in an industrializing country: The case of the Republic of Korea. *Social Indicators Research*, 10(3), 297–317. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00301097>
- Leung, Y. K., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within- and between-culture variation: Individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(3), 507–526. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0022151>
- *Levin, J. (2013). Religious behavior, health, and well-being among Israeli Jews: Findings from the European Social Survey. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 5, 272–282. doi: 10.1037/a0032601
- *Lindfors, P., Hultell, D., Rudman, A., & Gustavsson, J. P. (2014). Change and stability in subjective well-being over the transition from higher education to employment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 70, 188–193. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.06.043>
- *Lucas, R. E., Clark, A. E., Georgellis, Y., & Diener, E. (2004). Unemployment alters the set point for life satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 15(1), 8–13.
- *Luhmann, M., Murdoch, J. C., & Hawkey, L. C. (2014). Subjective Well-Being in Context County- and State-Level Socioeconomic Factors and Individual Moderators. *Social*

Psychological and Personality Science, 1948550614548075.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/1948550614548075>

*Luhmann, M., Schimmack, U., & Eid, M. (2011). Stability and variability in the relationship between subjective well-being and income. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 45(2), 186–197. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.01.004>

Maio, F. G. D. (2007). Income inequality measures. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 61(10), 849–852. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2006.052969>

*Marks, G. N., & Fleming, N. (1999). Influences and Consequences of Well-being Among Australian Young People: 1980–1995. *Social Indicators Research*, 46(3), 301–323. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006928507272>

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and Selves A Cycle of Mutual Constitution. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), 420–430. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610375557>

*Martos, T., & Kopp, M. S. (2011). Life Goals and Well-Being: Does Financial Status Matter? Evidence from a Representative Hungarian Sample. *Social Indicators Research*, 105(3), 561–568. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9788-7>

McBride, M. (2001). Relative-income effects on subjective well-being in the cross-section. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 45(3), 251–278.

McIntyre, K. P., & Eisenstadt, D. (2011). Social comparison as a self-regulatory measuring stick. *Self and Identity*, 10(2), 137–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298861003676529>

Michalos, A. C. (1985). Multiple discrepancies theory (MDT). *Social Indicators Research*, 16(4), 347–413. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00333288>

- *Mishra, V., Nielsen, I., & Smyth, R. (2012). How Does Relative Income and Variations in Short-Run Wellbeing Affect Wellbeing in the Long Run? Empirical Evidence From China's Korean Minority. *Social Indicators Research*, 115(1), 67–91.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0209-3>
- *Møller, V., & Saris, W. E. (2001). The Relationship between Subjective Well-Being and Domain Satisfaction in South Africa. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(1), 97–114.
- Møller, V., & Schlemmer, L. (1983). Quality of life in South Africa: Towards an instrument for the assessment of quality of life and basic needs. *Social Indicators Research*, 12(3), 225–279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00319805>
- Muthén, L.K., Muthén, B.O. (2012). *MPlus statistical analysis with latent variables: User's guide*, 7th ed. Muthén & Muthén, Los Angeles, CA.
- Narayan, A, R Van der Weide, A Cojocaru, C Lakner, S Redaelli, D Mahler, R Ramasubbaiah, and S Thewissen (2018), Fair Progress?: Economic Mobility Across Generations Around the World, *Equity and Development*, Washington DC: World Bank.
- *Ng, W., & Diener, E. (2014). What matters to the rich and the poor? Subjective well-being, financial satisfaction, and postmaterialist needs across the world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(2), 326–338. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0036856>
- Nikolaev, B., & Burns, A. (2014). Intergenerational mobility and subjective well-being—Evidence from the general social survey. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 53, 82–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2014.08.005>
- Norton, M. I. (2013). All ranks are local: Why humans are both (painfully) aware and (surprisingly) unaware of their lot in life. *Psychological Inquiry*, 24, 124–125.

- *O'Connor, B. P., & Vallerand, R. J. (1998). Psychological adjustment variables as predictors of mortality among nursing home residents. *Psychology and Aging, 13*(3), 368–374.
- Oishi, S., Kesebir, S., & Diener, E. (2011). Income inequality and happiness. *Psychological Science, 22*(9), 1095–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417262>
- *Oishi, S., Kimura, R., Hayashi, H., Tatsuki, S., Tamura, K., Ishii, K., & Tucker, J. (2015). Psychological adaptation to the Great Hanshin-Awaji Earthquake of 1995: 16 years later victims still report lower levels of subjective well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality, 55*, 84–90. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2015.02.001>
- Operario, Adler, N. E., & Williams, D. R. (2004). Subjective Social Status: Reliability and Predictive Utility for Global Health. *Psychology and Health, 19*(2), 237–246.
- *Oshio, T., Nozaki, K., & Kobayashi, M. (2010). Relative Income and Happiness in Asia: Evidence from Nationwide Surveys in China, Japan, and Korea. *Social Indicators Research, 104*(3), 351–367. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9754-9>
- *Oshio, T., Umeda, M., & Kawakami, N. (2012). Childhood Adversity and Adulthood Subjective Well-Being: Evidence from Japan. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 14*(3), 843–860. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-012-9358-y>
- *Oshio, T., & Urakawa, K. (2013). The Association Between Perceived Income Inequality and Subjective Well-being: Evidence from a Social Survey in Japan. *Social Indicators Research, 116*(3), 755–770. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0323-x>
- Pattillo, M. (1999). *Black picket fences: Privilege and peril among the black middle class*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- *Park, M., Kim, J., & Park, B. (2014). The effects of health on the life satisfaction of poor and nonpoor older women in Korea. *Health Care for Women International*, 35(11-12), 1287–1302. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07399332.2014.888064>
- *Pavlova, M. K., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2012). Age, cumulative (dis)advantage, and subjective well-being in employed and unemployed Germans: a moderated mediation model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(1), 93–104. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0026426>
- Piff, P. K., Stancato, D. M., Côté, S., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Keltner, D. (2012). Higher social class predicts increased unethical behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(11), 4086–4091. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1118373109>
- Pinquart, M., & Sörensen, S. (2000). Influences of socioeconomic status, social network, and competence on subjective well-being in later life: a meta-analysis. *Psychology and Aging*, 15(2), 187–224.
- Pickett, K. E., & Wilkinson, R. G. (2015). Income inequality and health: a causal review. *Social Science & Medicine (1982)*, 128, 316–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.12.031>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- *Morris, D. C. (1997). Health, Finances, Religious Involvement, and Life Satisfaction of Older Adults. *Journal of Religious Gerontology*, 10(2), 3–17. http://doi.org/10.1300/J078V10N02_02

- *Rankin, L. E., Jost, J. T., & Waksalak, C. J. (2009). System Justification and the Meaning of Life: Are the Existential Benefits of Ideology Distributed Unequally Across Racial Groups? *Social Justice Research*, 22(2-3), 312–333. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-009-0100-9>
- Reeves, R. V. (2017). *Dream hoarders: How the American middle class is leaving everyone else in the dust, why that is a problem, and what to do about it*. New York: Brookings.
- *Reitzel, L. R., Buchanan, T. S., Nguyen, N., & Ahluwalia, J. S. (2014). Associations of subjective social status with nondaily and daily smoking. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 38(2), 245–253. <http://doi.org/10.5993/AJHB.38.2.10>
- *Requena, F. (1995). Friendship and subjective well-being in Spain: A cross-national comparison with the United States. *Social Indicators Research*, 35(3), 271–288. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF01079161>
- *Riddick, C. C. (1985). Life satisfaction determinants of older males and females. *Leisure Sciences*, 7(1), 47–63. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01490408509512107>
- Rojas, M. (2004). *Well-being and the complexity of poverty: A subjective well-being approach* (No. 2004/29). Research Paper, UNU-WIDER, United Nations University (UNU). Retrieved from <http://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/63558>
- Rözer, J., & Kraaykamp, G. (2012). Income Inequality and Subjective Well-being: A Cross-National Study on the Conditional Effects of Individual and National Characteristics. *Social Indicators Research*, 113(3), 1009–1023. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0124-7>
- *Rubin, M., & Kelly, B. M. (2015). A cross-sectional investigation of parenting style and friendship as mediators of the relation between social class and mental health in a

university community. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 14.

<http://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-015-0227-2>

*Sandman, N., Valli, K., Kronholm, E., Revonsuo, A., Laatikainen, T., & Paunio, T. (2015).

Nightmares: risk factors among the Finnish general adult population. *Sleep*, 38(4), 507–

514. <http://doi.org/10.5665/sleep.4560>

*Sani, F., Magrin, M. E., Scignaro, M., & McCollum, R. (2010). In-group identification

mediates the effects of subjective in-group status on mental health. *The British Journal of Social Psychology / the British Psychological Society*, 49(Pt 4), 883–893.

<http://doi.org/10.1348/014466610X517414>

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (2015). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schyns, P. (1998). Cross-national Differences in Happiness: Economic and Cultural Factors Explored. *Social Indicators Research*, 43(1-2), 3–26.

<http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006814424293>

*Selim, S. (2007). Life Satisfaction and Happiness in Turkey. *Social Indicators Research*, 88(3), 531–562. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9218-z>

Senik, C. (2004). When information dominates comparison: Learning from Russian subjective panel data. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(9), 2099–2123.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727\(03\)00066-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(03)00066-5)

Shariff, A. F., Wiwad, D., & Akin, L. B. (2016). Income mobility breeds tolerance for income inequality: Cross-national and experimental evidence. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616635596>

- *Silver, R. C. & Holman, E. A. Coping with Community-based Traumatic Events: The Columbine High School Shootings and the 9/11 Terrorist Attacks." National Science Foundation, 8/99 - 7/03.
- *Singapore survey results. (2016, February 12). Retrieved from https://www.reddit.com/r/singapore/comments/45e8lo/rsingapore_survey_results/
- *Singh-Manoux, A., Adler, N. E., & Marmot, M. G. (2003). Subjective social status: its determinants and its association with measures of ill-health in the Whitehall II study. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 56(6), 1321–1333.
- Singh-Manoux, A., Marmot, M. G., & Adler, N. E. (2005). Does subjective social status predict health and change in health status better than objective status? *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 67(6), 855–861. <http://doi.org/10.1097/01.psy.0000188434.52941.a0>
- *Sivis-Cetinkaya, R. (2013). Turkish College Students' Subjective Wellbeing in Regard to Psychological Strengths and Demographic Variables: Implications for College Counseling. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 35(4), 317–330. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-013-9185-9>
- *Smith, Tom W, Peter Marsden, Michael Hout, and Jibum Kim. *General Social Surveys, 1972-2014* [machine-readable data file] /Principal Investigator, Tom W. Smith; Co-Principal Investigator, Peter V. Marsden; Co-Principal Investigator, Michael Hout; Sponsored by National Science Foundation. --NORC ed.-- Chicago: NORC at the University of Chicago [producer]; Storrs, CT: The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut [distributor], 2015.
- Starmans, C., Sheskin, M., & Bloom, P. (2017). Why people prefer unequal societies. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(4), 0082. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0082>

- *Steverink, N., & Lindenberg, S. (2006a). Which social needs are important for subjective well-being? What happens to them with aging? *Psychology and Aging*, 21(2), 281–290.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.21.2.281>
- *Steverink, N., & Lindenberg, S. (2006b). Which social needs are important for subjective well-being? What happens to them with aging? *Psychology and Aging*, 21(2), 281–290.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.21.2.281>
- Stutzer, A. (2004). The role of income aspirations in individual happiness. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 54(1), 89–109. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2003.04.003>
- *Suhail, K., & Chaudhry, H. R. (2004). Predictors of Subjective Well-Being in an Eastern Muslim Culture. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 23(3), 359–376.
<http://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.23.3.359.35451>
- *Sulimani-Aidan, Y., & Rimmerman, A. (2015). Beyond medical diagnosis: Factors contributing to life satisfaction of women with epilepsy in Israel. *Epilepsy & Behavior: E&B*, 45, 110–117. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2015.02.042>
- *Tan, J. J. X., Kraus, M. W., Impett, E. A., & Keltner, D. (2019). Partner commitment in close relationships mitigates social class differences in subjective well-being. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 11(1), 16-25.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1948550619837006>
- *Taylor, R. J., Chatters, L. M., Hardison, C. B., & Riley, A. (2001). Informal Social Support Networks and Subjective Well-Being among African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 27(4), 439–463. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0095798401027004004>
- *Thoits, P. A., & Hewitt, L. N. (2001). Volunteer work and well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 42(2), 115–131.

*Varnum, M. E. W. (2013). What Are Lay Theories of Social Class? *PLOS ONE*, 8(7), e70589.

<http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0070589>

Veenhoven, R. (1988). The utility of happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, 20(4), 333–354.

<http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00302332>

Veenhoven, R. (1991). Is happiness relative? *Social Indicators Research*, 24(1), 1–34.

<http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00292648>

Veenhoven, R. (2005). Return of Inequality in Modern Society? Test by Dispersion of Life-Satisfaction Across Time and Nations. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6(4), 457–487.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-005-8858-4>

*Vera-Villarreal, P., Celis-Atenas, K., Vez, P. P., Lillo, S., Bello, F., Diaz, N., & López, W.

(2012). Money, age and happiness: Association of Subjective wellbeing with socio-demographic variables. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 44, 155-163.

Vevea, J. L. & Woods, C. M. (2005). Publication bias in research synthesis: Sensitivity analysis using a priori weight functions. *Psychological Methods*, 10, 428-443. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.10.4.428

Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36(3), 1-48. URL: <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v36/i03/>

*Wang, J., & Xie, Y. (2015). Feeling good about the iron rice bowl: Economic sector and happiness in post-reform urban China. *Social Science Research*, 53, 203–217.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.05.008>

*Weaver, C. N. (2003). Happiness of Mexican Americans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 25(3), 275–294. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0739986303256905>

- *Westerhof, G. J., & Barrett, A. E. (2005). Age identity and subjective well-being: a comparison of the United States and Germany. *The Journals of Gerontology. Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 60(3), S129–136.
- Winters, J. V., & Li, Y. (2017). Urbanisation, natural amenities and subjective well-being: Evidence from US counties. *Urban Studies*, 54(8), 1956–1973.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098016631918>
- Wirtz, D., & Scollon, C. N. (2012). Culture, Visual Perspective, and the Effect of Material Success on Perceived Life Quality. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 43(3), 367–372. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111432292>
- Witter, R. A., Okun, M. A., Stock, W. A., & Haring, M. J. (1984). Education and Subjective Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6(2), 165–173. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1163911>
- *Wolbring, T., Keuschnigg, M., & Negele, E. (2011). Needs, Comparisons, and Adaptation: The Importance of Relative Income for Life Satisfaction. *European Sociological Review*, jcr042. <http://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcr042>
- *Zagefka, H., & Brown, R. (2005). Comparisons and Perceived Deprivation in Ethnic Minority Settings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(4), 467–482.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271711>
- Zavisca, J., & Hout, M. (2005). Does Money Buy Happiness in Unhappy Russia? *Berkeley Program in Eurasian and East European Studies*. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4j19w9f4>
- *Zhao, W. (2012). Economic inequality, status perceptions, and subjective well-being in

China's transitional economy. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 30(4), 433–450. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2012.07.001>

*Zhou, M. J., & Zhang, J. X. (2007). Rural inhabitants subjective well-being and its influence factors. *Chinese Mental Health Journal*, 21, 783-786.

