

Cover Page

Measurement Invariance of Personal Well-being Index (PWI-8) across 26 Countries

Magdalena Żemojtel-Piotrowska, University of Gdansk, Poland Jarosław P. Piotrowski, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Poznan Faculty, Poland Jan Ciecuch, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland and Zurich University, Switzerland Byron G. Adams, Tilburg University, the Netherlands and University of Johannesburg, South Africa Evgeny N. Osin, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia Rahkman Ardi, Airlangga University, Indonesia Sergiu Baltatescu, University of Oradea, Romania Arbinda Lal Bhomi, Tribhuvan University, Nepal Amanda Clinton, University of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico Gisela T. de Clunie, Universidad Tecnológica de Panamá, Panama Carla Esteves, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Portugal Valdiney Gouveia, Federal University of Paraíba, Brasil Ashraf Hosseini, University of Melbourne, Australia Hooria Seyedhosseini Ghaheh, Islamic Azad University, Iran Narine Kachatryan, Yerevan State University, Armenia Shanmukh Vasant Kamble, Karnatak University, India Anna Kawula, Pedagogic University in Cracov, Poland Kadi Liik, Talinn University, Estonia Eva Letovancova, Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia Sara Malo Cerrato, University of Girona, Spain Carles Alsinet Mora, University of Lleida, Spain Sofya Nartova-Bochaver, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia Marija Nikolic, LUM University, Italy Joonha Park, Nagoya University of Commerce and Business, Japan Elena Paspalanova, New Bulgarian University, Bulgaria Győző Pék, University of Debrecen, Hungary Joanna Rózycka-Tran, University of Gdansk, Poland Truong Thi Khanh Ha, Vietnam National University, Vietnam Takashi Tsubakita, Nagoya University of Commerce and Business, Japan Melanie Vauclair, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Portugal Anna Włodarczyk, University of Basque Country, Spain and University of Santiago de Chile, Chile John Maltby, University of Leicester, England

Corresponding author: Magdalena Żemojtel-Piotrowska, University of Gdansk, Bazynskiego 4, 80-952 Gdansk, Poland, email:

psymzp@ug.edu.pl, phone: (48)608485201 Authors Note Order of

authors reflects their contribution to the work. Correspondence

should be addressed to Magdalena A. Żemojtel-Piotrowska,

Institute of Psychology, University of Gdansk, Bazynskiego street

4, 80-952, Gdansk, Poland. E-mail:

psymzp@ug.edu.pl.

The work of Jarosław P. Piotrowski was supported by research grant rewarded by University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Poznan Faculty. The work of Jan Ciecuch was supported by grants 2014/14/M/HS6/00919 from the National Science Centre, Poland.

Abstract

This report examines the measurement invariance of the Personal Well-being Index with 8 items (PWI-8). University students (N = 5,731) from 26 countries completed the measure either through paper and pencil or electronic mode. We examined uni-dimensional structure of PWI and performed a Multi-group CFA (MGCFA) to assess the measurement invariance across the 26 countries, using conventional approach and the alignment procedure. The findings provide evidence of configural and partial metric invariance, as well as partial scalar invariance across samples. The findings suggest that PWI-8 can be used to examine correlates of life satisfaction across all included countries, however it is impossible to compare raw scores across countries.

Key words: Personal Well-being Index; cross-cultural studies; measurement invariance

Measurement Invariance of Personal Well-being Index in 26 Countries

Quality of life has become an important, well-researched topic over the last few years. More specifically this has been examined in terms of well-being, which is often assessed at national levels for international comparisons. These international comparisons, however, require measures which have been shown to be invariant across different cultural groups and countries. The objective of this study is to examine the measurement invariance of just such a measure, the Personal Well-being Index (PWI), which is considered one of the most popular measures for evaluating subjective well-being (International Well-being Group, 2013; Sirgy, 2012).

