Supplemental Document A

In developing the measurement model with hedonic well-being as outcome, we used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to compare two factor structures described in the literature. First, we tested the tripartite model proposed by Diener (1984), in which hedonic well-being was represented by three correlated latent constructs, namely, life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect. Second, we tested the hierarchical model (Busseri and Sadava, 2011: Model 2), which adds a higher-order hedonic well-being factor to the tripartite model. Maximum likelihood robust estimation was used. Fit indices for the tripartite model were: χ^2 (*df*) = 421.6 (205), CFI = .950, TLI = .927, RMSEA = .046, SRMR = .034, BIC = 24771, AIC = 24161; and for the hierarchical model: χ^2 (*df*) = 472.2 (225), CFI = .943, TLI = .924, RMSEA = .047, SRMR = .043, BIC = 24699, AIC = 24173. Because the tripartite model performed better on most fit indices, it was chosen as the basis for structural model analysis.

In developing the measurement model with eudaimonic well-being as outcome, we used CFA to compare three factor structures described in the literature. Model 1 specified six first-order factors joined together by a singer higher order factor (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Model 2 included six first-order factors, four of which (environmental mastery, personal growth, purpose In life, and self-acceptance) formed a second-order factor labeled as “competence,” plus two method factors indicated by positively- and negatively-worded items (Abbott, et al., 2010; Burns & Machin, 2009). Model 3 was a simplified version of Model 2 that excluded the method factors. Maximum likelihood robust estimation was used. Comparison of fit indices indicated that Model 2 provided the best fit to the data (χ^2 (*df*) = 1010.6 (637), CFI = .923, TLI = .906, RMSEA = .034, SRMR = .040, BIC = 43740, AIC = 42802). Model 2 performed better across fit indices than Model 1 (χ^2 (*df*) = 1519.5 (689), CFI = .829, TLI = .806, RMSEA = .049, SRMR = .054, BIC = 44054, AIC = 43335) and Model 3 (χ^2 (*df*) = 1426.9 (658), CFI = .908, TLI = .891, RMSEA = .037, SRMR = .051, BIC = 44079, AIC = 43272; $\Delta\chi^2$ = -257.1 for -31 *df*, *p* <.001). Therefore, Model 2 was selected as the basis for structural model analysis.

Supplemental Document B

Correlations among Exogenous Variables from the Measurement Model.

		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
(a)	C1: "cherished"	--								
(b)	C2: "harshly disciplined"	**-.40**	--							
(c)	C3: "ordinary"	**-.70**	**-.37**	--						
(d)	Childhood SES	**.11**	-.07	-.06	--					
(e)	Age	-.03	-.04	.07	**-.09**	--				
(f)	Marital status (1=Y, 0=N)	.07	-.05	-.03	.06	-.03	--			
(g)	Retirement status (1=Y, 0=N)	-.03	*-.08*	**.09**	**-.12**	**.30**	-.01	--		
(h)	Self-rated health (higher = better)	*.08*	**-.10**	-.10	**.16**	**-.22**	.03	**-.17**	--	
(i)	# Health conditions	.03	.02	*-.04*	<.01	**.19**	-.01	**.15**	**-.42**	--

Notes: Bold: $p \leq .05$; Italics: $p \leq .10$. C1, C2 and C3 refer to probabilities of being assigned to latent classes 1, 2 and 3, respectively. For each person, (C1 + C2 + C3) = 1.

Supplemental Document C

Latent factor correlations of hedonic and eudaimonic well-being dimensions.

	LS	PA	NA	COM	AUT
Hedonic well-being					
Life satisfaction (LS)	--	--	--	--	--
Positive affect (PA)	.56	--	--	--	--
Negative Affect (NA)	-.54	-.37	--	--	--
Eudaimonic well-being					
Competence (COM)	.72	.51	-.42	--	--
Autonomy (AUT)	.25	.30	-.30	.65	--
Positive relations with others (REL)	.45	.36	-.25	.74	.51

Note: All *p*'s <.01.

Supplemental Document D

Results from Saturated Structural Equation Model of Midlife Social Support Mediating the Association between Later-Life Hedonic Well-Being and Early Experiences, Adjusted for Eudaimonic Well-Being, Childhood SES and Covariates.

Mediation Components:

	Qual. Support			Quant. Support			Life Satisfaction			Positive Affect			Negative Affect		
	B	*SE*	*p*	*B*	*SE*	*p*	*B*	*SE*	*p*	*B*	*SE*	*p*	*B*	*SE*	*p*
C1: "cherished" (ref.)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
C2: "harshly disciplined"	**-1.53**	**0.35**	**<.001**	**-1.09**	**0.38**	**.004**	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--
C3: "ordinary"	**-0.93**	**0.23**	**<.001**	**-0.62**	**0.28**	**.03**	**-0.03**	**0.01**	**.02**	=0	--	--	=0	--	--
Qual. Support	--	--	--	--	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--
Quant. Support	--	--	--	--	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	**0.02**	**0.01**	**.002**
Competence	--	--	--	--	--	--	**0.30**	**0.04**	**<.001**	**0.86**	**0.23**	**<.001**	**-0.48**	**0.12**	**<.001**
Autonomy	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.13	0.03	<.001	-0.09	0.18	.61	0.001	0.09	.99
Positive Relations	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.04	0.03	.13	0.01	0.13	.93	0.10	0.08	.18

