ECONSTOR
Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of

ZBW Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Dang, Hai-Anh H.; Abanokova, Kseniya

Working Paper

Do Gender, Child, and Parent Characteristics Contribute to Intergenerational Subjective Well-being Mobility? Evidence from Russia during 1994-2019

GLO Discussion Paper, No. 1088

Provided in Cooperation with:
Global Labor Organization (GLO)

Suggested Citation: Dang, Hai-Anh H.; Abanokova, Kseniya (2022) : Do Gender, Child, and Parent Characteristics Contribute to Intergenerational Subjective Well-being Mobility? Evidence from Russia during 1994-2019, GLO Discussion Paper, No. 1088, Global Labor Organization (GLO), Essen

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/253546

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Do Gender, Child, and Parent Characteristics Contribute to Intergenerational Subjective Well-being Mobility? Evidence from Russia during 1994-2019

Hai-Anh H. Dang and Kseniya Abanokova [*]

April 2022

Abstract

Measuring the intergenerational mobility of welfare provides key inputs for policies, but very few studies examine intergenerational mobility of subjective well-being (SWB), particularly in a poorer, transitional country context. We make new contributions by analyzing rich panel SWB data from Russia over the past quarter century, which address various shortcomings with traditional income data. We find that intergenerational SWB mobility—as measured by subjective wealth and life satisfaction—exists, with daughters having higher transmission of SWB from their mothers than sons. Adding other child and parent characteristics to the multivariate regression models can reduce the estimated impacts of mothers' SWB by up to 40% but does not change the gender gaps in the intergenerational transmission. Our results are robust to different model specifications and sample restrictions.

Key words: intergenerational mobility, life satisfaction, subjective wealth, gender, panel data, Russia

JEL: D6, I3, J6, O1

[*] Dang (hdang@worldbank.org; corresponding author) is senior economist with the Data Production and Methods Unit, Development Data Group, World Bank and is also affiliated with GLO, IZA, Indiana University, and International School, Vietnam National University, Hanoi; Abanokova (kabanokova@hse.ru) is junior research fellow with Higher School of Economics, National Research University, Russia. We would like to thank Timothy Smeeding and participants at the 36th International Association for Research in Income and Wealth conference (Oslo) for useful comments on an earlier version. We would also like to thank the UK Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) for funding assistance through a Knowledge for Change (KCP) grant for the World Development Report 2021 "Data for Better Lives". We also acknowledge support from the NRU-HSE Basic Research Program.

1. Introduction

Analysis of intergenerational persistence of individual welfare has a key role in the design of social policies that help equalize opportunities and improve mobility across generations. Yet, while intergenerational mobility in income and other outcomes such as education has been examined extensively (Corak, 2013; Azam and Bhatt, 2015; Narayan *et al.*, 2018; Alesina *et al.*, 2021), the intergenerational transmission of subjective well-being has been much less studied. Growing evidence suggests that SWB offers a valid approach to measuring utility and revealed preferences (Fleurbaey, 2009). Indeed, the OECD have implemented a well-being measurement framework during the past decade that strongly focuses on subjective well-being (Durand, 2014). However, to our knowledge, no such study exists in a poorer, transitional country context.[1]

Furthermore, subjective well-being (SWB) data can help address practical challenges with traditional income data analysis. One common example is that women may report no labor income data if they do not participate in the labor market. Analysis of income data reported by working women thus suffers from the sample selection bias due to women's labor participation choices and results in biased estimates of gender difference in intergenerational income mobility. SWB data, which are typically available for women regardless of their working status, help tackle this data gap and various related missing data challenges such as coresident sample issues (Emran, Greene, and Shilpi, 2018).

In this short paper, we make new contributions by proposing to investigate the intergenerational mobility of welfare with subjective well-being (SWB) data. We offer an early study that investigates the following questions, with a strong focus on gender. Does intergenerational

[1] Existing studies that investigate the impacts of parental SWB on that of their children in richer countries are mostly found in other fields such as psychology and sociology. For example, Casa *et al.* (2012) and Augustijn (2021) observe (some) positive correlation of life satisfaction between parents and their children in Spain and Germany. See also Clark (2018) for a recent review of studies on happiness in economics.

mobility of SWB exist? If it does, is there any gender difference regarding SWB transmission, particularly between mothers and children? Do other different child and parent characteristics contribute to the differences in the intergenerational transmission of SWB?

We investigate these questions with rich panel household survey data from Russia, the Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey (RLMS) that spans the past quarter of century. Besides the long-running nature, the RLMS offers additional advantages. Its SWB data are found to proxy well for monetary income in Russia (Ravallion and Lokshin, 2002) and are more complete than monetary income data in various aspects. Furthermore, for measures of SWB, we analyze two outcomes—life satisfaction and subjective wealth—the latter of which was rarely examined before.

We find that intergenerational SWB mobility exists, with daughters having higher SWB transmission than sons. Adding other child and parent characteristics to the regressions can reduce the estimated impacts of mothers' SWB on that of their children by 27% and 40% respectively for subjective wealth and life satisfaction. But doing so does not generally change the gender gaps with SWB transmission.

This paper has five sections. We discuss data next before presenting the analytical method in Section 3. We discuss the estimation results, robustness checks, and heterogeneity analysis in Section 4 and finally conclude in Section 5.

2. Data

The Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey (RLMS) was initially created with funding from various sources including the G-7 countries, the USAID, and the World Bank. The survey is currently managed by the Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina, and Russia's National Research University Higher School of Economics. The ongoing panel survey started in

1994 and has been implemented every year since then, except for a break in 1997 and 1999. The RLMS collects nationally representative data on various topics, including SWB, household demographics, income and consumption, occupation characteristics, and others. The sample size has been replenished several times due to panel attrition, but hovers between 4,000 and 6,000 households (between 8,000 and 17,000 individuals) each year. Our sample covers 24 survey rounds in the period 1994-2019. Hardly any middle-income countries can offer such long-running and nationally representative panel data as the RLMS.

The RLMS collects data on two SWB outcomes—subjective wealth and life satisfaction—with the following questions: "*And now, please imagine a nine-step ladder where on the bottom, the first step, stand the poorest people, and on the highest step, the ninth, stand the rich. On which step of the nine steps are you personally standing today?*", and "*To what extent are you satisfied with your life in general at the present time?*" Subjective wealth is measured on a scale from 1 to 9, and life satisfaction is measured on a scale from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating higher SWB levels.

A useful feature of the RLMS is that, once household members who are 16 years old or older are interviewed, they are followed in subsequent survey rounds within the same primary sampling units. This design allows us to include in the estimation sample children who coreside with parents and, to some extent, those who reside separately from the parents.

