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**List of 90 pairs of statements, Study 1**

Table S1: Complete list of item pairs presented in Study 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| I am careful with money | I'm not that careful with money |
| I am generous | I am greedy |
| I cannot buy necessities | I can comfortably buy life's necessities |
| My life is not much fun | My life is pretty fun |
| I have no special advantages | I have special advantages |
| I am normal | I am unusual |
| I am not very connected with powerful others | I am well connected with powerful others |
| I don't know much about the arts | I know a lot about the arts |
| I lack free time | I have a lot of free time |
| I have poor mental health | I have excellent mental health |
| I am ignorant | I am knowledgeable |
| I am worthless | I am worthy |
| I have poor manners | I am well-mannered |
| I am often at the mercy of others | I am often responsible for others |
| I face barriers in achieving my goals | I get many opportunities to achieve my goals |
| I am undesirable | I am desirable |
| I am sad | I am happy |
| I am a modest person | I am arrogant |
| I am very empathic | I am not very empathic |
| I don't have much access to education | I have great access to education |
| I am unhealthy | I am healthy |
| The people I have connections with are generally not very wealthy | The people I have connections with are generally wealthy |
| I have few friends | I have many friends |
| I do not deserve success | I deserve success |
| I feel inferior to many people | I feel superior to many people |
| I have no savings or investments | I have savings or investments |
| I cannot go on vacations | I can go on vacations |
| I am unlucky | I am lucky |
| I am professionally unsuccessful | I am professionally successful |
| I am ethical | I am unethical |
| I am ashamed of who I am | I am proud of who I am |
| I have bad hygiene | I have good hygiene |
| I don't really know anyone who could help me get ahead | I know lots of people who could help me get ahead |
| I have little control over my life | I have complete control over my life |
| I need help from others | I don't need others' help |
| I don't have enough money | I generally have enough money |
| I live a modest life | I live a fancy lifestyle |
| I don't have very good political skills | I have great political skills |
| I am definitely not a member of the elite | I am a member of the elite |
| I face barriers to professional success | I have opportunities for professional success |
| I have few possessions | I have many possessions |
| I want more than what I have in life | I am happy with what I have in life |
| I am dependent on others | I am independent |
| The food I eat is low quality | The food I eat is good quality |
| I am not very skilled | I am very skilled |
| I am not able to buy whatever I want | I can buy basically anything I want |
| I am nice to others | I am not very nice to others |
| I have a difficult life | I have an easy life |
| I have little access to healthcare | I have ample access to healthcare |
| My clothes are shabby | My clothes are fancy |
| It's sometimes difficult for me to get where I want to go | It's easy for me to get where I want to go |
| My parents are not very well-off | My parents are wealthy |
| I live in a bad neighborhood | I live in a good neighborhood |
| I receive a lot of support from others | I provide a lot of support to others |
| I have low earnings | I have high earnings |
| I am underprivileged | I am privileged |
| I cannot go out much | I can go out a lot |
| I never have and never will receive an elite education | I received / am receiving an elite education |
| My family is not very privileged | My family is privileged |
| My life is filled with worry | My life is generally free from worry |
| I am unattractive | I am beautiful |
| I am at a disadvantage in life | I have few disadvantages in life |
| I cannot buy luxuries | I can afford to buy luxuries |
| I have a bad career | I have a good career |
| I have many social worries | I have few social worries |
| I have financial worries | I don't think much about money |
| Society discriminates against me | Society treats me fairly |
| I am not very cosmopolitan | I am very cosmopolitan |
| I feel hopeless about my future | I have high hopes for my future |
| I live in modest accommodations | I live in upscale accommodations |
| I don't deserve much in life | I am entitled to a good life |
| I am not very educated | I am highly educated |
| I sometimes feel oppressed | I never feel oppressed |
| I think a lot about others | I think a lot about myself |
| I have bad relationships with others | I have good relationships with others |
| I have many struggles in life | I have few struggles in life |
| I am envious of others | Others envy me |
| I am powerless | I am powerful |
| I am disadvantaged | I am advantaged |
| My family has few resources | My family has a lot of resources |
| I am lazy | I am hard-working |
| I am stupid | I am smart |
| I am shy | I am confident |
| I am unmotivated | I am motivated |
| Others dislike me | Others like me |
| Others disrespect me | Others admire me |
| I get abused by others | I receive favorable treatment |
| I don't have good social skills | I have great social skills |
| I face many barriers | I have many opportunities |
| I lack cultivation and refinement | I am very cultivated and refined |

**Varimax results, Studies 2a and 2b**

When we saved the varimax factor scores and examined their correlations with the ladder measure, in Study 2a we found that Factor 1 (elite life) and Factor 2 (easy life) correlated positively and strongly with the ladder measure; *relite* = .50, *reasy* =.45; both *p*s < .001. In contrast, Factor 3 (general positivity) did not correlate significantly with the ladder measure, *r* = .03, *p* = .547.

In Study 2b, the pattern with the varimax factor scores was similar: *relite* =.52, *reasy* = .44, both *p*s < .001; *rpositivity* = .18, *p* = .002. As with the oblimin rotation, there was a significant correlation with general positivity this time, presumably because Study 2b retained only items that had been correlated with the ladder measure in Study 2a.