Table 1. Effect sizes, sample sizes and moderator codes for each sample in the meta-analysis

Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES- SUBJSES	Income- SWB	Education- SWB	Objective SES- SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES- SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Chindarkar (2014)	Latin America	80271											0.08	0.08			
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Albania	985	20	3110				0.44	0.73	114.18	0.38		0.24	0.24	0.44	0.41	0.41
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Albania	998	20	4780	31.70			0.41	0.67	111.35	0.39		0.18	0.18	0.31	0.43	0.31
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Algeria	1264		8640						13.38	0.24		0.05	0.05	0.15	0.31	0.21
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Algeria	1165		14010						16.34	0.15		0.04	0.04	0.17	0.20	0.13
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Andorra	1003								167.80	0.21		0.07	0.07	0.15	0.16	0.10
Stack & Eshleman	Argentina	898	46					0.55	0.51	10.87						0.08	0.00
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Argentina	1075	46	10040	48.90			0.58	0.60	12.73	0.47		0.07	0.07	0.10	0.10	0.10
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Argentina	1002	46	14830	46.60			0.46	0.61	14.36	0.37		0.06	0.06		0.11	0.11
Suh et al. (1998)	Argentina	752	46	7960	46.80			0.55	0.51	12.09					0.12	0.07	0.10
ISSP 2007	Argentina	1332	46	16550	46.30			0.46	0.61	14.50	0.34	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.13		0.13
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Argentina	1269	46	11570	49.80			0.58	0.60	13.33	0.43		0.05	0.05	0.13	0.11	0.13
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Argentina	1019	46	19930	41.00			0.42	0.60	15.42	0.22		0.01	0.01	0.18	0.17	0.17
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Armenia	1989		1960				0.33	0.51	110.05	0.09		0.06	0.06	0.18	0.34	0.20
Abott & Sapsford (2006)	Armenia	2000		2700	35.40					107.15		0.29	0.18	0.23			
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Armenia	1094		7270	29.40			0.40	0.34	101.04	0.22		0.14	0.14	0.36	0.25	0.30
Stack & Eshleman	Australia	849	90	31.30			1.86	0.39	0.55	1.94					0.08		0.00
Marks & Fleming (1999)	Australia	1322	90									0.03		0.03			
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Australia	2008	90	20170	32.60		1.94	0.25	0.66	2.35	0.34		0.01	0.01	0.10	0.10	0.10
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Australia	1411	90	31360				0.25	0.66	2.66	0.36		0.08	0.08	0.16	0.20	0.13
Boyce et al. (2012)	Australia	8625	90	31360				0.24	0.65	2.66		0.06		0.06			
Rubin & Kelley (2015)	Australia	373	90										0.08	0.08		0.21	0.21
ISSP 1998	Australia	1075	90	23430				0.39	0.55	2.44	0.32	0.02	-0.07	-0.03		0.04	0.04
ISSP 2007	Australia	2342	90	34930				0.25	0.66	2.71	0.27	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.11		0.11
ISSP 2011	Australia	1329	90	40280				0.25	0.66	2.91	0.16	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.23		0.23
ISSP 2008	Australia	1450	90	35930	35.40		1.99	0.25	0.66	2.77	0.24	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.24		0.24
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES- SUBJSES	Income- SWB	Education- SWB	Objective SES- SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES- SWB	Subjective SES-SWB

98

ISSP 2002	Australia	1216	90	27940				0.25	0.66	2.56	0.29	0.00	-0.03	-0.01	0.23		0.23
ISSP 1991 Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Australia	2135	90	17070				0.39	0.55	2.25	0.31	-0.02	-0.04	-0.03	0.11		0.11
Correa-Velez et al. (2010)	Australia	1418	90	41520	32.60	4.40	2.00	0.24	0.65	2.96	0.35		0.07	0.07	0.22	0.20	0.22
Correa-Velez et al. (2010)	Australia	95	90							2.66					0.08		0.08
Correa-Velez et al. (2010)	Australia	76	90							2.69					0.17		0.17
Correa-Velez et al. (2010)	Australia	89	90							2.62					0.07		0.07
ISSP 1998	Austria	956	55	26510				0.48	0.39	96.60	0.31	0.09	0.10	0.10		0.09	0.09
ISSP 2007	Austria	1020	55	39350	30.60	3.60	1.80	0.51	0.45	100.46	0.25	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.14		0.14
ISSP 2008	Austria	994	55	41660	30.40	3.40	1.80	0.51	0.45	100.77	0.25	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.31		0.31
ISSP 2002	Austria	2011	55	31000				0.45	0.43	97.87	0.31	0.28	0.11	0.19	0.32		0.32
ISSP 1991 Ball & Chernova (2008)	Austria	862	55	20570				0.48	0.39	93.91	0.36	0.12	0.09	0.11	0.10		0.10
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Azerbaijan	1963		2730				0.14	0.35	94.19	0.16		0.00	0.00	0.17	0.21	0.19
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Azerbaijan	1002		14680				0.24	0.22	110.98	0.20		0.12	0.12	0.06	0.19	0.13
Camfield et al. (2009)	Bangladesh	1497	20	1160						903.82	0.46		0.18	0.18	0.24	0.26	0.22
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Bangladesh	275	20	1710						1052.37			0.12	0.12			
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Bangladesh	1459	20	1530						1017.73	0.41		0.18	0.18	0.35	0.28	0.33
Abott & Sapsford (2006)	Belarus	1969		4190				0.23	0.60	50.09	0.27		0.14	0.14	0.20	0.27	0.22
Suh et al. (1998) Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Belarus	2000		6460	30.60					48.95		0.28	0.13	0.20			
	Belarus	997		5430				0.23	0.60	50.23					0.07		0.07
	Belarus	1531		16820	27.20			0.21	0.55	46.69	0.15		0.02	0.02	0.37	0.23	0.30
ISSP 2007	Belgium	1088	75	37360	29.20	3.30	1.70	0.47	0.73	350.92	0.30	0.03	-0.05	-0.01	0.03		0.03
ISSP 2011	Belgium	2235	75	41700	28.10	3.40	1.70	0.36	0.74	364.54	0.38	0.18	0.13	0.16	0.33		0.33
ISSP 2008	Belgium	1103	75	39030	28.40	3.40	1.70	0.47	0.73	353.70	0.20	0.19	0.08	0.14	0.19		0.19
ISSP 2002 Ball & Chernova (2008)	Belgium	1117	75	30990				0.47	0.73	341.24	0.20	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.13		0.13
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Bosnia	793		2180				0.59	0.63	73.52	0.34		0.11	0.11	0.22	0.21	0.22
	Bosnia	1169		5200				0.41	0.67	73.35	0.35		0.18	0.18	0.33	0.28	0.30
Islam et al. (2009) Ball & Chernova (2008)	Brazil	576	38	12300	54.90					22.75	0.46	0.19		0.19		0.30	0.30
	Brazil	1139	38	8320	59.80			0.66	0.73	20.01	0.28		-0.02	-0.02	0.07	0.14	0.10
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES- SUBJSES	Income- SWB	Education- SWB	Objective SES- SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES- SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Bedin & Sarriera (2015)	Brazil	487	38													0.24	0.24

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

Bedin & Sarriera (2015)	Brazil	487	38													0.31	0.3
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Brazil	1500	38	11370	55.60	10.40	3.40	0.66	0.73	22.51	0.27		-0.02	-0.02	0.13	0.14	0.12
ISSP 2002 Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Brazil	1756	38	9260	58.10			0.66	0.73	21.48		0.02	0.06	0.04			
Suh et al. (1998)	Brazil	1668	38	6760				0.57	0.79	24.26	0.30		0.04	0.04	0.08	0.13	0.10
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Brazil							0.85	0.66	18.14	0.43		-0.07	-0.07	-0.03	0.02	-0.0
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Bulgaria	1057	30	5520				0.53	0.75	75.13	0.49		0.26	0.26	0.33	0.34	0.33
ISSP 1998	Bulgaria	1001	30	11030	35.70			0.53	0.75	69.97	0.47		0.23	0.23	0.38	0.32	0.33
ISSP 2007	Bulgaria	1023	30	6020				0.59	0.71	74.63	0.46	0.13	0.13	0.13		0.20	0.20
ISSP 2011	Bulgaria	981	30	11870	36.10			0.53	0.75	69.47	0.16	0.14	0.05	0.10	0.11		0.1
ISSP 2002	Bulgaria	976	30	15180	34.30			0.53	0.75	67.69	0.43	0.34	0.22	0.28	0.43		0.43
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Bulgaria	923	30	7890				0.53	0.75	72.03	0.31	0.26	0.20	0.23			
O'Connor & Vallerand (1998)	Burkina Faso	1518	15	1260						52.09	0.38		0.10	0.10	0.28	0.24	0.20
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Canada	129	80	19520		3.90	1.90			3.05		0.10	-0.10	0.00			
ISSP 1998	Canada	2164	80	37500		4.30	1.90	0.24	0.84	3.58	0.35		0.04	0.04	0.19	0.11	0.13
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Canada	900	80	25430	33.20	4.10	1.90	0.24	0.84	3.32	0.41	0.16	0.04	0.10		0.21	0.2
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Canada	1865	80	28590	33.30	4.10	1.90	0.24	0.84	3.37	0.36		0.01	0.01	0.15	0.13	0.14
Vera-Villarroel et al. (2012)	Chile	934	23	7750	54.90			0.60	0.70	19.62	0.40		0.06	0.06	0.23	0.18	0.2
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Chile	520	23										0.03	0.03			
Suh et al. (1998)	Chile	1000	23	13840	48.20			0.60	0.70	22.00	0.53		0.16	0.16	0.25	0.26	0.23
ISSP 1998	Chile	1467	23	4270	57.20			0.60	0.70	17.85					0.06	0.07	0.07
ISSP 2007	Chile	1327	23	8790	55.50			0.60	0.70	20.14	0.48	0.20	0.19	0.19		0.22	0.23
ISSP 2011	Chile	1172	23	15050				0.50	0.78	22.23	0.41	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.22		0.23
ISSP 2008	Chile	1103	23	19110	47.60	7.60	3.00	0.50	0.78	23.18	0.49	0.22	0.18	0.20	0.27		0.23
ISSP 2002	Chile	1063	23	15220				0.50	0.78	22.47	0.43	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.30		0.30
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Chile	1293	23	9930				0.60	0.70	21.09	0.42	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.19		0.19
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Chile	1190	23	9220	52.80			0.60	0.70	20.63	0.51		0.14	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.10
	Chile	988	23	20490				0.50	0.78	23.40	0.42		0.15	0.15	0.16	0.13	0.14

Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Inglehart et al. (2014)	China	1991	20	6860				0.46	0.61	140.38	0.17		0.12	0.12	0.31	0.28	0.30
Oshio et al. (2011)	China	3208	20	5860				0.46	0.61	139.65	0.26	0.13	0.16	0.14	0.27		0.23

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

100

Ball & Chernova (2008)	China	1495	20	1840				0.52	0.66	128.34	0.09		0.09	0.09	0.33	0.31	0.33
Wang & Xie (2015)	China	2229	20	3930				0.46	0.61	137.24		0.16	0.17	0.17		0.31	0.33
Wang & Xie (2015)	China	1535	20	7660	42.90			0.60	0.57	141.10		0.06	0.21	0.14			
Liang & Wang (2014)	China	10372	20	5050	41.00			0.46	0.61	138.87	0.18	0.13		0.13		0.34	0.33
Guo (2014)	China	1203	20	8340						141.80		0.21		0.21			
Mishra et al. (2012)	China	730	20									-0.01	-0.03	-0.02			
Suh et al. (1998)	China	977	20	990	32.30			0.52	0.49	120.92					0.08	0.08	0.08
Zhou & Zhang (2007)	China	1308	20									0.17		0.17			
Tang et al. (2006)	China	238	20									0.07	-0.05	0.01			
ISSP 2011	China	4971	20	10260	42.40	23.00	2.90	0.46	0.61	143.17	0.13	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.35		0.33
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	China	991	20	3180				0.46	0.61	135.47	0.24		0.00	0.00	0.19	0.34	0.20
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	China	2029	20	12260	39.70			0.60	0.57	144.58	0.24		0.08	0.08	0.19	0.20	0.19
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Colombia	2895	13	6620				0.82	0.66	34.00	0.41		0.01	0.01	0.06	0.03	0.03
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Colombia	2988	13	6650				0.82	0.66	34.58	0.45		0.05	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.07
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Colombia	3025	13	8110	53.70			0.82	0.66	38.44	0.42		0.00	0.00	0.08		0.08
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Colombia	1496	13	11760	52.70			0.68	0.71	41.53	0.33		0.06	0.06	0.13	0.06	0.09
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Croatia	1185	33	8650				0.51	0.74	81.41					0.27	0.24	0.23
ISSP 2007	Croatia	1068	33	18950				0.48	0.70	77.02	0.32	0.11	0.17	0.14	0.15		0.13
ISSP 2011	Croatia	1130	33	20190	32.30			0.48	0.70	76.49	0.32	0.20	0.12	0.16	0.35		0.33
ISSP 2008	Croatia	1128	33	20270				0.48	0.70	77.01	0.30	0.23	0.14	0.19	0.29		0.29
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Cyprus	1050		28320				0.38	0.89	113.15	0.39		0.12	0.12	0.25	0.11	0.13
ISSP 1998	Cyprus	857		19320				0.46	0.78	98.34	0.45	0.09	0.08	0.09		0.03	0.03
ISSP 2007	Cyprus	984		30750	31.10			0.38	0.89	115.12	0.55	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.14		0.13
ISSP 2008	Cyprus	848		34110	31.70			0.38	0.89	117.05	0.43	0.08	0.12	0.10	0.11		0.13
ISSP 2002	Cyprus	864		22340				0.38	0.89	105.73	0.70	0.16	0.12	0.14	0.18		0.13
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Cyprus	996		33140	32.60			0.38	0.89	121.74	0.34		0.13	0.13	0.23	0.13	0.13

Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Czech Republic	938	58	14710				0.51	0.21	133.23	0.41		0.18	0.18	0.22	0.27	0.23
Suh et al. (1998)	Czech Republic	921	58					0.47	0.24	133.41					0.10		0.10
ISSP 1998	Czech Republic	745	58	14710				0.51	0.21	133.23	0.42	0.14	0.04	0.09		0.03	0.03

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

ISSP 2007	Czech Republic	701	58	24460	26.00	3.00	1.80	0.51	0.21	133.32		0.05	-0.01	0.02		
ISSP 2011	Czech Republic	1707	58	26620	26.40	3.00	1.80	0.42	0.19	135.89	0.40	0.18	0.11	0.15	0.29	0.29
ISSP 2008	Czech Republic	1083	58	26040	26.30	2.90	1.70	0.51	0.21	134.43	0.47	0.21	0.19	0.20	0.35	0.35
ISSP 2002	Czech Republic	1151	58	17560				0.51	0.21	131.97	0.40	0.19	0.10	0.15	0.25	0.25
ISSP 1998	Denmark	946						0.59	0.60	125.01	0.38	0.07	0.01	0.04	0.09	0.09
ISSP 2011	Denmark	1357	74	45340	27.30	2.90	1.60	0.38	0.66	131.29	0.31	0.15	0.04	0.09	0.26	0.26
ISSP 2008	Denmark	1810	74	41740	25.20			0.44	0.69	129.48	0.34	0.11	0.03	0.07	0.12	0.12
ISSP 2002	Denmark	1282	74	30260				0.44	0.69	126.70	0.28	0.06	-0.04	0.01	0.13	0.13
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Dominican Republic	404	30	4910	47.40					164.62	0.32		0.03	0.03	0.12	0.12
ISSP 2007	Dominican Republic	2003	30	9360	48.90					193.31	0.33	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.12	0.12
ISSP 2008	Dominican Republic	1902	30	9860	48.10					195.78	0.39	0.13	0.17	0.15	0.13	0.13
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Ecuador	1202	8	10870	46.90			0.65	0.62	63.25	0.30		0.14	0.14	0.10	0.13
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Egypt	2996	25	6240				0.87	0.53	70.47	0.39		0.00	0.00	-0.04	-0.05
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Egypt	3051						0.87	0.53	80.00	0.36		0.10	0.10	0.37	0.30
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Egypt	1523	25	9940	29.80			0.60	0.70	86.82	0.36		0.01	0.01	0.16	0.15
Ball & Chernova (2008)	El Salvador	1227	19	4240	52.20					282.09	0.57		0.14	0.14	0.19	0.13
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Estonia	1020	60					0.27	0.79	33.40	0.34		0.16	0.16	0.32	0.35
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Estonia	1528	60	23310	32.50			0.33	0.63	31.32	0.34		0.19	0.19	0.41	0.32
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Ethiopia	1500	20	810				0.88	0.20	80.67	0.38		0.15	0.15	0.43	0.34
European countries		1371									0.30	0.14		0.14	0.43	0.43
Elgar et al. (2015)	Finland	981	63	19610		2.70	1.60	0.35	0.82	16.82	0.32		0.08	0.08	0.16	0.20
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Finland	13314	63									0.23	0.09	0.16		
Sandman et al. (2015)	Finland															

Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Finland	1014	63	32130		3.10	1.70	0.35	0.82	17.22	0.42		0.16	0.16	0.23	0.21	0.21
ISSP 2007	Finland	1287	63	37820	28.30	3.20	1.70	0.28	0.81	17.39	0.27	0.00	-0.03	-0.01	-0.01		-0.01
ISSP 2011	Finland	1287	63	40870	27.60	3.20	1.70	0.28	0.81	17.73	0.23	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.24		0.24
ISSP 2008	Finland	918	63	40040	27.80	3.20	1.70	0.28	0.81	17.48	0.26	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.19		0.19
ISSP 2002	Finland	1015	63	28650		3.00	1.70	0.35	0.82	17.07		0.06	0.11	0.09			

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	France	1001	71	33080	29.70			0.47	0.68	116.19	0.34		0.19	0.19	0.24		0.24
ISSP 1998	France	937	71	23660				0.47	0.68	109.92	0.47	0.02	0.02	0.02		0.09	0.09
ISSP 2007	France	1856	71	34770	32.40			0.47	0.68	116.91	0.40	0.01	-0.08	-0.04	0.07		0.07
ISSP 2011	France	2325	71	38440	33.30			0.47	0.68	119.34	0.27	0.11	0.20	0.15	0.29		0.29
ISSP 2008	France	2080	71	35860	33.00			0.47	0.68	117.57	0.39	0.24	0.18	0.21	0.20		0.20
ISSP 2002	France	1544	71	28820				0.47	0.68	112.87		0.20	0.12	0.16			
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Georgia	1500		6250	38.20			0.40	0.65	66.74	0.19		0.11	0.11	0.44	0.24	0.34
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Georgia	1997		1950	37.10			0.37	0.70	78.58	0.11		0.04	0.04	0.23	0.25	0.24
Abott & Sapsford (2006)	Georgia	2022		3080	39.60					70.23		0.35	0.16	0.25			
World Values Survey (Wave 6)	Georgia	1200		9180	37.60			0.40	0.65	65.07	0.24		0.15	0.15	0.41	0.32	0.37
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Germany	2000	67	24570				0.37	0.37	235.02	0.18		0.07	0.07	0.03	0.22	0.12
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	11557	67					0.45	0.34	223.01		0.10	0.07	0.09			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	10463	67					0.37	0.37	222.51		0.10	0.05	0.08			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	10067	67					0.37	0.37	222.61		0.07	0.05	0.06			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	9936	67					0.37	0.37	222.95		0.07	0.05	0.06			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	9469	67					0.37	0.37	223.83		0.09	0.04	0.06			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	9165	67					0.37	0.37	225.56		0.09	0.06	0.07			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	19687	67	37870	30.50			0.47	0.35	234.94		0.17	0.13	0.15			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	25322	67	39960	30.20			0.40	0.33	234.61		0.19	0.15	0.17			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	24815	67	43770	30.50	3.50	1.90	0.40	0.33	230.31		0.19	0.16	0.17			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	25344	67	44590		3.50	1.90	0.40	0.33	230.75		0.16	0.15	0.16			
Headey et al. (2014)	Germany	29339	67	46250	31.10	3.60	1.90	0.40	0.33	231.16		0.15	0.12	0.13			
Korner et al. (2012)	Germany	488	67	36990	31.30					235.94			0.18	0.18			
Korner et al. (2012)	Germany	386	67	38400	31.20	3.50	1.80			235.52			0.13	0.13			
Pavlova & Silbereisen (2012)	Germany	1382	67	32250	32.30			0.40	0.33	236.47		0.16		0.16			
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Pavlova & Silbereisen (2012)	Germany	254	67	34830	31.30			0.40	0.33	236.23		-0.05		-0.05			
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Germany	2064	67	34830	31.30			0.37	0.37	236.23	0.37		0.14	0.14	0.29	0.24	0.24
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	8978	67	19740				0.37	0.37	227.52		0.13		0.13			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	8868	67	21140	29.20			0.37	0.37	229.18		0.10	-0.05	0.03			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	12592	67	21860				0.37	0.37	230.93		0.19	-0.02	0.09			

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

103

Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	12413	67	21940				0.37	0.37	232.46		0.16	0.01	0.09			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	12628	67	22790	29.20			0.37	0.37	233.27		0.15	0.00	0.08			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	12969	67	23530	29.00			0.37	0.37	233.97		0.15	0.03	0.09			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	12757	67	24090				0.47	0.35	234.65		0.14	0.04	0.09			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	12537	67	24570				0.47	0.35	235.02		0.16	0.04	0.10			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	13847	67	25220	28.30			0.47	0.35	235.08		0.17	0.05	0.11			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	13337	67	26140				0.47	0.35	235.26		0.15	0.06	0.11			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	23266	67	27120	28.80			0.47	0.35	235.60		0.16	0.10	0.13			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	21156	67	28240	30.30			0.47	0.35	236.03		0.15	0.09	0.12			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	22624	67	28980	30.00			0.47	0.35	236.45		0.21	0.14	0.17			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	21395	67	29720	30.30			0.47	0.35	236.62		0.20	0.14	0.17			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	20864	67	32250	30.40			0.47	0.35	236.59		0.17	0.14	0.15			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	19972	67	32250	32.30			0.47	0.35	236.47		0.17	0.15	0.16			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	21110	67	34830	31.30			0.47	0.35	236.23		0.20	0.16	0.18			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	19771	67	36990	31.30			0.47	0.35	235.94		0.20	0.15	0.18			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	Germany	18647	67	38400	31.20	3.50	1.80	0.47	0.35	235.52		0.17	0.14	0.16			
Haase et al. (2008)	Germany	955	67	24090				0.40	0.33	234.65							
Haase et al. (2008)	Germany	600	67	32250	32.30			0.40	0.33	236.47			0.13	0.13			
Lang & Heckhausen (2001)	Germany	480	67	24570						235.02			0.12	0.12			
ISSP 2007	Germany	1641	67	36990	31.30			0.37	0.37	235.94	0.36	0.11	0.05	0.08	0.13	0.13	
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
ISSP 2011	Germany	1425	67	43770	30.50	3.50	1.90	0.47	0.35	230.31	0.31	0.22	0.07	0.14	0.28		0.29
ISSP 2008	Germany	1349	67	38400	31.20	3.50	1.80	0.37	0.37	235.52	0.32	0.22	0.10	0.16	0.26		0.29
ISSP 2002	Germany	897	67	28980	30.00			0.37	0.37	236.45	0.32	0.12	0.04	0.08	0.29		0.29
ISSP 1991	Germany	1196	67	21140	29.20			0.45	0.34	229.18	0.35	0.22	0.05	0.13	0.12		0.13
World Values Survey (Wave 6)	Germany	2025	67	46250	31.10	3.60	1.90	0.47	0.35	231.16	0.37		0.14	0.14	0.28	0.29	0.29
ISSP 1998	Germany (East)	801									0.29	0.08	0.03	0.06		0.13	0.13
ISSP 2002	Germany (East)	417									0.28	0.20	0.05	0.12	0.26		0.29

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

104

ISSP 1991	Germany (East)	1226									0.27	0.16	0.00	0.08	0.06		0.00
ISSP 1998	Germany (West)	1000	67	25220	28.30			0.37	0.37	235.08	0.40	0.07	-0.03	0.02		0.05	0.03
Addai et al. (2014)	Ghana	1534	15	2480				0.59	0.47	100.92	0.39		0.17	0.17	0.30	0.18	0.24
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Ghana	1552	15	3480	42.40			0.59	0.47	114.25	0.27		0.12	0.12	0.27	0.20	0.24
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Guatemala	1000	6	5280				0.93	0.39	119.42	0.35		0.04	0.04	0.11		0.11
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Hong Kong	1252	25	36650						6488.76	0.37		0.14	0.14	0.18	0.23	0.20
Lee (2009)	Hong Kong	109	25										0.04	0.04			
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Hong Kong	996	25	56930						6885.24	0.25		0.04	0.04	0.25	0.15	0.20
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Hungary	1007	80	19720	27.00	3.40	1.90	0.47	0.49	110.71	0.46		0.21	0.21	0.35	0.34	0.34
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Hungary	634	80	9880				0.46	0.55	114.33	0.51		0.18	0.18		0.32	0.33
Martos & Kopp (2011)	Hungary	4841	80	16160	34.70			0.46	0.55	112.57		0.19	0.19	0.19			0.33
ISSP 1998	Hungary	989	80	9880				0.54	0.67	114.33	0.41	0.20	0.23	0.21		0.18	0.13
ISSP 2007	Hungary	860	80	17780	27.90	3.10	1.70	0.47	0.49	112.22		0.24	0.21	0.23			
ISSP 2008	Hungary	803	80	19420	27.50			0.47	0.49	112.02	0.35	0.27	0.21	0.24	0.34		0.34
ISSP 2002	Hungary	854	80	13820				0.46	0.55	113.35	0.36	0.28	0.19	0.23	0.33		0.33
ISSP 1991	Hungary	928	80					0.54	0.67	115.43	0.41	0.13	0.18	0.16	0.19		0.19
Ball & Chernova (2008)	India	1906	48	1600				1.07	0.45	324.21	0.34		0.22	0.22	0.12	0.25	0.19
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	India	2001	48	3310				0.97	0.42	392.00	0.35		0.17	0.17	0.18	0.19	0.18
Biswas-Diener & Diener (2001)	India	83	48									0.45		0.45			
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	India	1971	48	2250				0.97	0.42	361.57	0.42		0.19	0.19	0.17	0.29	0.23
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	India	4010	48	4850	35.70	9.10	3.20	0.85	0.50	425.73	0.34		0.18	0.18	0.26	0.23	0.23
Suh et al. (1998)	India	846	48	1220				1.07	0.45	293.72	0.40		0.10	0.10	0.15	0.09	0.13
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Indonesia	2015	14	6260	34.20			0.76	0.47	126.59	0.32		0.09	0.09	0.22	0.15	0.19
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Indonesia	983	14	4650	29.00			0.71	0.35	118.37	0.28		0.12	0.12	0.31	0.17	0.24
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Iran	2667	41	16550						43.80	0.29		0.05	0.05	0.25	0.25	0.23
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Iran	2403	41	10520						40.29	0.28		0.10	0.10	0.23	0.25	0.24
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Iraq	2701	30	10990				0.83	0.59	62.76	0.28		0.04	0.04	0.18	0.20	0.19
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Iraq	2307	30	9270				0.83	0.59	60.16	0.27		0.01	0.01	0.24	0.22	0.23

