Ashoka University
Economics Discussion Paper 106

Life Satisfaction and Inequality in Slovakia: The Role of Income, Consumption and Wealth

October 2023

Biswajit Banerjee, National Bank of Slovakia; Ashoka University
Peter Tóth, National Bank of Slovakia; University of Economics in Bratislava, Slovakia

https://ashoka.edu.in/economics-discussionpapers

Life Satisfaction and Inequality in Slovakia: The Role of Income, Consumption and Wealth*

By

Biswajit Banerjee† and Peter Tóth‡

JEL Code: I31, D12, D31, G51

Keywords: Subjective well-being; Income; Consumption; Wealth; Self-centered inequality; Community-centered inequality

* Earlier versions of this paper were presented at a seminar at Krea University, Sri City, India in March 2022; at the Singapore Economic Review Conference, Singapore in August 2022; and at the Slovak Economic Association Conference, Bratislava in September 2022. The authors thank John Knight and the conference/seminar participants for helpful comments. Peter Tóth acknowledges financial support from the Slovak Research and Development Agency (APVV-20-0359).The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the institutions to which the authors are affiliated.

† Department of Economics, Ashoka University, Sonepat, Haryana 131029, India; National Bank of Slovakia, Imricha Karvaša 1, 81325 Bratislava, Slovakia;

‡ National Bank of Slovakia, Imricha Karvaša 1, 81325 Bratislava, Slovakia;
Department of Economic Policy, University of Economics in Bratislava, Slovakia.

Life Satisfaction and Inequality in Slovakia: The Role of Income, Consumption and Wealth

Abstract

In recent years, a small number of studies have emphasized that subjective well-being of individuals depends not only on income but also consumption and wealth. However, only a few have examined the influence of all three variables simultaneously. Empirical studies have also analyzed the role of self-centered and community-centered inequalities but the inclusion of both measures in the same specification is scarce. In a departure from much of the existing literature, this paper analyzes concurrently the influence of all three economic well-being indicators and both types of inequalities on subjective well-being. We find that absolute levels of income, consumption and wealth all have a significant positive effect that remains robust even after the inclusion of self-centered and community-centered inequalities in the regression equations. The evidence indicates that both types of inequalities are important considerations for subjective well-being, but with different influences. Self-centered inequality measured using reference group average has a positive signalling effect, while inequality defined by the position of an individual within the distribution of the relevant economic well-being indicator has a negative comparison effect. Whereas community-centered inequality in income has a positive signalling effect, consumption and wealth inequalities have a negative comparison effect.

1 Introduction

The literature on the factors that determine subjective well-being or life satisfaction or happiness of individuals[1] is vast.[2] The empirical work has focused mainly on the effect of income: own absolute income, the income of a reference group relative to one's own income, and income inequality. The idea that relative position matters to an individual's subjective well-being has a long history in the social science literature (e.g., Diener and Biswas-Diener, 2002; Duesenberry, 1949, Easterlin, 1974; and Veblen, 1899) and there is substantial empirical support. In empirical studies, the reference group has been measured in two different ways: persons with similar characteristics, and residents of a specific geographical location. The relative income measure can be broadly interpreted as a measure of the self-centered inequality approach to happiness (Clark

[1] The terms are most often used interchangeably.
[2] Notable surveys include Clark, 2016 and 2018; Clark et al., 2008; Clark and D'Ambrosio, 2015; Dolan et al., 2008; Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Ramos, 2014; Hagerty 2000; Helliwell et al., 2012; McBride, 2001; Ngamaba et al., 2018; and Senik, 2005 and 2009.

and D'Ambrosio, 2015). In this context, some studies have noted that individuals are influenced not only by the average income of the reference group, but also by the distribution of income in relation to the individual's income or by the rank-order of the individual's income within the predefined reference group (Brown et al., 2008; Knight and Gunatilaka, 2022; Wang et al., 2019). Researchers also are increasingly concerned about the effect of community-centered income inequality on subjective well-being - i.e., the effect of inequality within the relevant community irrespective of their own income or relative income (Clark and D'Ambrosio, 2015; Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Ramos, 2014; Senik, 2005 and 2009).

While own income is generally found to be positively correlated with subjective well-being (SWB), there is no consensus on the direction of the impact of relative income and income inequality. Empirical studies have found both positive and negative impacts of relative income and income inequality on SWB (Brown et al., 2015; Ngamaba et al., 2018). In the case of relative income, the negative effect likely signifies feelings of relative achievement or relative deprivation compared with others in the reference group, whereas the positive effect is seen as evidence of individuals using relative income as information to form expectations about their own future prospects (Hirschman and Rothschild, 1973). In the case of community-centered income inequality, a negative relationship is explained in terms of individuals having egalitarian preference for or aversion to income inequality, while a positive relationship is interpreted as individuals considering inequality as a signal for future self- advancement rather than as an undesirable feature (Knight et al., 2009; Senik, 2009).

The direction of relationship between relative income and SWB is sensitive to the definition and estimation technique of the reference group (Brown et al., 2015). Relative income has a greater effect on SWB if the reference group is narrowly defined than if broadly defined (Kingdon and Knight, 2007). Also, the pattern of results is less pronounced when the reference group is defined spatially. Goldsmith (2009) and Senik (2004) also argue that findings on the impact of relative income depend on the country context, particularly the socio-political and cultural settings.

Results on the impact of community-centered income inequality on SWB are influenced by the selection of the inequality measure, the type of income used for its calculation and the size of the geographic unit (Schneider, 2016). Knight and Gunatilaka (2022) note that empirical studies tend to analyze only self-centered inequality or community-centered inequality but not both together.

When both measures are considered together, SWB is more sensitive to variation in self-centered inequality than to variation in community-centered inequality.

In recent years, a small but growing number of studies have highlighted the importance of factors other than income, especially consumption and wealth, when analyzing SWB.[3] A main reason for the dearth of such studies is that data bases which include indicators of subjective well-being usually do not include information of consumption expenditure and wealth of households.

Consumption is considered to be a more relevant measure of utility or satisfaction than income for several reasons: income affects well-being indirectly via the flow of goods and services that it allows individuals to purchase; income is a poor proxy for the actual level of consumption expenditure since a significant proportion of households consume more than they earn; income is unable to capture the impact of the composition of the consumption basket on subjective well-being (Headey et al., 2008). In a similar vein as the studies on the role of income, empirical studies on the relationship between consumption and SWB have explored the role of absolute level of consumption, reference group consumption, and the rank of an individual's consumption within the relevant reference group. In addition, studies have examined the differential impact of different categories of consumption, particularly conspicuous consumption and basic consumption (Choung et al., 2020; Noll and Weick, 2015; Wang et al., 2019; Wu, 2020). The impact on SWB is stronger for consumption of conspicuous goods and services that are visible to others.

A narrow segment of the literature argues that wealth also influences SWB, independent of the effects of income and consumption, on account of a number of desirable properties: it exerts an influence on self-esteem, helps to smooth consumption over an individual's life cycle, provides security against income shocks, serves as collateral for debt, and generates income itself (Headey et al., 2008). Two different approaches have been taken in the measurement of wealth. A few studies focus on overall net wealth (e.g., Headey and Wooden, 2004; Headey et al., 2008; Knight and Gunatilaka, 2022) while some studies disaggregate wealth into assets and debt (e.g.,

[3] A special issue of the International Review of Economics in 2015 (volume 62, issue no. 2) was devoted to studies on the relationship between consumption and subjective well-being. Besides the studies included in this special issue, other notable studies on the importance of consumption to subjective well-being include Goldsmith (2009), Heady et al. (2008), Lewis (2014), Wang et al. (2019) and Wu (2020). The role of wealth has been explored in studies by Brown et al. (2005), Brown and Gray (2016), Heady and Wooden (2004), and Jantsch et al. (2022).

Brokešová et al., 2021; Brown and Gray, 2016; Goldsmith, 2009; Jantsch et al., 2022) and highlight the differential effects of different components of wealth.[4] Similar to the studies on the role of income and consumption, studies on the relationship between wealth and subjective well-being examine the impact of individuals' levels of the wealth, reference group wealth, and position of an individual relative to the reference group.