Life satisfaction is the cognitive component of subjective well-being and has a general character (Diener, 1984). According to Diener, Horowitz and Emmons (1985), life satisfaction is the effect of a judgmental process in which “a comparison of one’s circumstances with what is thought to be appropriate standard” (p.71) is made. Therefore, it refers to some standards of evaluation, which could be related to different life domains. PWI is the decomposition of life satisfaction in satisfactions with different domains (Cummins, Eckersley, Pallant, Van Vugt, & Misajon, 2003), namely: (1) standard of living, (2) personal health, (3) life achievements, (4) personal relationships, (5) personal safety, (6) community connectedness, (7) future security, and (8) religion and spirituality. The PWI has been used as an assessment of life satisfaction in child (Casas, Bello, González, & Aliqué, 2012), adolescent and student (Tomy, Norrish, & Cummins, 2011), aging (Bricker-Katz, Lincoln, & McCabe, 2009; Forjaz et al., 2011), and clinical populations (e.g. Engel & Cummins, 2011; Werner, 2012). The scale is intended to be inclusive of all important life domains which could contribute to the general level of life satisfaction and to serve as a tool in cross-cultural comparisons on relative importance of particular domains in life satisfaction (International Wellbeing Group, 2013). The idea behind developing the PWI was to include the most important predictors of general life satisfaction. A selection of domains was done by an international team and was based on several criteria: the

selection should include only basic domains important for predicting “life satisfaction as a whole”; each domain should refer to broad aspects of life, and each domain needs to represent an indicator and not a causal variable of general life satisfaction (see International Wellbeing Group, 2013).

Measurement Invariance as Means of Cross-Cultural Inquiry

Oishi (2010) pointed towards several important methodological and conceptual issues related to cross-cultural studies on subjective well-being; these are conceptual equivalence, translation issues, desirability of the concept, response style, item functioning, differences in self-presentations, memory bias, and validity criteria. For instance, single-item measures of subjective well-being like Cantrill's ladder or general items on life satisfaction are less reliable than longer scales and do not allow for more in-depth examination of cross-cultural equivalence in terms of measurement equivalence (see Oishi, 2010). As the PWI is a multi-item scale it is particularly useful in cross-cultural research. Based on the work of an international group of well-being researchers, it uses items that are simple and easy to translate, which allows for minimization of problems with conceptual equivalence and translations (see International Wellbeing Group, 2006, 2013).

Multi-group Confirmatory Factor Analysis (MGCFA) serves as a statistical tool for assessment of cross-cultural equivalence of a measure. Such analysis is fundamental for establishing the usefulness of any measure intended for cross-cultural research. There are three levels of measurement invariance which are most commonly used to establish whether a measure is equivalent: (a) Configural invariance provides indication that the general factor structure of the measure is the same across different groups. At this level, the construct is measured similarly in different samples. (b) Metric invariance indicates that the factor loading of items is similar, (i.e., load in the same way in assumed factor) across groups. At this level, measure correlates and/or predictors may be compared across samples. (c) Scalar invariance indicates that item intercepts are equal intercepts across groups. At this level means may be compared across samples (Davidov, Meuleman, Cieciuch, Schmidt, & Billiet, 2014). Scalar invariance is rarely found in large cross-cultural comparisons (see Davidov et al., 2014). In general, there are very few studies examining the measurement invariance of scales measuring

subjective well-being. For instance, only metric invariance was reported for Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) across samples from US, England, and Japan (Wishman, & Judd, 2016), and mixed results for SWLS invariance across Russian and US samples (Tucker, Ozer, Lyubomirski, & Boehm, 2006). Most studies typically focus on comparisons between several national groups, rarely examining large representation of countries (see also Ponizovsky, Dmitrova, Sachner, & Van de Schoot, 2013).

1
2
3 **The current study**
4

5 Despite the many cultural adaptations of this measure (see International Wellbeing Group,
6 2013, for details) and its increasing popularity among cross-cultural researchers, to the best of
7 our knowledge, there is little evidence that the PWI is invariant across different countries, with
8 the exceptions of adolescent samples in Chile and Brazil (Sarriera et al., 2014) or general
9 populations in Hong Kong and Australia (Lau, Cummins, & McPherson, 2005). Sometimes the
10 levels of PWI are compared without examination of measurement invariance, as in the case of
11 Romania and Hungary (Baltatescu, 2014). This report intends to fill this gap by examining the
12 measurement invariance of the PWI in university student samples across 26 countries.
13
14