Word Values																	
Survey (Wave 6)	Iraq	1189	30	15970				0.68	0.55	76.38	0.37		0.18	0.18	0.44	0.38	0.44
ISSP 1998	Ireland	940	70	22480				0.38	0.77	50.56	0.38	0.09	0.08	0.08		0.09	0.09
ISSP 2007	Ireland	1849	70	40430	31.90	3.80	1.90	0.34	0.80	63.82	0.27	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.13		0.13
ISSP 2008	Ireland	1837	70	38350	30.90	3.70	1.90	0.34	0.80	64.90	0.27	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.15		0.13
ISSP 2002	Ireland	1203	70	29520				0.38	0.77	57.00		0.14	0.10	0.12			
ISSP 1991	Ireland	977	70	13420				0.49	0.64	40.90	0.39	0.14	0.08	0.11	0.16		0.16
Levin (2013)	Israel	1849	54	28290	42.60			0.30	0.82	352.29			0.13	0.13			
Amit & Litwin (2010)	Israel	930	54	24600						320.25		0.12	0.19	0.16			
Sulimani-Aidan & Rimmerman (2015)	Israel	70	54										0.26	0.26			
ISSP 1998	Israel	1203	54	21300				0.35	0.79	275.92	0.22	0.13	0.16	0.14		0.31	0.31
ISSP 2007	Israel	1275	54	27420	41.00			0.30	0.82	331.80	0.23	0.10	0.03	0.06	0.25		0.23
ISSP 2011	Israel	1125	54	30160		5.90	2.30	0.30	0.82	358.86	0.25	0.15	0.07	0.11	0.31		0.31
ISSP 2008	Israel	889	54	26880				0.30	0.82	337.75	0.22	0.26	0.10	0.18	0.18		0.18
ISSP 2002	Israel	893	54	24290				0.35	0.79	303.60	0.28	0.21	0.12	0.17	0.27		0.27
ISSP 1991	Israel	907	54	15470				0.35	0.79	228.70		0.20	0.07	0.13			
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Israel	1183	54	23870	38.90			0.35	0.79	297.55	0.31		0.14	0.14	0.24	0.20	0.23
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Italy	1012						0.60	0.82	197.08	0.45		0.09	0.09	0.18	0.23	0.23
ISSP 1998	Italy	999	76	24810				0.60	0.82	193.49	0.31	0.07	0.12	0.10		0.15	0.13
ISSP 2011	Italy	1007	76	36250	35.10	4.30	2.00	0.51	0.76	201.88		0.23	0.07	0.15			
ISSP 2008	Italy	1065	76	35080	33.80	4.20	2.00	0.60	0.82	200.00	0.13	0.06	0.21	0.14	0.30		0.30
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
ISSP 1991	Italy	861	76	19180				0.63	0.68	192.98	0.40	0.14	0.08	0.11	0.11		0.11
Curhan et al. (2015)	Japan	1027	46	32740	32.10			0.31	0.86	351.34			0.16	0.16	0.29		0.29
Stack & Eshleman	Japan	1021	46							321.09					0.07		0.07
Oshio et al. (2011)	Japan	2125						0.38	0.71	350.77	0.07	0.07		0.07		0.33	0.27
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Japan	837	46	23610				0.31	0.86	344.05					0.20	0.31	0.23
Oshio & Urakawa (2014)	Japan	10826						0.38	0.71	350.66		0.25	0.08	0.17			0.43
Oshio et al. (2012)	Japan	3292	46	35890				0.39	0.53	351.31		0.10	0.05	0.07			
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Japan	1096						0.31	0.86	350.54	0.25		0.07	0.07	0.22	0.40	0.33
Oishi et al. (2015)	Japan	1349	46	29380				0.38	0.84	350.39		0.25		0.25			
Oishi et al. (2015)	Japan	938	46	32350				0.38	0.84	350.54		0.15		0.15			
Oishi et al. (2015)	Japan	1305	46	36790				0.31	0.86	350.66		0.21		0.21			

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

Suh et al. (1998)	Japan	860	46	19710				0.38	0.84	338.83					0.17	0.01	0.09
ISSP 1998	Japan	1245	46	25380				0.31	0.86	346.78	0.28	0.04	0.04	0.04		0.11	0.10
ISSP 2007	Japan	1220	46	35540				0.31	0.86	351.17	0.26	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.03		0.03
ISSP 2011	Japan	1165	46	36790				0.38	0.71	350.66	0.30	0.19	0.08	0.13	0.35		0.33
ISSP 2008	Japan	1031	46	35710	32.10	5.20	2.00	0.31	0.86	351.34	0.20	0.18	0.08	0.13	0.24		0.24
ISSP 2002	Japan	1095	46	28560				0.31	0.86	349.64	0.20	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.32		0.33
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Japan	1273	46	27220				0.31	0.86	347.99	0.23		0.09	0.09	0.20	0.46	0.33
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Japan	2216	46	35890				0.31	0.86	351.31	0.23		0.04	0.04	0.19	0.34	0.27
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Jordan	1212	30					0.42	0.80	59.13	0.31		0.12	0.12	0.22	0.27	0.23
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Jordan	1200						0.42	0.80	70.89	0.30		0.02	0.02	0.05	0.20	0.13
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Jordan	1200	30					0.34	0.80	100.47	0.19		0.08	0.08	0.24	0.17	0.23
Abott & Sapsford (2006)	Kazakhstan	2000								5.50		0.37	0.18	0.27			
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Kazakhstan	1500						0.32	0.36	6.13	0.23		0.08	0.08	0.19	0.18	0.19
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Kuwait	1125	25	84080						207.12	0.12		0.12	0.12	0.18	0.23	0.20
Abott & Sapsford (2006)	Kyrgyz Republic	2000		1690	30.20					25.78		0.29	0.07	0.18			
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Kyrgyz Republic	1040		1850	28.70			0.21	0.56	26.30	0.29		-0.04	-0.04	0.11	0.15	0.13
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Kyrgyz Republic	1466		2610	27.80			0.25	0.41	28.75	0.18		0.04	0.04	0.17	0.06	0.10
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Latvia	1190	70	5830	31.60			0.14	0.75	39.51	0.27		0.15	0.15	0.25	0.28	0.27
ISSP 1998	Latvia	1130	70	7120				0.14	0.75	38.75	0.40	0.13	0.11	0.12		0.17	0.17
ISSP 2007	Latvia	1017	70	17590	37.50	6.10	2.30	0.28	0.69	35.38	0.27	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.14		0.14
ISSP 2008	Latvia	731	70	19180	37.20	5.80	2.20	0.28	0.69	35.01	0.31	0.28	0.16	0.22	0.46		0.40
ISSP 2002	Latvia	714	70	10090				0.14	0.75	37.14	0.36	0.26	0.11	0.18	0.34		0.33
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Lebanon	1185	40	13250						578.16	0.21		0.09	0.09	0.25	0.15	0.20
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Libya	2102	38	17110						3.62	0.19		-0.05	-0.05	0.19	0.16	0.17
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Lithuania	996	60	6940				0.18	0.79	57.04	0.35		0.18	0.18	0.24	0.35	0.30
ISSP 2011	Lithuania	1128	60	22020	32.50	4.50	2.10	0.15	0.70	48.32	0.43	0.38	0.23	0.31	0.47		0.47
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Macedonia	979		5360				0.65	0.62	79.12	0.34		0.05	0.05	0.15	0.21	0.13
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Macedonia	1052		5980				0.65	0.62	80.33	0.41		0.23	0.23	0.39	0.29	0.33
Howell et al. (2006)	Malaysia	307	26	13660				0.46	0.90	75.18		0.21	-0.02	0.10			

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Malaysia	1201	26	17120				0.36	0.83	79.75	0.13		-0.01	-0.01	0.15	0.02	0.09
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Malaysia	1300	26	22250				0.36	0.83	88.47	0.12		0.02	0.02	0.21	0.09	0.13
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Mali	1534		1640				0.97	0.10	11.19	0.29		0.14	0.14	0.35	0.30	0.33
Stack & Eshleman	Mexico	1523	30					0.73	0.44	35.70					0.07		0.07
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Mexico	1477	30	8770	48.20			0.64	0.73	47.92	0.43		0.08	0.08	0.19	0.17	0.13
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Mexico	1560	30	12390	48.90			0.64	0.73	54.53	0.53		0.07	0.07	0.11		0.13
Suh et al. (1998)	Mexico	1434	30	6280				0.70	0.63	43.18					0.13	0.17	0.13
ISSP 2007	Mexico	1588	30	14050				0.64	0.73	56.16	0.33	0.02	0.09	0.05	0.10		0.10
ISSP 2008	Mexico	1441	30	14710	44.60			0.64	0.73	57.01	0.27	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.20		0.20
ISSP 2002	Mexico	1241	30	10990	49.00			0.64	0.73	52.31	0.34	0.10	0.15	0.12	0.09		0.09
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Mexico	1497	30	10850	51.40			0.64	0.73	50.88	0.50		0.01	0.01	0.09	0.07	0.09
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Mexico	1998	30	16830	45.40	8.10	2.80	0.49	0.77	60.33	0.31		0.04	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.09
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Moldova	979		2290				0.24	0.86	127.50	0.27		0.19	0.19	0.19	0.27	0.23
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Moldova	1046		4320	35.40			0.21	0.78	124.80	0.30		0.20	0.20	0.67	0.44	0.50
Abott & Sapsford (2006)	Moldova	2000		2590	38.00					126.46		0.36	0.15	0.25			
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Moldova	978		2840	35.80			0.24	0.86	126.16	0.32		0.15	0.15	0.33	0.17	0.23
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Montenegro	1014		7110				0.56	0.62	45.16	0.43		0.20	0.20	0.36	0.41	0.33
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Montenegro	229						0.56	0.62	45.43	0.37		0.09	0.09	0.25	0.27	0.20
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Morocco	1143	46	3800				0.91	0.44	65.26	0.40		0.03	0.03	0.26	0.28	0.27
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Morocco	1200	46	5490				0.91	0.44	69.83	0.40		0.25	0.25	0.59	0.47	0.53
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Morocco	1172	46	6590				0.80	0.56	73.45	0.46		0.19	0.19	0.27	0.24	0.20
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Netherlands	1050	80	41290	30.00			0.29	0.73	484.19	0.32		0.08	0.08	0.20		0.20
Steverink & Lindenberg (2006)	Netherlands	883	80	33040						475.30			0.10	0.10			
Steverink & Lindenberg (2006)	Netherlands	439	80	33040						475.30							
ISSP 1998	Netherlands	1573	80	27630				0.51	0.70	465.26		0.09	-0.01	0.04			
ISSP 2011	Netherlands	1279	80	47250	27.70	3.20	1.80	0.51	0.70	495.05	0.45	0.27	0.14	0.20	0.30		0.30
ISSP 2008	Netherlands	1808	80	45110	29.30			0.51	0.70	487.13	0.46	0.21	0.10	0.15	0.25		0.23
ISSP 2002	Netherlands	1013	80	34350				0.51	0.70	478.35		0.13	0.01	0.07			

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

ISSP 1991 Word Values Survey (Wave 6) Ball & Chernova (2008)	Netherlands	1366	80	20060				0.52	0.69	446.38	0.47	0.10	-0.04	0.03	0.07		0.07
	Netherlands	1865	80	48080	27.60	3.20	1.80	0.51	0.70	496.89	0.46		0.03	0.03	0.23	0.17	0.20
	New Zealand	1067	79	18460				0.19	0.56	14.49	0.33		0.02	0.02	0.15	0.17	0.10
ISSP 1998	New Zealand	864	79	18460				0.26	0.53	14.49	0.36	0.02	0.05	0.03		0.08	0.00
ISSP 2007	New Zealand	899	79	27290				0.19	0.56	16.04	0.18	-0.01	-0.07	-0.04	0.11		0.10
ISSP 2008	New Zealand	912	79	27700				0.19	0.56	16.18	0.28	0.09	0.03	0.06	0.14		0.14
ISSP 2002	New Zealand	883	79	22130				0.19	0.56	15.00		0.10	0.04	0.07	0.15		0.13
ISSP 1991 Inglehart et al. (2014)	New Zealand	935	79	13590				0.26	0.53	13.27	0.37	0.11	0.01	0.06	0.16		0.10
Word Values Survey (Wave 6) Ball & Chernova (2008)	New Zealand	954	79	23670				0.19	0.56	15.52	0.31		-0.03	-0.03	0.13	0.15	0.14
	New Zealand	762	79	31250		4.20	2.10	0.19	0.56	16.65	0.36		0.00	0.00	0.09	0.22	0.10
	Nigeria	1821	30	2080				0.38	0.51	118.52	0.52		0.12	0.12	0.22	0.19	0.20
Suh et al. (1998) Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Nigeria	886	30	2060				0.51	0.43	104.54	0.31		-0.05	-0.05	0.20	-0.01	0.10
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Nigeria	2014	30	2230				0.38	0.51	134.26	0.34		0.14	0.14	0.24	0.21	0.23
	Nigeria	1759	30	5130				0.59	0.56	183.61	0.39		0.17	0.17	0.27	0.19	0.23
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES- SUBJSES	Income- SWB	Education- SWB	Objective SES- SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES- SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
ISSP 1998	Northern Ireland	811											-0.02	-0.02			
ISSP 2002	Northern Ireland	571										0.17	0.07	0.12			
ISSP 1991 Ball & Chernova (2008)	Northern Ireland	745										0.15	0.10	0.12			
	Norway	1037	69	26490				0.38	0.66	12.00	0.32		0.10	0.10	0.18	0.13	0.10
ISSP 1998	Norway	1344	69	27870				0.38	0.66	12.13	0.38	0.02	-0.04	-0.01		-0.02	-0.00
ISSP 2007	Norway	1014	69	55720	27.10			0.49	0.61	12.89	0.22	0.03	-0.04	0.00	0.06		0.00
ISSP 2011	Norway	1564	69	62730	25.30	3.00	1.60	0.49	0.61	13.56	0.28	0.13	0.09	0.11	0.28		0.23
ISSP 2008	Norway	921	69	61480	27.00	3.00	1.60	0.49	0.61	13.06	0.20	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.22		0.23
ISSP 2002	Norway	1303	69	38070				0.38	0.66	12.43	0.31	0.09	-0.01	0.04	0.18		0.13
ISSP 1991 Inglehart et al. (2014)	Norway	1282	69	18940				0.45	0.69	11.67	0.33	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.04		0.00
	Norway	1025	69	55720	27.10			0.49	0.61	12.89	0.34		0.09	0.09	0.21	0.17	0.19
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Pakistan	733	14	2510				0.98	0.26	170.01	0.56		0.16	0.16	0.25	0.27	0.20
Suhail & Chaudhry (2004)	Pakistan	973	14									0.24		0.24			
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Pakistan	1691	14	2710	30.40			0.97	0.33	189.37	0.60		0.27	0.27	0.30	0.25	0.27
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Pakistan	1200	14	4450				0.93	0.33	242.95	0.27		0.19	0.19	0.27	0.23	0.23