Goldsmith (2009), and Headey et al. (2008) include absolute measures of income, consumption and wealth in the same equation, but without any reference group measures, and find that each of the three variables significantly affect SWB. However, there are no studies that have examined the role of reference group effects for all the three variables simultaneously. Goldsmith (2009) examines the reference effects of income and consumption concurrently but does not include wealth variables in the same equation. Brown and Gray (2016) and Jantsch et al. (2022) look at the reference effects of both income and wealth together, but do not consider the role of any measure of consumption. Brokešová et al. (2021) consider the values of different wealth components, total income and the reference value of real assets, but consumption is ignored in their analysis. Knight and Gunatilaka (2022) include net wealth, relative income, and income inequality in the estimated equation, but do not consider the impact of consumption.

In this paper, we examine the role of income, consumption and wealth on SWB in Slovakia using data collected in the 2017 Household Finance and Consumption Survey. A distinguishing feature of this Survey is that it included a question on life-satisfaction besides information on income and non-income measures of material well-being. This facilitates a variety of exercises that are not feasible using data from the vast majority of surveys that include indicators of SWB. The paper makes several notable contributions to the empirical literature on SWB. It adds to the limited number of studies that have examined the direct influence of consumption and wealth on SWB. The traditional specification of the relationship between SWB and income is augmented by including both consumption and wealth in the list of control variables. Also, a relationship between SWB and consumption is estimated in line with the specifications in the recent literature but it is enhanced by the inclusion of both income and wealth as control variables. In both the estimated

[4] Brown and Gray (2016) also make a distinction between real assets and financial assets, and between secured debt and unsecured debt.

relationships we look at the influence of absolute and reference group measures of the variable of interest, position of an individual within the reference group, and community-centered inequality.

We carry out various sensitivity tests for different measures of the determinants of SWB. The level of consumption expenditure is measured alternatively as total consumption or its components. Community-centered inequality is measured in two alternative ways: the Gini index and inter-percentile ratio. The measure of wealth is done in two alternative ways: net wealth and its disaggregation into assets and debt. We also carry out a sensitivity of the regression results for reference group effects to the reference group definition and the estimation technique of the reference group measure.[5]

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a selective overview of the literature. Section 3 describes the data and methodology. Section 4 presents the results of the econometric analysis, and Section 5 concludes.

2 Selective literature overview

Absolute income, relative income, income inequality and subjective well-being

Within country studies at any given point in time have typically found a positive correlation between absolute income and SWB (Diener, 1984; Easterlin 1974, 1975). Helliwell et al. (2012) refer to this finding as a cross-sectional "fact".[6] They also note that the empirical relationship between SWB and absolute income is best portrayed by a linear logarithmic form, which implies that an extra dollar increases the satisfaction of a poor person by a much greater extent than it increases the satisfaction of a richer person. In this vein, Easterlin (1995) argues that absolute income matters up to a certain level, after which relative income increasingly matters. In support, some studies have observed that the size of the coefficient on absolute income becomes smaller in

[5] Whereas Brown et al. (2015) look at the variation in the results for relative income obtained across studies that employ different reference group definition and reference group measure estimation technique, this paper examines the sensitivity of the results obtained for the same sample.

[6] The positive impact of absolute income on subjective well-being is attributed to the functional properties of income: a means to obtaining goods and services that are need-fulfilling; a source of status, self-esteem and anticipatory emotions; and a resource that buffers against major life events (Diener et al., 2013; Goldsmith, 2009).

the presence of the relative income variable (e.g., Caporale et al., 2009; Knight and Gunatilaka, 2022). An extreme finding is that obtained by Banerjee et al. (2021) in their study on North Macedonia: when absolute income and relative income variables are included together in the regression equation, the association between SWB and absolute income disappears.

Empirical studies on the influence of reference/relative income on SWB have found both positive and negative effects. The findings are sensitive to the definition of the reference group, measure of reference group income, and the country context. Reference group is sometimes defined on the basis of individual characteristics ("people like you") and sometimes defined spatially ("people near you"). In the "people like you" approach, reference group income is measured as the predicted income of people with similar characteristics, using regression equation of earnings (e.g., Clark and Oswald, 1996; Senik, 2004), or is calculated as the cell average of income for a specified set of characteristics (e.g., Ferrer-i-Carbonell, 2005; Kingdon and Knight, 2007).[7] In the "people near you" approach, reference group income is measured by the average income of a given geographical location which may be large or small, the choice being dictated by the nature of the available data. Knight and Gunatilaka (2022) note that it is rare for the two approaches to be combined. Since misspecification of the reference group may introduce noise or bias into the measures of the reference levels, another approach, when data permits, has been to define the reference group by asking people who they compare themselves to (Knight et al. 2009, Knight and Gunatilaka 2022).

Notable studies that have obtained a negative relationship when reference income is based on predicted income or cell average income of those with similar characteristics include Brown et al. (2015) and Clark and Oswald (1996) for the UK, McBride (2001) for USA, and Ferrer-i-Carbonell (2005) for Germany. However, measuring reference group income in a similar manner, Senik (2004) obtained a positive relationship for Russia. Caporale et al. (2009) and Senik (2008) found

[7] The cell mean approach to measuring the reference group is more common in the literature. Ten out of the 15 studies reviewed by Goldsmith (2009, Table 4.2) follow the cell mean approach. As Goldsmith (2009) points out, cell mean approaches have tended to use many fewer dimensions to define the reference good. For example, McBride (2001) and Caporale et al. (2009) define the reference group as all individuals who are in the age range of 5 years younger and 5 years older than the individual concerned. The consumption-related studies on SWB (Wang et al., 2019 and Wu, 2020) and wealth-related studies on SWB (Brown and Gray, 2016 and Jantsch et al., 2022) also favour the cell mean approach to defining the reference group.

an east-west divide in the impact of relative income on SWB: the relationship was negative in the case of "Western" European countries but positive in the case of Eastern European and Baltic countries. Senik (2008) also obtained a positive relationship for the USA using pooled GSS data for the period 1972-2001.

Brown et al. (2015) found that the sign and significance of reference income when the reference group was defined spatially were opposite to the pattern observed when the reference group was based on individual characteristics: the estimated effects under the spatial definition were positive with the significance of the coefficient varying by the estimation method of the regression equation. Measuring reference income as the mean income of the region in his study on Russia, Goldsmith (2009) obtained a positive but statistically insignificant coefficient. The coefficient on mean regional income was positive and significant only when consumption variables were present. Knight and Gunatilaka (2022) argue that studies which have failed to identify a comparator income effect on happiness are open to criticism that an inappropriate comparator group may have been examined.

A few studies show that the SWB of individuals is influenced by the rank order of their income within the predefined reference set or by whether their income was above or below the reference group average income. Drawing on data from the U.K.'s Workplace Employee Relations Survey for 1997–1998, Brown et al. (2008) found that the individual worker's position in the pay ordering had a significant positive effect on SWB. Using data collected in 2006 by the China General Social Survey, Wang et al (2015) found that SWB was significantly higher if individual income was above the average income of the district. Knight and Gunatilaka (2022) too found that in rural and urban China SWB was positively affected if income was above the village or city/town average. However, they also observed that it was negatively affected by income below the village or city/town average. The positive impact had a larger coefficient than the negative impact coefficient. In contrast, Ferrer-i-Carbonell (2005) for West Germany found an asymmetric effect: those with income above that of the reference group did not experience a positive impact on SWB while those with income below the reference group average had a significant negative impact. The estimated effects of the reference income variables on SWB in East Germany were not significant.

Research findings on the influence of community-centered income inequality on SWB are mixed. The studies reviewed by Clark and D'Ambrosio (2015) and Schneider (2016) show a negative

relationship in about one half of the studies, and a positive effect or no significant effect in the other one half of the studies. The Gini coefficient is the most popular indicator used to study the link between income inequality and SWB. Schneider (2016) has argued that its use may not always be justified and other inequality indicators may be more efficacious. Since the Gini coefficient reflects inequalities within the middle ranges, its use may not be appropriate if income polarization is an issue for individuals. In such instances, other indicators such as ratios of income in different percentiles may be more appropriate. In their study on the United States, Blanchflower and Oswald (2003) measured income inequality by the p75/p25 ratio and obtained a significant negative effect. Clark (2003) for the Great Britain measured inequality in terms of both the Gini coefficient and the p90/p10 ratio. He obtained a significant positive effect for the Gini coefficient and indicated (without reporting the actual result) that the finding on the p90/p10 was similar. Comparison of the effects of different measures of income inequality on SWB is rare.[8]

There are cross-country and within-country variations on the effects of community-centered income inequality on SWB. Recent studies on China reveal some interesting contrasts. Knight et al. (2009), using China Household Income Project (CHIP) survey 2002 data, found that an increase in the Gini coefficient of income inequality at the county level raised happiness in rural areas. Based on the same data source, Jiang et al. (2012) also found a significant positive coefficient between city-level Gini coefficient and happiness. However, the CHIP 2013 survey data did not indicate a significant effect of Gini on SWB in either rural or urban areas (Knight and Gunatilaka, 2022). But, the Theil measures of community income inequality had positive and significant coefficients, indicating sensitivity to both tails of the distribution. In contrast, using the 2006 Chinese General Social Science Survey data, Wang et al (2015) found an inverted U-shaped association between the Gini index and SWB in both urban and rural areas. Based on the 2015 Chinese General Social Survey, Ding et al. (2021) obtained a negative relationship in rural China and an inverted U-shaped relationship in urban areas.