15 In the current study, we examine the measurement invariance of PWI across countries from
16 different regions of the world: Europe (10), Asia (10), Africa (2), and Latin America (4). Among
17 them, there are the most affluent and developed countries, like UK or Japan, and less affluent,
18 agrarian societies like Iran or Kenya. In terms of cultural regions we had representatives for all
19 Huntington (1996) cultural groups (i.e., Western, Orthodox, Confucian, Japanese, Latin
20 American, Hindu, Buddhists, Islamic, African, and Sinic), and in terms of religion we had
21 countries representing all main world religions. This selection of countries is not exhaustive, but
22 it allows for examining measurement invariance of PWI across different languages and cultures.
23
24 The aim of the study was to investigate the measurement invariance of the PWI across different
25 countries and languages. Given the large number of countries compared, we expected to find
26 support only for the metric level of invariance, as scalar invariance is hardly found in large
27 cross-national comparisons.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Metho

d Sample and Procedure

Data were collected in a paper-pencil or online formats between April 2014 and August 2015. The sample comprised 5,530 university students (42.4 % men, $M = 21.29$, $SD = 3.15$, age ranged from 16 to 39). We excluded all participants above the age of 40 (1.7% of total sample) from the analyses, as in most countries the respondents' age was in the 18–25 range, and rarely exceeded 30 years. We also asked students to indicate the socioeconomic status of their families on a 7-point Likert-type scale (from 1 = *significantly below average* to 7 = *significantly over average*). The students majored in different fields (e.g., social sciences, technical sciences, and medical sciences) and originated from 26 countries (see Table 1 for a sample breakdown). They were recruited for the study during their classes and participated on a voluntary basis. They completed the PWI as part of a broader project on entitlement and subjective well-being. The paper-and-pencil surveys were administered in small groups ($n < 15$). In countries where the survey was administered in a non-native language, a researcher assisted students and explained the meaning of particular words. This was the case of India, Iran, Kenya, Nepal, and South Africa; however, only in Iran and Nepal is English not an official language.

--- Table 1 about here ---

1
2
3
4 **Measure**
5

6 *The Personal Well-being Index* (PWI, Cummins et al., 2003; International Wellbeing Group,
7 2013) measures satisfaction with different life domains: (1) standard of living, (2) health, (3) life
8 achievements, (4) personal relationships, (5) personal safety, (6) community connectedness, (7)
9 future security, and (8) religion and spirituality. Previous studies suggest that in different
10 countries the relative importance of religiosity and spirituality varies as a function of cultural
11 differences (Norris & Inglehart, 2004) and that they both significantly contribute to subjective
12 well-being (Casas, González, Figuer, & Malo, 2009; Piedmont, & Friedman, 2012). Therefore,
13 we used one combined question about religiosity and spirituality (*How much are you satisfied*
14 *with your spirituality or religion?*), as suggested by manual for PWI-8, despite some
15 researchers' postulating two parallel versions for item 8 (Sarriera et al., 2014). Participants
16 responded on an 11-point Likert-type scale (0 = *not at all satisfied* to 10 = *totally satisfied*).
17 National versions of scale were authorised versions or they were obtained by repeating back
18 translation procedures with bilingual researchers and with the participation of Robert Cummins
19 (see Table 1 for information on language of administration). **Statistical Analyses**
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 We started by using Mplus 7.4 to perform Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) in order to
41 test for a unidimensional structure of the PWI-8 in each country sample. Because the score
42 distributions were not perfectly normal and Mardia's multivariate skewness and kurtosis
43 statistics (presented in Supplementary Information, table SI.3) were significant in all samples,
44 we used the robust Satorra-Bentler χ^2 (Satorra & Bentler, 1994; referred to as estimator MLM in
45 Mplus). Because the country samples differed in gender distribution, we used weighting in all
46 analyses to equalize the contribution of male and female respondents within each country to the
47 model (the weights were calculated to achieve a target $N=100$ for males and females in each
48 group).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The model fit was examined using the most common fit indices: the Chi-square (χ^2), the CFI
2
3 (Comparative Fit Index), the RMSEA (Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation), and the
4
5 SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual). In larger samples ($N > 200$), practical fit
6
7 indices (CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR) are preferred to the χ^2 as they are less sensitive to sample size
8
9 (Chen, 2007; Davidov et al., 2014). CFI values above .90 were considered as evidence of an
10
11 acceptable model fit and those above .95 as evidence of a good fit. Because in smaller samples
12
13 RMSEA tends to over-reject correct models (Hu & Bentler, 1999), we used RMSEA values of
14
15 .10 and .06 as thresholds for acceptable and good fit, respectively. For SRMR, .08 and .05
16
17 thresholds were used (Brown, 2015). In samples where the fit of the one-factor theoretical model
18
19 was outside the acceptable range and a pronounced and interpretable outlier was found among
20
21 the modification indices, suggesting an error covariance, the latter was added and the model was
22
23 retested. We aimed to introduce as few modifications as possible in order to achieve acceptable
24
25 fit without over-complicating the model.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 After establishing the measurement model for each country, we proceeded by conducting
33
34 multi-group CFA (MGCFA) to test for configural, metric, and scalar measurement invariance.
35
36 We tested the invariance based on modified measurement models using a conventional approach
37
38 (Byrne, 2012). We used the Δ CFI and Δ RMSEA values of .010 and .015, respectively, as
39
40 evidence of pronounced difference between nested models (Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold,
41
42 2002). We looked for outliers among the modification indices and introduced them into the
43
44 model one-by-one, until the difference in practical fit indices between the configural invariance
45
46 and partial metric invariance models became small enough (Δ CFI \leq .01, Δ RMSEA \leq .015). The
47
48 procedure was repeated for scalar invariance.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 A potential drawback of the manual approach is that each modification results in a different
2 model, and the exact resulting list of non-invariant parameters is dependent on the sequence in
3 which modifications are entered into the model. In case of a long sequence of modifications, the
4 conventional approach (addressing the strongest modification index at each step) does not
5 guarantee that the resulting model will be optimal (i.e., simplest, with the fewest number of
6 non-invariant parameters). This problem is overcome by the alignment procedure (Asparouhov
7 & Muthén, 2014), which evaluates different combinations of non-equivalent parameters to find
8 an optimal model. We tried to cross-validate our findings using the alignment procedure, based
9 on the same modified measurement model. Finally, we tested the invariance of the PWI across
10 genders. Because the sample sizes were not large enough to test the invariance across genders in
11 each country separately, we tested a single-factor model in the combined sample with robust
12 chi-square (MLR) and standard errors computed using the sandwich estimator for clustered
13 samples to account for non-independence of observations within countries.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Result**