**Full factor loadings, Studies 2a and 2b**

**2a (Oblimin and Varimax rotations; alphabetical order of items)**

Table S2: Factor loadings for all items presented in Study 2a

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Factor | easy | elite | positive |
| Rotation | oblimin | varimax | oblimin | varimax | oblimin | varimax |
| access\_to\_education | 0.279 | 0.311 | 0.347 | 0.419 | -0.093 | 0.169 |
| access\_to\_health | 0.342 | 0.36 | 0.262 | 0.351 | -0.067 | 0.144 |
| admired\_by\_others | 0.195 | 0.261 | 0.27 | 0.33 | -0.465 | 0.518 |
| advantaged | 0.57 | 0.571 | 0.304 | 0.45 | 0.03 | 0.087 |
| arrogant | -0.062 | -0.067 | 0.397 | 0.364 | 0.477 | -0.445 |
| beautiful | 0.045 | 0.124 | 0.23 | 0.254 | -0.563 | 0.589 |
| buy\_anything | 0.594 | 0.59 | 0.358 | 0.507 | 0.134 | -0.008 |
| can\_buy\_luxury | 0.448 | 0.471 | 0.494 | 0.605 | 0.076 | 0.042 |
| **can\_buy\_necessities** | **0.646** | **0.617** | **0.115** | **0.281** | **0.096** | **0.014** |
| can\_go\_out\_alot | 0.511 | 0.517 | 0.262 | 0.394 | -0.028 | 0.131 |
| can\_vacation | 0.536 | 0.544 | 0.32 | 0.457 | 0.001 | 0.112 |
| complete\_control\_over\_life | 0.611 | 0.604 | -0.063 | 0.105 | -0.271 | 0.356 |
| confident | 0.03 | 0.108 | 0.445 | 0.456 | -0.322 | 0.369 |
| cosmopolitan | -0.062 | -0.007 | 0.518 | 0.496 | 0.023 | 0.019 |
| cultivated\_refined | -0.049 | 0.034 | 0.428 | 0.42 | -0.358 | 0.391 |
| deserve\_success | -0.059 | 0.027 | 0.264 | 0.26 | -0.54 | 0.554 |
| don’t\_need\_help | 0.565 | 0.517 | -0.208 | -0.057 | 0.005 | 0.061 |
| **don’t\_think\_about\_money** | **0.588** | **0.573** | **0.205** | **0.355** | **0.077** | **0.033** |
| **easy\_life** | **0.799** | **0.758** | **-0.026** | **0.184** | **0.009** | **0.11** |
| easy\_to\_get\_places | 0.647 | 0.634 | 0.089 | 0.261 | -0.078 | 0.185 |
| **elite\_education** | **0.066** | **0.119** | **0.57** | **0.581** | **0.033** | **0.033** |
| entitled\_to\_goodlife | 0.08 | 0.149 | 0.16 | 0.194 | -0.544 | 0.569 |
| envied\_by\_others | 0.335 | 0.348 | 0.197 | 0.285 | -0.085 | 0.155 |
| excellent\_mental\_health | 0.486 | 0.512 | 0.015 | 0.155 | -0.452 | 0.525 |
| family\_resources | 0.493 | 0.506 | 0.362 | 0.487 | 0.015 | 0.096 |
| fancy\_clothes | 0.248 | 0.298 | 0.468 | 0.531 | -0.129 | 0.212 |
| **fancy\_life** | **0.164** | **0.192** | **0.585** | **0.616** | **0.24** | **-0.156** |
| favorable\_treatment | 0.493 | 0.498 | 0.096 | 0.23 | -0.177 | 0.26 |
| feel\_superior | 0.377 | 0.4 | 0.342 | 0.439 | -0.055 | 0.146 |
| few\_disadvantages | 0.666 | 0.65 | 0.141 | 0.315 | -0.014 | 0.129 |
| few\_social\_worries | 0.508 | 0.503 | -0.097 | 0.045 | -0.284 | 0.35 |
| few\_struggles | 0.735 | 0.704 | 0.052 | 0.245 | 0.014 | 0.103 |
| good\_career | 0.41 | 0.451 | 0.394 | 0.503 | -0.197 | 0.297 |
| good\_food | 0.353 | 0.382 | 0.218 | 0.315 | -0.229 | 0.303 |
| good\_hygeine | 0.145 | 0.2 | -0.012 | 0.043 | -0.619 | 0.636 |
| good\_neighborhood | 0.386 | 0.391 | 0.033 | 0.139 | -0.196 | 0.257 |
| good\_relationships | 0.322 | 0.357 | -0.006 | 0.091 | -0.494 | 0.539 |
| great\_social\_skills | -0.09 | 0.013 | 0.424 | 0.409 | -0.529 | 0.554 |
| greedy | 0.065 | 0 | 0.073 | 0.072 | 0.675 | -0.654 |
| happy | 0.56 | 0.58 | 0.033 | 0.191 | -0.419 | 0.505 |
| happy\_with\_what\_i\_have | 0.646 | 0.604 | -0.077 | 0.093 | 0.033 | 0.058 |
| hard\_working | 0.124 | 0.182 | 0.062 | 0.109 | -0.559 | 0.581 |
| **have\_enough\_money** | **0.693** | **0.675** | **0.222** | **0.4** | **0.082** | **0.046** |
| have\_freetime | 0.289 | 0.251 | -0.129 | -0.054 | 0.104 | -0.072 |
| have\_savings | 0.535 | 0.535 | 0.314 | 0.45 | 0.074 | 0.039 |
| healthy | 0.542 | 0.549 | -0.003 | 0.148 | -0.316 | 0.396 |
| high\_earnings | 0.487 | 0.501 | 0.423 | 0.545 | 0.066 | 0.05 |
| high\_hopes | 0.34 | 0.392 | 0.231 | 0.329 | -0.43 | 0.502 |
| highly\_educated | 0.009 | 0.073 | 0.448 | 0.451 | -0.173 | 0.218 |
| I’m\_desirable | 0.219 | 0.285 | 0.227 | 0.295 | -0.513 | 0.566 |
| independent | 0.549 | 0.53 | -0.11 | 0.041 | -0.177 | 0.248 |
| know\_about\_arts | -0.308 | -0.223 | 0.502 | 0.421 | -0.181 | 0.183 |
| know\_people\_to\_get\_ahead | 0.374 | 0.407 | 0.496 | 0.589 | 0.013 | 0.093 |
| knowledgeable | -0.021 | 0.06 | 0.207 | 0.214 | -0.568 | 0.582 |
| life\_is\_fun | 0.525 | 0.543 | 0.182 | 0.324 | -0.23 | 0.326 |
| liked\_by\_others | 0.226 | 0.286 | 0.072 | 0.147 | -0.617 | 0.655 |
| lucky | 0.319 | 0.349 | 0.218 | 0.306 | -0.219 | 0.288 |
| many\_friends | 0.133 | 0.191 | 0.449 | 0.483 | -0.169 | 0.232 |
| many\_opportunities | 0.616 | 0.623 | 0.302 | 0.463 | -0.05 | 0.173 |
| many\_possessions | 0.258 | 0.289 | 0.328 | 0.394 | -0.085 | 0.156 |
| **member\_of\_elite** | **0.098** | **0.152** | **0.702** | **0.717** | **0.138** | **-0.053** |
| motivated | 0.18 | 0.254 | 0.183 | 0.244 | -0.622 | 0.663 |
| never\_feel\_oppressed | 0.715 | 0.669 | -0.118 | 0.072 | 0.002 | 0.095 |
| **no\_worries** | **0.711** | **0.686** | **0.094** | **0.28** | **0.005** | **0.112** |
| normal | 0.426 | 0.42 | -0.192 | -0.069 | -0.324 | 0.368 |
| not\_careful\_money | -0.258 | -0.269 | 0.054 | -0.022 | 0.281 | -0.313 |
| not\_empathic | 0.251 | 0.192 | 0.015 | 0.069 | 0.476 | -0.433 |
| not\_nice | -0.018 | -0.071 | 0.149 | 0.125 | 0.679 | -0.663 |
| opportunities\_for\_goals | 0.565 | 0.57 | 0.328 | 0.473 | 0.023 | 0.095 |
| opportunities\_for\_success | 0.447 | 0.476 | 0.434 | 0.548 | -0.049 | 0.159 |
| political\_skills | -0.047 | 0.021 | 0.525 | 0.51 | -0.114 | 0.158 |
| powerful | 0.191 | 0.258 | 0.454 | 0.507 | -0.276 | 0.348 |
| privileged | 0.551 | 0.557 | 0.316 | 0.457 | 0.011 | 0.104 |
| privileged\_family | 0.424 | 0.429 | 0.371 | 0.476 | 0.133 | -0.031 |
| professionally\_successful | 0.333 | 0.384 | 0.496 | 0.582 | -0.144 | 0.243 |
| proud | 0.48 | 0.51 | 0.114 | 0.249 | -0.39 | 0.472 |
| provides\_support | 0.026 | 0.042 | -0.139 | -0.123 | -0.307 | 0.296 |
| responsible\_for\_others | 0.234 | 0.255 | 0.01 | 0.08 | -0.302 | 0.337 |
| smart | -0.012 | 0.077 | 0.26 | 0.27 | -0.6 | 0.62 |
| society\_treatsme\_fairly | 0.592 | 0.565 | -0.127 | 0.034 | -0.134 | 0.211 |
| special\_advantages | 0.154 | 0.197 | 0.581 | 0.613 | 0.1 | -0.019 |
| think\_about\_self | 0.082 | 0.055 | 0.197 | 0.206 | 0.422 | -0.387 |
| unethical | -0.041 | -0.077 | 0.255 | 0.225 | 0.626 | -0.604 |
| upscale\_housing | 0.217 | 0.223 | 0.403 | 0.449 | 0.249 | -0.175 |
| very\_skilled | -0.01 | 0.085 | 0.474 | 0.478 | -0.441 | 0.483 |
| **wealth\_connections** | **0.139** | **0.194** | **0.736** | **0.761** | **0.15** | **-0.056** |
| wealthy\_parents | 0.215 | 0.235 | 0.451 | 0.499 | 0.166 | -0.087 |
| **well\_connected** | **0.101** | **0.158** | **0.702** | **0.719** | **0.113** | **-0.027** |
| well\_mannered | 0.021 | 0.075 | -0.114 | -0.09 | -0.651 | 0.639 |
| worthy | 0.312 | 0.367 | 0.162 | 0.255 | -0.509 | 0.57 |

*Note*. Final scale items selected after Study 3 are **bolded**, with cross-loadings **greyed out**)