Consumption and subjective well-being

Recent research has highlighted the importance of non-income measures of well-being. Choung et al. (2020) for Korea, Goldsmith (2009) for Russia, Headey et al. (2008) for Hungary and Wang et

[8] Knight and Gunatilaka (2022) is an exception.

al. (2019) for China included income, consumption and wealth in a regression equation together with the standard controls, and found that all these three variables had an independent positive effect on SWB. In a regression equation that included both income and consumption (but not wealth) and all the standard controls, Goldsmith (2009) for Russia and Noll and Weick (2015) for Germany found both variables to have a significant positive effect on SWB. However, Wu (2020) for Australia found that total consumption had no separate significant influence on SWB in the presence of income which had a positive significant effect. But, when consumption was disaggregated into conspicuous and basic consumption and was included in the regression equation with income, the coefficient on conspicuous consumption was positive and significant and income no longer had any significant effect.

Empirical studies also indicate that the content of the consumption basket matters for SWB. Choung et al. (2020) for Korea and Wu (2020) for Australia grouped the structure of consumption broadly into basic and conspicuous consumption and found a positive significant relationship between conspicuous consumption and SWB. The coefficient for basic consumption was negative in both studies, though statistically insignificant for the Australian sample. Choung et al. (2020) for Korea, Noll and Weick (2015) for Germany and Wang et al. (2019) for China disaggregated consumption expenditure into detailed categories and found that expenditure on leisure activities was positively correlated with SWB, and expenditure on healthcare was negatively correlated. Noll and Weick (2015) and Wang et al. (2019) found a positive effect of expenditure on clothing, but this expenditure category had no significant effect in the Korean sample. Noll and Weick (2015) observed a positive relationship between expenditure on education and SWB in Germany, but in the Korean sample of Choung et al. (2020) and Chinese sample of Wang et al. (2019) education expenditure had no significant effect.

The evidence on the influence of relative consumption on SWB is limited, given the dearth of studies that have looked into this issue. Choung et al. (2020) and Noll and Weick (2015) did not examine the role of relative consumption. Goldsmith (2009) for Russia examined the role of reference effects by estimating a regression equation that included mean income of region, mean consumption of region, household income and household consumption as explanatory variables. He found that both household income and household consumption had a positive significant effect on SWB. Mean income of region also had a positive significant coefficient indicating that this

measure functioned as a signal for future prospects. In contrast, mean consumption of region had a negative and significant coefficient, indicating that higher reference group consumption lowered SWB through the traditional comparison effect.

Wang et al. (2019) too found that reference group consumption had a negative effect on SWB in China. They included household consumption and cell average consumption (viz., average consumption of the gender-age-education reference group) in the regression equation and obtained a positive relationship for own consumption and a negative relationship for reference consumption.[9] In an alternative specification Wang et al. (2019) included cell average reference consumption and rank order of an individual's consumption within the relevant reference group simultaneously with the level of household consumption and other controls, and found that only cell average reference consumption was significant with a negative sign. Neither the level of consumption nor rank order of consumption exerted any significant effect.

Wu (2020) found that the effect of conspicuous consumption on SWB in Australia took place mainly through social comparisons. When the ranking of conspicuous consumption expenditure within the reference group was included in the regression equation in addition to the level of conspicuous consumption, the ranking of conspicuous consumption had a significant positive effect but the effect of the level of conspicuous consumption was no longer significant. The level of income and ranking of income in the reference group were also included in the specification but they had no significant effect on SWB.

Wealth and subjective well-being

The few studies that have empirically investigated the effects of wealth and income on SWB simultaneously found that both variables have a positive significant effect (e.g., Brokešová et al., 2021; Brown and Gray 2016; Headey and Wooden, 2004; Headey et al., 2008; Knight and Gunatilaka, 2022). Headey and Wooden (2004) for Australia, and Headey et al. (2008) for Australia, Germany, Britain and Hungary observed that wealth (net worth) had a stronger effect than income.[10] Researchers have highlighted the importance of separating net wealth into its

[9] The regression equation also included household per capita income and other standard controls as explanatory variables.

[10] The regression equation for Hungary also included level of consumption as an explanatory variable, and the effect of consumption was found to be stronger than wealth and income.

constituent parts because of their different effects on subjective well-being. Brokešová et al. (2021), Brown and Gray (2016), Goldsmith (2009), Jantsch et al. (2022) and Plagnol (2011) found that assets had a positive significant effect while debt had a negative significant effect.

Brown and Gray (2016) for Australia and Jantsch et al. (2022) for Germany examined the importance of relative wealth and relative income for SWB simultaneously and obtained contrasting results. Brown and Gray (2016) found that whereas average level of income of reference group was negatively related to SWB, the average level of net wealth or total assets of reference group was positively related. The average level of debt of the reference group did not have a significant impact. Brown and Gray (2016) explained these findings by suggesting that individuals are more likely to compare themselves with assets of the reference group as these are more conspicuous while household debt of comparators are harder to observe directly. In contrast to Brown and Gray's findings, Jantsch et al. (2022) found that reference group income, reference group wealth and reference group debt did not have any significant effect on SWB in Germany.

Both Brown and Gray (2016) and Jantsch et al. (2022) also checked for asymmetries in comparisons by taking into account whether individuals were below or above the reference group's income, total assets, and total debt. Brown and Gray (2016) found that having a level of household income above (below) that of the comparison group had positive (negative) effects on an individual's level of SWB. In contrast, having a level of net wealth above the average of the reference group had a negative impact, whereas having net wealth below the average of the reference group had a positive association. Separation of net wealth into total assets and debt reveals that this relationship was driven by the average level of total assets of the comparison group, rather than debt levels. According to Brown and Gray (2016), the negative effect of having net wealth above the average of the comparison group likely indicates an individual's dislike of inequality in net wealth and total assets. In contrast, Jantsch et al. (2022) found that having assets above the average of the reference group had a significant positive effect on subjective well-being, but none of the other comparisons vis-à-vis the reference group average had any significant effect.

3 Data

We use data from the Slovak Household Finance and Consumption Survey (HFCS) conducted in 2017, which currently is the latest wave available for research. The data was collected by the

National Bank of Slovakia in cooperation with the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic.[11] The sample of 2179 households is representative at the level of eight NUTS-3 regions.[12] The questionnaire contained questions about the detailed structure of assets, liabilities, consumption of households, as well as various socio-economic characteristics of the household members. As a question, the reference person filling in the questionnaire was also asked about his/her general satisfaction with life on a scale from 0 to 10, where zero means completely dissatisfied. The structure of the data is unique, where information on subjective well-being is observed together with income, wealth, consumption and their sub-components. Descriptive statistics of the variables used in the analysis are reported in Appendix Table A1.

It should be noted that the original data contains a sizeable number of missing values, which is natural when respondents are asked to fill in a detailed questionnaire. To correct for the selective response to different questions, the data collectors applied multiple imputation techniques and imputed missing values by five estimates. We take this feature of the dataset into account throughout the whole analysis and adjust our point estimates and standard errors following the standard procedures for multiple-imputed data suggested by Rubin (2004).