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

109

Word Values Survey (Wave 6) Ball & Chernova (2008)	Palestine	995									0.33		0.18	0.18	0.33	0.31	0.33
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Peru	1189	16	4500				0.70	0.73	19.34	0.36		0.11	0.11	0.08	0.14	0.11
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Peru	1500	16	6770	50.30			0.70	0.73	21.96	0.46		0.08	0.08	0.15	0.10	0.12
Word Values Survey (Wave 6) Ball & Chernova (2008)	Peru	1486	16	5110	51.30			0.70	0.73	20.94	0.36		0.05	0.05	0.17	0.16	0.10
	Peru	1182	16	10680	44.40			0.55	0.73	23.05	0.34		0.13	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.14
ISSP 1998	Philippines	1199	32	3180				0.33	0.61	239.47	0.34		0.12	0.12		0.15	0.13
ISSP 2007	Philippines	1117	32	3600				0.33	0.61	250.43	0.36	0.09	0.13	0.11		0.11	0.11
ISSP 2011	Philippines	1197	32	5710				0.25	0.69	299.85	0.24	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07		0.07
ISSP 2008	Philippines	1189	32	6820				0.25	0.69	320.52	0.24	0.08	0.03	0.05	0.02		0.02
ISSP 2008	Philippines	1139	32	5980				0.25	0.69	304.87	0.19	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.09		0.09
ISSP 2002	Philippines	1051	32	4230				0.25	0.69	272.88	0.19	0.08	0.03	0.05	0.17		0.17
ISSP 1991	Philippines	1199	32	2600				0.33	0.61	212.81	0.39		0.11	0.11	0.10		0.10
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES- SUBJSES	Income- SWB	Education- SWB	Objective SES- SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES- SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Philippines	1199	32	4090				0.25	0.69	267.21	0.31		0.04	0.04	0.27	0.10	0.19
Word Values Survey (Wave 6) Ball & Chernova (2008)	Philippines	1200	32	7330	42.20			0.25	0.69	326.03	0.22		0.09	0.09	0.12	0.07	0.10
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Poland	1088	60	8860				0.38	0.80	126.19	0.41		0.18	0.18	0.33	0.29	0.33
Suh et al. (1998)	Poland	920	60					0.38	0.80	123.94					0.20	0.17	0.19
ISSP 1998	Poland	1067	60	9410	32.30			0.43	0.69	126.23	0.36	0.04	0.01	0.02		0.04	0.04
ISSP 2007	Poland	1287	60	16220	33.50	3.90	2.00	0.43	0.69	124.45	0.35	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.15		0.13
ISSP 2011	Poland	1103	60	22020	32.80	3.90	1.90	0.47	0.54	124.30	0.19	0.11	0.09	0.10	0.27		0.27
ISSP 2008	Poland	1108	60	17990	33.70	4.00	1.90	0.47	0.54	124.47	0.30	0.18	0.23	0.20	0.32		0.33
ISSP 2002	Poland	1128	60	11740	34.10			0.43	0.69	124.82	0.30	0.23	0.24	0.23	0.33		0.33
ISSP 1991	Poland	908	60	5720				0.43	0.69	124.87		0.23	0.15	0.19			
Word Values Survey (Wave 6) Fernandes et al. (2012)	Poland	963	60	22940	32.40	3.90	1.90	0.47	0.54	124.30	0.41		0.09	0.09	0.17	0.12	0.14
Fernandes et al. (2012)	Portugal	1246	27	26260	36.30	4.50	2.10			115.27		0.06	0.06	0.06			
	Portugal	1246	27	26260	36.30	4.50	2.10			115.27		0.13	0.12	0.12			
ISSP 1998	Portugal	1154	27	16600				0.75	0.62	111.04	0.46	0.13	0.13	0.13		0.13	0.13
ISSP 2011	Portugal	942	27	26260	36.30	4.50	2.10	0.75	0.62	115.27	0.31	0.19	0.23	0.21	0.27		0.27
ISSP 2008	Portugal	948	27	25590	36.60	4.70	2.30	0.75	0.62	115.43	0.40	0.26	0.27	0.26	0.24		0.24
ISSP 2002	Portugal	907	27	20010				0.75	0.62	113.88	0.48	0.21	0.13	0.17	0.14		0.14

110

Ball & Chernova (2008)	Puerto Rico	1145	27	12720						415.23	0.30		0.03	0.03	0.09	0.10	0.10
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Puerto Rico	709	27	17020						430.53	0.23		-0.01	-0.01	0.05	0.13	0.09
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Qatar	1059	25	105360						159.89	0.24		0.00	0.00	0.18	0.15	0.10
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Romania	1226	30	5480		0.64	0.79			98.03	0.44		0.23	0.23	0.26	0.27	0.27
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Romania	1776	30	9320		0.64	0.79			92.70	0.53		0.29	0.29	0.40	0.38	0.39
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Romania	1478	30	18600	36.50		0.52	0.73		87.20	0.34		0.19	0.19	0.35	0.30	0.33
Graham et al. (2004)	Russia	5004	39	5570			0.21	0.85				0.15	0.07	0.11			
Graham et al. (2004)	Russia	5057	39	6650	37.10		0.21	0.85				0.03	0.08	0.06			
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Russia	1906	39	5570			0.31	0.80		9.06	0.35		0.15	0.15	0.28	0.24	0.20
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Russia	2033	39	14480	41.00			0.18	0.79	8.73	0.30		0.08	0.08	0.21		0.20
Abbott & Sapsford (2006)	Russia	4006	39	7260	36.90					8.91		0.30	0.13	0.22			
Suh et al. (1998)	Russia	1664	39	7990				0.31	0.80	9.05					0.08		0.09
ISSP 1998	Russia	1377	39	5230	38.10			0.21	0.85	9.02	0.28	0.00	0.02	0.01		0.05	0.09
ISSP 2007	Russia	2002	39	16280	42.30			0.18	0.79	8.72	0.22	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.05		0.09
ISSP 2011	Russia	1443	39	23590	39.70	5.90	2.50	0.18	0.79	8.73	0.30	0.32	0.21	0.27	0.44		0.40
ISSP 2008	Russia	781	39	19600	41.60			0.18	0.79	8.72	0.24	0.28	0.18	0.23	0.35		0.39
ISSP 2002	Russia	1339	39	7880	37.30			0.21	0.85	8.87		0.14	0.17	0.16			
ISSP 1991	Russia	2518	39	7820				0.31	0.80	9.07		0.05	0.04	0.05			
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Russia	2452	39	23590	39.70	5.90	2.50	0.18	0.79	8.73	0.24		0.08	0.08	0.31	0.22	0.20
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Rwanda	1507		1120				0.70	0.39	375.91	0.37		0.22	0.22	0.40	0.18	0.29
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Rwanda	1527		1570				0.70	0.39	427.63	0.38		0.10	0.10	0.23	0.13	0.19
Aboalshamat et al. (2015)	Saudi Arabia	422	25	51250						13.56		0.11		0.11			
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Saudi Arabia	1494	25	35910						10.45	0.17		0.07	0.07	0.21	0.20	0.20
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Serbia	1220	25	10070	29.70			0.46	0.64	84.74	0.46		0.27	0.27	0.48	0.39	0.40
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Serbia	1184	25	6140				0.50	0.66	85.79	0.40		0.17	0.17	0.25	0.33	0.29
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Serbia	1218	25					0.50	0.66	87.10	0.41		0.09	0.09	0.16	0.21	0.19
Tan (2015)	Singapore	1167	20	85090						7908.72						0.17	0.17
Tang & Tan (2018)	Singapore	251	20	94500						7953.00	0.39		0.05	0.05	0.30		0.30

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Singapore	1512	20	42030						6186.59	0.36		-0.02	-0.02	0.16	0.19	0.19
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Singapore	1967	20	75470						7524.70	0.22		-0.03	-0.03	0.17	0.11	0.14
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Slovak Republic	1058	52	10620				0.38	0.50	112.07	0.42		0.14	0.14	0.20	0.27	0.27
Suh et al. (1998)	Slovak Republic	462	52					0.33	0.58	110.17					0.03		0.03
ISSP 1998	Slovak Republic	1237	52	10620				0.38	0.50	112.07	0.42	0.10	0.11	0.10		0.17	0.17
ISSP 2007	Slovak Republic	1109	52	20540	24.70	3.00	1.70	0.31	0.40	111.74	0.39	0.12	0.06	0.09	0.20		0.20
ISSP 2011	Slovak Republic	1120	52	24900	26.50	3.30	1.70	0.38	0.50	112.26	0.34	0.35	0.16	0.25	0.34		0.34
ISSP 2008	Slovak Republic	901	52	23250	26.00	3.10	1.80	0.31	0.40	111.83	0.39	0.20	0.15	0.17	0.33		0.33
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
ISSP 2002	Slovak Republic	1100	52	13240				0.38	0.50	111.79	0.25	0.18	0.11	0.15	0.16		0.16
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Slovenia	998	27	13620				0.43	0.52	98.80	0.50		0.22	0.22		0.25	0.25
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Slovenia	1037	27	23720	24.60	3.00	1.70	0.43	0.52	99.33	0.46		0.22	0.22	0.30	0.21	0.21
ISSP 1998	Slovenia	745	27	16020				0.43	0.52	98.39	0.48	0.08	0.09	0.08		0.09	0.09
ISSP 2007	Slovenia	517	27	26970	24.40	3.00	1.60	0.51	0.53	100.21	0.33	0.21	0.16	0.19	0.16		0.16
ISSP 2011	Slovenia	1002	27	28410	24.90	3.20	1.60	0.51	0.53	101.90	0.31	0.22	0.21	0.21	0.23		0.23
ISSP 2008	Slovenia	974	27	28850	23.70	3.00	1.60	0.51	0.53	100.33	0.33	0.19	0.23	0.21	0.33		0.33
ISSP 2002	Slovenia	1056	27	20130				0.43	0.52	99.03	0.34	0.18	0.16	0.17	0.23		0.23
ISSP 1991	Slovenia	1509	27					0.48	0.55	99.28		0.26	0.17	0.21			
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Slovenia	1054	27	28410	24.90	3.20	1.60	0.51	0.53	101.90	0.45		0.21	0.21	0.29	0.23	0.23
Cramm, Möller, & Nieboer (2012)	South Africa	1020	65					0.61	0.63	36.55		0.17	0.12	0.14			
Stack & Eshleman	South Africa	1277	65					0.85	0.37	24.85					0.13		0.13
Ball & Chernova (2008)	South Africa	2925	65	6850	60.70			0.74	0.50	34.82	0.53		0.27	0.27	0.31	0.38	0.38
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	South Africa	2988	65	10330				0.61	0.63	39.97	0.33		0.16	0.16	0.32	0.26	0.26
Cramm et al. (2010)	South Africa	1011	65									0.17	0.13	0.15			
Møller & Saris (2001)	South Africa	1848	65	6600				0.74	0.50	34.16		0.29		0.29			
Suh et al. (1998)	South Africa	2345	65	6190				0.74	0.50	30.34	0.64		0.27	0.27	0.37		0.37
ISSP 2007	South Africa	2181	65	10870				0.61	0.63	40.49	0.47	0.21	0.20	0.21	0.30		0.30
ISSP 2011	South Africa	2166	65	11870				0.38	0.78	42.87	0.42	0.26	0.28	0.27	0.38		0.38
ISSP 2008	South Africa	2682	65	11300	63.00			0.61	0.63	41.04	0.46	0.22	0.20	0.21	0.35		0.35
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	South Africa	2997	65	7750				0.61	0.63	37.57	0.37		0.16	0.16	0.40	0.33	0.33

Word Values																	
Survey (Wave 6)	South Africa	3491	65	12480				0.38	0.78	44.26	0.29		0.17	0.17	0.37	0.29	0.33
Stack & Eshleman	South Korea	917	18							407.70					0.14		0.14
Oshio et al. (2011)	South Korea	1552	18	25720	31.70			0.32	0.93	499.98	0.37	0.22	0.18	0.20		0.29	0.29
Ball & Chernova (2008)	South Korea	1246	18	14370						471.95	0.42		0.08	0.08	0.06	0.16	0.16
Park et al. (2014)	South Korea	2356	18	28650	32.30					505.77			0.15	0.15		0.25	0.25
Ha & Kim (2012)	South Korea	1602	18	28260				0.32	0.93	508.01	0.47	0.22	0.14	0.18	0.28		0.33
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	South Korea	1200	18	24010						497.52	0.25		0.05	0.05	0.30	0.28	0.29
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Suh et al. (1998)	South Korea	1171	18	8260				0.53	0.87	444.43	0.41		0.15	0.15	0.19	0.22	0.22
ISSP 2007	South Korea	1366	18	27740				0.32	0.93	502.31	0.41	0.15	0.10	0.12	0.19		0.19
ISSP 2011	South Korea	1399	18	31410				0.32	0.93	513.80	0.35	0.22	0.20	0.21	0.28		0.29
ISSP 2008	South Korea	1446	18	28650	32.30			0.32	0.93	505.77	0.46	0.26	0.24	0.25	0.31		0.33
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	South Korea	1173	18	19040				0.32	0.93	489.67	0.23		0.10	0.10	0.27		0.27
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	South Korea	1181	18	30400	32.00			0.32	0.93	509.82	0.30		0.07	0.07	0.18	0.25	0.29
Requena (1995)	Spain	1200	51	14850				0.79	0.56	78.81		0.13	0.13	0.13			
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Spain	1200	51	16150				0.79	0.56	79.54	0.45		0.09	0.09	0.12	0.11	0.16
Guardiola & Guillen-Royo (2015)	Spain	907	51	31760	35.40	4.90	2.00	0.64	0.76	93.51		0.07	0.12	0.09			
Suh et al. (1998)	Spain	1151	51	13520				0.79	0.56	77.82					0.10	0.09	0.09
ISSP 1998	Spain	1691	51	18870				0.64	0.76	80.54	0.36	0.13	0.13	0.13		0.09	0.09
ISSP 2011	Spain	1914	51	31510	35.70	5.10	2.10	0.50	0.86	93.51	0.36	0.22	0.17	0.20	0.21		0.29
ISSP 2008	Spain	1641	51	32570	34.20	4.60	2.00	0.64	0.76	92.13	0.45	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.19		0.19
ISSP 2002	Spain	1556	51	24090				0.64	0.76	83.02		0.12	0.11	0.12			
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Spain	1203	51	21450				0.64	0.76	81.30	0.33		0.13	0.13	0.11	0.13	0.13
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Spain	1200	51	31810	34.10	4.60	2.00	0.50	0.86	90.62	0.41		0.17	0.17	0.20	0.19	0.19
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Spain	1162	51	31510	35.70	5.10	2.10	0.50	0.86	93.51	0.37		0.16	0.16	0.28	0.27	0.29
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Srpska	399									0.44		0.13	0.13	0.29	0.23	0.29
Lundberg & Kristenson (2008)	Sweden	795	71	38440	26.40			0.36	0.85	22.13	0.22		0.05	0.05	0.53		0.53
Stack & Eshleman	Sweden	854	71							20.28					0.04		0.04
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Sweden	949	71	23270				0.27	0.87	21.55	0.39		0.06	0.06	0.19	0.13	0.16
Lindfors et al. (2014)	Sweden	1462	71	32050	25.30			0.33	0.71	21.83						0.08	0.08

