

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING AS PREDICTOR OF SATISFACTION WITH LIFE AND HAPPINESS.

EKATERINA UGLANOVA,
Ph.D. in Social Psychology,
Department of Humanities,
Higher School of Economic (Saint-Petersburg Branch),
Saint-Petersburg, Russia E-mail: uglanovaea@mail.ru

ABSTRACT.

The issue-to-be-considered reflects necessity of separate analysis of subjective and objective economic well-being, which occurred as a sequence of discovery and accumulation of gaps between objective economic situation and its' evaluations. Within the bound of this research, terms "subjective quality of life" and "subjective wellbeing" are used as synonymous notions; *satisfaction with life* and *happiness* are considered as principal indicators of subjective quality of life on the operational level. Methods used in the empirical research include 11-point scale for life satisfaction measure, "elation-depression" scale of A. E. Wessman & D. F. Ricks for happiness measure, interview, and economic attitudes measurement scales. The sample consists of 340 subjects, all Russian citizens; it is divided into four age groups: 17-20 years old, 21-24 y. o., 25 - 33 y. o., over 33 y. o. Such division takes into account peculiarities of political and economical socialization in Russia. Using correlation analysis, *subjective* economy-related predictors of subjective wellbeing are found; they include satisfaction with income, satisfaction with standard of living, perception of individual and national financial situation in the near future, social comparison, and recent changes in individual financial situation. All together these predictors explain 27% of variance in satisfaction with life and 19% of variance in feeling of happiness. Future changes expectations (in other words, financial optimism / pessimism) turned to be the best predictor for happiness (which is not surprising, taking into consideration unstable Russian economy) - it explains 11%. Satisfaction with income is the best predictor of satisfaction with life, which by itself explains 14,5%.

The combination of predictors depends on the age of respondents; this is also true for their relative significance. The number of economy-related predictors of subjective quality of life slightly decreases as the age grows. However, it does not signify the weakening of correlation between subjective economic wellbeing and subjective quality of life, since the percentage of variance explained by the former, does not decrease.

Gender also turned to be a factor of economy-related predictors' set. Financial characteristics play more important role in subjective wellbeing of women comparing to men; the image of national economic situation in the near future, satisfaction with income, and social comparison make the minimum number of economy-related predictors of overall satisfaction with life. In men' sample the sufficient economy-related predictor of life satisfaction is image of individual financial situation.

KEY WORDS: SATISFACTION WITH LIFE, HAPPINESS, SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC WELL-BEING.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: This research was funded by a grant from Russian Foundation of Humanities, # 04-06-00473a. I would also like to acknowledge support of Academic Fellowship Program (OSI, Budapest) in publication of this paper.

ISQOLS Conference, November 2004,
Philadelphia, USA

INTRODUCTION.

The reason for separating "objective" and "subjective" economic well-being developed as number of facts of discrepancy between objective economic prosperity and its' perception by people grew up. B. Strümpel suggests to distinguish "objective economic status" and "subjective economic status", at that correlation between them is rather weak. (B. Strümpel, 1974). It has been convincingly shown in number of studies, that objective measures of prosperity, first of all, income, do not explain much of variance in subjective well-being. According to F. Andrews & S. Whithey (1976), factors of age, gender, race, income, education and occupation account all together for only 8% of variance in satisfaction with life index. In study of R. Inglehart (1977, 1978) the block of independent variables including age, gender, income, occupation, education, religious affiliation, church attendance, community size, labor union membership, and region, explain only 6% of variance in satisfaction with life. Correlations between income and happiness are rather weak: Pearson coefficient ranges from 0,15 to 0,25 (A. Campbell. 1976; R. Inglehart, 1986; Heady, 1993; A. Furnham & M. Argyle, 1998). Finally, the most striking finding in this field is represented by so-called "satisfaction-paradox", which is the state of being satisfied with life under poverty level, and "dissatisfaction-dilemma", which is, in contrary, the state of being unsatisfied with objectively privileged living conditions (Zapf, 1984).