4 Empirical approach

Our baseline specification is as follows.

$$SWB_i = \alpha_0 + Y'_i\beta + W'_i\gamma + C'_i\delta + X'_i\theta + H'\kappa + \rho_j + \varepsilon_i \qquad (1)$$

[11] The HFCS is run about every three to four years since 2010 in the whole Eurosystem and a few additional countries, as part of an ECB research network. https://www.ecb.europa.eu/stats/ecb_surveys/hfcs/html/index.en.html

[12] The NUTS classification (Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics) is a hierarchical system for dividing up the economic territory of the EU and the UK. NUTS-1 represents major socio-economic regions; NUTS-2 represents basic regions for the application of regional policies; and NUTS-3 represents small regions for specific diagnoses. See https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/nuts/background

Subjective well-being (*SWB*) is linked to indicators of economic well-being (*EWB*), such as components of gross income (vector *Y*), components of net wealth (vector *W*), and components of consumption (vector *C*), where *i* indexes the reference person of the household. All *EWB* indicators are expressed in natural logarithms of household totals divided by the number of household members. Additional control variables are included in the specification, such as individual characteristics of the reference person in the household (*X*), household characteristics (*H*), and subregional dummies (ρ_j). Individual characteristics are age, age-squared, and a list of categorical variables for gender, highest education level attained, labor market status and marital status. Household characteristics are a dummy variable for the presence of children in the household and an indicator of the degree of urbanization in the neighbourhood of main residence. Subregional dummies correspond to the sixteen subregions defined by the Slovak Institute of Employment.[13] The last term in (1), ε_i are i.i.d. normal disturbances.

In alternative versions of the baseline specification, we disaggregate income, consumption and wealth into subcomponents. Income is disaggregated into labour income, transfers and other income. Total consumption split into conspicuous and non-conspicuous components. The former includes expenditure on holidays and eating outside of home, while non-conspicuous consumption is residual consumption. The above division is driven by data availability. Net wealth is separated into gross assets and gross liabilities. The coefficients of all the *EWB* indicators, except for gross liabilities, are expected to have a positive sign.

We assume that our *SWB* indicator, recorded on an eleven-point scale, is cardinal and estimate the regression equation using ordinary least squares (OLS). As noted in earlier studies, it makes little difference in the results if one alternatively assumes an ordinal SWB measure and estimates an ordered response model instead of the computationally simpler OLS (see, for example, Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters, 2004).

[13] Subregions can be seen as an intermediate step between the eight regions of NUTS-3 and 79 districts of Slovakia. The Institute of Employment (a Slovak NGO) defined sixteen subregions grouping socio-economically and geographically similar districts into relatively homogenous units. Some subregions cross the borders of official NUTS-3 regions. Their definition is a well-known alternative to the official regional classification in Slovakia. https://www.iz.sk/en/projects/regions-of-slovakia

In the next part of the analysis, we expand the baseline specification by including self-centered inequality and community-centered inequality, following Knight and Gunatilaka (2022). Thus:

$$SWB_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SCI_i^e + \beta_2 CCI_i^e + EWB'_i\lambda + X'_i\mu + H'_i\pi + \varrho_j + \upsilon_i \qquad (2)$$

Self-centered inequality (SCI^e) aims to compare the individual with a reference group in terms of *EWB* indicator $e \in \{Y, W, C\}$.[14] We use cell means by age-education-region groups (as in Ferrer-i-Carbonell, 2005; Kingdon and Knight, 2007), where cells are defined by eight NUTS-3 regions, three age- and two education categories of respondents.[15] As noted earlier, the cell mean approach to measuring the reference group is more common in the literature. A further narrowing of the reference group was not feasible due to limited subsample sizes of the resulting cells. We check the sensitivity of results to using other standard *SCI* measures found in the literature,[16] all of which are based on broader, regional reference groups.

Community-centered inequality (CCI^e) focuses on overall inequality in the broader, spatially defined reference group rather than on the position of the household within the group. These are standard inequality measures computed for each of the eight NUTS-3 regions, such as the Gini coefficient or different inter-percentile ratios of the 90th, 50th and the 10th percentiles of *EWB* indicator $e \in \{Y, W, C\}$.

Based on mixed empirical evidence in the literature, the expected signs of coefficients on SCI^e and CCI^e are ambiguous. A negative coefficient is associated with the envy effect, which is a standard result for developed countries. Whereas, a positive coefficient is in line with the signaling or information effect, suggesting that higher inequality in the reference group signals better future opportunities and *SWB* for individuals. The signaling effect is often found for developing countries.

[14] In earlier studies, *SCI* was also called relative measure of *EWB*.
[15] See Table A3 in the Appendix for descriptive statistics by cells.
[16] Such as regional means and percentiles, predicted values of *EWB* based on a first-stage model, and regional ranks.

5 Results

Table 1 reports OLS estimates of five alternative specifications of equation (1) in which income, consumption and wealth are included concurrently together with the control variables noted in Section 4. Column 1 represents the baseline specification with natural logarithms of per capita household income, per capita household consumption, and per capita net wealth of households. The full set of estimates including all control variables can be found in Table A6 in the Appendix.[17] In column 2 income is divided into labour income, transfers and other income to test the hypothesis that the three channels have different impact on SWB (Goldsmith, 2009). In column 3, consumption is disaggregated into conspicuous and other consumption to test the hypothesis that the consumption of goods and services that are visible to others has a stronger association with happiness than the rest of consumption (Wang et al., 2019). Similarly, in column 4 net wealth is separated into gross assets and gross liabilities to test the hypothesis that these subcomponents have different effects on SWB (Brokešová et al., 2021; Brown and Gray, 2016; Goldsmith, 2009, Jantsch et al., 2022). In column 5 all the economic well-being indicators are included in disaggregate form.

The results support the earlier findings of Choung et al. (2020), Goldsmith (2009) and Headey et al. (2008) that income, consumption and wealth each has a significant positve effect on SWB. As Goldsmith (2009) argues, the evidence is consistent with the view that each of these variables affect SWB through status, self-esteem and anticipation channels. The results in column 2 indicate that labour income and other income have similar influence on SWB but the effect of transfer income is smaller. Column 3 shows that the structure of the consumption basket matters for SWB. Consistent with the hypothesis posited above and the findings of previous research, conspicuous consumption expenditure has a significant positive effect on SWB. However, while the coefficient on other consumption expenditure is also positive, it is not statistically significant. Column 4 shows that assets and liabilities have opposite effects on SWB, and that the positive effect of assets has a greater impact than the negative effect of liabilities. The coefficient on gross assets is positive and significant while the coefficient on gross liabilities is negative but not statistically significant.

[17] The estimates for the individual- and household-specific characteristics do not change considerably for alternative specifications considered in this paper and are broadly in line with other studies. Hence, we do not discuss the findings on the control variables in detail.

This is contrary to the findings of studies by Brown and Gray (2016), Goldsmith (2009) and Jantsch et al. (2022) who obtained a positive significant effect of assets and a negative signficant effect of debt. This difference could be attributed to differences in country context. A main component of assets of Slovak household is housing while gross liabilities mainly comprise mortgage debt. It is therefore highly likely that SWB of Slovak households is affected by the net value of housing rather that individual components of wealth.[18] When all the subcomponents of the three economic well-being indicators are included together, the coefficient on labour income ceases to be significant while that on other (non-conspicuous) consumption becomes significant (column 5). It is notable that the size of the coefficients on aggregate measures of income, consumption, and wealth are larger than the sum of the coefficients on the respective components. This is perhaps indicative of the separate channels of influence being measured inaccurately.

[Table 1 about here]

Tables 2 to 4 show the estimates of the expanded specification in equation (2) separately for the relationship between SWB and income, consumption, and wealth. In each of the separate regressions, measures of self-centered inequality (i.e., a reference group measure) and community-centered inequality in the relevant variable of interest (i.e., income, consumption, or wealth) are added to the baseline specification shown in column 1 of Table 1. Self-centered inequality is measured by cell means of the variable of interest for the region-age-education reference group.[19] In the case of community-centered inequality we compare the results of specifications containing the regional Gini coefficient with those for regional percentile ratios derived from the 90th, 50th and the 10th percentile values (p90, p50, p10). While the Gini coefficient reflects inequalities within the middle ranges of the underlying distribution, percentile ratios give more weight to tails (see Clark, 2003; and Knight and Gunatilaka, 2022). With the exception of the study by Knight and Gunatilaka (2022), the inclusion of both self-centered inequality and community-centered inequality in the same specification is scarce in the literature. Also, to the best of our knowledge,

[18] Jantsch et al. (2022, Table 4) for Germany found that non-mortgage debt mattered more for SWB than mortgage debt: the coefficient on mortgage debt was negative and statistically significant while the coefficient on mortgage debt was not statistically significant.
[19] In section 6 we analyze the sensitivity of results for choosing other measures of self-centered inequality.

our study is the first to compare the effects of self-centered inequality and community-centered inequality for all three EWB indicators $e \in \{Y, W, C\}$.