Summary of Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects

	Life Satisfaction			Positive Affect			Negative Affect		
	B	*SE*	*p* / 95%CI	*B*	*SE*	*p* / 95%CI	*B*	*SE*	*p* / 95%CI
Direct effects:									
C2: "harshly disciplined"	=0	--	--	=0	--	--			
C3: "ordinary"	**-0.03**	**0.01**	**.02**	=0	--	--			
Indirect effects:									
C2 → Qual. Support → outcome	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--
C2 → Quant. Support → outcome	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	**-0.02**	**0.01**	**(-0.05, -0.01)**
C3 → Qual. Support → outcome	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--
C3 → Quant. Support → outcome	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	**-0.01**	**0.01**	**(-0.03, -0.001)**
Total effects:									
C2	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	**-0.02**	**0.01**	**.02**
C3	**-0.03**	**0.01**	**.02**	=0	--	--	*-0.01*	*0.01*	*.06*

Notes: Bold: $p \leq .05$; Italics: $p \leq .10$. For indirect effects, 95% confidence intervals (CI) that do not overlap with 0 are considered significant and marked in bold. C2 and C3 refer to the probability of being assigned to latent class 2 and 3, respectively. Qual. Support = qualitative social support. Quant. support = quantitative social support. Positive Relations = Positive Relations with Others. In the saturated model, hedonic well-being factors were regressed on latent class probabilities (C2, C3), all covariates, eudaimonic well-being factors, and social support variables; social support variables were regressed on latent class probabilities, age, and childhood socioeconomic status. Model

trimming followed the same procedures as described in the Methods section. Hedonic well-being factors were adjusted for age, childhood SES, and eudaimonic well-being factors throughout the model-trimming process. To facilitate model estimation, measurement model parameters for hedonic and eudaimonic well-being factors were fixed at values estimated in the respective best-fitting measurement model. Model fit indices for this model were: X^2 (*df*)=2159 (1475), CFI=.925, TLI=.926, RMSEA=.031, BIC=53125, SRMR=.059.

Supplemental Document E

Results from Saturated Structural Equation Model of Midlife Social Support Mediating the Association between Later-Life Eudaimonic Well-Being and Early Experiences, Adjusted for Hedonic Well-Being Childhood SES and Covariates.

Mediation Components:

	Qual. Support			Quant. Support			Competence			Autonomy			Positive Relations with Others		
	B	*SE*	*p*	*B*	*SE*	*p*	*B*	*SE*	*p*	*B*	*SE*	*p*	*B*	*SE*	*p*
C1: "cherished" (ref.)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
C2: "harshly disciplined"	**-1.53**	**0.35**	**<.001**	**-1.07**	**0.38**	**.01**	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	*-0.12*	*0.06*	*.06*
C3: "ordinary"	**-0.95**	**0.23**	**<.001**	**-0.63**	**0.28**	**.03**	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	**-0.11**	**0.05**	**.01**
Qual. Support	--	--	--	--	--	--	**0.02**	**0.01**	**<.001**	=0	--	--	**0.07**	**0.01**	**<.001**
Quant. Support	--	--	--	--	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--
Life Satisfaction	--	--	--	--	--	--	**1.93**	**0.26**	**<.001**	0.22	0.30	.46	**1.44**	**0.32**	**<.001**
Positive Affect	--	--	--	--	--	--	**0.15**	**0.03**	**<.001**	**0.15**	**0.04**	**<.001**	**0.14**	**0.05**	**.002**
Negative Affect	--	--	--	--	--	--	*-0.12*	*0.06*	*.06*	**-0.20**	**0.08**	**.01**	-0.04	0.10	0.68

Summary of Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects

	Competence			Autonomy			Positive Relations with Others		
	B	*SE*	*p* / 95%CI	*B*	*SE*	*p* / 95%CI	*B*	*SE*	*p* / 95%CI
Direct effects:									
C2: "harshly disciplined"	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	*-0.12*	*0.06*	*.06*
C3: "ordinary"	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	**-0.11**	**0.05**	**.01**
Indirect effects:									
C2 → Qual. Support → outcome	**-0.03**	**0.01**	**(-0.06, -0.01)**	=0	--	--	**-0.11**	**0.03**	**(-0.17, -0.06)**
C2 → Quant. Support → outcome	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--
C3 → Qual. Support → outcome	**-0.02**	**0.01**	**(-0.04, -0.01)**	=0	--	--	**-0.07**	**0.02**	**(-0.11, -0.03)**
C3 → Quant. Support → outcome	=0	--	--	=0	--	--	=0	--	--
Total effects:									
C2	**-0.03**	**0.01**	**.01**	=0	--	--	**-0.23**	**0.07**	**.001**
C3	**-0.02**	**0.01**	**.01**	=0	--	--	**-0.18**	**0.05**	**<.001**

Notes: Bold: $p \leq .05$; Italics: $p \leq .10$. For indirect effects, 95% confidence intervals (CI) that do not overlap with 0 are considered significant and marked in bold. C2 and C3 refer to the probability of being assigned to latent class 2 and 3, respectively. Qual. Support = qualitative social support. Quant support = quantitative social support. In the saturated model, eudaimonic well-being factors were regressed on latent

class probabilities (C2, C3), all covariates, hedonic well-being factors, and social support variables; social support variables were regressed on latent class probabilities, age, and childhood socioeconomic status. Model trimming followed the same procedures as described in the Methods section. Eudaimonic well-being factors were adjusted for age, childhood SES, and hedonic well-being factors throughout the model-trimming process. To facilitate model estimation, measurement model parameters for hedonic and eudaimonic well-being factors were fixed at values estimated in the respective best-fitting measurement model. Model fit indices for this model were: X^2 (*df*)=2079 (1432), CFI=.929, TLI=.930, RMSEA=.030, BIC=52555, SRMR=.058.