Table S1. Logistic Regression Predicting the Likelihood of Retention at age 42 Using Childhood Variables and Different Missing Data Methods.

		1970 British	Cohort Study	y	195	1958 National Child Development Study				
-	Mod	lel 1	Mod	Model 2		del 1	Model 2			
-	OR	p	OR	p	OR	p	OR	p		
Female	1.40	< .01	1.44	< .01	1.23	< .01	1.23	<.01		
Cognitive ability	1.02	< .01	1.04	< .01	1.02	< .01	1.02	< .01		
Self-control	1.01	< .01	1.01	< .01	1.04	< .01	1.04	< .01		
Psychological distress	1.00	.26	1.00	.33	0.97	.02	0.96	< .01		
Parental social class	1.10	< .01	1.10	< .01	1.02	.31	1.04	.02		
Parental education	0.97	.04	0.97	.02	0.98	.29	0.99	.62		
Parental dwelling size	1.01	.51	1.04	< .01	1.02	.31	1.01	.40		
Missing data method	Monte	Carlo	Mean in	nputation	Monte	e Carlo	Mean in	nputation		
	integr	ation			integ	ration				

Table S2. Correlation Matrix for Key Variables in the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS)

	LS	SRH	FD	F	CA	SC	DS	PS	PE	PD	S	Е	D	MS	ME
Life satisfaction (LS)	1														
Self-rated health (SRH)	.333**	1													
Financial difficulties (FD)	382**	294**	1												
Female (F)	.035**	0.019	0.014	1											
Cognitive ability (CA)	.055**	.160**	145**	033**	1										
Self-control (SC)	.112**	.167**	141**	.182**	.413**	1									
Psychological distress (DS)	054**	085**	.067**	.045**	209**	387**	1								
Parental social class (PS)	.067**	.126**	106**	-0.015	.295**	.151**	056**	1							
Parental education (PE)	.055**	.128**	116**	-0.006	.316**	.175**	077**	.521**	1						
Parental dwelling size (PD)	.026*	.073**	066**	0.006	.151**	.052**	026*	.283**	.300**	1					
Participant social class (S)	.082**	.132**	184**	0.009	.297**	.239**	109**	.222**	.236**	.133**	1				
Participant education (E)	.075**	.168**	161**	.022*	.390**	.286**	112**	.346**	.433**	.213**	.367**	1			
Participant dwelling size (D)	.234**	.186**	240**	.023*	.187**	.158**	081**	.172**	.155**	.150**	.200**	.209**	1		
Mobility in social class (MS)	.030*	.026*	087**	0.022	0.013	.082**	037**	618**	227**	116**	.630**	.025*	.037**	1	
Mobility in education (ME)	.043**	.082**	090**	.040**	.188**	.178**	062**	-0.017	279**	0.011	.215**	.745**	.107**	.191**	1
Mobility in dwelling size (MD)	.184**	.120**	168**	0.016	.062**	.102**	055**	024*	049**	509**	.094**	.046**	.775**	.103**	.082**

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Significant at the 0.1% level. \*\* Significant at the 1% level. \* Significant at the 5% level.

Table S3. Correlation Matrix for Key Variables in the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS).