Regression estimates presented in Tables 2 to 4 confirm that the positive and statistically significant effects of absolute measures of income, consumption, and wealth on SWB are robust to the inclusion of the inequality measures. Focusing on income inequality in Table 2, both self-centered and community-centered measures had a positive and statistically significant effect on SWB. The coefficients on reference group income, regional Gini index of income inequality and all the inter-percentile ratios for income are positive and statistically significant. This can be interpreted as evidence that individuals consider both reference group income and community-centered income inequality as a positive signal for future self-advancement rather than as an undesirable feature. A positive and statistically significant effect of reference group income is consistent with earlier findings of Caporale et al. (2009) and Senik (2004 and 2008) for Eastern European countries.

[Table 2 about here]

In contrast to the findings for income inequality, self-centered consumption inequality and community-centered consumption inequality exerted opposite influences on SWB. As Table 3 shows, the effect of self-centered consumption inequality was positive while that of community-centered consumption inequality was negative. Thus, reference group average consumption has a positive signalling effect for future prospects while community-centered consumption inequality is viewed as a local public „bad“. Among the various community-centered measures, the coefficient is statistically significant only for the p90/p10 and the p50/p10 inter-percentile ratios, which suggests that the role of inequality on SWB is particularly dominant in the left tail of the distribution. The positive effect of self-centered consumption inequality in Slovakia is contrary to the negative effect observed by Goldsmith (2009) for Russia and Wang et al. (2019) for China, which can be attributed to differences in country context. To the best of our knowledge, there is no other study that examines the linkage between the community-centered inequality of consumption and SWB.

[Table 3 about here]

In the case of wealth also, the effects of self-centered wealth inequality and community-centered wealth inequality on SWB are different. As Table 4 shows, reference group wealth has no significant effect, consistent with the finding of Jantsch et al. (2022) for Germany, while all the different measures of community-centered wealth inequality have a negative association. However, only the coefficients on the Gini index and the p90/p10 inter-percentile ratio are statistically significant. This suggests that wealth polarization at any of the tails of the distribution does not stand out as the main driver of the association with SWB of individuals and that inequality within the middle ranges is just as relevant.

[Table 4 about here]

Table 5 presents the results of another extension of the model in which we examine the role of reference group measures and community-centered inequality for income, consumption and wealth simultaneously in the presence of the absolute values of these three variables. The results indicate that overall the SWB of individuals is affected positively by absolute values of income, consumption and wealth, and negatively by community-centered consumption inequality, especially at the lower tail of the distribution. The size and statistical significance of the coefficients on the absolute values of income, consumption and wealth are stable in all specifications, while the coefficients on the reference group measures remain insignificant. When community-centered inequality measures are added to the specification, consumption inequality measured by the p50/p10 interpercentile ratio is negative and statistically significant, but the community-centered income inequality and wealth inequality measures are siginificant only if consumption inequality is not included in the same specification (column 4).

[Table 5 about here]

6 Sensitivity analysis

In this section we compare the sensitivity of results to using different measures of self-centered inequality for each of the EWB variables of interest. These measures include: regional median; the 75th percentile; predicted value based on regional and socio-economic characteristics of the

referece person (similarly to Welsch and Kühling, 2015); cell means by region-age-education categories (as in Ferrer-i-Carbonell, 2005; Kingdon and Knight, 2007); a pair of dummies for tails in the regional distribution, being equal to one if the value of the variable of interest is larger than the 75th or smaller than the 25th percentile, respectively (following Jantsch et al., 2022; and Knight and Gunatilaka, 2022); and regional ranks expressing the percentage of respondents in the region with a lower value of the variable of interest than the individual respondent (used e.g. in Wu, 2020).

Tables 6 to 8 report the estimates for different measures of self-centered inequality separately for income, consumption and net wealth. In general, we can conclude that results vary both in terms of statistical significance and signs of the estimated coefficients; i.e., the estimates are sensitive to the choice of the self-centered inequality measure.

[Table 6 about here]

Looking at the alternative specifications for reference group income in Table 6, the results for cell mean income and predicted income of those with the same characteristics are mutually supportive (columns 3 and 4). Both measures have a positive and significant effect on SWB, a result which is commonly interpreted as evidence of demonstration effect and expectation of future prospects. However, there is no significant impact of reference group income on SWB when it is measured spatially by the regional median or regional 75th percentile (columns 1 and 2). This is consistent with the observation of Brown et al. (2015) and Kingdon and Knight (2007) that relative income has a weaker effect on SWB if the reference group is broadly defined. The impact of reference group income on SWB changes when it is measured in terms of the position of an individual's income within the income distribution instead of average income of the reference group. SWB is significantly lower if individual income is below the 25th percentile income level (column 5). In a similar vein, SWB increases significantly as the income ranking of an individual within the reference group rises (column 6), consistent with the result obtained by Wu (2020) for Australia. Both these findings signify feelings of relative achievement or relative deprivation compared with others in the reference group, which is the opposite of what the results in the first four columns of Table 6 suggest. Furthermore, when reference income is defined by the position of an individual's income within the income distribution, the association between SWB and absolute income and absolute consumption disappears.

[Table 7 about here]

In the case of the consumption-SWB relationship (Table 7), the results for the alternative reference group measures are also mixed. The cell mean consumption has a significant positive effect on SWB (column 4). In contrast, the regional median, regional 75th percentile and predicted consumption have a negative effect, but only the effect of the 75th percentile consumption is statistically significant (columns 1, 2 and 3). SWB is also significantly lower if individual consumption is below the 25th percentile level (column 5). However, an individual's consumption ranking does not have a significant effect on SWB (column 6). The coefficient on absolute consumption ceases to be statistically significant when reference consumption is depicted by the position of an individual within the distribution (columns 5 and 6).

[Table 8 about here]

As in the case of income and consumption, the results for wealth ranking and the position of an individual within the wealth distribution are statistically significant (columns 4 and 5 of Table 8) and signify feelings of relative achievement compared with others in the reference group. However, the effect kicks in only if an individual's wealth is above the 75th percentile level. In contrast, reference group average wealth depicted by the regional median has a significant positive effect on SWB, but the effects of the regional p75 and cell mean measures are not statistically significant (columns 1, 2 and 3).

7 Conclusions

On the basis of data from the 2017 Slovak Household Finance and Consumption Survey, this paper analyzes the determinants of SWB from a multidimensional perspective. The standard approach to empirical SWB research has tended to focus on the role of income, mainly because of reasons of data availability. In recent years, a small but growing number of studies have highlighted the importance of consumption and wealth when analyzing SWB. A limited number of studies has argued that models exclusively based on income, consumption or wealth are incomplete and that it is important to distinguish between consumption, income and wealth as separate channels affecting SWB. This view is supported by the finding in our paper that the absolute level of each of these three variables has a significant positive effect on SWB. This finding remains robust even

after the inclusion of self-centered inequality and community-centered inequality as explanatory variables in the regression equations.

The paper also examines the differential effects of separate sources of income, structure of consumption, and components of wealth on SWB. The regression results show that the effect on SWB is stronger for labour income, conspicuous consumption expenditure and gross assets. However, the effects of aggregate measures of income, consumption and net wealth dominate the effects through the subcomponents of these variables, perhaps reflecting measurement issues and the complex transmission channels.

In a departure from much of the existing literature, this paper analyzes concurrently the influence of self-centered inequality and community-centered inequality measures on SWB. The evidence indicates that both types of inequalities are important considerations for SWB. We find that individuals consider the economic wellbeing of their narrow reference groups as positive signals for their own future self-advancement, which holds for income, consumption and to some extent also for wealth. However, when evaluating inequality in broader, regional communities, the associations between inequality and SWB differ for the underlying economic indicators. While regional income inequality has a positive signalling effect for future prospects, consumption and wealth inequalities bear a negative comparison effect. The above contrasting finding may be explained by the higher visibility of one's consumption and wealth in comparison with income.