36 **s Scale structure across countries**

37 The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) values of the PWI in each national sample
38 are presented in Table 1. Cronbach's alpha values above .70, indicating good reliability (Lance,
39 Butts, & Michels, 2006), were found in all samples. To ensure unidimensionality, we conducted
40 parallel analysis (Horn, 1954). In all 26 samples, only the first eigenvalue exceeded the one
41 obtained for random data using parallel analysis, and all the items exhibited significant loadings
42 on the single dimension.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Table 2 presents the results of single-sample CFA analyses for the initial (theoretical)
54 model. In most countries, the theoretical model showed acceptable fit, based on the
55 combination of practical fit indices. The fit of the model was outside the acceptable range in
56 Spain, Poland, South Korea, Hungary, Romania, Indonesia, and Panama.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 --- Table 2 about here --
2
3

4 We explored the modification indices in countries with unacceptable and marginal fit
5 and introduced additional covariances in cases where they were theoretically justified and a
6 strong ($\Delta\chi^2 > 10$) outlier was found among modification indices. The error covariance for items
7 4 and 5 (relationships and safety) was found in three Hispanic countries, in line with previous
8 studies (Sarriera et al., 2014). The error covariance of items 4 and 6 (relationships and feeling
9 part of community) was peculiar to two post-Communist Central European countries (Poland,
10 Hungary). The other error covariances were explained by back-translation analysis. For
11 instance, the error covariance of items 5 and 7 was found in countries (Poland, Brazil) where
12 local translations used the same word for “safety” and “security”. In South Korea, items 1, 3,
13 and 7, reflecting satisfaction with financial success, were associated. We added two error
14 covariances to address this weak subdimension. The introduction of additional error
15 covariances resulted in acceptable fit in all countries (shown in Table 3).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 --- Table 3 about here --
34
35
36