However, these studies were conducted in so-called "societies of affluence", while the proposed research was conducted on Russian sample. According to E. Diener (1993), relationship of subjective well-being to economic development is not linear: as nation's prosperity grows, its' influence on subjective well-being of people weakens. Therefore, it's possible to hypothesize, that in modern Russian society objective economic status plays much more important role and explains higher percent of variance in satisfaction with life comparing to "societies of affluence". However, processing of data from 9th wave of Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey, conducted since 1994 by Institute of Sociology, Russian Academy of Science, in collaboration with University of North Carolina at the Chapel Hill, shows that correlation between income and satisfaction with life is weak: $R = 0.089$. At the same time, analysis of responses to open question "What do you lack in your life?" demonstrates that 50.5% of respondents mentioned "money" in one or another way. These facts suggest an idea that for Russian people, too, income is less important predictor of subjective well-being than perception and evaluation of economic position.

N. Ackerman & B. Paolucci (1983) studied relationship of objective and subjective income adequacy to perceived life quality. Subjective income adequacy (perceived income's capacity to provide "comfortable life") explains bigger percentage of variance in satisfaction with life comparing to objective income adequacy (ration of household income to living wage). Another important finding made by N. Ackerman & B. Paolucci is that subjective income adequacy positively correlates not only with overall satisfaction with life, but also with satisfaction with income and level of consumption.

Subjective economic well-being depends on actual person's status comparing to aspirations, needs and perception of one's own merits (B. Strümpel, 1974). It influences the whole range of personal economic activities (consumption, savings, etc.) as well as person's integration into society (trust to authorities and social institutions).

B. Strümpel marks out several components of subjective economic well-being, including satisfaction with income; satisfaction with standard of living, which is, in fact, perceived capacity of one's income to provide a 'comfortable life'; perceived fairness of financial resources distribution; income changes expectations (B. Strümpel, 1974). A. Campbell adds to this list recent income changes, the best situation one can hope for, the worse

situation one has ever faced, and financial situation of typical American (A. Campbell, 1976).

The proposed research aims to analyze relationship of subjective economy-related predictors to subjective quality of life. In order to accomplish this goal, economy-related correlates of subjective well-being measures will be marked out; afterwards, the relative significance of predictors will be determined. Finally, age and gender differences will be considered.

METHODOLOGY

The sample included 340 people (57 % female), all Russian citizen. The data was collected in 2003 - 2004 in three Russian cities - Yaroslavl, Moscow, and Saint-Petersburg. Respondents were between 18 and 78 years old.

The sample was divided into four groups according to age. For this purpose I used classification of L. Gozman and E. Shestopal (1998) that takes into account peculiarities of primary economical and political socialization. Since I suppose that economic socialization of people, who were born before the period of "late stagnation" (before 1969) is characterized, to a great extent, by similar features, the sample was divided into four following groups: respondents born in 1982-1985 (105 subjects were included in this group); those born in 1977-1982 (80 subjects); those born in 1969-1977 (80 subjects); those born in 1969 and earlier (75 subjects).

Methods used in the empirical research include:

- 1) 11-point scale for satisfaction with "life in general" measure. The responses to the question were in the form of, "Taking all things together, how satisfied are you with your life?" *0-5/10/15/20/25/30/35/40/45/50*
- 2) "Elation-depression" 10-point scale of A. E. Wessman & D. F. Ricks for happiness measure. Respondents were asked to determine their prevalent emotional state, taking into consideration "last few days". *A-10/9/8/7/6/5/4/3/2/1/0*
- 3) 11-point scales for assessment of satisfaction with different life domains such as: safety, income, health, family life, job, housing, leisure, government, public health care system, and environment.
- 4) Method of in-depth interview is used to provide data on respondents' representations regarding determinants of subjective well-being; attitudes toward money and money operations such as everyday expenditures, savings, budget planning, investments and debts; life values; satisfaction with different life domains. 182 people were interviewed.
- 5) Questionnaire, which consisted of 2 parts. The first part included questions on perception of future changes in individual and national economic situation, recent changes in financial wellbeing, level of consumption, and social comparison. The second part contained questions on demographic characteristics.