This paper also compares the results for different measures of self-centered inequality on SWB applied to the same sample and concludes that the findings are sensitive to the choice of the inequality measure. Reference group average income and consumption measured on the basis of individual characteristics have a significant positive effect on SWB, signifying a signalling effect, but the effect is not visible when the reference group is measured spatially. In contrast, if the reference group measure is defined by the position of an individual within the distribution of income, consumption or wealth instead of reference group average, the results indicate an opposite comparison effect on SWB that suggest feelings of relative achievement or relative deprivation compared to others in the reference group. The comparison effect of the distribution-based reference group measure is asymmetric. The comparison effect operates upward if income or consumption is below the 25th percentile and downward if wealth level is above the 75^{th} percentile level.

The policy implications of these findings, especially the distributional aspects, are not straightforward. Clearly, policies that promote growth in income and consumption and facilitate wealth accumulation should increase welfare or SWB of individuals. However, one should be wary of drawing conclusions based on a snapshot picture of inequalities. It is doubtful that a positive signalling effect of self-centered and community-centered inequalities observed at a particular point in time can be interpreted to mean that increase in inequalities would increase SWB in a dynamic setting. Our evidence shows that the SWB of individuals is influenced by the comparison effect rather than the information effect based on their position in the distribution of income, consumption and wealth. In particular, it would be important to avoid a widening of inequalities in income and consumption at the lower end of the distribution.

REFERENCES

Banerjee, B., Ball, R. and Mughal, A. G. 2021. Ethnicity and Subjective Well-being in the Republic of North Macedonia, *Eastern European Economics*, 59:4, 360-377. DOI: 10.1080/00128775.2021.1908833

Blanchflower, D. G. and Oswald, A. J. 2003. Does inequality reduce happiness? Evidence from the states of the USA from the 1970s to the 1990s. Paper presented at the conference "Paradoxes of Happiness in Economics", Milan.

Brokešová, Z., Cupák, A., Lepinteur, A. and Rizov, M., 2021. Wealth, Assets and Life Satisfaction: A Metadata Instrumental-Variable Approach, National Bank of Slovakia Working Paper No. WP 4/2021.

Brown, G. D. A., Gardner, J., Oswald, A. J. and Qian, J. 2008. Does wage rank affect employees' well-being? *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy & Society, 47*(3), 355–389. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-232X.2008.00525.x

Brown, S. and Gray, D. 2016. Household finances and well-being in Australia: An empirical analysis of comparison effects. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 53: 17–36. doi:10.1016/j.joep.2015.12.006

Brown, S., Gray, D. and Roberts, J. 2015. The relative income hypothesis: A comparison of methods. *Economic Letters* 130: 47–50 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2015.02.031

Caporale, G. M., Georgellis, Y., Tsitsianis, N. and Yin, Y. P. 2009. Income and happiness across Europe: Do reference values matter? *Journal of Economic Psychology* 30 (1): 42–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2008.06.004

Choung, Y., Pak, T. and Chatterjee, S. 2020. Consumption and life satisfaction: The Korean evidence. *International Journal of Consumer Studies 45(5):1007–1019.* doi:10.1111/ijcs.12620

Clark, A. E. 2003. Inequality-aversion and income mobility: a direct test. DELTA Working Paper, 2003-11, Paris. https://worlddatabaseofhappiness-archive.eur.nl/hap_bib/freetexts/clark_ae_2003.pdf

Clark, A. E. 2018. Four decades of the economics of happiness: Where next. *Review of Income and Wealth* 64 (2): 245–269. DOI:10.1111/roiw.12369

Clark, A. and D'Ambrosio, C. 2015. Attitudes to income inequality: Experimental and survey evidence. In A. Atkinson and F. Bourguignon (Editors) *The Handbook of Income Distribution*, vol 2, pp. 1147-1208, North Holland: Amsterdam and Oxford. DOI:10.1016/B978-0-444-59428-0.00014-X

Clark, A., Frijters, P. and Shields, M. 2008. Relative income, happiness and utility: An explanation for the Easterlin paradox and other issues. *Journal of Economic Literature* 46 (1): 95–144. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27646948

Clark, A.E. and Oswald, A.J., 1996. Satisfaction and comparison income. *Journal of Public Economics*, 61(3): 359-381. https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2727(95)01564-7

Diener, E., 1984. Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95 (3): 542–575. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542

Diener, E. and Biswas-Diener, R., 2002. Will money increase subjective well-being? *Social Indicators Research*, 57, pp.119-169. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014411319119

Ding, J., Salinas-Jiménez, J. and Salinas-Jiménez, M.d. 2021. The Impact of Income Inequality on Subjective Well-Being: The Case of China. *Journal of Happiness Studies* **22**, 845–866. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-020-00254-4

Dolan, P., Peasgood, T. and White, M., 2008. Do we really know what makes us happy? A review of the economic literature on the factors associated with subjective well-being. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 29 (1): 94-122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2007.09.001

Duesenberry, J.S., 1949. Income, saving and the theory of consumer behavior. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Easterlin, R. A. 1974. Does economic growth improve the human lot? Some empirical evidence. In David, P. A. and Melvin, W. R. eds. *Nations and Households in Economic Growth.* New York: Academic Press. pp. 89–125.

Easterlin, R. A., 1995. Will increasing the incomes of all increase the happiness of all? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 27 (1): 35–47.

Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. 2005. Income and well-being: an empirical analysis of the comparison income effect. *Journal of Public Economics* 89 (5–6): 997–1019. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2004.06.003

Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. and Frijters, P., 2004. How important is methodology for the estimates of the determinants of happiness? *The Economic Journal*, 114(497), pp.641-659. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2004.00235.x

Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. and Ramos, X. 2014. Inequality and happiness. Journal of economic surveys 28 (5): 1016–1027. https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12049

Goldsmith, G. 2009. Essays in the economics of subjective well-being. Unpublished D. Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford. https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:0106206d-80b7-45f9-9850-cd8e7d5c0e97/download_file?file_format=application%2Fpdf&safe_filename=swbessays_electronic.pdf&type_of_work=Thesis

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

Headey, B. and Wooden, M. 2004. The Effects of Wealth and Income on Subjective Well-Being and Ill-Being. *Economic Record* 80 (s1):S24–S33. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4932.2004.00181.x

Headey, B., Muffels, R. and Wooden, M. 2008. Money Does not Buy Happiness: Or Does It? A Reassessment Based on the Combined Effects of Wealth, Income and Consumption. Social Indicators Research 87 (1): 65–82. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9146-y

Helliwell, J., Layard, R. and Sachs, J. Editors. 2012. *The World Happiness Report*.

https://s3.amazonaws.com/happiness-report/2012/World_Happiness_Report_2012.pdf

Hirschman, A. and Rothschild, M. 1973. The changing tolerance for income inequality in the course of economic development. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 87 (4): 544–566. https://doi.org/10.2307/1882024

Jantsch, A., Le Blanc, J. and Schmidt, T., 2022. Wealth and subjective well-being in Germany. Deutsche Bundesbank Discussion Paper No. 11/2022.
http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4094558

Jiang, S., Lu, M., and Sato, H. 2012. Identity, inequality, and happiness: Evidence from urban China. *World Development*, 40(6): 1190–1200

Kingdon, G. and Knight, J. 2007. Community, comparisons and subjective well-being in a divided society. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 64 (1): 69–90.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2007.03.004

Knight, J. and Gunatilaka, R. 2022. Income inequality and happiness: Which inequalities matter in China? *China Economic Review* 72, 101765.

Knight, J., Song, L., and Gunatilaka, R., 2009. Subjective well-being and its determinants in rural China. *China Economic Review*, 20(4), pp.635-649.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2008.09.003

Lewis, J. 2014. Income, expenditure and personal well-being, 2011/12. Office for National Statistics, United Kingdom.
http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/7617/mrdoc/pdf/7617_iepwb_1112_userguide.pdf

McBride, M. 2001. Relative-income effects on subjective well-being in the cross-section. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 45 ( ): 251–278
https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681(01)00145-7

Ngamaba, K. H., Panagioti, M. and Armitage, C. J. 2018. Income inequality and subjective well-being: a systematic review and meta analysis. *Quality of Life Research* 27 (3):577-596.
doi: 10.1007/s11136-017-1719-x.

Noll, H-H. and Weick. 2015. Consumption expenditures and subjective well-being: empirical evidence from Germany. *International Review of Economics* 62(2):101-119.
DOI: 10.1007/s12232-014-0219-3

Plagnol, A. C. 2011. Financial satisfaction over the life course: The influence of assets and liabilities. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 32(1), 45–64.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2010.10.006

Rubin, D. B. 2004. Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys. Vol. 81. John Wiley & Sons.