**2b (Oblimin and Varimax rotations; alphabetical order of items)**

Table S3: Factor loadings for all items presented in Study 2b

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Factor | easy | elite | positive |
| Rotation | oblimin | varimax | oblimin | varimax | oblimin | varimax |
| access\_to\_education | -0.035 | 0.121 | 0.512 | 0.534 | 0.312 | 0.384 |
| access\_to\_health | 0.269 | 0.328 | 0.254 | 0.333 | 0.147 | 0.252 |
| advantaged | 0.406 | 0.488 | 0.398 | 0.509 | 0.172 | 0.334 |
| buy\_anything | 0.832 | 0.787 | 0.101 | 0.289 | -0.067 | 0.152 |
| can\_buy\_luxury | 0.723 | 0.696 | 0.22 | 0.369 | -0.129 | 0.087 |
| **can\_buy\_necessities** | **0.639** | **0.635** | **0.065** | **0.237** | **0.12** | **0.282** |
| can\_go\_out\_alot | 0.589 | 0.605 | 0.176 | 0.328 | 0.098 | 0.267 |
| can\_vacation | 0.634 | 0.65 | 0.144 | 0.315 | 0.145 | 0.318 |
| **don’t\_think\_about\_money** | **0.736** | **0.684** | **-0.111** | **0.082** | **0.068** | **0.223** |
| **easy\_life** | **0.42** | **0.478** | **0.149** | **0.291** | **0.292** | **0.411** |
| easy\_to\_get\_places | 0.44 | 0.487 | 0.064 | 0.218 | 0.326 | 0.433 |
| **elite\_education** | **-0.169** | **-0.002** | **0.739** | **0.689** | **0.103** | **0.189** |
| envied\_by\_others | 0.2 | 0.255 | 0.041 | 0.136 | 0.315 | 0.361 |
| excellent\_mental\_health | 0.117 | 0.208 | -0.146 | -0.012 | 0.665 | 0.647 |
| family\_resources | 0.306 | 0.393 | 0.491 | 0.561 | 0.078 | 0.235 |
| fancy\_clothes | 0.358 | 0.415 | 0.286 | 0.385 | 0.139 | 0.271 |
| **fancy\_life** | **0.453** | **0.466** | **0.485** | **0.539** | **-0.262** | **-0.061** |
| favorable\_treatment | 0.243 | 0.306 | 0.026 | 0.143 | 0.39 | 0.441 |
| feel\_superior | 0.088 | 0.228 | 0.312 | 0.393 | 0.462 | 0.524 |
| few\_disadvantages | 0.363 | 0.448 | 0.25 | 0.379 | 0.319 | 0.441 |
| few\_struggles | 0.522 | 0.555 | 0.026 | 0.2 | 0.315 | 0.436 |
| good\_career | 0.188 | 0.31 | 0.213 | 0.327 | 0.498 | 0.566 |
| good\_food | 0.344 | 0.386 | 0.038 | 0.165 | 0.293 | 0.374 |
| good\_neighborhood | 0.314 | 0.315 | -0.053 | 0.049 | 0.161 | 0.222 |
| happy | 0.187 | 0.297 | -0.137 | 0.031 | 0.782 | 0.78 |
| happy\_with\_what\_ihave | 0.629 | 0.582 | -0.171 | 0.006 | 0.118 | 0.236 |
| **have\_enough\_money** | **0.809** | **0.773** | **0.062** | **0.258** | **0.004** | **0.209** |
| have\_savings | 0.653 | 0.626 | 0.033 | 0.196 | 0.035 | 0.197 |
| healthy | 0.157 | 0.236 | -0.031 | 0.084 | 0.502 | 0.519 |
| high\_earnings | 0.62 | 0.63 | 0.204 | 0.356 | 0.051 | 0.234 |
| high\_hopes | -0.163 | 0.018 | 0.109 | 0.187 | 0.801 | 0.757 |
| highly\_educated | -0.291 | -0.102 | 0.604 | 0.561 | 0.316 | 0.342 |
| know\_people\_toget\_ahead | 0.173 | 0.292 | 0.391 | 0.466 | 0.301 | 0.402 |
| life\_is\_fun | 0.266 | 0.371 | 0.077 | 0.225 | 0.569 | 0.63 |
| lucky | 0.096 | 0.236 | 0.281 | 0.37 | 0.495 | 0.553 |
| many\_opportunities | 0.411 | 0.489 | 0.203 | 0.348 | 0.346 | 0.47 |
| many\_possessions | 0.386 | 0.427 | 0.35 | 0.431 | -0.004 | 0.15 |
| **member\_of\_elite** | **0.227** | **0.303** | **0.561** | **0.586** | **-0.078** | **0.077** |
| never\_feel\_oppressed | 0.253 | 0.293 | 0.018 | 0.121 | 0.277 | 0.332 |
| **no\_worries** | **0.546** | **0.564** | **-0.123** | **0.074** | **0.393** | **0.491** |
| opportunities\_for\_goals | 0.411 | 0.497 | 0.232 | 0.379 | 0.357 | 0.486 |
| opportunities\_for\_success | 0.197 | 0.321 | 0.261 | 0.37 | 0.46 | 0.54 |
| powerful | 0.1 | 0.231 | 0.197 | 0.296 | 0.534 | 0.576 |
| privileged | 0.211 | 0.328 | 0.551 | 0.606 | 0.142 | 0.286 |
| privileged\_family | 0.224 | 0.328 | 0.684 | 0.708 | -0.052 | 0.123 |
| professionally\_successful | 0.265 | 0.373 | 0.286 | 0.398 | 0.378 | 0.48 |
| proud | 0.023 | 0.167 | -0.082 | 0.055 | 0.854 | 0.82 |
| special\_advantages | 0.137 | 0.238 | 0.628 | 0.634 | -0.04 | 0.105 |
| upscale\_housing | 0.48 | 0.479 | 0.391 | 0.459 | -0.237 | -0.047 |
| very\_skilled | -0.189 | -0.008 | 0.369 | 0.392 | 0.537 | 0.541 |
| **wealth\_connections** | **0.222** | **0.304** | **0.529** | **0.563** | **-0.019** | **0.128** |
| wealthy\_parents | -0.009 | 0.092 | 0.622 | 0.587 | -0.078 | 0.031 |
| **well\_connected** | **0.188** | **0.29** | **0.447** | **0.502** | **0.161** | **0.279** |
| worthy | -0.044 | 0.115 | -0.034 | 0.087 | 0.864 | 0.822 |

*Note*. Final scale items selected after Study 3 are **bolded**, with cross-loadings **greyed out**)

**Elite × easy interactions across studies**

For every variable in every study, we ran a model with the predictors being elite life scores (centered), easy life scores (centered) and their interaction (see Table S4); see main text for a brief discussion of the only consistent pattern of interactions, involving self-focused traits. For these traits, Table S5 presents the simple slopes.

Table S4: Interaction statistics for elite by easy interaction; all studies and all variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Study 2a | Study 2b | Study 3 | Study 4 | Study 5 | SOM |
|  | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* |
| Ladder measure | -0.00 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.01 | -0.02 | 0.44 | -0.05 | 0.93 | -0.06 | 2.27\* | -0.04 | 1.55 |
| Current rank markers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income | 0.01 | 0.22 | 0.01 | 0.24 | -0.11 | 2.06\* | 0.07 | 1.41 | -0.03 | 1.09 | -0.07 | 2.04\* |
| Net worth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.84 | 0.86 | 30 | 1.92† |
| Log net worth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.01 | 0.75 | -0.00 | 0.33 |
| Liquidity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.23 | 0.05 | -517 | 2.43\* |
| Log liquidity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.12 | 2.69\* | -0.16 | 4.05\*\*\* |
| Cultural markers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | -0.02 | 0.75 | -0.06 | 1.64 | -0.11 | 2.57\* | 0.03 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.72 |
| Parental education | 0.01 | 0.28 | -0.04 | 0.77 | -0.12 | 2.72\*\* | 0.01 | 0.32 | -0.02 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.26 |
| Parental SES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.07 | 2.56\* | 0.02 | 0.58 |
| Grandparental SES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.05 | 2.51\* | 0.06 | 3.59\*\*\* |
| Magnanimous traits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agreeableness | 0.08 | 2.40\* | -0.00 | 0.03 | -0.02 | 0.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neuroticism | -0.01 | 0.32 | -0.01 | 0.27 | 0.04 | 1.92† |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Self-esteem |  |  |  |  | -0.05 | 1.39 | -0.04 | 0.79 |  |  |  |  |
| Self-esteem (gen) |  |  |  |  | -0.06 | 1.75† |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Past donations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -17.90 | 0.79 |  |  |
| Log past donations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.02 | 0.48 |  |  |
| Donation behavior |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.01 | 0.35 |  |  |
| Self-focused traits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism | 0.01 | 2.05\* | 0.01 | 1.50 | 0.14 | 1.69† |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism (self-ag) |  |  |  |  | 0.16 | 1.99\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entitlement |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 | 1.42 |  |  | 0.05 | 2.94\*\* |
| Empathic accuracy |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.29 | 1.89† |  |  | -0.11 | 1.27 |
| Communal |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.01 | 0.45 |  |  | -0.00 | 0.00 |
| Communal: I care |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.07 | 2.10\* |  |  | -0.02 | 1.46 |
| Communal: You care |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 | 2.60\*\* |  |  | 0.03 | 2.69\*\* |
| Volunteering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 | 1.29 |  |  |
| Percent redistributed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.34 | 4.23\*\*\* |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extraversion | 0.03 | 0.70 | -0.01 | 0.10 | -0.00 | 0.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conscientiousness | 0.06 | 1.87† | 0.02 | 0.35 | -0.01 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Openness | 0.07 | 1.88† | 0.04 | 0.83 | -0.01 | 0.38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Power |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.02 | 0.88 |  |  |  |  |
| BJW |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.62 |  |  |  |  |
| Life satisfaction |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.01 | 0.32 |  |  |  |  |
| Subjective health |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 | 0.22 |  |  |  |  |