The income was not measured in this study, however, in order to estimate the level of living, respondents were asked to choose the most appropriate description of their consumption level. 0,5% said that "they can hardly manage buying food"; 13,5% agreed with statement "We have enough money to buy the food, however, purchase of cloth is complicated"; 31% of respondents stated that "their money is enough for food and cloth, but they can't afford such things as TV or refrigerator"; 49% said that "their money is enough for food, cloth, and long - life consumer goods, but they can't afford things like car or summer house"; finally, 6% stated that "they can afford all listed above".

Respondents were also asked to identify themselves with one of socio-economic categories. 3,3% of them named themselves "poor"; 25,1% stated they are "below average",

53,6% said that their position is "average", 18 % - "above average". None of our respondents identified him/herself as "rich".

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive data.

Subjective economic well-being (SEWB) is viewed in this paper as substructure of subjective quality of life (subjective well-being). Consequently, components of SEWB are those measures of financial well-being which correlate with principal components of subjective life quality - satisfaction with life (cognitive component) and happiness (affective component). The following components of SEWB were marked out:

- 1) Satisfaction with income, which was measured by 11-point scale. The question was in the form of, "To what extent your income is relevant to your work efforts?"
- 2) Satisfaction with standard of living, which is defined as perceived capacity of income to provide comfortable life, and was measured by question "To what extent your household income is capable to provide comfortable life for you and your family"?
- 3) Social comparison, which included several measures: comparison with "average Russian", comparison with "average folk of respondent's age and education level", comparison with "respected person". To measure it, respondents were offered 100-point scale, where 1 stands for "the worse financial conditions you can imagine", and 100 stands for "the best financial conditions you can imagine". Respondent was asked to indicate their own position on this scale, how they perceive it, positions of "average Russian", "average folk of respondent's age and education level", "person they respect". The differences between respondent's position and other three points were used in further statistical analysis.
- 4) Future changes expectations. In this study I considered two dimensions of future changes: shift in individual well-being and changes in national economy. Respondents were asked to indicate whether in the near future they expect their personal financial situation (or national economy) to "remain the same", "slightly improve", "considerably improve", "slightly worsen", or "considerable worsen".
- 5) The best financial situation one can hope for, which was measured with 100-point scale. The difference between person's present position and the point indicated as the best possible situation was subject to analysis.
- 6) The best financial situation one has ever experienced, which was also measured with 100-point scale. The difference between present position and best ever experienced is a vector of shift in financial well-being.
- 7) The worse financial situation one has ever faced. The measurement procedure and its' purpose were similar to the one of best situation ever experienced.
- 8) Recent changes in financial situation. Respondents were asked to indicate whether their financial situation lately "remained the same", "slightly improved", "considerably improved", "slightly worsened", or "considerable worsened".

Correlation analysis allowed to determine components of subjective economic well-being. These are: 1) satisfaction with income; 2) satisfaction with standard of living; 3) recent changes; 4) future changes expectations; 5) social comparison (with average folk of respondent's age and education level).

Computing Pearson correlations also allowed to fix structural relationships between components of SEWB ($p < 0.01$, all correlations are positive), see Fig. 1:

Fig. 1. Correlations between components of SEWB.

Table 1 shows correlations between components of SEWB.

Components of SEWB	Satisfaction with income	Recent changes	Future changes expectations	Satisfaction with standard of living	Social comparison
Satisfaction with income	1.000	0.241		0.460	0.341
Recent changes	0.241	1.000		-	-
Future changes expectations	0.210	-	1.000	0.244	-
Satisfaction with standard of living	0.460	-	0.244	1.000	0.289
Social comparison	0.341	-	-	0.289	1.000

Table 1. Pearson two-tailed correlations, significant at $p < 0,01$.

The mean for overall satisfaction with life is 7,4. It's worth to notice that satisfaction with life domains never reaches that point as shown in Table 2.