Schneider, S.M. 2016. Income inequality and subjective wellbeing: trends, challenges, and research divisions. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 17: 1719–1739.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-015-9655-3

Senik, C. 2004. When information dominates comparison: Learning from Russian subjective panel data. *Journal of Public Economics* 88 (9–10): 2099–2123 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(03)00066-5

Senik, C. 2005. Income distribution and well-being: What can we learn from subjective data? *Journal of Economic Surveys* 19 (1): 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0950-0804.2005.00238.x

Senik, C., 2008. Ambition and jealousy: Income interactions in the 'Old'Europe versus the 'New'Europe and the United States. *Economica*, 75(299), pp.495-513. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0335.2007.00629.x

Senik, C. 2009. Income distribution and subjective happiness: A survey. OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers no. 96. OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/218860720683

Veblen, T. 1899. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Wang, H., Cheng, Z. and Smyth, R. 2019. Consumption and Happiness. *The Journal of Development Studies* 55 (1): 120–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2017.1371294

Wang, P., Pan, J., & Luo, Z. (2015). The impact of income inequality on individual happiness: Evidence from China. Social Indicators Research, 121, 413–435.

Wu, F. 2020. An examination of the effects of consumption expenditures on life satisfaction in Australia. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 21 (8) : 2735–2771. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00161-3

Tables in the main text

Table 1: Life satisfaction and economic well-being

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Income	0.269***		0.239***	0.248***	
Labor income		0.045**			0.011
Transfer income		0.012			0.010
Other income		0.041*			0.057***
Consumption	0.278*	0.377***		0.364***	
Conspicuous cons.			0.077***		0.081***
Other consumption			0.122		0.269**
Net wealth	0.911***	0.917***	0.900***		
Total assets				0.185***	0.183***
Total liabilities				-0.022	-0.019
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adjusted R-squared	0.2249	0.2231	0.2292	0.2220	0.2233
Observations	2179	2179	2179	2179	2179

Note: ***, **, and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively, here and in all subsequent tables. A constant was included. Control variables are: age, age-squared; categories of gender, education, labor market status, marital status, presence of children in the household, degree of urbanization; and subregional dummies.

Table 2: Life satisfaction and community-centered inequality in income

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Income	0.257***	0.267***	0.248***	0.245***
Consumption	0.271**	0.254*	0.287**	0.296**
Net wealth	0.882***	0.900***	0.896***	0.897***
SCI in income:				
Cell means	0.422*	0.326	0.482**	0.343
CCI in income:				
Regional p90/p10	1.057***			
Regional p90/p50		1.938*		
Regional p50/p10			1.830***	
Regional Gini				9.329***
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adjusted R-squared	0.2376	0.2311	0.2314	0.2332
Observations	2179	2179	2179	2179

Note: A constant and control variables listed in the notes of Table 1 were included.

Table 3: Life satisfaction and community-centered inequality in consumption

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Income	0.261***	0.264***	0.260***	0.263***
Consumption	0.275*	0.269*	0.254*	0.250*
Net wealth	0.877***	0.892***	0.894***	0.909***
SCI in consumption:				
Cell means	0.582	0.639	0.667*	0.700*
CCI in consumption:				
Regional p90/p10	-1.927***			
Regional p90/p50		-3.092		
Regional p50/p10			-3.825***	
Regional Gini				-1.197
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adjusted R-squared	0.2370	0.2284	0.2368	0.2264
Observations	2179	2179	2179	2179

Note: A constant and control variables listed in the notes of Table 1 were included.

Table 4: Life satisfaction and community-centered inequality in net wealth

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Income	0.266***	0.283***	0.265***	0.273***
Consumption	0.299**	0.265*	0.297**	0.305**
Net wealth	0.870***	0.873***	0.876***	0.862***
SCI in net wealth:				
Cell means	0.623	0.391	0.641	0.531
CCI in net wealth:				
Regional p90/p10	-0.011			
Regional p90/p50		-0.534**		
Regional p50/p10			-0.022	
Regional Gini				-7.161*
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adjusted R-squared	0.2291	0.2290	0.2270	0.2284
Observations	2179	2179	2179	2179

Note: A constant and control variables listed in the notes of Table 1 were included.

Table 5: Life satisfaction and inequality in income, consumption and net wealth

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Income	0.324***	0.314***	0.305***	0.312***	0.261***	0.257***
Consumption	0.506***	0.509***			0.261*	0.259*
Net wealth			0.960***	0.939***	0.899***	0.888***
SCI (cell means):						
Income	0.175	0.231	0.332	0.391	0.125	0.220
Consumption	0.482	0.508			0.434	0.504
Net wealth			0.261	-0.033	0.231	-0.101
Regional CCI:						
Income p50/p10		1.200		1.860***		1.235
Consumption p50/p10		-3.388***				-2.796**
Net wealth p90/p50				-0.556**		-0.188
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adjusted R-squared	0.1977	0.2108	0.2242	0.2327	0.2261	0.2376
Observations	2179	2179	2179	2179	2179	2179

Note: A constant and all control variables listed in the notes of Table 1 were included.

Table 6: Life satisfaction and self-centered inequality in income

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Income	0.269***	0.270***	0.213***	0.255***	0.134	0.033
Consumption	0.279*	0.276*	0.132	0.275*	0.210	0.181
Net wealth	0.910***	0.908***	0.847***	0.910***	0.934***	0.906***
SCI in income:						
Regional median	0.204					
Regional p75 income		0.922				
Predicted income			4.129***			
Cell means of income				0.399*		
Income >= p75					0.014	
Income <= p25					-0.453***	
Region. rank of income						0.924***
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adjusted R-squared	0.2246	0.2583	0.2263	0.2302	0.2252	0.2302
Observations	2179	2179	2179	2179	2179	2179

Note: A constant and all control variables listed in the notes of Table 1 were included.

Table 7: Life satisfaction and self-centered inequality in consumption

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Income	0.269***	0.266***	0.357***	0.263***	0.276***	0.270***
Consumption	0.278*	0.290**	0.307**	0.249*	0.068	0.104
Net wealth	0.911***	0.904***	1.008***	0.911***	0.924***	0.913***
SCI in consumption:						
Regional median	-0.032					
Regional p75		-2.926*				
Predicted consumption			-0.501			
Cell means				0.703*		
Consumption >= p75					0.034	
Consumption <= p25					-0.252*	
Regional rank						0.284
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adjusted R-squared	0.2246	0.2250	0.2265	0.2256	0.2270	0.2248
Observations	2179	2179	2179	2179	2179	2179

Note: A constant and all control variables listed in the notes of Table 1 were included.

Table 8: Life satisfaction and self-centered inequality in net wealth

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Income	0.276***	0.271***	0.269***	0.270***	0.259***
Consumption	0.283**	0.282**	0.284**	0.237*	0.228*
Net wealth	0.884***	0.900***	0.881***	0.606***	0.255
SCI in net wealth:					
Regional median	2.062**				
Regional p75		2.036			
Cell means			0.597		
Net wealth >= p75				0.321*	
Net wealth <= p25				-0.211	
Regional rank					1.278***
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adjusted R-squared	0.2295	0.2258	0.2278	0.2269	0.2322
Observations	2179	2179	2179	2179	2179

Note: A constant and all control variables listed in the notes of Table 1 were included.