Note: Coefficients for raw net worth and raw liquidity are expressed in thousands of dollars

Table S5: Simple slopes; all studies and all self-focused variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Simple slope | Study 2a | Study 2b | Study 3 | Study 4 | Study 5 | SOM |
| Variable | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* | *b* | *t* |
| Elite life, at +1SD easy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism | 0.10 | 8.34\*\*\* | 0.09 | 6.08 | 0.06 | 6.81\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism (self-ag) |  |  |  |  | 0.06 | 6.89\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entitlement |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.45 | 6.77 |  |  | 0.49 | 16.74\*\*\* |
| Empathic accuracy |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.32 | 4.58 |  |  | -2.36 | 15.50\*\*\* |
| Communal |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 | 1.11 |  |  | -0.05 | 3.59\*\*\* |
| Communal: I care |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.04 | 0.70 |  |  | -0.18 | 9.33\*\*\* |
| Communal: You care |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.22 | 3.57\*\*\* |  |  | 0.19 | 2.33\* |
| Volunteering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.19 | 4.31\*\*\* |  |  |
| Percent redistributed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.76 | 11.36\*\*\* |  |  |
| Elite life, at -1SD easy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism | 0.07 | 4.70\*\*\* | 0.06 | 3.70\*\*\* | 0.04 | 3.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism (self-ag) |  |  |  |  | 0.04 | 2.95\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entitlement |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.31 | 3.65\*\*\* |  |  | 0.34 | 7.52\*\*\* |
| Empathic accuracy |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.49 | 1.35 |  |  | -2.03 | 8.53\*\*\* |
| Communal |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 | 1.43 |  |  | -0.05 | 2.29\* |
| Communal: I care |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | 1.97\* |  |  | -0.14 | 4.38\*\*\* |
| Communal: You care |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.02 | 0.30 |  |  | 0.10 | 3.28\*\* |
| Volunteering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11 | 1.65† |  |  |
| Percent redistributed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.96 | 3.42\*\*\* |  |  |
| Easy life, at +1SD elite |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism | 0.002 | 0.19 | 0.02 | 1.29 | 0.01 | 1.31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism (self-ag) |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entitlement |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.08 | 1.14 |  |  | 0.04 | 0.96 |
| Empathic accuracy |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.08 | 0.27 |  |  | 0.14 | 0.64 |
| Communal |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.07 | 1.46 |  |  | -0.01 | 0.60 |
| Communal: I care |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.14 | 2.25\* |  |  | -0.02 | 0.69 |
| Communal: You care |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 | 0.70 |  |  | 0.001 | 0.05 |
| Volunteering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.43 |  |  |
| Percent redistributed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.42 | 1.97\* |  |  |
| Easy life, at -1SD elite |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism | -0.03 | 2.62\*\* | -0.01 | 0.47 | -0.01 | 0.82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism (self-ag) |  |  |  |  | -0.02 | 2.23\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entitlement |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.21 | 3.57 |  |  | -0.18 | 5.97\*\*\* |
| Empathic accuracy |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.63 | 2.50\* |  |  | 0.45 | 2.89\*\* |
| Communal |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.05 | 1.14 |  |  | 0.01 | 0.81 |
| Communal: I care |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.36 |  |  | 0.03 | 1.38 |
| Communal: You care |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.16 | 3.05\*\* |  |  | -0.08 | 4.21\*\*\* |
| Volunteering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.06 | 1.27 |  |  |
| Percent redistributed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.09 | 3.47\*\*\* |  |  |

**Pilot for Study 4**

**Participants and procedure**

The pilot study followed the same procedure as the main study, with the exception that we included no attention checks. The sample was 103 participants (45 women, mean age = 33.6, 84% European American) from Amazon Mechanical Turk.

**Results**

We followed the same analysis strategy that we pre-registered for Study 4.

***Factor analyses***

In the exploratory factor analysis, the first five eigenvalues were 6.1, 1.3, 0.7, 0.5 and 0.4, indicating a two-factor structure. The items loaded as expected, with the exception of one unexpectedly high cross-loading (see Table S6).

Table S6: Item loadings, pilot for Study 4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension | Elite | Easy |
| I am a member of the elite / I am definitely not a member of the elite | **.904** | .021 |
| I am well connected with powerful others / I am not very well-connected with powerful others | **.906** | .033 |
| The people I have connections with are generally wealthy / The people I have connections with are generally not very wealthy | **.870** | .037 |
| I received / am receiving an elite education / I never have and never will receive an elite education | **.744** | -.067 |
| I have a fancy lifestyle / I live a modest life | **.853** | .076 |
| I can comfortably buy necessities / I cannot buy necessities | -.209 | **.942** |
| I generally have enough money / I don’t have enough money | .221 | **.752** |
| I have an easy life / I have a difficult life | .188 | **.743** |
| I don’t think much about money / I have financial worries | **.451** | **.491** |
| My life is generally free from worry / my life is filled with worry | .106 | **.752** |

In the confirmatory factor analysis, results were indistinguishable from those in Study 4 (see Table S7); the final model included four supplementary covariations.

Table S7: Confirmatory factor analysis model fit statistics; pilot for Study 4

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Chi square(lower is better) | CFI(higher is better) | RMSEA(lower is better) |
| One-factor | 172\*\*\* | .827 | .195 |
| Two-factor | 79\*\*\* | .943 | .114 |
| Two-factor, correlated residuals | 33, ns | .996 | .033 |

\*\*: *p* < .01; \*\*\*: *p* < .001

***Associations with objective measures***

Results replicated all key findings from Study 4, except that both dimensions similarly predicted participants’ own education (see Table S8).

Table S8: Zero-order (and partial) correlations of elite versus easy life and other SES variables

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlations | Tests of difference  |
| SES variable | Elite | Easy | Between *r*s | Between *rpartial*s |
| Ladder measure (*N*=103) | **.55** (**.32**) | **.50** (**.22**) | *t*=0.73, *p*=.467 | *z*=0.75, *p*=.453 |
| Household income (*N*=103) | **.22** (.11) | **.21** (.09) | *t*=0.14, *p*=.889 | *z*=0.12, *p*=.905 |
| Education (*N*=102) | **.39** (**.21**) | **.24** (-.04) | *t*=**1.98**, *p*=.050 | *z*=1.78, *p*=.075 |
| Parental education (*N*=101) | **.20** (**.30**) | -.02 (-.12) | *t*=**2.90**, *p*=.005 | *z*=**3.00**, *p=*.003 |

*Note*. *N* for all partial correlations (shown in parentheses) is the 101 participants with no missing data on these variables. Correlations, *t*s and *z*s significant at *p* < .05 are **bolded**.

***Associations with behavior and personality traits***

Concerning our three key predictions, the pilot study’s results were similar to those in Study 4 (see Table S9). Elite life was a stronger predictor than easy life of feelings of entitlement and of low empathic accuracy. Unlike Study 4, the pilot study also supported our prediction regarding communal orientation: Elite life individuals scored especially low on that measure, particularly on items regarding their desire to care for others.