We focus on individuals for whom we have complete information about their (biological or non-biological) mothers, since there are many missing observations for fathers, and households in which parents and children are 25 or older but younger than 56 years old. Following Haider and Solon (2006), we restrict the sample to children who are close to age 35 and parents who are close to age 40 (i.e., one observation for the parent and one observation for the child, both are closest to

their respective earning peaks). Further restricting the sample to non-missing SWB outcomes and individual and family characteristics leaves the final estimation samples of 3,943 and 3,912 matched pairs respectively for subjective wealth and life satisfaction, with the average ages of 45.4 for mothers and 30.9 for children.[2] Figure 1 suggests that these are the ages with highest income levels over the life course.[3] This figure also confirms that these are the age ranges where SWB patterns most resemble those of monetary income.

Table 1 highlights the advantages of SWB data over (missing labor) income data in various aspects, including types of reported incomes, coresidence status, and gender differences. While slightly more than 90% of mothers (and children) report (total) household incomes, only 81% and 69% report individual incomes and labor incomes. Furthermore, the majority (more than 60%) of the children are living with parents in our sample; for these children, the RLMS does not collect data on their total income separately from that of their parents. A gap of 5 percentage points also exists between daughters (75%) and sons (80%) regarding available labor income data. On the other hand, SWB data address this challenge, since such data are available for almost 100% of the sample for mothers, sons, and daughters.[4]

3. Analytical Method

We estimate the following model

$$SWB_i^c = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 SWB_i^p + \varphi' X_i^c + \vartheta' X_i^p + \omega_i \quad (1)$$

[2] We provide the descriptive statistics in Table A.1, Appendix A.

[3] Haider and Solon (2006) show that annual earnings observed for individuals between their mid-thirties and mid-forties are most suited as a proxy for lifetime earnings, which is supported with analysis of various data sources for Russia (Gimpelson, 2019). Restricting the data to mother-children pairs matched by the same ages significantly reduces the sample size and raises attrition and missing data bias concerns. But we offer robustness checks for other ages in Section 4.2. See Dang *et al.* (2020) for a related study of intra-generational income mobility for Russia.

[4] Analysis of the unrestricted (annual repeated cross sectional) sample shows that only 70% of women report positive labor incomes, while 99% women report SWB outcomes.

where SWB_i^c and SWB_i^p respectively represents the SWB of child i and his/ her mother, and X_i^c and X_i^p are vectors of children's and parents' characteristics, respectively. α_1 is the coefficient of interest and represents the intergenerational transmission of SWB from parents to children. In line with the existing literature on the intergenerational transmission of income, we expect children's subjective well-being SWB_i^c to be positively associated with that of their parents SWB_i^p.

We sequentially add blocks of variables in Equation (1) to evaluate the contributions of different child and parent characteristics to intergenerational SWB mobility. That is, whether, and how much α_1 changes when we add these characteristics. Beyond evaluation purposes, if these characteristics (e.g., child education) help change intergenerational SWB mobility, the results provide relevant inputs for policy.[5] We include the following parents and child characteristics, which were shown to be important determinants of life satisfaction and subjective wealth for Russia (Ravallion and Lokshin, 2002)

i. *socio-demographic variables*, including age, age squared and education level of the mother (and the father if child has a father) and the child(ren), and marital status of the child,
ii. *employment*: whether the mother and the child are currently working or not working,
iii. *health*: self-assessment of health of the child
iv. *coresident status*: living with the mother/father at the survey year
v. *household characteristics of both generations*: log of household size, household structure and log of total household income, and
vi. *geographical regions*: living areas, federal regions.

[5] A similar method was employed to evaluate gaps in student education performance between different ethnic groups or countries (Fryer and Levitt, 2004; Singh, 2020; Dang *et al.*, 2021).

For easier interpretation, we estimate Equation (1) using the OLS method. This is consistent with Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters (2004) who provide evidence that the results from OLS and ordered logit regressions do not differ in terms of sign and significance of the effects. We estimate robust standard errors which are clustered at the mother level.

To further investigate whether gender differences in SWB exist, we add the interaction term between mothers' SWB and child gender to examine if intergenerational SWB mobility differs for daughters and sons. We estimate the following equation

$$SWB_i^c = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SWB_i^p + \beta_2 Gender_i^c + \beta_3 SWB_i^p * Gender_i^c + \theta' X_i^c + \lambda' X_i^p + \eta_i \quad (2)$$

where β_3 represents the interaction effects between a mother's SWB and her child's gender. For completeness, we also write out the dummy variable for child gender from the child characteristics X_i^c in Equation (1), with gender being equal to 1 for daughters and 0 for sons.

4. Estimation Results

4.1. Main Results

Table 2 shows the estimation results for Equation (1), which suggest that mothers' SWB has strongly statistically impacts on that of children for all model specifications. Yet, the estimated intergenerational transmission of SWB ($\widehat{\alpha_1}$) decreases when we add child and parent characteristics. In particular, $\widehat{\alpha_1}$ ranges from 0.20 (Model 1, without any control variables) to 0.15 (Model 10, with all the control variables). Table 3 also shows qualitatively similar results for life satisfaction, with the corresponding estimates ranging between 0.19 and 0.11.

For better interpretation, we plot in Figure 2 the relative changes of $\widehat{\alpha_1}$ for the different models, using Model 1 as the base model. Put differently, we examine how much α_1 changes when we add the different child and parent characteristics under the other models, compared to its estimate under Model 1 (without any control variable). This figure indicates that adding child characteristics

including age, gender, marital status, education, employment, and health status can reduce $\widehat{\alpha_1}$ by up to 18% (=(0.203-0.166)/0.203) for subjective wealth and 26% for life satisfaction (under Models 2 to 4). Further adding other child characteristics such as own household composition and income and similar mothers' characteristics and regional characteristics leads to reductions of $\widehat{\alpha_1}$ by roughly 27% and 40% respectively for subjective wealth and life satisfaction (under Models 5 to 10).

Tables 4 and 5 present the estimation results for Equation (2) respectively for subjective wealth and life satisfaction. There are positive and strongly statistically significant interactive effects ($\widehat{\beta_3}$) for mothers' SWB on their daughters. $\widehat{\beta_3}$ hovers around 0.06-0.07 for subjective wealth and 0.05-0.08 for life satisfaction. These results suggest that gender differences in SWB transmission exist, with daughters having higher subjective wealth and life satisfaction transmission than sons.

But different from the results for Tables 2 and 3, this gender gap ($\widehat{\beta_3}$) changes less when we add more control variables to Equation (2). Figure 3 shows that adding all the child and mother and regional characteristics can reduce $\widehat{\beta_3}$ by up to 18% for subjective wealth and 29% for life satisfaction.

4.2. Robustness Checks

We implement a battery of robustness checks, which show that the estimation results are robust to various model specifications and sample restrictions. First, following Solon (1992), we restrict the sample of parents and children to individuals with longer-run subjective welfare status. In particular, we compute mothers' SWB values averaged over the three or five years centering around age 35 for children and around 40 years old for parents. The estimation results for Equation

(1), shown in Tables A.4 and A.5 in Appendix A, are similar to those in Table 2.[6] Averaging SWB over three years also does not change the direction of the gender gap in SWB transmission (Tables A.6 and A.7). Second, we analyze other variants of parents and children's centering ages (such as 35, 40, or 55 years old for both parents and children, shown in Tables A.8-A.13). Third, we show the results estimated separately for daughter and son samples in Tables A.14 to A.17. Both these checks indicate that the impacts of mothers' SWB remain strongly statistically significant.