Appendix A. Descriptive tables and figures

Table A1: Descriptive statistics

Variable	mean	sd	p10	p50	p90
Life satisfaction	6.7	2.0	4.0	7.0	9.0
Age	54.1	14.8	35.0	54.0	74.0
Household members	2.8	1.4	1.0	3.0	5.0
Income	7 623	9 568	3 163	6 043	12 697
Consumption	3 595	1 851	1 800	3 300	5 712
non-conspicuous	2 557	1 171	1 279	2 376	4 204
conspicuous	520	763	0	300	1 298
Net wealth	42 802	80 572	3 173	27 330	82 667
Total assets	46 099	80 882	4 914	30 377	85 649
Total liabilities	3 297	9 015	0	0	11 819
Education					
lower secondary	0.11				
upper secondary	0.68				
tertiary	0.21				
Gender					
male	0.66				
female	0.34				
Labor status					
empoyed	0.59				
unemployed	0.03				
retired	0.35				
other	0.03				
Marital status					
single	0.12				
married	0.62				
widowed	0.15				
divorced	0.11				
Urbanization					
city	0.23				
town or suburbs	0.34				
village	0.43				
Kids in the household					
none	0.60				
one or more	0.40				

Table A2: Regional inequality measures

indicator	SK	BB	BA	KE	NR	PO	TN	TT	ZA
p90/p10									
income	4.01	4.74	3.69	3.64	3.51	4.42	3.95	3.72	3.42
consumption	3.17	2.83	2.50	3.50	3.10	3.35	2.61	2.88	2.97
net wealth	26.05	23.59	15.18	60.51	27.38	21.50	18.36	82.69	16.90
p90/p50									
income	2.10	2.16	2.25	1.88	1.87	1.98	2.13	2.35	2.08
consumption	1.73	1.65	1.54	1.63	1.80	1.64	1.65	1.82	1.80
net wealth	3.02	3.83	2.15	3.70	3.63	3.17	2.44	2.24	2.75
p50/p10									
income	1.91	2.20	1.64	1.93	1.88	2.23	1.86	1.58	1.64
consumption	1.83	1.71	1.63	2.14	1.72	2.04	1.59	1.58	1.65
net wealth	8.61	6.15	7.07	16.35	7.54	6.78	7.52	36.96	6.17
Gini									
income	0.35	0.47	0.32	0.33	0.29	0.32	0.34	0.32	0.29
consumption	0.25	0.26	0.23	0.25	0.24	0.27	0.22	0.24	0.25
net wealth	0.56	0.62	0.42	0.63	0.58	0.60	0.48	0.57	0.45

Note: SK - Slovakia, BB - Banská Bystrica, BA - Bratislava, KE - Košice, NR - Nitra, PO - Prešov, TN - Trenčín, TT - Trnava, ZA - Žilina. Income, consumption and net wealth per household member.

Table A3: Means of income, consumption and net wealth by region-age-education cells

age	education		BB	BA	KE	NR	PO	TN	TT	ZA
20-45	low									
		income	4820	9131	5178	3865	4646	8811	5986	4927
		consumption	2362	4604	2823	2317	2436	3453	3314	3154
		net wealth	14482	39356	22009	11162	25434	28130	16851	25059
		observations	40	63	48	31	40	37	34	41
20-45	high									
		income	5995	11529	10503	9411	5910	8995	11798	7452
		consumption	2960	5018	4415	3529	2827	3108	3155	3886
		net wealth	33538	43430	48333	30904	26497	64422	23315	40020
		observations	14	50	18	9	14	19	8	12
46-60	low									
		income	6010	9076	5904	6870	6369	9481	7829	5908
		consumption	3007	4630	3097	3494	3306	4071	4165	2925
		net wealth	48149	67208	31993	30051	47041	43622	35521	31065
		observations	62	48	67	63	76	56	43	64
46-60	high									
		income	23096	13112	13036	10462	8839	12586	17896	7190
		consumption	5032	5086	4753	3466	4003	4367	7311	3430
		net wealth	155297	71413	122989	93045	87423	60878	147640	29818
		observations	22	33	28	22	22	20	14	13
>60	low									
		income	5231	6784	5320	5126	5366	5844	5838	5269
		consumption	3548	4399	3488	3565	3624	3620	4341	3501
		net wealth	30753	69450	30111	32351	34184	40223	50445	35457
		observations	129	72	102	142	109	89	111	108
>60	high									
		income	8447	7665	9845	9178	7321	10489	7568	10030
		consumption	4946	4393	4246	4230	3892	3872	4757	5179
		net wealth	97447	62410	63776	84725	92595	59740	71946	57421
		observations	23	23	30	23	23	21	25	18

Note: Age refers to the reference person of the household, low education level means ISCED 3 or lower.

Table A4: Means of income, consumption and net wealth by cells (as a ratio of the national average)

age	education		BB	BA	KE	NR	PO	TN	TT	ZA
20-45	low									
		income	0.63	1.20	0.68	0.51	0.61	1.16	0.79	0.65
		consumption	0.66	1.28	0.79	0.64	0.68	0.96	0.92	0.88
		net wealth	0.34	0.92	0.51	0.26	0.59	0.66	0.39	0.59
		observations	40	63	48	31	40	37	34	41
20-45	high									
		income	0.79	1.51	1.38	1.23	0.78	1.18	1.55	0.98
		consumption	0.82	1.40	1.23	0.98	0.79	0.86	0.88	1.08
		net wealth	0.78	1.01	1.13	0.72	0.62	1.51	0.54	0.94
		observations	14	50	18	9	14	19	8	12
46-60	low									
		income	0.79	1.19	0.77	0.90	0.84	1.24	1.03	0.77
		consumption	0.84	1.29	0.86	0.97	0.92	1.13	1.16	0.81
		net wealth	1.12	1.57	0.75	0.70	1.10	1.02	0.83	0.73
		observations	62	48	67	63	76	56	43	64
46-60	high									
		income	3.03	1.72	1.71	1.37	1.16	1.65	2.35	0.94
		consumption	1.40	1.41	1.32	0.96	1.11	1.21	2.03	0.95
		net wealth	3.63	1.67	2.87	2.17	2.04	1.42	3.45	0.70
		observations	22	33	28	22	22	20	14	13
>60	low									
		income	0.69	0.89	0.70	0.67	0.70	0.77	0.77	0.69
		consumption	0.99	1.22	0.97	0.99	1.01	1.01	1.21	0.97
		net wealth	0.72	1.62	0.70	0.76	0.80	0.94	1.18	0.83
		observations	129	72	102	142	109	89	111	108
>60	high									
		income	1.11	1.01	1.29	1.20	0.96	1.38	0.99	1.32
		consumption	1.38	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.08	1.08	1.32	1.44
		net wealth	2.28	1.46	1.49	1.98	2.16	1.40	1.68	1.34
		observations	23	23	30	23	23	21	25	18

Note: Age refers to the reference person of the household, low education level means ISCED 3 or lower.

Table A5: Correlation matrix of subjective well-being and the main explanatory variables

	SWB	Income	Cons.	Net w.	Cell m. income	Cell m. cons.	Cell m. net w.	Income p50/p10	Cons. p50/p10	Net w. p90/p50
SWB	1.000									
Income	0.241	1.000								
Consumption	0.188	0.484	1.000							
Net wealth	0.277	0.334	0.433	1.000						
Cell m. income	0.214	0.356	0.327	0.306	1.000					
Cell m. cons.	0.162	0.271	0.430	0.306	0.761	1.000				
Cell m. net w.	0.186	0.269	0.325	0.406	0.755	0.755	1.000			
Inc. p50/p10	-0.068	-0.110	-0.175	-0.074	-0.308	-0.407	-0.182	1.000		
Cons. p50/p10	-0.082	-0.079	-0.142	-0.073	-0.222	-0.331	-0.180	0.568	1.000	
Net w. p90/p50	-0.131	-0.129	-0.201	-0.126	-0.363	-0.468	-0.311	0.700	0.588	1.000

Note: The explanatory variables are expressed in natural logarithms of per capita income, consumption and wealth of household members.

Table A6: Full set of estimates for the baseline model in Table 1, column 1

	(1)
Income	0.269***
Consumption	0.278*
Net wealth	0.911***
Age of HH head	-0.103***
Age of HH head^2	0.001***
Education level of HH head (base: Lower sec.)	
Upper secondary	0.203
Tertiary	0.796***
Female HH head	0.054
Labor market status (base: Employed)	
Unemployed	-0.873***
Retired	-0.179
Other	-0.637*
Marital status (base: Single)	
Married	0.461**
Widowed	-0.171
Divorced	-0.381*
Degree of urbanization (base: Village)	
City	0.195
Town or suburbs	-0.065
Children in the HH	0.553***
Subregional dummies (base: Bratislava)	
Banské mestá	-0.897***
Dolná Nitra	-0.159
Dolné Považie	0.062
Dolný Zemplín	-0.509
Horehronie	0.193
Horná Nitra	-0.525*
Horné Považie - Liptov	0.352
Horný Zemplín	0.075
Juhoslovenská kotlina	0.168
Kopanice	0.077
Košická kotlina -Torysa	-0.097
Kysuce a Orava	0.186
Podunajsko	-0.183
Spišské mestá	-0.015
Stredné Považie	-0.435*
Constant	-5.909***
Adjusted R-squared	0.2249
Observations	2179

Note: Income, consumption and net wealth of households are expressed in natural logarithms of per capita levels.