37 **Measurement invariance analyses across countries**

38
39 We proceeded by conducting invariance analyses. The multi-group model included
40 modified measurement models for 10 countries and theoretical model for the remaining 16
41 countries. The configural model showed good fit to the data, the fit of the metric model was
42 acceptable, and the fit of the scalar model was poor (see Table 4). The chi-square differences
43 were also significant ($p < .001$) between the three models. The difference in practical fit
44 indices between the configural and metric models was very small for RMSEA (Δ RMSEA =
45 .003), but above the recommended .01 threshold for the CFI (Δ CFI = .018) and we followed
46 by establishing partial metric invariance. After six constraints for non-invariant loadings (listed
47 in supplementary material) were relaxed, the difference in practical fit indices between the
48 configural invariance and partial metric invariance models became small enough (Δ CFI = .01).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

We followed by establishing the partial scalar invariance. After relaxing 74 constraints for equal intercepts, the corresponding modification indices became non-significant at $p < .01$ level and we stopped the procedure to reduce the risk of false positives. Even though the ΔCFI criterion was not reached ($\Delta CFI = .024$), the $\Delta RMSEA$ and $\Delta SRMR$ were quite small ($< .010$), and practical fit indices (Table 4) were within acceptable limits. Because these indices are to be interpreted in combination (Brown, 2015), we deemed the resulting partial scalar invariance model acceptable. The complete list of non-invariant parameters obtained from the final partial scalar invariance model is given in Supplementary Information (table SI.1). The item mean and intercept estimates based on the resulting model are also given in Supplementary Information (tables SI.4 and SI.5).

1 --- Table 4 about here --
2
3

4 The number of non-equivalent intercepts ranged from 6 to 12 per item. Some of the
5 intercepts revealed meaningful patterns. For instance, non-equivalence of the intercept of item 3
6 (achieving in life) was more often found in Asian, collectivistic cultures. Non-equivalence of the
7 intercept of item 6 (feeling part of your community) was typically found in Latin American
8 countries, but not in post-Communist ones.
9

10 --- Table 5 about here--The estimates of
11 latent factor means and variances obtained from the model are presented in
12 Table 5. The latent factor means were highly correlated with the observed
13 means ($r = .95$).
14

15 To cross-validate the model, we performed the alignment procedure. The results are
16 presented in Supplementary Information (table SI.2). The alignment procedure has identified a
17 smaller number of non-equivalent parameters, 1 loading and 37 intercepts, suggesting that the
18 conventional approach is more conservative. Thirty-three of these intercepts were also
19 identified as non-equivalent using the conventional approach. The latent factor means
20 estimated using the alignment procedure were highly correlated with the observed means ($r =$
21 $.98$) and with those obtained using the conventional approach ($r = .96$). These data indicate a
22 fairly good convergence of the findings from the two procedures.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Invariance analysis across gender

As our national samples differed in the gender distribution, we considered the possibility that some of the non-invariant parameters we found in the CFA analyses could be explained by gender. To gauge the contribution of gender to the measurement non-invariance, we performed a multi-group CFA for females and males in the combined sample, using country as a cluster variable to account for non-independence of observations within each country. The resulting fit indices and model comparison results are shown in Table 6. All three models showed good fit to the data. The difference between the nested models in terms of practical fit indices was below the thresholds suggested by Chen (2007), indicating that gender does not have any uniform effects on measurement invariance across countries.

Discussion Our objective was to establish measurement invariance of the PWI-8 across 26 countries. We found that the PWI was unidimensional, with Cronbach's alphas indicating acceptable internal consistency in all countries. MGCFA confirmed that the basic construct structure of the PWI-8 is similar across groups. Although additional covariances between items can improve the fit in some countries, in most countries the fit of the theoretical model was very close to the acceptable range. The same was true for configural and metric-invariant MGCFA models. Although the difference between these two nested models was significant in terms of chi-square difference, the difference in practical fit indices was small, suggesting that the comparison of effects (e.g., correlations) obtained using the PWI in different languages across countries should not be biased by non-equivalent loadings. However, the poor fit of the scalar invariance model indicates that the comparison of raw scores between countries is impossible. On the other hand, the partial scalar invariance model indicated acceptable fit, allowing for a meaningful comparison of latent means across groups. Taken together, these findings suggest that it is possible to examine the predictors and correlates of the subjective well-being phenomenon using the PWI-8 across countries. The

disagreement between the practical fit indices (Δ CFI vs. Δ RMSEA and Δ SRMR) can be explained by the fact that these fit indices are associated with the number of parameters in the model in different ways, and existing cutoff criteria (Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002) are all based on simulations for 2 groups, where the number of parameters is much smaller. We could not find any simulation studies investigating optimal cut-off points for practical fit indices with a large number of groups.