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

Lindfors et al. (2014)	Sweden	1382	71	33760	26.10					21.92						0.10	0.10
Lindfors et al. (2014)	Sweden	1373	71	38440	26.40					22.13						0.05	0.05
Lindfors et al. (2014)	Sweden	1266	71	41850	27.10					22.29						0.03	0.03
Lindfors et al. (2014)	Sweden	1142	71	43360	28.10					22.47						0.00	0.00
Lindfors et al. (2014)	Sweden	1064	71	40640	27.30					22.66						0.07	0.07
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Lindfors et al. (2014)	Sweden	1024	71	42780	27.70					22.86						0.07	0.07
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Sweden	1003	71	38440	26.40			0.27	0.87	22.13	0.32		-0.03	-0.03	0.19	0.17	0.17
ISSP 1998	Sweden	1009	71	25330				0.27	0.87	21.57	0.30	0.04	-0.03	0.00		0.07	0.07
ISSP 2007	Sweden	1122	71	41850	27.10			0.27	0.87	22.29	0.27	0.08	0.25	0.17	0.14		0.14
ISSP 2011	Sweden	989	71	44720	27.60			0.29	0.78	23.03	0.21	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.30		0.30
ISSP 2008	Sweden	1031	71	43360	28.10			0.29	0.78	22.47	0.19	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.25		0.25
ISSP 2002	Sweden	923	71	30720				0.27	0.87	21.75	0.24	0.13	0.02	0.08	0.12		0.12
Fors Connolly & Johansson Sevä (2018)	Sweden	1260	71									0.22	0.03	0.13			
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Sweden	973	71	27140				0.27	0.87	21.59	0.35		-0.03	-0.03	0.18	0.12	0.12
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Sweden	1183	71	44720	27.60			0.29	0.78	23.03	0.24		0.05	0.05	0.20	0.20	0.20
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Switzerland	1152	68	31360				0.47	0.60	178.91	0.34		0.03	0.03	0.14	0.14	0.14
Suh et al. (1998)	Switzerland	1108	68					0.39	0.57	168.15	0.13		-0.03	-0.03	0.06		0.06
ISSP 1998	Switzerland	1006	68	34510				0.47	0.60	179.88	0.37	0.05	-0.02	0.01		0.02	0.02
ISSP 2007	Switzerland	977	68	50050	34.30	3.70	1.90	0.47	0.60	191.09	0.36	0.11	0.04	0.08	0.15		0.15
ISSP 2011	Switzerland	1160	68	56830	31.70	3.70	1.80	0.31	0.60	200.23	0.35	0.09	0.05	0.07	0.21		0.21
ISSP 2008	Switzerland	1209	68	49150	33.80	3.70	1.90	0.47	0.60	193.53	0.42	0.23	0.12	0.17	0.29		0.29
ISSP 2002	Switzerland	684	68	38720				0.47	0.60	184.32	0.35	0.17	-0.05	0.06	0.28		0.28
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Switzerland	1241	68	50050	34.30	3.70	1.90	0.47	0.60	191.09	0.32		0.03	0.03	0.15	0.16	0.16
Cornman et al. (2012)	Taiwan	679	17	32.60							0.31	0.16	0.20	0.18	0.30		0.30
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Taiwan	720	17					0.60	0.81		0.39		0.13	0.13	0.23	0.23	0.23
Ip & Cheung (2014)	Taiwan	1136	17									0.11	0.00	0.05			
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Taiwan	1227						0.40	0.94		0.35		0.15	0.15	0.31	0.26	0.26
ISSP 2007	Taiwan	1975	17					0.40	0.94		0.23	0.03	-0.04	0.00	0.06		0.06
ISSP 2011	Taiwan	1037	17					0.40	0.94		0.22	0.12	0.04	0.08	0.26		0.26

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

ISSP 2008	Taiwan	1747	17					0.40	0.94			0.06	0.02	0.04			
ISSP 2002	Taiwan	1868	17					0.60	0.81			0.11	0.14	0.13			
Word Values																	
Survey (Wave 6)	Taiwan	1216	17					0.40	0.94		0.36		0.07	0.07	0.25	0.21	0.23
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Tanzania	1131	25	1280				0.50	0.56	38.82	0.39		0.04	0.04	0.10	0.13	0.14
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Ariyabuddhiphongs & Jaiwong (2010)	Thailand	400	20														
Camfield et al. (2009)	Thailand	330	20	9200	42.50					127.22			0.14	0.14			
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Thailand	1534	20	11480	39.80					129.54	0.32		0.10	0.10	0.26	0.08	0.11
Word Values																	
Survey (Wave 6)	Thailand	1178	20	14340	37.80					133.38	0.25		-0.05	-0.05	0.00	0.07	0.09
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Trinidad and Tobago	1002	16	25920						253.91	0.15		-0.03	-0.03	0.13	0.16	0.14
Word Values	Trinidad and Tobago																
Survey (Wave 6)	Tobago	997	16	29130						258.90	0.18		0.05	0.05	0.20	0.12	0.10
Word Values																	
Survey (Wave 6)	Tunisia	1197		10540				0.68	0.58	70.50	0.26		0.13	0.13	0.25	0.21	0.23
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Turkey	1864	37	7890				0.62	0.50	77.21	0.37		-0.04	-0.04	0.07	0.12	0.10
Sivis-Cetinkaya (2013)	Turkey	991	37	20460	40.20	6.00	2.50			97.00		0.11		0.11			
Suh et al. (1998)	Turkey	1004	37	6040				0.62	0.50	70.06	0.35		0.00	0.00	0.15		0.13
ISSP 2011	Turkey	1298	37	19480	40.00	6.10	2.50	0.67	0.59	95.43	0.22	0.08	0.04	0.06	0.18		0.13
ISSP 2008	Turkey	1450	37	15890	39.00			0.67	0.59	91.50	0.31	0.15	0.04	0.10	0.25		0.23
Kezer (2018)	Turkey	3016	37	25340	42.90	5.70	2.50	0.62	0.75	102.04	0.28	0.23	0.12	0.17	0.25		0.23
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Turkey	3207	37	8990				0.67	0.59	83.41	0.34		0.00	0.00	0.15	0.18	0.17
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Turkey	1346	37	14710	38.40			0.58	0.63	90.41	0.37		0.02	0.02	0.02	0.14	0.09
Word Values																	
Survey (Wave 6)	Turkey	1601	37	20460	40.20	6.00	2.50	0.58	0.63	122.06	0.27		0.00	0.00	0.19	0.16	0.17
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Uganda	995		860				0.64	0.36	122.06	0.27		0.07	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.09
Singh-Manoux et al. (2003)	UK	6981	89	27640							0.46	0.13	0.01	0.07	0.33		0.33
Zagefka & Brown (2005)	UK	235															0.29
Boyce et al. (2010)	UK	86679										0.05		0.05			
Ball & Chernova (2008)	UK	941	89	23540				0.42	0.64	241.75	0.47		-0.01	-0.01	0.16	0.14	0.13
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	UK	1041	89	32940	34.30	4.40	2.10	0.42	0.64	249.66	0.34		0.06	0.06	0.17		0.17
Binder & Coad (2011)	UK	11591	89	34590	34.60	4.60	2.10	0.42	0.64	251.51		0.09	0.01	0.05			
Luhmann et al. (2011)	UK	8090	89	20990				0.42	0.64	240.43							

Flouri (2004)	UK	2203	89	26360				0.42	0.64	243.43			0.07	0.07			
Flouri (2004)	UK	2168	89	27710				0.42	0.64	244.37			0.08	0.08			
Easterbrook et al. (2015)	UK	61959	89									0.07	-0.05	0.01			
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
ISSP 1998	UK	726	89	23540				0.45	0.54	241.75		0.01	-0.01	0.00			
ISSP 2007	UK	777	89	35240	35.70	4.60	2.10	0.42	0.64	253.47		0.04	0.00	0.02			
ISSP 2011	UK	757	89	36970	33.20	4.20	2.10	0.36	0.73	261.48		0.21	0.03	0.12			
ISSP 2008	UK	1684	89	36090	34.10	4.50	2.10	0.42	0.64	255.48		0.13	0.04	0.09			
ISSP 2002	UK	1745	89	29260		4.50	2.10	0.42	0.64	245.40		0.07	-0.02	0.02			
ISSP 1991	UK	1233	89	17250				0.45	0.54	237.36		0.15	0.03	0.09			
Sani et al. (2010)	UK - Scotland	113	89	36500	45.60										0.45		0.45
Hunter et al. (2008)	India	153	89										0.27	0.27			
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Ukraine	2562	25	3380	35.20			0.22	0.84	88.13	0.26		0.15	0.15	0.21	0.32	0.20
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Ukraine	1000	25	7110	29.80			0.19	0.77	80.76	0.27		0.19	0.19	0.45	0.30	0.30
Abott & Sapsford (2006)	Ukraine	2500	25	4230						84.03		0.35	0.22	0.28			
ISSP 2008	Ukraine	1808	25	8350	26.60			0.22	0.84	79.85	0.32	0.28	0.26	0.27	0.34		0.34
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Ukraine	1500	25	8090	24.60			0.19	0.77	78.90	0.32		0.17	0.17	0.35	0.22	0.20
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Uruguay	984	36	8880						18.55	0.46		0.07	0.07	0.20	0.11	0.10
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Uruguay	1000	36	12120	45.90					19.00	0.35		0.10	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.10
ISSP 2007	Uruguay	1343	36	13240	46.40					19.04	0.40	0.13	0.14	0.14	0.23		0.20
ISSP 2008	Uruguay	970	36	14320	45.10					19.09	0.37	0.17	0.10	0.13	0.16		0.10
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Uruguay	990	36	17380	42.20					19.25	0.25		0.08	0.08	0.22	0.14	0.10
Curhan et al. (2015)	USA	1805	91	42060	40.50			0.37	0.71	31.96			0.06	0.06	0.37		0.30
Reitzel et al. (2014)	USA	2274	91	53110				0.45	0.56	34.31	0.33	0.21	0.10	0.15	0.42		0.40
Downing (2012)	USA	224	91	53110						34.31	0.30	0.19	0.05	0.12			0.20
Estrada & Arciniega (2015)	USA	168	91	54340	41.00			0.34	0.47	34.55					0.22		0.20
Baldassare et al. (1984)	USA	202	91					0.42	0.51	24.05			0.18	0.18			
Thoits & Hewitt (2001)	USA	3617	91		37.50			0.34	0.47	26.22		0.00	0.12	0.06			
Kehn (1995)	USA	98	91	27250	40.20					28.73			0.09	0.09			
Stack & Eshleman	USA	1924	91							25.05					0.11	0.07	0.00
Varnum (2003)	USA	1249	91	47160				0.45	0.56	32.57	0.33		0.09	0.09	0.26	0.23	0.20

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

Ball & Chernova (2008)	USA	1474	91	28450				0.47	0.64	29.07	0.34		0.06	0.06	0.15	0.15	0.15
Jones et al. (2003)	USA	129	91										0.26	0.26			
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES- SUBJSES	Income- SWB	Education- SWB	Objective SES- SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES- SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Morris (1997)	USA	215	91	27250	40.20					28.73			0.20	0.20			
Luhmann et al. (2014)	USA	5975	91	4694						33.24		0.19		0.19			
Kwate & Goodman (2014)	USA	630	91	48900	40.40			0.45	0.56	33.82		0.19	0.16	0.17	0.38		0.38
		10123															
Davis & Wu (2013)	USA	40	91									0.32	0.16	0.24			
		10093															
Davis & Wu (2013)	USA	3	91									0.24	0.12	0.18			
Davis & Wu (2013)	USA	82826	91									0.24	0.13	0.19			
Davis & Wu (2013)	USA	23716	91									0.22	0.13	0.18			
Faas (2013)	USA	1530	91	46940						33.54	0.08	0.12	0.01	0.07	0.28		0.28
Anderson et al. (2012)	USA	88	91														
Anderson et al. (2012)	USA	316	91								0.26	0.18	0.06	0.12	0.34		0.34
Anderson et al. (2012)	USA	156	91														
Anderson et al. (2012)	USA	116	91														
Rankin et al. (2009)	USA	151	91							32.26		0.27	0.05	0.16			
Kasser & Sheldon (2008)	USA	73	91	48280	41.10			0.45	0.56	32.88		0.22		0.22			
Kasser & Sheldon (2008)	USA	134	91	42060	40.50			0.45	0.56	31.96		0.33		0.33			
Francis-sharnowski (2009)	USA	202	91	48290				0.34	0.47	33.24			0.13	0.13			
Ali (2006)	USA	300	91					0.42	0.51	32.26		0.11		0.11			
Benyamini et al. (2004)	USA	830	91										0.06	0.06			
Johnson & Krueger (2006)	USA	1996	91									0.12	0.06	0.09			
Keyes et al. (2002)	USA	3032	91									0.09	0.03	0.06			
Taylor et al. (2001)	USA	2107	91		34.60			0.42	0.51	24.57		0.02	-0.06	-0.02			
Bratte (2001)	USA	884	91	25090						28.01		-0.08		-0.08			
Hart et al. (2005)	USA	79	91									0.31	0.13	0.22			
Hart et al. (2005)	USA	68	91									0.21	0.11	0.16			
Hout (2016)	USA	1354	91							23.35	0.26	0.17	0.06	0.11		0.16	0.16
Hout (2016)	USA	1403	91							23.58	0.30	0.14	0.09	0.11		0.16	0.16
Hout (2016)	USA	1394	91							23.81	0.24	0.18	0.10	0.14		0.12	0.12
Hout (2016)	USA	1397	91							24.05	0.29	0.19	0.12	0.15		0.15	0.15