Table S9: Zero-order (and partial) correlations of elite versus easy life with traits / behavior

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlations | Tests of difference  |
| Trait / behavior | Elite | Easy | Between *r*s | Between *rpartial*s |
| Self-focus related |  |  |  |  |
| Entitlement (*N* = 103) | **.50** (**.43**) | **.28** (-.09) | *t*=**3.09**, *p*=.003 | *z*=**3.90**, *p*<.001 |
| Empathic accuracy (*N* = 103) | **-.61** (**-.49**) | **-.41** (.01) | *t*=**-3.12**, *p*=.002 | *z*=**-3.91**, *p*<.001 |
| Communal (*N* = 103) | **-.47** (**-.39**) | **-.29** (.05) | *t*=-**2.59**, *p*=.011 | *z*=**-3.27**, *p*=.001 |
| I help should others (*N* = 103) | **-.56** (**-.49**) | **-.33** (.09) | *t*=**-3.52**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**-4.42**, *p*<.001 |
| Others should help me (*N* = 103) | .06 (.08) | .003 (-.06) | *t*=0.76, *p*=.449 | *z*=0.99, *p*=.322 |
| Not self-focus related |  |  |  |  |
| Self-esteem (*N* = 103) | **.41** (.07) | **.53** (**.38**) | *t*=-1.84, *p*=.069 | *z*=**2.33**, *p*=.020 |
| Power (*N* = 103) | -.02 (-**.29**) | **.27** (**.40**) | *t*=**-4.05**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**-5.14**, *p*<.001 |
| Belief in a just world (*N* = 103) | **.49** (**.37**) | **.34** (.01) | *t*=**2.08**, *p*=.040 | *z*=**2.63**, *p*=.009 |
| Life satisfaction (*N* = 103) | **.54** (.13) | **.69** (**.52**) | *t*=**-2.55**, *p*=.012 | *z*=**-3.12**, *p*=.002 |
| Subjective health (*N* = 103) | **.35** (.07) | **.44** (**.29**) | *t*=-1.27, *p*=.207 | *z*=-1.62, *p*=.105 |

*Note*. There were no missing data on these variables so *N* for all partial correlations (shown in parentheses) is 103 participants. Correlations, *t*s and *z*s significant at *p* < .05 are **bolded**.

Concerning our less central predictions, we replicated the self-esteem effect from Study 3 (which did not emerge in Study 4), and as expected power and belief in a just world were positively related to both dimensions (though unlike in Study 4, in the pilot study the strength of these associations differed between the two dimensions).

Regarding the variables for which we had made no predictions, life satisfaction (like in Study 4) and subjective health (unlike in Study 4) were both more strongly related to easy life than to elite life.

Where these findings differ from Study 4’s, we consider Study 4’s to be more reliable given that study’s larger sample size and pre-registered design.

**Analyses including Study 4 participants who skipped trials**

As noted in the main text, we made the post hoc decision to exclude eight participants (out of 373) who skipped trials on the Mind in the Eyes task, only from analyses involving that task.

Table 12: Zero-order (and partial) correlations of elite vs. easy life with psychological measures

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlations | Tests of difference  |
|  | Elite | Easy | Between *r*s | Between *rpartial*s |
| Empathic accuracy (*N* = 372) | **-.16** (**-.22**) | -.01 (.09) | *t*=**-2.81**, *p*=.005 | *z*=**-4.23**, *p*<.001 |

*Note*. *N* for all partial correlations is the 367 participants with no missing data on psychological variables; partial correlations are in parentheses. Correlations, *t*s and *z*s significant at *p* < .05 are **bolded**.

**Additional study replicating key findings from Studies 4 and 5**

One final study (pre-registered at <https://osf.io/ufqhn/>) aimed to replicate some key findings on the self-focused traits (empathic accuracy, entitlement, communal orientation) and other markers of SES (Study 5’s additional measures of current rank and historical cultural privilege), to measure participants’ SES after (rather than before) the individual difference measures, and to test our findings using a more representative sample. To achieve the latter goal, we contracted a survey company that specializes in recruiting participants based on their demographics, including hard-to-reach groups (such as high SES individuals), and requested a sample that was representative of national education and income levels. We collected this data in conjunction with data for another study, reported in (Authors, In Principle Acceptance); the two studies both touch on the association between SES and empathic accuracy, but ask different specific questions and report no overlapping associations.

**Method**

***Participants***

We contracted Dynata to recruit 1139 American participants; as pre-registered, this excludes an additional 240 participants who failed more than one of three attention checks, or did not write something sensible in response to an open-ended question at the end of the survey. Sample demographics are reported in Table 1 in the main paper. The initial sample (i.e., prior to exclusions) used quotas to match to the US census in terms of gender, income and education. The final sample covered the entire range of the ladder measure from 1 to 10 (*M* = 5.27, median = 5, *SD* = 2.24).

***Procedure***

Participants first completed a brief demographics survey that did *not* include our SES measures, with the exception of income and education, as the survey company required these questions to come first so they could ensure a representative sample. Participants then completed the empathic accuracy (mean accuracy: 61%), entitlement (α = .89), and communal orientation (αtotal = .72, αI should help others = .86, αOthers should help me = .69) measures from Study 4; the latter two contained the first two attention checks as in Study 4. They then completed the final 10-item measure of the easy and elite dimensions of SES; this included the third attention check also as in Study 4. Participants then completed a more comprehensive set of SES measures, including Study 5’s measures of familial SES (parental SES, grandparental SES) and of wealth (net worth, liquidity), as well as the ladder measure of SES. In this study, to match the categories along which we were attempting to match available census data, all our measures of education omitted the category “some graduate / professional school”.

Because our study was part of a larger data collection effort (Authors, under review), the version of the ladder measure we administered here was *not* the hybrid measure we used in our prior studies—that is, it did *not* ask participants to consider their social class; rather, it used the standard language that prior work has tied more closely to the current rank perspective:

Imagine that this ladder shows how your society is set up. At the top of the ladder are the people who are best off – they have the most money, the highest amount of schooling, and the jobs that bring the most respect. At the bottom are the people who are the worst off – they have the least money, little or no education, no jobs or jobs that no one wants or respects. Now think about yourself. Please tell us where you think you would currently be on this ladder.

As part of the more comprehensive set of SES measures, we included an exploratory item asking for participants subjective perceptions of their own upward mobility: “How does your current social class standing compare to your family's when you were growing up?”; response scale ranging from 1 (*Much lower than my family growing up*) to 5 (*Much higher than my family growing up*). We describe analyses using this measure in the section labeled “Relation between easy life and upward mobility”.

At the end of the study, we asked participants to type what they thought the it was about, and used their open-ended response as a pre-registered exclusion criterion. The procedure also included several measures we do not report on here, as they were part of the larger data collection effort and not part of our pre-registration.

**Results**

***Confirming the two-dimensional structure of subjective SES***

Our first set of analyses examined the dimensional structure of subjective SES. A pre-registered exploratory factor analysis on the ten subjective SES items used the same specifications as in the main text studies. The scree plot indicated a two-factor solution (with the first five eigenvalues being 5.0, 2.0, 0.6, 0.5, and 0.4). The items loaded as expected onto their respective factors (see Table S10).

Table S10: Item loadings, Additional Study

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension | Elite | Easy |
| I am well connected with powerful others / I am not very well-connected with powerful others | **.878** | -.030 |
| I am a member of the elite / I am definitely not a member of the elite | **.877** | .003 |
| The people I have connections with are generally wealthy / The people I have connections with are generally not very wealthy | **.840** | .010 |
| I have a fancy lifestyle / I live a modest life | **.818** | .031 |
| I received / am receiving an elite education / I never have and never will receive an elite education | **.749** | .018 |
| I can comfortably buy necessities / I cannot buy necessities | -.154 | **.907** |
| I generally have enough money / I don’t have enough money | .025 | **.890** |
| I don’t think much about money / I have financial worries | .063 | **.811** |
| I have an easy life / I have a difficult life | .055 | **.805** |
| My life is generally free from worry / my life is filled with worry | .112 | **.750** |

Next, pre-registered confirmatory factor analyses using the lavaan package in R tested both a two-factor structure and a one-factor structure (Table S11, top two rows). Comparing the relative chi square, CFI and RMSEA values confirmed that a two-factor solution was a better fit than a one-factor solution. Moreover, when we allowed four supplementary covariations between items from the same subscale, model fit met our absolute criteria (Table S11, bottom row).