1 Therefore, simulation studies investigating the effects of the number of groups on fit indices
2
3 are necessary.
4

5
6 The results of analysis using an alignment approach based on the theoretical model suggest
7
8 that despite the presence of some weak non-invariance of loadings and pronounced
9
10 non-invariance of item intercepts in some countries, the observed mean scores are very similar to
11
12 unbiased latent factor scores. Although removal of bias can slightly change the rank ordering of
13
14 countries, these effects were only pronounced for a few countries (Kenya, Japan, Israel, and
15
16 South Africa).
17

18
19 We also developed modified measurement models by introducing theoretically
20
21 interpretable and strongly significant ($p < .001$) modification indices for some countries.
22
23 However, in most cases these modification indices accounted for translation artefacts, which
24
25 can be removed by improving certain translations of the instrument into other languages.
26
27 Interestingly, in all countries where the English version was used instead of local languages
28
29 (i.e., India, Iran, Kenya, Nepal, and South Africa), there was no need to introduce
30
31 modifications and the unidimensional theoretical model was well fitted to the data.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The attempts to develop partial scalar invariance models using the older, manual approach
2
3 and alignment approach resulted in different, although largely overlapping, sets of non-invariant
4
5 parameters. Items referring to more objective realities, such as one's living standard and health,
6
7 turned out to be more invariant, compared to the items referring to more subjective phenomena,
8
9 such as one's spirituality or future security.
10

11
12
13 Finally, gender does not seem to contribute to non-invariance of loadings and intercepts in
14
15 any uniform manner across countries. However, because our samples did not allow for the
16
17 evaluation of gender invariance in each country separately, this analysis does not rule out the
18
19 possibility of country-specific non-invariance associated with gender. **Limitations and**
20
21 **recommendation for future studies**
22
23

24
25 The current report has several limitations: the use of student samples, the lack of several
26
27 important cultures and countries (such as Chinese or American), and the overrepresentation of
28
29 European countries. For practical reasons we used both online and paper-pencil surveys, and in
30
31 some countries, the questionnaire was distributed in English, rather than in a native language,
32
33 which may have led to increased measurement error. Also, the student samples were not
34
35 representative of their respective countries, which precludes us from interpreting the substantial
36
37 differences in the mean score estimates. Finally, although we decided in favour of using a
38
39 combined item for measuring satisfaction with religion and spirituality, these constructs are not
40
41 interchangeable (Piedmont & Friedman, 2012). As this solution happened to work well both in
42
43 CFA and MGCFA it could be used in cross-cultural comparisons; however, for further
44
45 exploration of the importance of religion and spirituality as separate factors in shaping overall
46
47 life satisfaction, two separate items should be used (see Casas et al., 2009; Sarriera et al., 2014).
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 In terms of specific recommendations, PWI researchers could use this tool in all of the
55
56 countries included in the current study as an indicator of general life satisfaction, measured by a
57
58 combination of domain-specific items. The small number of non-invariant loadings that we
59
60 found suggests that satisfaction in these domains contributes more or less equally to overall life
61
62
63
64
65

satisfaction. However, we have found some consistently repeating cultural differences, which could be further explored. For instance, in the South Korean sample we have found evidence in favour of an additional factor representing concern about financial success, suggesting that in this population life satisfaction might be somewhat affected by materialism. Differences in intercepts for some PWI items suggest that these items may have specific meaning in certain cultural contexts. For instance, lower intercept for item 3, reflecting satisfaction with achievement in life, was typically found in collectivistic countries, indicating that individuals in such countries are somewhat less likely to admit satisfaction with their individual achievements. As collectivistic countries are typically “face-saving” cultures (Bond, 1991), life achievement could mean that individuals just fit into their social environment, contrary to individualistic countries, where life achievements would mean developing unique characteristics. As PWI statements are typically very general (as they are aimed to represent broad life domains; see International Wellbeing Group, 2013), the cultural meaning of these broad statements could be affected by cultural context. Our study provides some suggestions of where this may be the case (e.g., life achievement, feeling part of community).