Fourth, we consider households with complete data on individuals' fathers and mothers when these individuals were 16 years old or older (Tables A.18 and A.19). Fifth, we consider fathers' SWB instead of mothers' SWB where data on fathers are available (Tables A.20 and A.21). Sixth, we control for both mothers' SWB and fathers' SWB in the same regression (Tables A.22 and A.23). Both mothers and father SWB are positively correlated with child`s SWB. Seventh, we control for the maximal SWB of mothers and fathers where there are data on fathers (Tables A.24 and A.25).

Eighth, to address concerns that intergenerational (education) mobility can be biased in coresident samples, we restrict the estimation sample to the sample where children live with their parents in the survey year used for analysis. (Tables A.26 and A.27). Ninth, given recent findings that intergenerational education mobility can correlate with intergenerational SWB mobility (Nikolaev and Burns 2014; Schuck and Steiber, 2018; Bridger and Daly, 2020), we replace children`s individual education achievement with two dummy variables indicating whether they have upward or downward education mobility compared to their parents (Tables A.28 and A.29). The results remain qualitatively similar in these cases.

[6] The results for Equation (2) show that while the gender gaps almost disappear with subjective wealth (Table A.7), these gaps remain strongly statistically significant for life satisfaction (Table A.8).

Tenth, we restrict the estimation sample to cases where either children or mothers have positive labor incomes (Tables A.30 to A.33), or where both have positive labor incomes (Tables A.34 and A.35). The estimates suggest that our results remain qualitatively similar. The impacts of mothers' SWB remain strongly statistically significant even when we restrict the sample of mothers and/or children to those that do not have labor income (not shown). Eleventh, we re-estimate Equation (1) with the ordered logit model, which shows qualitatively similar results (Tables A.36 and A.37).

Finally, the estimation results for similar robustness checks for Equation (2) (not shown) are qualitatively consistent with those for Tables 4 and 5 and suggest that daughters have lower SWB than sons, but they have higher SWB transmission from their mothers in these estimates.

5. Conclusion

In this short paper, we make new contributions by investigating intergenerational SWB mobility, measured with subjective wealth and life satisfaction, using rich household panel data from Russia over the past quarter century. We find that intergenerational SWB mobility exists, with higher SWB transmission between mothers and daughters. Yet, controlling for other child and parent characteristics significantly reduces the estimated impacts of mothers' SWB on those of their children. Our results are robust to different model specifications and sample restrictions

While popular measures of intergenerational mobility typically uses income to proxy for lifetime welfare, analysis with income data is challenged by various reporting and missing data issues. We propose to estimate intergenerational SWB mobility as an alternative to address these issues. SWB data are particularly useful in settings where there are missing income data for children because children do not live with their parents, or missing income data for women who do not participate in the labor market.

References

Alesina, A., Hohmann, S., Michalopoulos, S., & Papaioannou, E. (2021). Intergenerational mobility in Africa. *Econometrica*, *89*(1), 1-35.

Augustijn, L. (2021). The Intergenerational Transmission of Life Satisfaction between Parents and Children and the Mediating Role of Supportive Parenting. *Journal of Family Issues*, 0192513X21995868.

Azam, M. and Bhatt, V. (2015). Like father, like son? Intergenerational educational mobility in India. *Demography*, *52*(6), pp.1929-1959.

Bridger, E., & Daly, M. (2020). Intergenerational social mobility predicts midlife well-being: Prospective evidence from two large British cohorts. *Social Science & Medicine*, 261, 113217.

Casas, F., Coenders, G., González, M., Malo, S., Bertran, I. and Figuer, C. (2012). Testing the relationship between parents' and their children's subjective well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 13(6): 1031-1051.

Clark, A.E. (2018). Four decades of the economics of happiness: Where next? *Review of Income and Wealth*, 64(2): 245-269.

Corak, M. (2013). Income inequality, equality of opportunity, and intergenerational mobility. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *27*(3), 79-102.

Dang, H. A. H., Lokshin, M. M., Abanokova, K., & Bussolo, M. (2020). Welfare dynamics and inequality in the Russian Federation during 1994–2015. *European Journal of Development Research*, 32(4): 812-846.

Dang, H.-A., Glewwe, P., Lee, J., & Vu, K. (2021). "What Explains Vietnam's Exceptional Performance in Education Relative to Other Countries? Analysis of the 2012 and 2015 PISA Data". *IZA Discussion Paper* No. 14315.

Durand, M. (2015). The OECD better life initiative: How's life? and the measurement of well-being. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 61(1): 4-17.

Emran, M.S., Greene, W. and Shilpi, F. (2018). When measure matters: coresidency, truncation bias, and intergenerational mobility in developing countries. *Journal of Human Resources*, 53(3): 589-607.

Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A., & Frijters, P. (2004). How important is methodology for the estimates of the determinants of happiness? *Economic Journal*, *114*(497), 641-659.

Fleurbaey, M. (2009). Beyond GDP: The quest for a measure of social welfare. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *47*(4), 1029-75.

Fryer Jr, R. G., & Levitt, S. D. (2004). Understanding the black-white test score gap in the first two years of school. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, *86*(2), 447-464.

Gimpelson, V. (2019). Age and wage: stylized facts and Russian evidence. *HSE Economic Journal*, 23(2): 185-237.

Haider, S., & Solon, G. (2006). Life-cycle variation in the association between current and lifetime earnings. *American Economic Review*, 96(4), 1308-1320.

Molina, J. A., Navarro, M., & Walker, I. (2011). Intergenerational Well-Being Mobility in Europe. *Kyklos*, *64*(2), 253-270.

Narayan, A., Van der Weide, R., Cojocaru, A., Lakner, C., Redaelli, S., Mahler, D. G., ... & Thewissen, S. (2018). *Fair progress? Economic mobility across generations around the world*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

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.

Ravallion, M., & Lokshin, M. (2002). Self-rated economic welfare in Russia. *European Economic Review*, *46*(8), 1453-1473.

Schuck, B., & Steiber, N. (2018). Does intergenerational educational mobility shape the well-being of young Europeans? Evidence from the European Social Survey. *Social Indicators Research*, *139*(3), 1237-1255.

Singh, A. (2020). Learning more with every year: School year productivity and international learning divergence. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, *18*(4), 1770-1813.

Solon, G. (1992). Intergenerational income mobility in the United States. *American Economic Review*, 82(3), 393-408.