Table S11: Confirmatory factor analysis model fit statistics; Additional Study

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Chi square(lower is better) | CFI(higher is better) | RMSEA(lower is better) |
| One-factor | 2190\*\*\* | .693 | .233 |
| Two-factor | 288\*\*\* | .964 | .081 |
| Two-factor, correlated residuals | 118\*\*\* | .987 | .051 |

\*\*\*: *p* < .001

Replicating Study 4, both exploratory and confirmatory analyses indicated that the 10-item measure of SES we developed is comprised of two distinct dimensions, one representing the experience of an elite life, and the other the experience of an easy life.

***Associations with objective measures of SES***

As in past studies, we computed and compared zero-order and partial correlations (controlling for the other subscale) (see Table S12).

Table S12: Zero-order (and partial) correlations of elite versus easy life with other SES variables

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlations | Tests of difference  |
| SES variable | Elite | Easy | Between *r*s | Between *rpartial*s |
| Ladder measure (*N* = 1139) | **.47** (**.24**) | **.60** (**.47**) | *t*=**-5.58**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**-6.31**, *p*<.001 |
| Current rank markers |  |  |  |  |
| Household income (*N* = 1139) | **.39** (**.22**) | **.43** (**.29**) | *t*=**2.23**, *p*=.026 | *z*=1.78, *p*=.075 |
| Net worth (*N* = 696) | **.16** (**.10**) | **.16** (**.10**) | *t*=0.00, *p*>.999 | *z*=-0.02, *p*=.984 |
| Log net worth (*N* = 696) | **.16** (-.00) | **.36** (**.33**) | *t*=**-5.67**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**-6.38**, *p*<.001 |
| Liquidity (*N* = 698) | .07 (**.08**) | -.01 (-.04) | *t*=**2.13**, *p*=.033 | *z*=**2.24**, *p*=.025 |
| Log liquidity (*N* = 698) | **.27** (.03) | **.58** (**.53**) | *t*=**-10.01**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**-10.43**, *p*<.001 |
| Cultural privilege markers |  |  |  |  |
| Education (*N* = 1139) | **.20** (.06) | **.30** (**.19**) | *t*=**-3.56**, *p*<.001 | *z*=-**3.15**, *p*=.002 |
| Parental education (*N* = 1137) | **.25** (**.21**) | **.16** (.05) | *t*=**3.15**, *p*=.002 | *z*=**3.88**, *p*<.001 |
| Parental SES (*N* = 1139) | **.41** (**.31**) | **.31** (**.12**) | *t*=**3.73**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**4.76**, *p*<.001 |
| Grandparental SES (*N* = 1136) | **.38** (**.29**) | **.26** (**.09**) | *t*=**4.40**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**4.95**, *p*<.001 |

*Note*. Many participants did not report their net worth or liquidity; because of these missing data, we analyzed partial correlations (shown in parentheses) separately for these variables. For all other partial correlations *N* is the 1134 participants with no missing data on all other variables. Correlations, *t*s and *z*s significant at *p* < .05 are **bolded**.

For the first time, the easy life dimension was more strongly related to the ladder measure. If indeed the easy life is linked with a rank-based interpretation of SES, this could be because this study we shifted from our hybrid version to the more traditional rank-based one. Further consistent with the rank-based interpretation, the easy life dimension was also more strongly related to income (for the first time) and to the (log transformed) wealth variables (as in Study 4). Some investigative exploring revealed three outliers (in our sample of 1139) who alone accounted why we did not observe this pattern with the raw wealth variables: (1) A single participant reported being worth 100 million dollars (25 standard deviations above the mean, with the next highest score being less than 3 standard deviations above the mean), and (2) two participants reported liquidity multiple times over what they had reported for their net worth—respectively 250 and 90 million dollars (25 and 9 standard deviations above the mean with the next highest score being less than 1 standard deviation above the mean). Excluding these outliers resulted in stronger associations with the easy compared to elite dimension, as in Study 4.

Consistent with our prior findings, the elite life dimension was more strongly related to historical cultural privilege variables (parental education and all measures of familial SES). However, in this study we found that participants’ *own* education was more strongly related to the easy life dimension. This could be because in this study we used coarser education categories, to line up with the categories used in the US census.

***Is the elite life dimension especially linked with self-focus?***

Table S13 reports results using the same zero-order / partial correlation analysis strategy described previously. Results supported all three of our predictions: The elite life dimension predicted entitlement, low empathic accuracy, and low communal orientation more strongly than did the easy life dimension. When we further broke down communal orientation, people who scored high in elite life tended to score *higher* on the desire for *others* to help *them,* but *lower* on the desire to help others.

Table S13: Zero-order (and partial) correlations of elite versus easy life with traits / behavior

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlations | Tests of difference  |
| Trait / behavior | Elite | Easy | Between *r*s | Between *rpartial*s |
| Entitlement | **.52** (**.51**) | **.16** (**-.14**) | *t*=**14.37**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**16.77**, *p*<.001 |
| Empathic accuracy | **-.54** (**-.51**) | **-.22** (**.08**) | *t*=**-12.85**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**-15.32**, *p*<.001 |
| Communal | **-.18** (**-.15**) | **-.10** (-.01) | *t*=**-2.76**, *p*=.006 | *z*=**-3.36**, *p*<.001 |
| I should help others | **-.37** (**-.34**) | **-.17** (.03) | *t*=**-7.29**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**-9.15**, *p*<.001 |
| Others should help me | **.34** (**.33**) | **.11** (**-.08**) | *t*=**-8.32**, *p*<.001 | *z*=**10.08**, *p*<.001 |

*Note*. *N* for all correlations and partial correlations is 1139 (no participants were missing data); partial correlations are in parentheses. Correlations, *t*s and *z*s significant at *p* < .05 are bolded.

**Study 5, samples analyzed separately**

Below we report graphs and tables for Study 5, broken down by sample. There were virtually no differences in terms of the comparisons between relationships (see Tables S14 and S15).

Table S14: Zero-order (and partial) correlations of elite versus easy life with other SES variables

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Elite | Easy  | Elite versus easya |
| SES variable | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B |
| Ladder measure (*N*s = 422, 403) | **.55** (**.34**) | **.56** (**.43**) | **.57** (**.36**) | **.60** (**.46**) | ns (ns) | ns (ns) |
| Current rank markers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household income (*N*s = 410, 376) | **.31** (**.15**) | **.36** (**.21**) | **.34** (**.20**) | **.41** (**.28**) | ns (ns) | ns (ns) |
| Net worth (*N*s = 225, 256) | .08 (-.09) | **.25** (**.10**) | **.30** (**.31**) | **.34** (**.25**) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) | ns (†) |
| Log net worth (*N*s = 225, 256) | .12 (.003) | **.27** (.08) | **.25** (**.22**) | **.43** (**.35**) | † (\*)  | \*\* (\*\*\*) |
| Liquidity (*N*s = 241, 246) | .09 (-.05) | **.22** (.10) | **.26** (**.25**) | **.28** (**.20**) | \*\* (\*\*\*) | ns (ns) |
| Log liquidity (*N*s = 241, 246) | **.32** (**.14**) | **.22** (.03) | **.43** (**.32**) | **.42** (**.37**) | † (\*) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) |
| Cultural privilege markers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education (*N*s = 417, 382) | **.29** (**.25**) | **.34** (**.31**) | **.16** (.01) | **.17** (.01) | \*\* (\*\*\*) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) |
| Parental education (*N*s = 408, 382) | **.28** (**.27**) | **.31** (**.33**) | **.11** (-.05) | .05 (**-.12**) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) |
| Parental SES (*N*s = 422, 384) | **.36** (**.30**) | **.37** (**.34**) | **.18** (-.03) | **.17** (-.003) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) |
| Grandparental SES (*N*s = 421, 383) | **.29** (**.25**) | **.21** (**.16**) | **.14** (-.03) | **.11** (.01) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) | \* (\*) |

*Note*. As noted in the main text, many participants did not report their net worth or liquidity; because of these missing data, we analyzed partial correlations (shown in parentheses) separately for these variables. For all other partial correlations *N* is all participants with no missing data on all other variables (Sample A: 394; Sample B: 355). Correlations significant at *p* < .05 are **bolded**.

a This column reports significance thresholds for comparisons between zero-order (and between partial) correlations
†: *p* < .10, \*: *p* < .05, \*\*: *p* < .01; \*\*\*: *p* < .001