Indicator	Mean	Std. Dev.
Satisfaction with "life in general"	7,4	2,8
Satisfaction with health	6,1	2,3
Satisfaction with income	3,9	2,5
Satisfaction with education	6,7	2,2
Satisfaction with job	5,7	2,3
Satisfaction with housing	6,0	2,6
Satisfaction with family life	6,8	2,9
Satisfaction with public health care system	3,3	2,3
Satisfaction with environment	3,8	2,0
Satisfaction with leisure	6,0	2,4
Satisfaction with safety level	4,4	2,6
Satisfaction with government performance	4,1	2,4

Table 2. Means for satisfaction with life domains.

Future expectations of respondents are quite optimistic. As regards individual financial situation, 12% of people expect considerable changes to the best, 32,3% expect "some changes to the best", 49,7% think that their financial situation will remain the same, 4,4% suppose that things will get a little worse, and 1,6% of respondents expect considerable changes to the worse. As for national economic situation, people demonstrate slightly less optimistic attitudes. Majority of respondents (41,3%) suppose that things will not change in the near future, 35,3% expect slight changes to the best, 3,2% hope for considerable changes to the best, 16,3% think that things will get a little worse, and 3,8% expect considerable deterioration of national economic situation. Nevertheless, images of future individual and national conditions are significantly correlated ($r=0,16$; $p < 0,05$).

As regards recent changes, 6% of respondents declare significant improvement in their financial situation, 36,4% note slight improvement, 41,3% say that their situation has not changed, 14,1% declare slight deterioration, and, finally, 2,2% of respondents describe their financial situation as considerably changed to the worse. Image of future economic

situation seems not to be influenced by recent changes: correlation between these two measures turned to be insignificant.

Regression analysis.

In order to explore the relative influence of economic well-being components on subjective quality of life, the procedure of hierarchical regression analysis was used. Tables #3 and #4 demonstrate the results.

As we can see, the block of demographic variables (including age, gender, education, occupation, marital status) explains very small percentage of variance both in happiness and satisfaction with life. Future changes expectations accounts for additional 12,8 % of variance in satisfaction with life. In case of happiness, it is the most effective economy-related predictor which by itself explains 11% of variance.

On the third step variable reflecting recent changes in respondents' financial situation was introduced into model. This step was statistically insignificant and added only 1% to the total amount of explained variance.

Introduction of social comparison on the next step of analysis turned to be statistically insignificant as well. Two other variables are significant only as regards satisfaction with life: introduction of satisfaction with income into the model increased the amount of explained variance in satisfaction with life up to 24%, and satisfaction with standard of living added other 3%; however, neither satisfaction with income, nor satisfaction with standard of living proved to be significant predictors of happiness.

Model	Variables	R square	P
1	Age, gender, education, occupation, marital status	0.02	0.755
2	Model 1+ future changes expectations	0.13	0.001
3	Model 2 + recent financial changes	0.14	0.300
4	Model 3 + social comparison	0.14	0.861
5	Model 4 + satisfaction with income	0.24	0.000
6	Model 5 + satisfaction with standard of living	0.27	0.016

Table 3. Results of hierarchical regression analysis, prediction of satisfaction with life.

Model	Variables	R square	P
1	Age, gender, education, occupation, marital status	0.03	0.455
2	Model 1 + future changes expectations	0.14	0.001
3	Model 2 + recent financial changes	0.15	0.196
4	Model 3 + social comparison	0.15	0.222
5	Model 4 + satisfaction with income	0.17	0.081
6	Model 5 + satisfaction with standard of living	0.19	0.086

Table 4. Results of hierarchical regression analysis, prediction of happiness.

So, the set of five variables explains 27% of total variance in satisfaction with life and 198% of variance in happiness. The most effective economy-related predictor of happiness is future changes expectations (explains 11% of variance); as for satisfaction with life, it is satisfaction with income (explains 14.5% of variance), which plays the role of most-effective economy-related predictor.