Table 1. Percentage of Sample with Non-missing Data (%)

	Representative Sample			Child-Parent Sample			
	All	**Males**	**Females**	**Mothers**	**Children**	**Sons**	**Daughters**
Subjective wealth	98.4	98.1	98.6	100	100	100	100
Life satisfaction	99.4	99.4	99.4	99.4	99.8	99.9	99.7
	Positive (non-missing and non-zero) income						
Individual labor income	73.3	76.0	71.0	68.7	77.4	80.1	74.6
Individual total income	83.6	83.3	83.8	81.2	85.3	84.5	86.1
Household total income	93.7	93.4	93.9	93	94.3	93.9	94.6
Total sample size	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 2. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.203***	0.174***	0.166***	0.166***	0.154***	0.154***	0.151***	0.151***	0.163***	0.148***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.041	0.078	0.093	0.101	0.114	0.117	0.120	0.120	0.126	0.147
Number of children	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943
Number of mothers	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level. Full regression results are shown in Table A.3.

Table 3. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.191***	0.157***	0.141***	0.141***	0.111***	0.112***	0.118***	0.118***	0.122***	0.114***
	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.042	0.109	0.149	0.175	0.212	0.218	0.220	0.219	0.219	0.226
Number of children	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912
Number of mothers	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level. Full regression results are shown in Table A.4.

Table 4. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth, with Gender and Interaction Term

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.169***	0.146***	0.138***	0.137***	0.124***	0.123***	0.120***	0.120***	0.131***	0.117***
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Child`s gender (1=daughter, 0=son)	-0.163	-0.234*	-0.219*	-0.209*	-0.224*	-0.218*	-0.218*	-0.218*	-0.239**	-0.219*
	(0.123)	(0.121)	(0.120)	(0.120)	(0.121)	(0.121)	(0.121)	(0.121)	(0.121)	(0.119)
Mother`s subjective wealth # Child`s gender	0.068**	0.057*	0.056*	0.058*	0.060*	0.062**	0.062**	0.062**	0.064**	0.064**
	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.030)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.043	0.079	0.093	0.102	0.114	0.118	0.121	0.121	0.127	0.147
Number of children	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943
Number of mothers	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table 5. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction, with Gender and Interaction Term

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.152***	0.124***	0.110***	0.111***	0.083***	0.085***	0.090***	0.090***	0.094***	0.086***
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.020)
Child`s gender (1=daughter, 0=son)	-0.149*	-0.213***	-0.186**	-0.157**	-0.166**	-0.151*	-0.162**	-0.162**	-0.164**	-0.153*
	(0.086)	(0.083)	(0.081)	(0.080)	(0.079)	(0.079)	(0.078)	(0.078)	(0.078)	(0.078)
Mother`s life satisfaction # Child`s gender	0.076***	0.065**	0.061**	0.058**	0.056**	0.054**	0.056**	0.056**	0.056**	0.054**
	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)
Control variables										
Child`s age, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.043	0.110	0.150	0.175	0.213	0.218	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.227
Number of children	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912
Number of mothers	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Figure 1. Subjective Well-being vs. Monetary Income by Age, RLMS 1994-2019



Figure 2. Relative Changes of Effects of Mother`s Subjective Wellbeing on Child`s Wellbeing, RLMS 1994-2019



Figure 3. Gender differences in SWB transmission, RLMS 1994-2019



Appendix A: Additional Tables and Figures

Table A.1. Summary Statistics of Selected Variables

	Children	Mothers	Fathers
Variables	Mean (Std. Dev.)	Mean (Std. Dev.)	Mean (Std. Dev.)
Subjective wealth	4.12 (1.45)	3.60 (1.47)	3.74 (1.53)
Life satisfaction	3.22 (1.18)	2.58 (1.16)	2.67 (1.20)
Age	30.86 (3.82)	45.36 (5.27)	38.65 (7.98)
Male	0.51 (0.50)		
Female	0.49 (0.50)		
Single	0.35 (0.48)		
Married	0.52 (0.50)		
Divorced/Widowed/Separated	0.13 (0.34)		
Unfinished secondary	0.13 (0.33)	0.11 (0.31)	0.09 (0.28)
Finished secondary	0.30 (0.46)	0.38 (0.49)	0.28 (0.45)
Vocational	0.22 (0.41)	0.31 (0.46)	0.11 (0.31)
University or higher	0.35 (0.48)	0.20 (0.40)	0.10 (0.30)
Bad health	0.44 (0.50)		
Good health	0.56 (0.50)		
Currently working	0.78 (0.41)	0.75 (0.43)	
Currently not working	0.22 (0.41)	0.25 (0.43)	
Currently not living with mother	0.36 (0.48)		
Currently living with mother	0.64 (0.48)		
Currently not living with father/no father	0.67 (0.47)		
Currently living with father	0.33 (0.47)		
Sample size	3,943	2,963	1,627

Table A.2. Estimated Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.203***	0.174***	0.166***	0.166***	0.154***	0.154***	0.151***	0.151***	0.163***	0.148***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Child`s individual characteristics										
Age		0.032	0.030	0.032	0.029	0.024	0.015	0.014	-0.007	-0.017
		(0.075)	(0.076)	(0.072)	(0.072)	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.072)	(0.070)	(0.068)
Age squared/100		-0.066	-0.054	-0.056	-0.051	-0.043	-0.022	-0.022	0.006	0.015
		(0.120)	(0.121)	(0.115)	(0.114)	(0.114)	(0.114)	(0.114)	(0.112)	(0.109)
Female		-0.032	-0.018	-0.002	-0.008	0.005	0.006	0.006	-0.008	0.010
		(0.046)	(0.046)	(0.046)	(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.046)
Married		0.203***	0.212***	0.176***	0.168***	0.096	0.113*	0.113*	0.122*	0.175***
		(0.053)	(0.052)	(0.052)	(0.058)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.062)
Divorced/Widowed/Separated		-0.178**	-0.169**	-0.191**	-0.167**	-0.154**	-0.145*	-0.145*	-0.157**	-0.136*
		(0.080)	(0.079)	(0.078)	(0.079)	(0.078)	(0.078)	(0.079)	(0.078)	(0.077)
Child`s education (reference - unfinished secondary)										
Finished secondary		0.242***	0.217***	0.204***	0.214***	0.206***	0.188**	0.189**	0.196**	0.118
		(0.077)	(0.077)	(0.077)	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.075)
Vocational		0.378***	0.350***	0.299***	0.272***	0.262***	0.239***	0.240***	0.262***	0.187**
		(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.081)	(0.081)	(0.082)	(0.082)
Higher		0.699***	0.653***	0.580***	0.529***	0.509***	0.489***	0.490***	0.519***	0.423***
		(0.078)	(0.078)	(0.079)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.084)	(0.084)	(0.086)	(0.085)
Good health self-assessement			0.355***	0.341***	0.317***	0.312***	0.305***	0.305***	0.299***	0.257***
			(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.046)	(0.046)	(0.046)	(0.046)	(0.046)
Currently not working				-0.340***	-0.269***	-0.278***	-0.283***	-0.284***	-0.282***	-0.351***
				(0.064)	(0.063)	(0.063)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.059)
Child`s household characteristics										
Log of household size					0.028	0.149	0.148	0.146	0.039	-0.120
					(0.068)	(0.094)	(0.093)	(0.093)	(0.096)	(0.092)
Proportion of household members in 0-5 years old					-0.192	-0.465*	-0.473**	-0.470*	-0.361	-0.141
					(0.201)	(0.242)	(0.241)	(0.241)	(0.243)	(0.237)
Proportion of household members in 6-15 years old					0.078	-0.195	-0.193	-0.191	-0.108	0.101
					(0.168)	(0.211)	(0.210)	(0.210)	(0.214)	(0.209)
Log of household income					0.188***	0.189***	0.172***	0.172***	0.207***	0.242***
					(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.035)
Child`s coresidence										
Living with mother						-0.267***	-0.241***	-0.240***	-0.205**	-0.169**
						(0.078)	(0.079)	(0.079)	(0.080)	(0.078)
No father						-0.039	0.155	0.154	0.199**	0.160*
						(0.056)	(0.096)	(0.096)	(0.097)	(0.094)
Living with father						0.079	0.113	0.113	0.113	0.099
						(0.074)	(0.075)	(0.075)	(0.075)	(0.073)