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

117

Hout (2016)	USA	1419	91							24.30	0.31	0.15	0.04	0.09		0.12	0.12
Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES-SUBJSES	Income-SWB	Education-SWB	Objective SES-SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES-SWB	Subject SES-SWB
Hout (2016)	USA	1353	91							24.30	0.25	0.19	0.11	0.15		0.18	0.18
Hout (2016)	USA	1677	91							25.29	0.20	0.19	0.10	0.14		0.15	0.15
Hout (2016)	USA	1430	91							25.53	0.35	0.15	0.13	0.14		0.11	0.11
Hout (2016)	USA	1320	91					0.37	0.71	25.75	0.25	0.20	0.12	0.16		0.13	0.13
Hout (2016)	USA	1329	91		37.50			0.37	0.71	26.22	0.31	0.21	0.09	0.15		0.21	0.21
Hout (2016)	USA	1419	91							25.98	0.23	0.14	0.07	0.11		0.15	0.15
Hout (2016)	USA	1637	91					0.37	0.71	26.45	0.22	0.19	0.06	0.13		0.23	0.23
Hout (2016)	USA	1346	91					0.37	0.71	26.70	0.33	0.14	0.07	0.11		0.17	0.17
Hout (2016)	USA	1371	91					0.37	0.71	26.95	0.26	0.19	0.06	0.13		0.17	0.17
Hout (2016)	USA	1223	91	23640				0.37	0.71	27.26	0.26	0.13	0.09	0.11		0.16	0.16
Hout (2016)	USA	1358	91	24100	38.20			0.37	0.71	27.62	0.28	0.20	0.13	0.16		0.20	0.20
Hout (2016)	USA	1463	91	25910				0.37	0.71	28.38	0.29	0.20	0.09	0.15		0.17	0.17
Hout (2016)	USA	2627	91	27250	40.20			0.37	0.71	28.73	0.27	0.18	0.12	0.15		0.19	0.19
Hout (2016)	USA	2544	91	29870				0.47	0.64	29.41	0.28	0.17	0.09	0.13		0.16	0.16
Hout (2016)	USA	2481	91	33120				0.47	0.64	30.12	0.25	0.16	0.13	0.15		0.21	0.21
Hout (2016)	USA	2421	91	36800	40.40			0.47	0.64	30.80	0.23	0.18	0.14	0.16		0.16	0.16
Hout (2016)	USA	1223	91	38430				0.47	0.64	31.39	0.26	0.17	0.09	0.13		0.19	0.19
Hout (2016)	USA	1173	91	42060	40.50			0.47	0.64	31.96	0.31	0.16	0.12	0.14		0.15	0.15
Hout (2016)	USA	1770	91	48290				0.45	0.56	33.24	0.30	0.16	0.14	0.15		0.21	0.21
Hout (2016)	USA	3873	91	47160				0.47	0.64	32.57	0.27	0.17	0.14	0.16		0.21	0.21
Hout (2016)	USA	1804	91	48900	40.40			0.45	0.56	33.82	0.28	0.14	0.13	0.13		0.18	0.18
Hout (2016)	USA	1752	91	53110				0.45	0.56	34.31	0.28	0.15	0.09	0.12		0.19	0.19
Eom (2016)	USA	305	91	58960				0.34	0.47	35.32	0.41	0.12	-0.09	0.02	0.32		0.32
Tan & Kraus (2015)	USA	599	91	58300				0.34	0.47	35.06	0.33	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.40		0.40
Tan, Kraus, Impett & Keltner (2019)	USA	160	91	48290				0.34	0.47	33.24	0.21		0.04	0.04	0.06		0.06
Toon et al. (2015)	USA	419	91								0.29		0.11	0.11		0.23	0.23
Silver, Holman, & Poulin (2002)	USA	2035	91	38430				0.47	0.64	31.39		0.23	0.10	0.16			
Smith, Hout, & Marsden (2017)	USA	1468	91							22.92	0.35	0.14	0.07	0.11		0.17	0.17
Smith, Hout, & Marsden (2017)	USA	1393	91							23.14	0.23	0.20	0.04	0.12		0.13	0.13
Smith, Hout, & Marsden (2017)	USA	2310	91	56730				0.45	0.56	34.81	0.30	0.14	0.15	0.15		0.17	0.17

Study	Country	N	Culture	GNI	GINI	90/10 Ratio	90/50 Ratio	Relative Mobility	Absolute Mobility	Population Density	OBJSES- SUBJSES	Income- SWB	Education- SWB	Objective SES- SWB	Ladder SES-SWB	Perceive SES- SWB	Subjective SES-SWB
Smith, Hout, & Marsden (2017)	USA	2428	91	58960				0.45	0.56	35.32	0.28	0.19	0.12	0.15		0.22	0.23
Smith, Hout, & Marsden (2017)	USA	2348	91	63390				0.45	0.56	35.77	0.25	0.16	0.11	0.14		0.17	0.18
ISSP 1998	USA	1150	91	33120				0.47	0.64	30.12	0.33	0.17	0.08	0.12		0.18	0.19
ISSP 2007	USA	1406	91	48280	41.10			0.47	0.64	32.88		0.10	0.07	0.08			
ISSP 2011	USA	1411	91	50810				0.45	0.56	34.06		0.16	0.06	0.11			
ISSP 2008	USA	1209	91	48290				0.45	0.56	33.24		0.20	0.11	0.15			
ISSP 2002	USA	1068	91	38430				0.47	0.64	31.39		0.13	0.08	0.10			
ISSP 1991	USA	1233	91	24100	38.20			0.37	0.71	27.62	0.28	0.18	0.07	0.13	0.14		0.14
Bennett, Wilson, Arvanitakis, Boyle, Toledo-Morrell, & Schneider, 2013	USA	428	91	31500	40.80					29.77	0.19	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.13		0.13
Fors Connolly & Johansson Sevä (2018)	USA	1260	91									0.37	0.05	0.21			
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	USA	1196	91	34720				0.47	0.64	30.47	0.26		0.06	0.06	0.20	0.21	0.22
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	USA	2218	91	50810				0.45	0.56	34.06	0.28		0.01	0.01	0.24	0.20	0.21
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Uzbekistan	1493		4650				0.12	0.30	68.97	0.31		-0.01	-0.01	0.19	0.07	0.13
Ball & Chernova (2008)	Venezuela	1166	12	11030						25.38	0.33		0.07	0.07	0.10	0.10	0.10
ISSP 2008	Venezuela	909	12	17550						31.33		0.07	0.08	0.07			
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Venezuela	1198	12	11470						27.43	0.33		0.07	0.07	0.17	0.15	0.16
Salinas-Jimenez et al. (2010)	Vietnam	1220	20	3260	35.80			0.50	0.70	272.90	0.24		0.09	0.09	0.38	0.11	0.23
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Vietnam	979	20	2350				0.46	0.82	259.55	0.14		0.12	0.12	0.30	0.13	0.23
Orviska et al. (2012)		21940										0.15	0.11	0.13			
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Yemen	983								48.91	0.24		0.08	0.08	0.35	0.31	0.33
Inglehart et al. (2014)	Zambia	1500	35	2350						16.82	0.36		0.18	0.18	0.25	0.20	0.23
Bruni & Stanca (2005)	Zimbabwe	999		2300						30.82	0.41		0.13	0.13	0.14	0.16	0.17
Word Values Survey (Wave 6)	Zimbabwe	1499		2210						33.90	0.33		0.15	0.15	0.33	0.23	0.24
Hayo & Seifert (2003)		5831										0.15	0.06	0.10			

Table 2. Percentage of total studies by region based on World Bank Classification

Region	Percentage (%)
Europe & Central Asia	48.3
East Asia & Pacific	16.6
North America	13.8
Latin America & Caribbean	9.3
Middle East & North Africa	5.3
Sub-Saharan Africa	4.5
South Asia	2.2

Table 3. Percentage of total studies by country.

Country	Percentage (%)
United States	13.1
Germany	7.8
Sweden	3.0
Japan	2.9
United Kingdom	2.9
Australia	2.6
China	2.2
Russia	2.0
South Korea	1.9
Turkey	1.9
South Africa	1.9
Spain	1.8
Chile	1.8
Poland	1.6
Israel	1.6
Philippines	1.4
Taiwan	1.4
Netherlands	1.4
Slovenia	1.4
Mexico	1.4
New Zealand	1.3
Hungary	1.3
Norway	1.3
Switzerland	1.3
Brazil	1.3
Czech Republic	1.1
Finland	1.1
Slovak Republic	1.1
Bulgaria	< 1
Cyprus	< 1
France	< 1
Portugal	< 1
Argentina	< 1

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

121

India	< 1
Austria	< 1
Ireland	< 1
Italy	< 1
Latvia	< 1
Ukraine	< 1
Uruguay	< 1
Singapore	< 1
Thailand	< 1
Belarus	< 1
Belgium	< 1
Croatia	< 1
Denmark	< 1
Georgia	< 1
Moldova	< 1
Colombia	< 1
Peru	< 1
Canada	< 1
Pakistan	< 1
Nigeria	< 1
Hong Kong, SAR	< 1
Malaysia	< 1
Armenia	< 1
Kyrgyz Republic	< 1
Northern Ireland	< 1
Romania	< 1
Serbia	< 1
Dominican Republic	< 1
Venezuela	< 1
Egypt	< 1
Iraq	< 1
Jordan	< 1
Morocco	< 1
Bangladesh	< 1
Indonesia	< 1

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

122

Vietnam	< 1
Albania	< 1
Azerbaijan	< 1
Bosnia & Herzegovina	< 1
Estonia	< 1
Kazakhstan	< 1
Lithuania	< 1
Macedonia	< 1
Montenegro	< 1
Trinidad & Tobago	< 1
Iran	< 1
Saudi Arabia	< 1
Ghana	< 1
Rwanda	< 1
Zimbabwe	< 1
Andorra	< 1
Srpska	< 1
Uzbekistan	< 1
Ecuador	< 1
El Salvador	< 1
Guatemala	< 1
Algeria	< 1
Kuwait	< 1
Lebanon	< 1
Libya	< 1
Qatar	< 1
Tunisia	< 1
Yemen	< 1
Palestine	< 1
Burkina Faso	< 1
Ethiopia	< 1
Mali	< 1
Tanzania	< 1
Uganda	< 1
Zambia	< 1

Table 4. Random-effects analysis of effect size estimates of the SES-SWB association (non-dependence assumed).

SES measure	N	<i>k</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>SD_r</i>	ρ	<i>SD_ρ</i>	% Var	80% CV _{LL}	80% CV _{UL}	95% CI _{LL}	95% CI _{UL}
Objective SES	2762664	586	0.161	0.078	0.163	0.075	3.30	0.066	0.259	0.156	0.169
<i>Income</i>	2350643	335	0.225	0.095	0.234	0.087	1.42	0.123	0.345	0.224	0.245
<i>Education</i>	2623194	561	0.119	0.061	0.122	0.057	5.65	0.049	0.195	0.117	0.127
Subjective SES	625332	477	0.212	0.103	0.217	0.097	6.22	0.094	0.341	0.216	0.218
<i>Ladder SES</i>	523155	389	0.219	0.107	0.220	0.102	5.87	0.089	0.350	0.209	0.231
<i>Perceived SES</i>	423627	299	0.195	0.093	0.196	0.087	7.60	0.084	0.308	0.186	0.207

Note. N = Sample size; *k* = Number of correlations; *r* = meta-analytic effect size (uncorrected); *SD_r* = Standard deviation of effect size (uncorrected); ρ = meta-analytic effect size (corrected); *SD_ρ* = Standard deviation of effect size (corrected); % Var: Percentage variance due to sampling error (< 75% indicates that the variance in estimates are unlikely due to artifacts and moderators should be evaluated); 80% CV_{LL} and CV_{UL} = 80% Credibility interval; 95% CI_{LL} and CI_{UL} = 95% Confidence interval.

Table 5. Random-effects multivariate meta-analysis using SEM Approach (dependence assumed).

Effect Sizes	<i>r</i>	95% CI	Test of Homogeneity of Effect		Significant Likelihood-Ratio
			Sizes (<i>Q</i>)	<i>I</i> ₂	
Objective SES-SWB	0.109	[.102, .116]	$Q(df = 879) = 10287.53, p < .001$	0.87	$\Delta\chi^2(df = 2) = 759.84, p < .001$
Subjective SES-SWB	0.209	[.200, .218]		0.934	
Income-SWB	0.147	[.134, .161]	$Q(df = 281) = 3265.25, p < .001$	0.893	$\Delta\chi^2(df = 2) = 252.62, p < .001$
Ladder SES-SWB	0.223	[.206, .240]		0.936	
Income-SWB	0.149	[.136, .162]	$Q(df = 343) = 4092.71, p < .001$	0.8	$\Delta\chi^2(df = 2) = 504.12, p < .001$
Perceived SES-SWB	0.194	[.183, .205]		0.922	
Education-SWB	0.098	[.090, .106]	$Q(df = 500) = 5236.54, p < .001$	0.88	$\Delta\chi^2(df = 2) = 456.96, p < .001$
Ladder SES-SWB	0.220	[.205, .236]		0.934	
Education-SWB	0.098	[.089, .106]	$Q(df = 343) = 5403.27, p < .001$	0.867	$\Delta\chi^2(df = 2) = 481.34, p < .001$
Perceived SES-SWB	0.194	[.183, .204]		0.922	

Table 6. Zero-order correlations between moderators.

	Wealth of Countries	Cultural Orientation (Individualism)	Income Inequality (GINI)	Income Inequality (90/10 Ratio)	Population Density	Absolute Social Mobility	Relative Social Mobility
Wealth of Countries	1						
Cultural Orientation (Individualism)	.56***	1					
Income Inequality (GINI)	-.39***	-.36***	1				
Income Inequality (90/10 Ratio)	-.58***	-.40***	.84***	1			
Population Density	0.0039	-.26***	-.27***	-0.037	1		
Absolute Social Mobility	.11*	-.15**	.31***	.31**	-.17***	1	
Relative Social Mobility	-.21***	-.32***	.33***	0.1	.19***	-.24***	1

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 7. Moderators of objective and subjective SES-SWB relations (non-dependence assumed).