There is support for such outcome coming from national surveys. Regression analysis of data from Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey (2000), has shown that satisfaction with financial circumstances explains as much as 24,5% of variance in satisfaction with life, while the block of economy-related factors including satisfaction with financial circumstances, future changes expectations, recent changes, and self-anchoring on "rich -poor" scale, explain 26% of variance.

The importance of future financial situation image is not surprising if we take Russian unstable economics into consideration. According to R. Inglehart (1986), the possible explanation can be found in so called "aspiration - adjustment model". Within the bounds of this model subjective well-being reflects the gap between aspiration level and one's perceived situation (A. Michalos, 1980). As R. Inglehart point out, correlations between subjective well-being and stable characteristics (such as sex) are weaker than correlations between relatively unstable characteristics (such as income, marital status, etc.) and subjective life quality. Since from the beginning of 1990s Russian economy has been more or less unstable, financial expectations play important role in subjective well-being, having an impact, first of all, on its' affective component (happiness).

Age and gender differences.

The number of economy-related predictors of subjective well-being and their predictive value depend on respondent age (see Fig. 2). In group of respondents who are 17-20 years old five measures turned to be related to happiness and satisfaction with life: satisfaction with income, satisfaction with standard of living, social comparison, recent changes and future individual and national changes expectations. The best predictor of satisfaction with life is satisfaction with standard of living (explains 13,3% of variance), and the best predictor of happiness is future changes in national economy expectations, which explains 6,9% of variance in happiness.

In the next age group (21-24 years old) the set of economy-related predictors of subjective life quality consists of satisfaction with income, social comparison, satisfaction with standard of living, and future changes expectations. Image of national economic situation in the near future has the most predictive value in the case of satisfaction with life (explains 20,1% of variance). Satisfaction with income is the best and sufficient predictor of happiness, which explains 20% of variance.

Respondents who are between 25 and 33 years old are characterized by correlation between subjective life quality and recent changes in financial situation, satisfaction with standard of living, social comparison, individual changes expectations. In this case recent changes accounts for the biggest percent of variance in both satisfaction with life (accounts for as much as 36,8% of variance) and happiness (explains 21,2% of variance).

Finally, for respondents over 33 years old it is true that only three economy-related measures turned to be correlated with subjective well-being: future individual and national changes expectations, and satisfaction with income. Satisfaction with income is the best economy - related predictor of satisfaction with life, it accounts for 19,1% of variance, while future individual changes expectations is the most powerful predictor of happiness (explains 20,4% of variance).

So, the structure of subjective economic well-being modifies with age. However, it would be incorrect to make a conclusion about weakening of correlation between subjective quality of life and economic factors, since the percentage explained by the latter does not decrease.

Fig. 2. Number of economy-related predictors of subjective life quality in age groups.

The common feature of all age groups is significant correlation between subjective

well-being measures and future changes expectations. This result was well supported by interview data. Anxiety related to possible deterioration of nation-wide and individual situation, presentiment of financial problems / crises negatively affect subjective well-being.

Let's now consider gender differences in the structure of SEWB and relative significance of its' components. First of all, it seems that financial characteristics play more important role in subjective well-being of women comparing to men. Future changes expectations, satisfaction with income and satisfaction with standard of living make the minimum number of economy-related predictors of overall satisfaction with life and happiness of women. All together these characteristics explain 34,5% of variance in satisfaction with life and account for 19,1% of variance in happiness. In men sample, recent changes in financial situation turned to be the best predictor of happiness (accounts for 5,2% of variance); future individual changes expectations is the best predictor of satisfaction with life, it explains 4,2% of variance. Why financial well-being is more involved into subjective life quality of women comparing to men? It is traditionally assumed that in Russia women are in less favorable economic position than men, and one of explanations that firstly comes to researcher's mind lies within the bound of so called "scarcity hypothesis" (R. Inglehart, 1977). According to this hypothesis, people assign greater value to their needs which they feel scarcity in. Objective income was not measured accurately in this study, however, no significant differences between men's and women's level of consumption, socio-economic category, and satisfaction with income have been found. This forces us to search other possible explanations for gender differences. The result is rather surprising also from psychoanalytical perspective, which tends to associate masculinity, and, therefore, positive masculine identity in European culture with income and ability to make money (R. Gould, A. Belkin, 2000). Russian psychoanalyst A. Belkin refers to cases of men's sexual problems caused by financial failures (A. Belkin, 2000). If we consider positive self-identity as part of subjective well-being, economic features should play, from this point of view, more important role, in life quality of men, which is not confirmed in this research.