Mother`s individual characteristics										
Age							-0.043	-0.041	-0.005	0.018
							(0.094)	(0.095)	(0.095)	(0.093)
Age squared/100							0.032	0.030	-0.003	-0.024
							(0.102)	(0.102)	(0.102)	(0.100)
Mother`s education (reference - unfinished education)										
Finished secondary							0.172**	0.173**	0.181**	0.175**
							(0.086)	(0.086)	(0.086)	(0.083)
Vocational							0.106	0.108	0.134	0.143
							(0.089)	(0.089)	(0.089)	(0.087)
Higher							0.106	0.109	0.136	0.139
							(0.100)	(0.100)	(0.099)	(0.097)
Father`s education (reference - unfinished education or no father)										
Finished secondary							0.150	0.149	0.159*	0.125
							(0.095)	(0.095)	(0.094)	(0.091)
Vocational							0.185*	0.184	0.204*	0.176
							(0.112)	(0.112)	(0.112)	(0.109)
Higher							0.180	0.179	0.183	0.158
							(0.120)	(0.120)	(0.117)	(0.115)
Mother is not currently working								0.012	-0.023	-0.064
								(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.058)
Mother`s household characteristics										
Proportion of household members in 0-5 years old									0.086	0.011
									(0.343)	(0.323)
Proportion of household members in 6-15 years old									0.018	0.005
									(0.163)	(0.158)
Log of household size									0.194**	0.142*
									(0.084)	(0.082)
Log of household income									-0.077***	-0.060***
									(0.017)	(0.016)
Regional characteristics										
Moscow or Sant-Petersburg										0.132
										(0.083)
Other cities										-0.049
										(0.063)
Constant	3.364***	2.643**	2.449**	2.556**	0.558	0.748	1.992	1.958	1.557	0.797
	(0.068)	(1.165)	(1.172)	(1.118)	(1.148)	(1.141)	(2.442)	(2.455)	(2.447)	(2.395)
Adjusted R2	0.041	0.078	0.093	0.101	0.114	0.117	0.120	0.120	0.126	0.147
Number of children	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943	3,943
Number of mothers	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963	2,963

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level. Model 10 additionally controls for dummy variables for seven regions.

Table A.3. Estimated Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.191***	0.157***	0.141***	0.141***	0.111***	0.112***	0.118***	0.118***	0.122***	0.114***
	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Child`s individual characteristics										
Age		0.026	0.024	0.025	0.007	0.001	-0.008	-0.008	-0.011	-0.021
		(0.068)	(0.067)	(0.063)	(0.062)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.063)
Age squared/100		-0.063	-0.050	-0.052	-0.023	-0.014	0.002	0.002	0.005	0.018
		(0.109)	(0.108)	(0.102)	(0.101)	(0.103)	(0.104)	(0.104)	(0.104)	(0.102)
Female		-0.046	-0.028	-0.007	-0.022	-0.012	-0.017	-0.017	-0.020	-0.013
		(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)
Married		0.307***	0.319***	0.273***	0.224***	0.141***	0.147***	0.147***	0.147***	0.165***
		(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.041)	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.045)
Divorced/Widowed/Separated		-0.255***	-0.245***	-0.271***	-0.264***	-0.251***	-0.244***	-0.245***	-0.247***	-0.235***
		(0.059)	(0.057)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.056)	(0.056)
Child`s education (reference - unfinished secondary)										
Finished secondary		0.134**	0.104*	0.084	0.099*	0.094*	0.095*	0.095*	0.096*	0.062
		(0.062)	(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.057)	(0.057)	(0.056)	(0.057)	(0.057)	(0.056)
Vocational		0.280***	0.245***	0.179***	0.139**	0.135**	0.145**	0.144**	0.148**	0.113*
		(0.064)	(0.063)	(0.062)	(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.060)
Higher		0.506***	0.451***	0.357***	0.272***	0.262***	0.295***	0.294***	0.300***	0.264***
		(0.062)	(0.060)	(0.059)	(0.058)	(0.058)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.061)
Good health self-assessement			0.447***	0.428***	0.417***	0.415***	0.409***	0.409***	0.408***	0.385***
			(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.033)
Currently not working				-0.439***	-0.307***	-0.315***	-0.313***	-0.312***	-0.311***	-0.338***
				(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.045)
Child`s household characteristics										
Log of household size					-0.204***	-0.046	-0.053	-0.050	-0.067	-0.114*
					(0.046)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.068)	(0.068)
Proportion of household members in 0-5 years old					0.433***	0.100	0.093	0.090	0.094	0.176
					(0.145)	(0.169)	(0.169)	(0.169)	(0.171)	(0.172)
Proportion of household members in 6-15 years old					0.293**	-0.038	-0.033	-0.036	-0.028	0.051
					(0.124)	(0.149)	(0.148)	(0.148)	(0.151)	(0.150)
Log of household income					0.269***	0.268***	0.267***	0.267***	0.272***	0.279***
					(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.028)
Child`s coresidence										
Living with mother						-0.265***	-0.251***	-0.252***	-0.248***	-0.235***
						(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.055)	(0.056)	(0.055)
No father						-0.036	-0.038	-0.037	-0.034	-0.055
						(0.038)	(0.069)	(0.069)	(0.069)	(0.069)
Living with father						0.016	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.028
						(0.050)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.051)