Moderator	SES Measure	k	Estimate	SE	z value	95% CI _{LL}	95% CI _{UL}
Wealth of Countries	Objective SES	489	-.011**	.0036	-2.95	-.018	-.004
	<i>Income</i>	267	-.018*	.0072	-2.51	-.032	-.004
	<i>Education</i>	472	-.016***	.0036	-4.51	-.023	-.009
	Subjective SES	412	-.005	.0051	-0.94	-.015	.005
	<i>Ladder SES</i>	350	-.003	.0058	-0.58	-.015	.008
	<i>Perceived SES</i>	256	-.017**	.0056	-3.00	-.028	-.006
Cultural Orientation	Objective SES	520	-.0032	.0055	-0.58	-.014	.008
	<i>Income</i>	313	-.004	.0089	-0.46	-.022	.013
	<i>Education</i>	498	-.018**	.0057	-3.22	-.029	-.007
	Subjective SES	422	-.0053	.0082	-0.64	-.021	.011
	<i>Ladder SES</i>	340	.0067	.0098	0.68	-.013	.026
	<i>Perceived SES</i>	253	-.013	.0093	-1.39	-.031	.005
Income Inequality (GINI)	Objective SES	234	-.042†	.023	-1.82	-.087	.003
	<i>Income</i>	142	-.023	.038	-0.61	-.098	.051
	<i>Education</i>	227	-.017	.024	-0.72	-.063	.029
	Subjective SES	195	-.072*	.033	-2.17	-.136	-.007
	<i>Ladder SES</i>	171	-.13***	.036	-3.54	-.200	-.058
	<i>Perceived SES</i>	100	-.034	.040	-0.86	-.111	.044
Income Inequality (90/10 Ratio)	Objective SES	87	-.027	.023	-1.18	-.073	.018
	<i>Income</i>	64	-.015	.032	-0.46	-.077	.048
	<i>Education</i>	86	-.017	.024	-0.71	-.063	.029
	Subjective SES	68	.014	.030	0.45	-.045	.072
	<i>Ladder SES</i>	67	.013	.031	0.69	-.048	.073
	<i>Perceived SES</i>	22	-.050	.036	-1.41	-.121	.020
Population Density	Objective SES	533	.0066**	.0025	2.69	.0002	.012
	<i>Income</i>	297	.0078*	.0038	2.07	.0004	.015
	<i>Education</i>	514	.0060*	.0025	2.37	.0010	.011

	Subjective SES	457	.012***	.004	3.30	.0046	.018
	<i>Ladder SES</i>	375	.0076†	.0041	1.83	-.0005	.016
	<i>Perceived SES</i>	289	.013**	.0041	3.20	.0051	.021
Absolute Social Mobility	Objective SES	458	-.0085	.011	-0.81	-.029	.012
	<i>Income</i>	265	-.012	.014	-0.83	-.040	.016
	<i>Education</i>	445	.0003	.001	-.023	-.022	.021
	Subjective SES	391	-.005	.017	-0.29	-.039	.029
	<i>Ladder SES</i>	330	-.014	.019	-0.72	-.052	.024
	<i>Perceived SES</i>	235	-.0019	.021	-0.91	-.042	.039
Relative Social Mobility	Objective SES	458	-.028**	.009	-3.17	-.046	.011
	<i>Income</i>	265	-.029†	.015	-1.89	-.058	.001
	<i>Education</i>	445	-.036***	.009	-3.86	-.054	.018
	Subjective SES	391	.012	.013	0.92	-.013	.037
	<i>Ladder SES</i>	330	.013	.014	0.93	-.015	.041
	<i>Perceived SES</i>	235	.0073	.015	0.49	-.022	.037

Note. Estimates indicate the influence of the moderator on the effect sizes with each SES measure. z value tests the null hypothesis that the parameter is zero in the population. † $p < 0.10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 8. Moderators of objective and subjective SES-SWB relations (dependence assumed).

Moderator	SES Measure	<i>k</i>	Estimate	SE	<i>z</i> value	95% CI _{LL}	95% CI _{UL}
Wealth of Countries	Objective SES	515	-.009*	.004	-2.28	-.017	-.0013
	Subjective SES		-.005	.005	-0.94	-.015	.005
	<i>Income</i>	267	-.011	.013	-0.82	-.036	.015
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		.012	.016	0.78	-.019	.043
	<i>Income</i>	288	.015*	.008	1.97	.0007	.030
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-.015**	.006	-2.68	-.027	-.004
	<i>Education</i>	469	-.017***	.004	-4.07	-.026	-.009
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		.027*	.013	2.02	.0008	.054
	<i>Education</i>	479	-.019***	.005	-4.06	-.028	-.010
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-.015**	.006	-2.68	-.027	-.004
	Objective SES	565	-.004	.006	-0.75	-.017	.0077
	Subjective SES		-.002	.008	-0.22	-.018	.014
Cultural Orientation	<i>Income</i>	271	-.027†	.015	-1.78	-.056	.0027
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		-.006	.018	-0.31	-.042	.030
	<i>Income</i>	295	.039***	.011	3.47	.017	.061
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-.008	.009	-0.90	-.027	.010
	<i>Education</i>	449	-.019*	.008	-2.50	-.034	-.0042
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		.028†	.016	1.67	-.005	.060
	<i>Education</i>	463	-.014†	.008	-1.81	-.029	.001
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-.008	.009	-0.88	-.027	.010
	Objective SES	247	-.044†	.025	-1.76	-.093	.005
Income Inequality	Objective SES	247	-.044†	.025	-1.76	-.093	.005

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

130

(GINI)	Subjective SES		-.108***	.033	-3.29	-.173	-.044
	<i>Income</i>	162	-.019	.047	-0.41	-.110	.072
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		-.027	.055	-0.49	-.136	.081
	<i>Income</i>	104	-.012	.088	-0.14	-.184	.161
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-.090*	.041	-2.23	-.170	-.011
	<i>Education</i>	243	-.035	.027	-1.31	-.088	.017
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		-.079†	.049	-1.60	-.018	.018
	<i>Education</i>	178	-.034	.035	-0.95	-.103	.036
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-.091*	.040	-2.25	-.170	-.012
Income Inequality (90/10 Ratio)	Objective SES	136	-.023	.025	-0.93	-.073	.026
	Subjective SES		.014	.030	0.47	-.044	.072
	<i>Income</i>	90	-.008	.035	-0.22	-.077	.061
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		.060	.038	1.58	-.015	.134
	<i>Income</i>	3	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Education</i>	112	-.011	.024	-0.44	-.058	.037
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		.036	.036	1.00	-.034	.107
	<i>Education</i>	44	-.061	.042	-1.45	-.143	.022
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-.052	.034	-1.53	-.119	.015
Population Density	Objective SES	572	.008**	.003	2.91	.003	.013
	Subjective SES		.009*	.004	2.47	.002	.016
	<i>Income</i>	267	.017**	.005	3.00	.006	.028
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		.004	.007	0.63	-.009	.018

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STATUS AND WELL-BEING

131

	<i>Income</i>	336	-.010†	.006	-1.88	-.021	.0004
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		.011**	.004	2.68	.003	.020
	<i>Education</i>	482	.007*	.003	2.34	.001	.014
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		.003	.006	0.53	-.009	.015
	<i>Education</i>	538	.010**	.004	2.90	.003	.017
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		.011**	.004	2.67	.003	.020
Absolute Social Mobility	Objective SES	479	-.010	.013	-0.74	-.035	.016
	Subjective SES		-.012	.018	-0.66	-.046	.023
	<i>Income</i>	259	-.029	.026	-1.13	-.080	.022
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		-.048	.031	-1.55	-.109	.013
	<i>Income</i>	278	-.024	.031	-0.77	-.084	.037
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-.003	.021	-0.15	-.044	.037
	<i>Education</i>	440	-.008	.014	-0.57	-.037	.020
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		-.064*	.027	-2.35	-.117	-.011
	<i>Education</i>	447	-.015	.016	-0.94	-.047	.016
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		-.003	.020	-0.14	-.043	.038
	Objective SES	479	-.026**	.010	-2.73	-.045	-.007
	Subjective SES		.010	.013	0.75	-.016	.035
Relative Social Mobility	<i>Income</i>	257	-.020	.022	-0.95	-.063	.022
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		.006	.026	0.25	-.045	.058
	<i>Income</i>	278	-.035	.024	-1.46	-.081	.012
	<i>Perceived SES</i>		.004	.015	0.26	-.026	.033
	<i>Education</i>	440	-.033**	.010	-3.14	-.053	-.012
	<i>Ladder SES</i>		.018	.022	0.82	-.026	.062

<i>Education</i>	447	-.034**	.011	-2.99	-.057	-.012
<i>Perceived SES</i>		.004	.015	0.28	-.025	.034

Note. Estimates indicate the influence of the moderator on the effect sizes with each SES measure. z value tests the null hypothesis that the parameter is zero in the population. † $p < 0.10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 9. Summary of Moderator Analyses.

Moderator	Effect Size	Income	Education	Ladder SES	Perceived SES
Wealth of Country	Non-dependent	-	-	0	-
	Dependent	0 (ladder) + (perceived)	-	0 (income) + (education)	-
Cultural Orientation (Individualism)	Non-dependent	0	-	0	0
	Dependent	- (ladder) + (perceived)	-	0	0
Inequality (GINI)	Non-dependent	0	0	-	0
	Dependent	0	0	-	-
Inequality (90/10 and 90/50 ratio)	Non-dependent	0	0	0	0
	Dependent	0	0	0	0
Population Density	Non-dependent	+	+	+	+
	Dependent	+ (ladder) - (perceived)	+	0	+
Absolute Social Mobility	Non-dependent	0	0	0	0
	Dependent	0	0	0 (income) - (education)	0
Relative Social Mobility	Non-dependent	-	-	0	0
	Dependent	0	-	0	0

Note. Non-dependent reflects effect size examined in simple meta-regression models. Dependent reflects effect size examined in mixed-level SEM models. Positive (+) denotes that the effect size increased with higher levels of the moderator. Negative (-) denotes that the effect size decreased with higher levels of the moderator. Zero (0) denotes that the effect size did not vary with levels of the moderator. Cells with two signs indicate differing patterns depending on the SES measure (in parenthesis) that was concurrently estimated in the model mixed-level SEM model.

Table 10. Effect sizes, sample sizes and manipulations for each sample in the meta-analysis of the ladder SES manipulation studies.

Study	N	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95% CI-LL	95% CI-UL
Kraus, Adler, & Chen (2013)	300	Shame		Neutral	0.03	-0.251	0.30
Kraus, Adler, & Chen (2013)	300	Sad		Neutral	0.02	-0.255	0.30
Pieritz, Süßenbach, Rief, & Euteneuer (2016)	64	Low	High		0.54	0.04	1.04
Brown-Iannuzzi, Lundberg, Kay, & Payne (2014)	152	Low	High		0.67	0.35	1.00
Kraus, Cote, & Keltner	81	Low	High		0.53	0.09	0.97
Kraus, Horberg, Goetz, & Keltner (2011)	91	Low	High		0.53	0.11	0.94
Kraus & Keltner (2013)	163	Low	High		0.70	0.39	1.02
Piff, Stancato, Cote, Mendoza-Denton, & Keltner (2012)	129	Low	High		0.62	0.27	0.97
Schubert, Süßenbach, Schäfer, & Euteneuer (2016)	72	Low	High		0.45	-0.02	0.92
Anderson, Kraus, Galinsky, & Keltner (2012)	228	Low	High		0.54	0.27	0.80
Kraus & Adler (unpublished)	338	Low	High		0.16	-0.094	0.42
Kraus & Adler (unpublished)	338		High	Control	0.05	-0.219	0.33
Kraus & Adler (unpublished)	338	Low		Control	-0.10	-0.363	0.16
Kraus, Anderson, & Callaghan (2015)	403	Low	High		0.59	0.39	0.79
Emery & Le (2014)	566	Low	High		0.32	0.15	0.49
Sim, Lim, Leow & Cheon	50	Low		Control	-0.30	-0.854	0.26
Cheon, Lim, McCrickerd, Zaihan, & Forde	93	Low	High		0.04	-0.454	0.54
Cheon, Lim, McCrickerd, Zaihan, & Forde	93		High	Control	-0.13	-0.631	0.37
Cheon, Lim, McCrickerd, Zaihan, & Forde	93	Low		Control	-0.10	-0.595	0.40
Kraus & Tan (2015)	420	Low	High		0.49	0.29	0.68
Davis & Reyna (2015)	284	Low	High		0.26	0.03	0.50
Huang, Liu, Wang, & Zhang (2016)	120	Low	High		0.30	-0.057	0.66
Huang, Liu, Wang, & Zhang (2016)	120	Low	High		-0.58	-0.946	-0.22
Huang, Liu, Wang, & Zhang (2016)	59	Low	High		0.54	0.02	1.05
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	424		Money	Control	0.09	-0.097	0.28
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	455		Money	Control	-0.21	-0.401	-0.02
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	364		Money	Control	0.01	-0.194	0.22
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	313	Scarcity		Control	-0.19	-0.404	0.03
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	326		Abundance	Control	-0.15	-0.363	0.06
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	325	Scarcity	Abundance		0.05	-0.164	0.26
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	347		Money	Control	0.01	-0.198	0.22
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	267	Low power		Control	0.00	-0.224	0.22

Study	N	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95% CI-LL	95% CI-UL
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	264		High power	Control	-0.04	-0.262	0.18
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	217	Low power	High power		-0.05	-0.272	0.18
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	435		Money	Control	-0.06	-0.260	0.13
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	423		Money	Control	-0.21	-0.403	-0.01
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	340		Money	Control	0.04	-0.174	0.25
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	325	Scarcity		Control	-0.15	-0.357	0.07
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	342		Abundance	Control	-0.22	-0.434	-0.01
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	323	Scarcity	Abundance		-0.07	-0.281	0.14
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	376		Money	Control	-0.19	-0.398	0.01
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	303	Low power		Control	-0.34	-0.566	-0.12
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	286		High power	Control	-0.14	-0.361	0.07
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	245	Low power	High power		0.19	-0.034	0.42
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	113		Money	Control	-0.15	-0.496	0.19
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	109		Money	Control	0.03	-0.326	0.38
Caruso, Shapira, & Landy (2017)	110		Abundance	Control	-0.10	-0.436	0.24
Li, Lu, Xia, & Guo (2018)	70	Low	High		0.90	0.41	1.39
Godsell, Randle, Bateson, & Nettle (2019)	123	Low		Control	-0.11	-0.465	0.25
Tan & Mendes (Unpublished)	124	Low		Control	-0.23	-0.586	0.12
Powell (2013)	85	Low	High		0.59	0.15	1.03

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow diagram of information on the search procedure.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 2. Overall meta-analytic effect sizes (r) of the associations between objective SES, subjective SES and SWB.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 3. Funnel plot of effect sizes of the objective SES-SWB associations for all studies. Standard errors of are plotted against the effect sizes.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 4. Funnel plot of effect sizes of the subjective SES-SWB associations for all studies. Standard errors of are plotted against the effect sizes.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 5. Path analyses illustrating subjective SES as a mediator of the objective SES and SWB association. All path estimates are significant, $p < .001$.

a. Overall subjective SES as a mediator of the objective SES-SWB association.

b. Ladder SES as a mediator of the income-SWB and education-SWB association.

c. Perceived SES as a mediator of the income-SWB and education-SWB association.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 6. Wealth of countries as a moderator. The y-axis represents the effect sizes and the x-axis represents levels of the moderator. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate. Note: † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

(d)

(e)

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 7. Cultural orientation as a moderator. The y-axis represents the effect sizes and the x-axis represents levels of the moderator. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate. Note: † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

(d)

(e)

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 8. Income inequality (GINI) as a moderator. The y-axis represents the effect sizes and the x-axis represents levels of the moderator. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate. Note: † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

(d)

(e)

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 9. Population density as a moderator. The y-axis represents the effect sizes and the x-axis represents levels of the moderator. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate. Note: † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

(d)

(e)

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 10. Absolute social mobility as a moderator. The y-axis represents the effect sizes and the x-axis represents levels of the moderator. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate. Note: † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

(d)

(e)

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 11. Relative social mobility as a moderator. The y-axis represents the effect sizes and the x-axis represents levels of the moderator. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate. Note: † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

(d)

(e)

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC STANDING AND WELL-BEING

Figure 12. Funnel plot of effect sizes of the all studies that used the social comparison manipulation to affect subjective SES ratings. Standard errors of are plotted against the effect sizes.