The fundamental question that arises here concerns *causality*: whether overall subjective quality of life is determined by separate components of subjective well-being, or, on the contrary, overall subjective well-being shapes images of separate aspects of life and determines degrees of satisfaction with income, future changes expectations, etc.? In other words, the question is whether there is "bottom-up" or "top-down" relationship? As B. Heady points out, satisfaction with standard of living is dependent on overall evaluation of life quality (B. Heady, 1981). A. Campbell supposes bilateral relation between overall satisfaction with life and satisfaction with separate life domains (A. Campbell, 1981). Some possible ideas regarding causality can be withdrawn from interview data. It may be assumed that there is bilateral relation between subjective well-being and satisfaction with income, future changes expectations, recent changes, and social comparison. At the same time, satisfaction with standard of living is characterized with unilateral relationship to subjective quality of life, at that the latter appears as independent variable. However, I would like to underline hypothetical character of this idea, and further investigations need to be done.

Satisfaction with life domains and SWEB.

In order to analyze relationship of satisfaction with life domains to components of subjective economic well-being, we have chosen following life domains: health, education, job, dwelling, family life, social welfare system, public health, environment, leisure, safety, and government performance. Pearson correlations were computed in order to determine the quantity of significant links.

Correlation analysis has shown that every life domain is significantly correlated with

certain number of subjective economic well-being components. These numbers are shown in Fig. 3.

Fig. 3. Number of correlations between SEWB components and satisfaction with life domains.

Satisfaction with health correlates with all components of SEWB except for social comparison. There is supporting evidence coming from literature sources. According to A. Furnham and M. Argyle, income is related to physical and psychological health, social relations, leisure, job, and family life (A. Furnham, M. Argyle; 1998). Surprisingly, satisfaction with job correlated only with satisfaction with income.

We now proceed to speculations about relationship of satisfaction with life domains to subjective economic well-being. Supposedly, satisfaction with certain domains, such as health, social relations, marriage and family life is in the base of subjective quality of life, thus, reinforcement of satisfaction with given domains improves general subjective well-being. At the same time, improvement of life quality leads to more positive evaluation of SEWB components. Interview results provide support for this thesis. Satisfaction with several domains is viewed by respondents as basis for well-being, these domains include health and marriage, sometimes - education. Feeling good about these aspects of life may, through better life quality, compensate low evaluations of other domains. During the interview this mechanism shows in phrases like "If one is healthy, the rest is not a problem", etc. About 43% of respondents displayed, in one way or another, such perceptive trend as regards health, about 31% think this way about social relations, and about 24% perceive good marriage and good family life as essential condition of being happy and satisfied with life. Low level of satisfaction with these spheres leads to deterioration of life quality and, consequently, negatively affects economic well-being. At the same time, perceived importance of the latter grows up: for instance, among those who are less satisfied with health, marriage and available social support, the level of income is perceived as principal condition of successful marriage (though correlation between satisfaction with income and satisfaction with family life is not significant) or being in good health: about 42% of "less satisfied" demonstrate such vision of causal relations being considered.