Mother`s individual characteristics										
Age							-0.060	-0.061	-0.060	-0.048
							(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.065)	(0.065)
Age squared/100							0.057	0.060	0.058	0.048
							(0.069)	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.070)
Mother`s education (reference - unfinished education)										
Finished secondary							0.103*	0.102*	0.104*	0.103*
							(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.062)	(0.061)
Vocational							0.070	0.067	0.073	0.080
							(0.063)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.063)
Higher							-0.027	-0.030	-0.024	-0.023
							(0.072)	(0.073)	(0.073)	(0.072)
Father`s education (reference - unfinished education or no father)										
Finished secondary							-0.025	-0.024	-0.025	-0.044
							(0.069)	(0.069)	(0.069)	(0.068)
Vocational							-0.089	-0.088	-0.087	-0.095
							(0.077)	(0.077)	(0.077)	(0.076)
Higher							-0.020	-0.018	-0.019	-0.035
							(0.083)	(0.083)	(0.083)	(0.082)
Mother is not currently working								-0.016	-0.022	-0.036
								(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.042)
Mother`s household characteristics										
Proportion of household members in 0-5 years old									0.110	0.049
									(0.211)	(0.208)
Proportion of household members in 6-15 years old									-0.034	-0.045
									(0.115)	(0.114)
Log of household size									0.026	0.018
									(0.054)	(0.054)
Log of household income									-0.014	-0.006
									(0.013)	(0.012)
Regional characteristics										
Moscow or Sant-Petersburg										0.009
										(0.057)
Other cities										0.025
										(0.046)
Constant	2.716***	2.219**	1.983*	2.130**	-0.207	-0.024	1.558	1.600	1.650	1.552
	(0.046)	(1.034)	(1.022)	(0.973)	(0.990)	(1.006)	(1.782)	(1.792)	(1.810)	(1.802)
Adjusted R2	0.042	0.109	0.149	0.175	0.212	0.218	0.220	0.219	0.219	0.226
Number of children	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912
Number of mothers	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level. Model 10 additionally controls for dummy variables for seven regions.

Table A.4. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth, Averaged over Three and Five Years

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth averaged over 3 years	0.317***	0.280***	0.263***	0.268***	0.248***	0.247***	0.241***	0.241***	0.257***	0.225***
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Adjusted R2	0.066	0.098	0.112	0.120	0.131	0.136	0.137	0.137	0.143	0.162
Number of children	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308
Number of mothers	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421
Mother`s subjective wealth averaged over 5 years	0.361***	0.320***	0.307***	0.312***	0.287***	0.282***	0.282***	0.281***	0.296***	0.250***
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)
Adjusted R2	0.073	0.100	0.112	0.118	0.132	0.135	0.137	0.137	0.144	0.167
Number of children	2,646	2,646	2,646	2,646	2,646	2,646	2,646	2,646	2,646	2,646
Number of mothers	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901	1,901
			Control variables							
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.5. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction Averaged over Three and Five Years

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction averaged over 3 years	0.271***	0.219***	0.196***	0.193***	0.146***	0.148***	0.160***	0.160***	0.169***	0.154***
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Adjusted R2	0.057	0.125	0.161	0.185	0.218	0.223	0.226	0.225	0.225	0.235
Number of children	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302
Number of mothers	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416
Mother`s life satisfaction averaged over 5 years	0.274***	0.216***	0.199***	0.199***	0.143***	0.142***	0.156***	0.156***	0.167***	0.148***
	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.026)
Adjusted R2	0.050	0.116	0.151	0.174	0.207	0.211	0.214	0.213	0.213	0.226
Number of children	2,641	2,641	2,641	2,641	2,641	2,641	2,641	2,641	2,641	2,641
Number of mothers	1,897	1,897	1,897	1,897	1,897	1,897	1,897	1,897	1,897	1,897
			Control variables							
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.6. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth Averaged over Three Years, with Gender and Interaction Term

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth averaged over 3 years	0.287***	0.249***	0.233***	0.237***	0.216***	0.214***	0.208***	0.208***	0.222***	0.188***
	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.031)
Child`s gender (1=daughter, 0=son)	-0.147	-0.249	-0.241	-0.221	-0.221	-0.215	-0.218	-0.218	-0.244	-0.239
	(0.163)	(0.161)	(0.159)	(0.159)	(0.158)	(0.157)	(0.158)	(0.158)	(0.158)	(0.154)
Mother`s subjective wealth averaged over 3 years # Child`s gender	0.061	0.062	0.062	0.060	0.064	0.066	0.067*	0.067*	0.071*	0.074*
	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.039)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.067	0.098	0.112	0.120	0.131	0.136	0.138	0.138	0.144	0.163
Number of children	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308	3,308
Number of mothers	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421	2,421

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.7. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction Averaged over Three Years, with Gender and Interaction Term

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction averaged over 3 years	0.222***	0.175***	0.153***	0.150***	0.103***	0.106***	0.116***	0.117***	0.125***	0.114***
	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.027)
Child`s gender (1=daughter, 0=son)	-0.228**	-0.292***	-0.274***	-0.258**	-0.261***	-0.246**	-0.261***	-0.261***	-0.263***	-0.243**
	(0.108)	(0.105)	(0.103)	(0.101)	(0.099)	(0.098)	(0.098)	(0.098)	(0.098)	(0.098)
Mother`s life satisfaction averaged over 3 years # Child`s gender	0.099***	0.090**	0.088**	0.089**	0.090***	0.087**	0.090***	0.090***	0.089***	0.084**
	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.034)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.058	0.127	0.162	0.187	0.219	0.224	0.227	0.227	0.226	0.236
Number of children	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302
Number of mothers	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.8. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth when Mother`s and Child`s Ages are Centered at 35 years old

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.180***	0.153***	0.146***	0.146***	0.135***	0.134***	0.133***	0.132***	0.144***	0.130***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.033	0.070	0.087	0.094	0.108	0.112	0.114	0.114	0.120	0.144
Number of children	3,957	3,957	3,957	3,957	3,957	3,957	3,957	3,957	3,957	3,957
Number of mothers	2,971	2,971	2,971	2,971	2,971	2,971	2,971	2,971	2,971	2,971

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.9. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction when Mother`s and Child`s Ages are Centered at 35 years old

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.176***	0.143***	0.129***	0.127***	0.098***	0.100***	0.107***	0.107***	0.108***	0.103***
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)
			Control variables							
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.035	0.103	0.145	0.168	0.208	0.214	0.216	0.216	0.215	0.225
Number of children	3,932	3,932	3,932	3,932	3,932	3,932	3,932	3,932	3,932	3,932
Number of mothers	2,953	2,953	2,953	2,953	2,953	2,953	2,953	2,953	2,953	2,953

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.10. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth when Mother`s and Child`s Ages are Centered at 40 years old

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.208***	0.177***	0.171***	0.170***	0.160***	0.159***	0.155***	0.155***	0.170***	0.151***
	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.017)
			Control variables							
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.044	0.080	0.097	0.108	0.118	0.121	0.124	0.124	0.131	0.157
Number of children	3,946	3,946	3,946	3,946	3,946	3,946	3,946	3,946	3,946	3,946
Number of mothers	2,964	2,964	2,964	2,964	2,964	2,964	2,964	2,964	2,964	2,964

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.11. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction when Mother`s and Child`s Ages are Centered at 40 years old

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.171***	0.136***	0.123***	0.122***	0.096***	0.097***	0.102***	0.101***	0.107***	0.100***
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.034	0.105	0.151	0.180	0.213	0.220	0.221	0.221	0.222	0.229
Number of children	3,915	3,915	3,915	3,915	3,915	3,915	3,915	3,915	3,915	3,915
Number of mothers	2,945	2,945	2,945	2,945	2,945	2,945	2,945	2,945	2,945	2,945