Table S15: Zero-order (and partial) correlations of elite versus easy life with prosociality variables

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Elite | Easy  | Elite versus easya |
| Prosociality variable | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B |
| Declarative prosociality |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volunteering (*N*s = 422, 386) | **.10** (**.11**) | **.21** (**.20**) | .04 (-.03) | .07 (-.05) | ns (\*\*\*) | \*\* (\*\*\*) |
| Pct redistributed (*N*s = 412, 372) | **.26** (**.24**) | **.47** (**.44**) | **.10** (-.06) | **.18** (-.06) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) | \*\*\* (\*\*\*) |
| Demonstrated prosociality |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Past donations (*N*s = 420, 400) | .05 (-.06) | **.14** (-.02) | **.16** (**.17**) | **.15** (**.14**) | \* (\*\*\*) | ns (\*) |
| Log past donations (*N*s = 420, 400) | .02 (-.04) | **.20** (-.03) | **.11** (**.12**) | **.26** (**.18**) | \* (\*) | \* (\*) |
| Donation behavior (*N*s = 422, 381) | -.05 (**-.11**) | .003 (-.05) | .08 (**.13**) | **.12** (**.12**) | \*\* (\*\*\*) | \* (\*\*) |

*Note*. For all partial correlations *N* is all participants with no missing data on these variables (Sample A: 412; Sample B: 366). Correlations significant at *p* < .05 are **bolded**.

a This column reports significance thresholds for comparisons between zero-order (and between partial) correlations
†: *p* < .10, \*: *p* < .05, \*\*: *p* < .01; \*\*\*: *p* < .001

**Study 5 donation analyses, more missing data**

As noted in the main text, many participants entered names of charitable organizations without specifying amounts they had donated. The main text analyses include those participants as having made no past donations; here we present analyses treating those participants’ past donation data as missing.

Table 14: Zero-order (and partial) correlations of elite versus easy life with prosociality variables

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Correlations | Tests of difference  |
|  | Elite | Easy | Between *r*s | Between *rpartial*s |
| Past donations (*N* = 642) | .07 (-.02) | **.17** (**.16**) | *t*=**-2.50**, *p*=.013 | *z*=**-3.24**, *p*<.001 |
| Log past donations (*N* = 642) | **.14** (.03) | **.21** (**.17**) | *t*=**-1.99**, *p*=.048 | *z*=**-2.53**, *p*=.011 |

*Note*. Correlations, *t*s and *z*s significant at *p* < .05 are **bolded**.

**Tests of invariance across race and gender categories**

We combined data from all studies and used two strategies to test whether subjective SES followed the same two-dimensional structure for people belonging to different gender and racial categories. First, Table S16 shows the results of separate EFAs for men and for women (we did not include participants who reported other genders in this analysis), and Table S17 shows the results of separate EFAs for different groups of racial categories. To test the similarity of these findings, for each factor we computed the item-level correlation between the factor loadings for men and for women (easy: *r*>.99; elite: *r*>.99), between the factor loadings for White and for non-White participants (easy: *r*>.99; elite: *r*=.98), and between the factor loadings for relatively advantaged racial categories (White and Asian; see Birnbaum et al., 2021) and for participants from other racial categories (easy: *r*>.99; elite: *r*=.98). These extremely high correlations indicate that the patterns of factor loadings were extremely similar between these different demographic groups.

Table S16: Item loadings for separate gender categories

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Men | Women |
| Dimension | Elite | Easy | Elite | Easy |
| Connected with powerful others  | **.860** | .004 | **.805** | .019 |
| Connected with wealthy others | **.829** | .023 | **.808** | .008 |
| Elite education | **.747** | -.051 | **.701** | -.059 |
| Fancy lifestyle | **.790** | .051 | **.684** | .130 |
| Member of the elite  | **.858** | .024 | **.853** | -.031 |
| Comfortably buy necessities | -.132 | **.855** | -.098 | **.826** |
| Don’t think about money | .076 | **.776** | .070 | **.811** |
| Easy life | .049 | **.796** | -.001 | **.818** |
| Enough money | .108 | **.807** | .054 | **.852** |
| Free from worry | .005 | **.814** | .033 | **.790** |

Table S17: Item loadings for separate racial categories

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | White | Non-White | White / Asian | Other categories |
| Dimension | Elite | Easy | Elite | Easy | Elite | Easy | Elite | Easy |
| Connected with powerful others  | **.826** | .002 | **.819** | .001 | **.852** | -.014 | **.709** | .032 |
| Connected with wealthy others | **.844** | -.026 | **.844** | -.026 | **.827** | -.004 | **.840** | -.006 |
| Elite education | **.735** | -.037 | **.639** | .045 | **.733** | -.035 | **.655** | .018 |
| Fancy lifestyle | **.752** | .086 | **.746** | .073 | **.746** | .093 | **.770** | .045 |
| Member of the elite  | **.866** | -.002 | **.849** | -.013 | **.861** | .002 | **.861** | -.026 |
| Comfortably buy necessities | -.112 | **.841** | -.201 | **.897** | -.119 | **.842** | -.187 | **.891** |
| Don’t think about money | .076 | **.776** | .193 | **.697** | .053 | **.806** | .207 | **.697** |
| Easy life | .015 | **.815** | .090 | **.736** | .022 | **.809** | .061 | **.757** |
| Enough money | .050 | **.810** | .201 | **.723** | .063 | **.848** | .213 | **.718** |
| Free from worry | .048 | **.790** | .042 | **.773** | .049 | **.789** | .024 | **.786** |

Second, Table S17 shows results from formal tests of invariance, comparing different kinds of confirmatory factor analyses between men and women (we did not include participants who reported other genders in this analysis), between White and non-White participants, and between relatively advantaged racial categories (White and Asian; see Birnbaum et al., 2021) and participants from other racial categories. In all three cases we found evidence of configural invariance; that is, within-gender and within-race CFAs that assigned each item to the elite or easy factors showed good fit. For all race comparisons we also found metric invariance; that is, constraining the factor loadings to be identical did not worsen model fit. For the gender comparison, constraining the factor loadings to be identical did slightly reduce model fit, suggesting the factor loadings may differ slightly between men and women, but as Table S16 above shows, the difference was minimal.

 Table S17: Tests of invariance between gender and race categories

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type of test(test metric) | Configural invariance(goodness of fit) | Metric invariance(comparison with configural invariance models) |
| Men vs. women and other genders | CFI: .997RMSEA: .025 | Chi square diff = 100.29,df = 10, *p* < .001 |
| White vs. non-White | CFI: .998RMSEA: .024 | Chi square diff = 11.474,df = 10, *p* = .322 |
| Relatively advantaged vs. disadvantaged (White and Asian vs. other categories) | CFI: .998RMSEA: .024 | Chi square diff = 10.732,df = 10, *p* = .379 |

**Relation between easy life and upward mobility**

As noted in the main text, we examined how the easy life dimension compared to measures of upward mobility. For participants in Study 5, we computed perceptions of upward mobility across their own lives as the difference between participants’ (standardized) current SES and their (standardized) reports of their parents’ SES while they (the participants) were growing up. For participants in the additional study, we directly measured it. Upward mobility correlated more strongly with our easy life measure (*r*Study 5 = .39; *r*Additional = .36) than with our elite life measure (*r*Study 5 = .18; *r*Additional = .11). Moreover, just like the easy life measure, upward mobility predicted greater net worth (Study 5: *r*raw = .23, *p* < .001; *r*log transformed = .11, *p* = .016; additional study: *r*raw = .08, *p* = .048; *r*log transformed = .27, *p* < .001), and greater liquidity (Study 5: *r*raw = .20, *p* < .001; *r*log transformed = .25, *p* < .001; additional study: *r*raw = .05, *p* = .198; *r*log transformed = .42, *p* < .001), greater prosociality (measured in Study 5 only; past donations to charity, *r*raw donations = .15, *p* < .001; *r*log transformed donations = .19, *p* < .001, and donation within the study, *r* = .12, *p* < .001). We therefore predicted each of these donation variables from easy life and upward mobility in simultaneous regressions; Table S18 shows that these predictors explained independent variance. Easy life is therefore linked with, and may function similarly to, perceived upward mobility, but the two constructs are nonetheless distinct and independently predict prosociality.