	LS	SRH	FD	F	CA	SC	DS	PS	PE	PD	S	Е	D	MS	ME
Life satisfaction (LS)	1														
Self-rated health (SRH)	.240**	1.00													
Financial difficulties (FD)	330**	229**	1.00												
Female (F)	.027**	-0.02	0.00	1.00											
Cognitive ability (CA)	.075**	.182**	177**	.064**	1.00										
Self-control (SC)	.071**	.127**	116**	.243**	$.370^{**}$	1.00									
Psychological distress (DS)	100**	137**	.135**	119**	369**	428**	1.00								
Parental social class (PS)	.036**	.119**	103**	-0.01	.290**	.135**	129**	1.00							
Parental education (PE)	0.01	.092**	082**	0.01	.282**	.097**	103**	.474**	1.00						
Parental dwelling size (PD)	0.02	.074**	037**	028**	.125**	.041**	058**	.300**	.328**	1.00					
Participant social class (S)	.064**	.122**	194**	040**	.375**	.171**	208**	.234**	.251**	.116**	1.00				
Participant education (E)	.061**	.152**	175**	-0.01	.433**	.215**	205**	.361**	.415**	.200**	.409**	1.00			
Participant dwelling size (D)	.179**	.155**	249**	0.01	.233**	.125**	147**	.207**	.193**	.178**	.249**	.262**	1.00		
Mobility in social class (MS)	.031**	.029**	100**	-0.02	.091**	.049**	082**	607**	181**	145**	.631**	.050**	.043**	1.00	
Mobility in education (ME)	.056**	.079**	117**	-0.02	.237**	.158**	128**	0.02	343**	040**	.237**	.713**	.121**	.185**	1.00
Mobility in dwelling size (MD)	.142**	.080**	188**	.028**	.115**	.086**	091**	024*	056**	517**	.130**	.091**	.750**	.138**	.139**

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Significant at the 0.1% level. \*\* Significant at the 1% level. \* Significant at the 5% level.

Table S4. Standardized Path Coefficients of the Association between Intergenerational Social Mobility and Life Satisfaction at age 42 Before and After the Addition of Each Childhood Trait in the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS; N = 9,683) and the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS; N = 11,265).

	No co	ontrols	+ Cogniti	ive ability	+ Self-	control	+ Di	stress	+ All child	hood traits
Study	BCS	NCDS								
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
	95% <i>CI</i>									
Intergenerational	.19	.15	.19	.14	.18	.14	.19	.14	.18	.13
social mobility <sup>a</sup>	[.17, .21]	[.13, .16]	[.16, .21]	[.12, .16]	[.16, .20]	[.12, .16]	[.16, .21]	[.12, .16]	[.15, .20]	[.12, .15]

*Note.* All estimates are statistically significant at the p<0.001 level. 95% confidence intervals presented in brackets.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Intergenerational social mobility is modelled as a composite latent factor with formative indicators (i.e. intergenerational changes in educational attainment, social class, and dwelling size).

Table S5.

Standardized Path Coefficients of the Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects of Intergenerational Social Mobility on Life Satisfaction at age 50 in the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS).

	Life satisfaction (age 50)
	β [95% <i>CI</i> ]
Total effect	.130 [.110, .152]
Total direct effect	.076 [.055, .098]
Total indirect effect	.055 [.047, .063]
via self-rated health	.013 [.009, .018]
via financial difficulties	.042 [.036, .048]

*Note.* All estimates are statistically significant at the p<0.05 level. 95% confidence intervals presented in brackets. Models are adjusted for gender, childhood cognitive ability, self-control, and distress.

## INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY AND WELL-BEING

Table S6. Attrition Weighted Analyses of the Association between Intergenerational Social Mobility and Life Satisfaction, Self-rated health, and Perceived Financial Difficulties at age 42 in the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS; N = 9,683) and the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS; N = 11,265).

	Life satisfaction		Self-rate	ed health	Financial difficulties		
Study	BCS	NCDS	BCS	NCDS	BCS	NCDS	
	β	β	β	β	β	β	
	95% <i>CI</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	
Intergenerational	.19	.14	.14	.11	20	22	
social mobility <sup>a</sup>	[.17, .21]	[.12, .16]	[.12, .17]	[.09, .14]	[22,17]	[24,20]	
+ Childhood	.18	.13	.11	.06	18	19	
traits <sup>b</sup>	[.15, .20]	[.11, .15]	[.09, .14]	[.04, .08]	[20,15]	[21,17]	

*Note*. All estimates are statistically significant at the p<0.001 level. 95% confidence intervals presented in brackets.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Intergenerational social mobility is modelled as a composite latent factor with formative indicators (i.e. intergenerational changes in educational attainment, social class, and dwelling size).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Models include further adjustment for childhood traits: cognitive ability, self-control, and child distress.

## INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY AND WELL-BEING: SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Table S7. Attrition Weighted Analyses of the Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects of Intergenerational Social Mobility on Life Satisfaction at age 42 in the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS; N = 9,683) and the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS; N = 11,265).

	Life satisfaction					
Study	BCS	NCDS				
	β [95% <i>CI</i> ]	β [95% <i>CI</i> ]				
Total effect	.18 [.15, .20]	.13 [.11, .15]				
Total direct effect	.10 [.07, .12]	.07 [.05, .09]				
Total indirect effect	.08 [.07, .09]	.06 [.06, .07]				
via self-rated health	.03 [.02, .03]	.01 [.01, .02]				
via financial difficulties	.05 [.04, .06]	.05 [.05, .06]				

*Note.* All estimates are statistically significant at the p<0.05 level. 95% confidence intervals presented in brackets. Models are adjusted for gender, childhood cognitive ability, self-control, and distress.

Table S8. Standardized Path Coefficients of the Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects of Intergenerational Social Mobility on Life Satisfaction at age 42 in the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS; N = 9,683) and the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS; N = 11,265).

Study	1970	British Cohort St	tudy	1958 National Child Development Study				
		N = 9,683			N = 11,265			
	β [95% <i>CI</i> ]	β [95% <i>CI</i> ]	β [95% <i>CI</i> ]					
Total effect	.18 [.16, .20]	.21 [.18, .24]	.10 [.07, .12]	.13 [.11, .15]	.16 [.13, .18]	.09 [.06, .11]		
Total direct effect	.10 [.07, .12]	.12 [.10, .15]	.02 [01, .04]	.07 [.05, .09]	.10 [.07, .12]	.03 [.002, .05]		
Total indirect effect	.08 [.07, .09]	.08 [.07, .09]	.08 [.07, .09]	.06 [.06, .07]	.06 [.05, .07]	.06 [.05, .07]		
via self-rated health	.03 [.02, .03]	.03 [.02, .03]	.03 [.02, .03]	.01 [.01, .02]	.01 [.01, .01]	.01 [.01, .01]		
via financial difficulties	.05 [.05, .06]	.05 [.04, .06]	.05 [.05, .06]	.05 [.05, .06]	.05 [.04, .06]	.05 [.05, .06]		
Parental SES <sup>a</sup>		.07 [.04, .09]	-		.06 [.03, .08]	_		
Participant SES <sup>a</sup>		_	.12 [.10, .14]		_	.08 [.06, .10]		

*Note.* All estimates are statistically significant at the p<0.05 level. 95% confidence intervals presented in brackets. Models are adjusted for gender, childhood cognitive ability, self-control, and distress.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Socioeconomic status (SES) is measured as a formative construct using dwelling size, social class, and age participant left education.

Table S9. Standardized Path Coefficients of the Association between Intergenerational Social Mobility and Longitudinal Changes in Life Satisfaction in the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS; N = 9,683) and the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS; N = 11,265).

	$\Delta$ Life satisfaction age 30 to $42^a$	$\Delta$ Life satisfaction age 42 to $50^{b}$
Study	BCS	NCDS
Intergenerational	.12	.07
social mobility <sup>c</sup>	[.10,.14]	[.05, .08]
+ Childhood traits <sup>d</sup>	.11	.07
	[.09, .13]	[.05, .08]

*Note.* All estimates are statistically significant at the p<0.001 level. 95% confidence intervals presented in brackets.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Model adjusted for participant gender and life satisfaction at age 30.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Model adjusted for participant gender and life satisfaction at age 42.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> Intergenerational social mobility is modelled as a composite latent factor with formative indicators (i.e. intergenerational changes in educational attainment, social class, and dwelling size).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup> Models include further adjustment for childhood traits: cognitive ability, self-control, and child distress.