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.12. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth when Mother`s and Child`s Ages are Centered at 55 years old

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.342***	0.321***	0.311***	0.315***	0.303***	0.300***	0.300***	0.304***	0.309***	0.284***
	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.117	0.148	0.165	0.174	0.182	0.183	0.184	0.188	0.189	0.209
Number of children	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Number of mothers	3,005	3,005	3,005	3,005	3,005	3,005	3,005	3,005	3,005	3,005

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.13. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction when Mother`s and Child`s Ages are Centered at 55 years old

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.265***	0.235***	0.213***	0.211***	0.183***	0.182***	0.184***	0.185***	0.182***	0.171***
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.078	0.144	0.182	0.208	0.231	0.236	0.236	0.237	0.238	0.245
Number of children	3,971	3,971	3,971	3,971	3,971	3,971	3,971	3,971	3,971	3,971
Number of mothers	2,983	2,983	2,983	2,983	2,983	2,983	2,983	2,983	2,983	2,983

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.14. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth between Mothers and Daughters

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.229***	0.195***	0.190***	0.191***	0.173***	0.173***	0.165***	0.165***	0.177***	0.159***
	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)
			Control variables							
Child`s age, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother (and father)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.054	0.086	0.093	0.096	0.127	0.131	0.132	0.131	0.136	0.154
Number of children	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937
Number of mothers	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.15. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction between Mothers and Daughters

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.224***	0.188***	0.173***	0.172***	0.136***	0.136***	0.145***	0.143***	0.144***	0.137***
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence mother (and father)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.060	0.120	0.154	0.164	0.216	0.218	0.223	0.223	0.222	0.224
Number of children	1,923	1,923	1,923	1,923	1,923	1,923	1,923	1,923	1,923	1,923
Number of mothers	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.16. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth between Mothers and Sons

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.166***	0.144***	0.135***	0.134***	0.125***	0.125***	0.124***	0.124***	0.137***	0.126***
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother (and father)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.027	0.064	0.086	0.100	0.107	0.109	0.115	0.115	0.123	0.144
Number of children	2,001	2,001	2,001	2,001	2,001	2,001	2,001	2,001	2,001	2,001
Number of mothers	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.17. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction between Mothers and Sons

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.154***	0.122***	0.107***	0.108***	0.082***	0.084***	0.090***	0.090***	0.095***	0.088***
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence mother (and father)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.025	0.109	0.154	0.200	0.228	0.237	0.237	0.236	0.236	0.245
Number of children	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,984
Number of mothers	1,690	1,690	1,690	1,690	1,690	1,690	1,690	1,690	1,690	1,690

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.18. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth in Full Families

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.189***	0.159***	0.149***	0.149***	0.134***	0.134***	0.132***	0.132***	0.144***	0.117***
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.022)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.036	0.076	0.091	0.093	0.114	0.116	0.119	0.119	0.124	0.155
Number of children	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282
Number of families	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at families` level.

Table A.19. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction in Full Families

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.167***	0.121***	0.103***	0.104***	0.078***	0.076***	0.084***	0.084***	0.091***	0.075***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.032	0.108	0.145	0.166	0.212	0.216	0.217	0.216	0.216	0.227
Number of children	2,264	2,264	2,264	2,264	2,264	2,264	2,264	2,264	2,264	2,264
Number of families	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at families` level.

Table A.20. Intergenerational Mobility of Father`s Subjective Wealth in Full Families

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Father`s subjective wealth	0.185***	0.156***	0.149***	0.149***	0.134***	0.132***	0.127***	0.135***	0.152***	0.130***
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s age and education, mother`s education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Father`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.037	0.077	0.092	0.095	0.115	0.117	0.118	0.122	0.128	0.157
Number of children	2,283	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,282	2,254	2,254
Number of families	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,649	1,627	1,627

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at families` level.

Table A.21. Intergenerational Mobility of Father`s Life Satisfaction in Full Families

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Father`s life satisfaction	0.173***	0.133***	0.115***	0.113***	0.090***	0.090***	0.097***	0.103***	0.112***	0.101***
	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s age and education, mother`s education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Father`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.037	0.116	0.150	0.168	0.215	0.220	0.221	0.222	0.223	0.234
Number of children	2,262	2,261	2,261	2,261	2,261	2,261	2,261	2,261	2,234	2,234
Number of families	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,637	1,616	1,616

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at families` level.

Table A.22. Intergenerational Mobility of Father`s and Mother`s Subjective Wealth in Full Families

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Father`s subjective wealth	0.128***	0.109***	0.105***	0.107***	0.096***	0.094***	0.090***	0.096***	0.105***	0.094***
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.131***	0.112***	0.104***	0.103***	0.093***	0.095***	0.096***	0.097***	0.106***	0.086***
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.025)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s age and education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.051	0.087	0.101	0.104	0.123	0.124	0.129	0.132	0.139	0.163
Number of children	2,255	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254
Number of families	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at families` level.

Table A.23. Intergenerational Mobility of Father`s and Mother`s Life Satisfaction in Full Families

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Father`s life satisfaction	0.126***	0.102***	0.090***	0.087***	0.072***	0.072***	0.077***	0.084***	0.091***	0.083***
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.112***	0.080***	0.068***	0.070***	0.053**	0.050**	0.058***	0.057***	0.064***	0.053**
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s age and education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.049	0.123	0.154	0.174	0.219	0.223	0.224	0.225	0.227	0.237
Number of children	2,223	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222
Number of families	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at families` level.

Table A.24. Intergenerational Mobility of Maximum of Father`s and Mother`s Subjective Wealth in Full Families

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Maximum subjective wealth	0.230***	0.198***	0.188***	0.189***	0.173***	0.171***	0.166***	0.171***	0.181***	0.157***
	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s age and education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.049	0.087	0.102	0.105	0.124	0.126	0.129	0.133	0.137	0.163
Number of children	2,255	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254
Number of families	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627	1,627

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at families` level.

Table A.25. Intergenerational Mobility of Maximum of Father`s and Mother`s Life Satisfaction in Full Families

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Maximum life satisfaction	0.199***	0.154***	0.135***	0.136***	0.105***	0.103***	0.113***	0.118***	0.124***	0.111***
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s age and education							Y	Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Father`s and mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.042	0.120	0.153	0.173	0.218	0.222	0.222	0.223	0.225	0.235
Number of children	2,223	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222	2,222
Number of families	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608	1,608

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at families` level.

Table A.26. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth, Coresident Sample.

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.261***	0.227***	0.222***	0.221***	0.207***	0.206***	0.202***	0.202***	0.215***	0.196***
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.064	0.104	0.117	0.122	0.138	0.138	0.143	0.142	0.153	0.174
Number of children	2,502	2,502	2,502	2,502	2,502	2,502	2,502	2,502	2,502	2,502
Number of mothers	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.27. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction, Coresident Sample.