Relation of satisfaction with other life domains, such as public health system, job, leisure, government performance to economic well-being is rather different. It seems that economic well-being serves as independent variable in this case: for example, satisfaction with income influences satisfaction with job (there is significant correlation between them, $r = 0.27$, $p = 0.002$), satisfaction with public health care system (through access to private medical services), satisfaction with government performance, and leisure (through access to broader variety of activities). Interview data support this conclusion. Linking satisfaction with income and satisfaction with job is one of the most common respondents' remark concerning causality: about 58% of working respondents mention this relationship. Respondents tend to relate their *income* with government performance ($r = 0.166$, $p = 0.02$; 24% of interviewees mentioned grow of income as necessary condition of their satisfaction with government performance improvement), *access to qualitative health care services* ($r = 0.377$, $p = 0.000$; 22% of interviewees think that such link exists) and *cultural events* ($r = 0.229$, $p = 0.002$; 29.5% of interviewees think this way), etc., and satisfaction with these domains is perceived as dependent on economic well-being. This is also true for standard of living and perspective of financial improvement

Satisfaction with safety level is needed to be analyzed separately. It correlates with all components of SEWB, except for social comparison. According to A. Lewis and H. Goldberg (A. Lewis & H. Goldberg, 1978), basic need for safety, if constantly left unsatis-

fied, may result in pathological inclination for money issues, since money in this case represent safety. Thus correlation between satisfaction with safety level and SEWB is probably determined by deep psychological features.

One of perspectives of causality analysis is dividing person's environment into micro- and macro-environment. It seems that life domains, that belong primarily to micro-environment, such as health and marriage, serve as factor of SEWB. At the same time, domains of macro-environment, such as government performance and public health care system, depend on SEWB. However, again I would like to emphasize hypothetical status of these speculations, which need to be studied further.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has certain number of limitations. First of all, it does not consider rural population of Russia, who's economic behavior and attitudes are rather different from those of urban population. Secondly, people with higher education are slightly over-represented in the sample.

At the same time, several important conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, the data provides information about subjective economic well-being of people, living in unstable economy. Thus, the paper broadens available psychological data on relationship of economic well-being to subjective life quality. The most effective subjective economy-related predictors of satisfaction with life and happiness were found; these are future changes expectations in case of happiness, and satisfaction with income in case of satisfaction with life. The study has also shown that the number of economy-related predictors of subjective quality of life slightly decreases with age; their relative significance also modifies. However, relationship between SWEB and subjective quality of life does not weaken with age. The paper also presents some speculations regarding causal relationship of SWEB to satisfaction with life "in general" and satisfaction with life domains. The hypothesis-to-be-investigated is that domains of micro-environment serve as factor of SWEB, while macro-environment domains depend on SWEB.

REFERENCES

1. Ackerman N, Paolucci B.: 1983, 'Objective and Subjective Income Adequacy: Their Relationship to Perceived Life Quality Measures', *Social Indicators Research* 12, pp. 25-49.
2. Andrews F. M., Whithey S.: 1976, *Social Indicators of Well-being* (Plenum, New York and London).
3. Belkin, A.: 2000, *The Scent of Money* (Terra, Moscow).
4. Campbell A., Converse P. E., Rodgers W.L.: 1976, *The Quality of American Life* (Russell Sage Foundation, New York).
5. Furnham A., Argyle, M.: 1998, *The Psychology of Money* (Routledge, London & New York).
6. Inglehart R, Rabier J.-R.: 1986, 'Aspirations Adapt to Situations - But Why are the Belgians so Much Happier Than the French?', *Research on the Quality of Life* (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center), pp. 1-56.
7. Inglehart, R: 1977, *The Silent Revolution. Changing Values and Political Style among Western Publics* (Princeton).
8. Michalos, A.: 1980, 'Satisfaction and Happiness', *Social Indicators Research* 8, pp.

- 385-422.
9. Mullis R. J.: 1992, 'Measures of Economic Well-being as Predictors of Psychological Wellbeing', *Social Indicators Research* 26, pp. 119-135.
 10. Olson G. I., Schober B. I.: 1993, 'The Satisfied Poor', *Social Indicators Research* 28, pp. 173-193.
 11. Strümpel B.: 1974, 'Economic Well-being as an Object of Social Measurement', *Subjective Elements of Wellbeing* (Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development), pp. 75-122.