Table S18: Results from regressions predicting wealth and prosociality from easy life and upward mobility

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Easy life*b*, (*SE*), *t*(df), *p* | Upward mobility*b*, (*SE*), *t*(df), *p* |
| Additional study |  |  |
| Net worth | 384 (104), *t*(693) = 3.67, *p* < .001 | 34 (163), *t*(693) = 0.21, *p* = .836 |
| Net worth log | .11 (.01), *t*(693) = 7.83, *p* < .001 | .07 (.02), *t*(693) = 3.45, *p* < .001 |
| Liquidity | -252 (270), *t*(694) = 0.94, *p* = .350 | 663 (423), *t*(694) = 1.57, *p* = .117 |
| Liquidity log | .75 (.05), *t*(694) = 14.42, *p* < .001 | .50 (.08), *t*(694) = 6.12, *p* < .001 |
| Study 5 |  |  |
| Net worth | 59 (10), *t*(477) = 5.77, *p* < .001 | 32 (14), *t*(477) = 2.35, *p* < .001 |
| Net worth log | .08 (.01), *t*(477) = 6.08, *p* < .001 | -.01 (.02), *t*(477) = 0.37, *p* = .715 |
| Liquidity | 31 (7), *t*(483) = 4.70, *p* < .001 | 19 (9), *t*(483) = 2.16, *p* = .032 |
| Liquidity log | .57 (.07), *t*(483) = 8.41, *p* < .001 | .19 (.09), *t*(483) = 2.12, *p* = .035 |
| Past donations | 104 (37), *t*(799) = 3.01, *p* = .003 | 105 (46), *t*(799) = 2.26, *p* = .024 |
| Past donations log | .18 (.06), *t*(799) = 3.12, *p* = .002 | .17 (.08), *t*(799) = 2.31, *p* = .021 |
| Donation amount | .02 (.01), *t*(800) = 1.95, *p* = .052 | .02 (.01), *t*(800) = 2.33, *p* = .020 |

*Note*. Coefficients for raw net worth and raw liquidity are expressed in thousands of dollars

**Comparing our scales to established markers of SES as predictors**

To test whether our new scales add predictive power over and above established markers of SES, we conducted two sets of analyses. First, collapsing across all available data, we predicted each of our magnanimous and self-focused DVs from the SES ladder, income, education and parental education[[1]](#footnote-1) simultaneously, with random intercepts for study (see Table S19). We standardized Big 5 scores within study given that we had measured them using different scales in Studies 2a/b and Study 3.

In general, the ladder measure tended to predict most DVs without distinguishing between magnanimous and self-focused ones. Income tended to predict only the magnanimous variables, though more weakly than our easy life measure. Education was inconsistent: It was a positive predictor of some magnanimous variables, but predicted both greater and lesser self-focus depending on the variable. Parental education was not a strong predictor. Education overall may be too crude a marker, given that educational institutions in the United States vary greatly in their quality and their renown, meaning that the same level of degree from two different schools offers very different cultural access.

Table S19: Predicting DVs from established markers of SES

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DV | SES | Income | Education | Parental education |
|  | b | t | b | t | b | t | b | t |
| Magnanimous traits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agreeableness | 0.005 | 0.24 | -0.01 | 0.70 | 0.02 | 0.91 | -0.04 | 1.71† |
| Emotional stability | 0.03 | 1.27 | 0.05 | 2.61\*\* | -0.003 | -0.92 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Self-esteem | 0.28 | 10.09\*\*\* | 0.003 | 0.95 | 0.13 | 3.28\*\*\* | -0.05 | 1.23 |
| Past donations | 53.65 | 2.07\* | 105 | 3.67\*\*\* | 6.61 | 0.87 | -6.24 | 0.20 |
| Past donations log | 0.04 | 1.02 | 0.19 | 3.91\*\*\* | 0.12 | 1.82† | 0.07 | 1.27 |
| Donation amount | 0.002 | 0.30 | 0.01 | 1.92† | 0.003 | 0.29 | -0.01 | 1.11 |
| Self-focused traits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism | 0.04 | 8.45\*\*\* | -0.003 | 0.84 | -0.004 | 0.75 | 0.01 | 1.57 |
| Entitlement | 0.14 | 8.28\*\*\* | 0.00 | 0.15 | -0.08 | 3.02\*\* | 0.05 | 1.92† |
| Social perception | -0.42 | 4.94\*\*\* | 0.32 | 4.38\*\*\* | 0.66 | 4.79\*\*\* | -0.03 | 0.20 |
| Com. orientation | -0.00 | 0.25 | -0.01 | 0.85 | 0.00 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.30 |
| Volunteering | 0.07 | 2.46\* | 0.02 | 0.58 | 0.12 | 2.94\*\* | 0.03 | 1.05 |
| Pct. redistribution | 2.16 | 5.43\*\*\* | 0.11 | 0.26 | -0.60 | 1.01 | 0.89 | 1.85† |

Second, also collapsing across all available data, we used the PROCESS macro in SPSS to test whether either or both of our two scales (included as parallel mediators in model 4) accounted for indirect effects between the established markers and any of our DVs (see Table S20). We had no a priori prediction for these, but the emerging pattern generally aligned with our other findings. If (parental) education—a key marker of cultural privilege—was involved, or if a self-focused DV was involved, elite life generally accounted for a larger indirect effect than easy life did. Easy life accounted for larger indirect effects linking only less clearly cultural SES metrics of SES with magnanimous DVs.

Table S20: Point estimate and significance level for indirect effects through easy and elite life

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DV | SES | Income | Education | Parental education |
| Indirect effect through | Easy | Elite | Easy | Elite | Easy | Elite | Easy | Elite |
| Magnanimous traits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agreeableness | 0.07\*\*\* | -0.04 | 0.07\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.001 | -0.02† | -0.01 | -0.02 |
| Emotional stability | 0.12\*\*\* | 0.07\*\* | 0.11\*\*\* | 0.04\*\* | 0.001 | 0.05\*\* | -0.02† | 0.05\*\* |
| Self-esteem | 0.13\*\*\* | 0.14\*\*\* | 0.13\*\*\* | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.02 | 0.09\*\*\* | -0.05\*\* | 0.13\*\*\* |
| Past donations | 0.09\*\*\* | 0.03 | 0.05\*\*\* | 0.01 | -0.003 | 0.01 | -0.01 | 0.02 |
| Past donations log | 0.06\*\*\* | 0.02 | 0.03\*\*\* | 0.01 | -0.003 | 0.01 | -0.02\* | 0.02 |
| Donation amount | 0.34\*\* | -0.06 | 023\*\* | -0.02 | -0.001 | -0.03 | -0.01\* | 0.01 |
| Self-focused traits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narcissism | 0.45\*\*\* | 1.24\*\*\* | 0.42\*\*\* | 0.84\*\*\* | 0.001 | 0.98\*\*\* | -0.08† | 0.93\*\*\* |
| Entitlement | 0.11\*\*\* | 0.18\*\*\* | 0.09\*\*\* | 0.25\*\*\* | 0.03\*\*\* | 0.11\*\*\* | -0.002 | 0.18\*\*\* |
| (low) social perception | 0.03\*\*\* | 0.05\*\*\* | 0.02\*\*\* | 0.05\*\*\* | 0.01\*\*\* | 0.03\*\*\* | -0.002 | 0.04\*\*\* |
| (low) com. orientation | 0.18\*\*\* | 0.13\*\*\* | 0.13\*\*\* | 0.14\*\*\* | 0.05\*\*\* | 0.05\*\*\* | 0.001 | 0.10\*\*\* |
| Volunteering | 0.03 | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.02 | 0.04\*\* | 0.00 | 0.04\*\*\* | -0.01 | 0.07\*\*\* |
| Pct. redistribution | 0.01\*\*\* | 0.01\*\*\* | 0.004\*\* | 0.01\*\*\* | 0.01\*\*\* | -0.0002 | -0.001† | 0.01\*\*\* |

*Notes*.

For ease of presentation, we rescaled the raw past donations variable to express past donations in thousands of dollars

For each pair of parallel indirect effects, the one in green is descriptively larger in the direction of the anticipated total effect

1. Our additional study omitted the education category “some graduate / professional school”, which across all studies was selected only rarely (fewer than 3% of participants). We therefore recoded the education variable for that study by inserting an empty category between “college degree” and “graduate / professional degree”) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)