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.238***	0.194***	0.179***	0.176***	0.128***	0.128***	0.134***	0.135***	0.144***	0.133***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.062	0.121	0.171	0.197	0.231	0.230	0.232	0.232	0.233	0.239
Number of children	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485	2,485
Number of mothers	2,033	2,033	2,033	2,033	2,033	2,033	2,033	2,033	2,033	2,033

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.28. Intergenerational Transmission of Subjective Wealth

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.196***	0.191***	0.182***	0.179***	0.163***	0.162***	0.149***	0.149***	0.161***	0.146***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.017)
Upward educational mobility	0.159***	0.146***	0.134**	0.118**	0.132**	0.118**	0.213***	0.213***	0.224***	0.190***
	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.060)	(0.059)
Downward educational mobility	-0.172***	-0.158**	-0.149**	-0.128**	-0.114*	-0.100	-0.141**	-0.140**	-0.155**	-0.125**
	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.061)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.047	0.056	0.073	0.085	0.102	0.106	0.114	0.114	0.121	0.141
Number of children	3,938	3,938	3,938	3,938	3,938	3,938	3,938	3,938	3,938	3,938
Number of mothers	2,959	2,959	2,959	2,959	2,959	2,959	2,959	2,959	2,959	2,959

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.29. Intergenerational Transmission of Life Satisfaction

Dependent variable is child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.186***	0.175***	0.157***	0.152***	0.115***	0.116***	0.117***	0.117***	0.119***	0.110***
	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Upward educational mobility	0.116***	0.100**	0.086**	0.069*	0.086**	0.077**	0.106***	0.106***	0.108***	0.105***
	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.040)
Downward educational mobility	-0.171***	-0.157***	-0.147***	-0.119***	-0.109**	-0.100**	-0.129***	-0.128***	-0.130***	-0.112***
	(0.046)	(0.045)	(0.044)	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)
			Control variables							
Child`s age, gender, marital status		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessement health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.051	0.090	0.134	0.167	0.212	0.217	0.220	0.220	0.219	0.226
Number of children	3,907	3,907	3,907	3,907	3,907	3,907	3,907	3,907	3,907	3,907
Number of mothers	2,939	2,939	2,939	2,939	2,939	2,939	2,939	2,939	2,939	2,939

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.30. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth when Children have Positive Labor Income

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.182***	0.157***	0.148***	0.148***	0.137***	0.137***	0.134***	0.134***	0.148***	0.138***
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.035	0.062	0.074	0.074	0.084	0.089	0.092	0.091	0.100	0.115
Number of children	3,122	3,122	3,122	3,122	3,122	3,122	3,122	3,122	3,122	3,122
Number of mothers	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464	2,464

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.31. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction when Children have Positive Labor Income

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.174***	0.146***	0.129***	0.128***	0.099***	0.100***	0.108***	0.106***	0.113***	0.105***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.038	0.099	0.133	0.138	0.174	0.180	0.182	0.182	0.183	0.187
Number of children	3,098	3,098	3,098	3,098	3,098	3,098	3,098	3,098	3,098	3,098
Number of mothers	2,448	2,448	2,448	2,448	2,448	2,448	2,448	2,448	2,448	2,448

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.32. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth when Mothers have Positive Labor Income

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.193***	0.163***	0.155***	0.155***	0.146***	0.147***	0.148***	0.147***	0.153***	0.146***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.037	0.070	0.077	0.091	0.101	0.104	0.104	0.105	0.106	0.115
Number of children	2,764	2,764	2,764	2,764	2,764	2,764	2,764	2,764	2,764	2,764
Number of mothers	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130	2,130

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.33. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction when Mothers have Positive Labor Income

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.202***	0.174***	0.155***	0.154***	0.130***	0.132***	0.136***	0.136***	0.134***	0.129***
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.048	0.110	0.148	0.178	0.213	0.219	0.221	0.221	0.220	0.221
Number of children	2,742	2,742	2,742	2,742	2,742	2,742	2,742	2,742	2,742	2,742
Number of mothers	2,114	2,114	2,114	2,114	2,114	2,114	2,114	2,114	2,114	2,114

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.34. Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth when Children and Mothers have Positive Labor Income

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.184***	0.161***	0.153***	0.153***	0.144***	0.144***	0.146***	0.146***	0.152***	0.148***
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)
					Control variables					
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.036	0.055	0.059	0.059	0.071	0.073	0.075	0.075	0.076	0.081
Number of children	2,213	2,213	2,213	2,213	2,213	2,213	2,213	2,213	2,213	2,213
Number of mothers	1,770	1,770	1,770	1,770	1,770	1,770	1,770	1,770	1,770	1,770

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.35. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction when Children and Mothers have Positive Labor Income

Dependent variable is child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.183***	0.163***	0.145***	0.144***	0.119***	0.122***	0.128***	0.127***	0.126***	0.121***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.022)
				Control variables						
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessment health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.044	0.093	0.122	0.126	0.163	0.170	0.171	0.171	0.170	0.170
Number of children	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194	2,194
Number of mothers	1,756	1,756	1,756	1,756	1,756	1,756	1,756	1,756	1,756	1,756

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.36 Intergenerational Mobility of Subjective Wealth, Ordered Logit

Dependent var: child`s subjective wealth	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s subjective wealth	0.254*** (0.023)	0.222*** (0.024)	0.214*** (0.024)	0.217*** (0.024)	0.204*** (0.024)	0.204*** (0.024)	0.204*** (0.024)	0.204*** (0.024)	0.223*** (0.024)	0.205*** (0.024)
			Control variables							
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessement health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.012	0.022	0.026	0.029	0.033	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.038	0.046
Number of observations	3,939	3,939	3,939	3,939	3,939	3,939	3,939	3,939	3,939	3,939
Number of mothers	2,960	2,960	2,960	2,960	2,960	2,960	2,960	2,960	2,960	2,960

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.

Table A.37. Intergenerational Mobility of Life Satisfaction, Ordered Logit

Dependent var: child`s life satisfaction	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**	**Model 6**	**Model 7**	**Model 8**	**Model 9**	**Model 10**
Mother`s life satisfaction	0.327***	0.277***	0.253***	0.255***	0.204***	0.206***	0.219***	0.219***	0.228***	0.212***
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)
			Control variables							
Child`s age, gender, marital status, education		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s self-assessement health			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s employment status				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s household size, composition, income					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Child`s coresidence with mother and father (if present)						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s age and education, father`s education (if present)							Y	Y	Y	Y
Mother`s employment status								Y	Y	Y
Mother`s household size, composition, income									Y	Y
Regional characteristics										Y
Adjusted R2	0.015	0.040	0.058	0.067	0.083	0.086	0.088	0.088	0.088	0.091
Number of observations	3,909	3,909	3,909	3,909	3,909	3,909	3,909	3,909	3,909	3,909
Number of mothers	2,941	2,941	2,941	2,941	2,941	2,941	2,941	2,941	2,941	2,941

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Standard errors are clustered at mother`s level.