1
2
3 **Conclusion**
4

5 The current report provided information about the possibility of cross-cultural research
6
7 among university students based on PWI-8 scores, providing evidence of partial metric
8
9 invariance allowing the cross-country comparison of effects, but not of group or individual raw
10
11 scores. We also compared the results of different approaches to establishing unbiased factor
12
13 means across countries. This provides valuable information on the further development of
14
15 subjective well-being research in different cultural contexts. As the main goal of the
16
17 International Wellbeing Group is to explore the importance of satisfaction with particular
18
19 domains in shaping overall life satisfaction, our findings indicate that this research goal could be
20
21 realised successfully in cross-cultural research.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- 1
2
3
4 Asparouhov, T. & Muthén, B. (2014). Multiple-Group Factor Analysis Alignment. *Structural*
5
6 *Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 21, 1-14. doi:
7
8 10.1080/10705511.2014.919210
9
- 10 Baltatescu, S. (2014). Romanian-Hungarian cross-border region, Personal Well-being Index. In:
11
12 Alex C. Michalos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* (pp.
13
14 5598-5605). Netherlands: Springer.
15
16
- 17 Bond, M. H. (1991). *Beyond the Chinese face: Insights from psychology*. Oxford University
18
19 Press.
20
21
- 22 Bricker-Katz, G., Lincoln, M., & McCabe, P. (2009). A Life-time of Stuttering: How
23
24 emotional reactions to stuttering impact activities and participation in older people.
25
26 *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 31, 1742–1752. doi: 10.1080/09638280902738672
27
28
- 29 Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research*. 2nd Ed. N. Y.: The
30
31 Guilford Press. Byrne, B. N. (2012). *Structural Equation Modelling with Mplus*. N.Y.:
32
33 Routledge. Casas, F., Bello, A., González, M., & Aligué, M. (2012). Personal Well-Being
34
35 among Spanish
36
37 Adolescents. *Journal of Social Research & Policy*, 3, 19-45. doi: 10.1007/s11482-009
38
39 -9066-x
40
41
42
43
44
- 45 Casas, F., González, M., Figuer, C., & Malo, S. (2009). Satisfaction with spirituality and with
46
47 religion, and personal well-being among Spanish adolescents and young university
48
49 students. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 4, 1, 23-45.
50
51
- 52 Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Structural Equation Modeling, 14, 464-504.

Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 9, 233-255. doi:

10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5

Cummins, R. A., Eckersley, R., Pallant, J., Van Vugt, J., & Misajon, R. (2003). Developing a national index of subjective wellbeing: The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index. *Social*

Indicators Research, 64, 159–190. doi: 10.1023/A:1024704320683

Davidov, E., Meuleman, B., Cieciuch, J., Schmidt, P., & Billiet, J. (2014). Measurement equivalence in cross-national research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40, 55-75. doi:

10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043137

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542-575.

Engel, L., & Cummins, R. A. (2011). Impact of dose adjustment for normal eating in Australia

(OzDAFNE) on subjective wellbeing, coping resources and negative affect in adults

with type 1 diabetes: A prospective comparison study. *Diabetes Research and Clinical*

Practice, 91, 271–279. doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2010.11.023

Forjaz, F. M., Prieto-Flores, M. E., Ayala, A., Rodriguez-Blazquez, C., Fernandez-Mayoralas,

G., Rojo-Perez, F., & Martinez-Martin, P. (2011). Measurement properties of the Community

Wellbeing Index in older adults. *Quality of Life Research*, 20, 733-743. doi:

10.1007/s11136-010-9794-2.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:

Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modelling*, 6, 1-55.

Huntington, S. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and remaking of world order*. New York:

Touchstone.

- 1 International Wellbeing Group (2006). *Personal Wellbeing Index*. Melbourne, Australia:
2
3 Australian Centre on Quality of Life, Deakin University. Retrieved from
4
5 http://www.deakin.edu.au/research/acqol/instruments/wellbeing_index.htm
6
7
8 International Wellbeing Group (2013). *Personal Wellbeing Index: 5th edition*. Melbourne,
9
10 Australia: Australian Centre on Quality of Life, Deakin University. Retrieved from [http://](http://www.deakin.edu.au/research/acqol/instruments/wellbeingindex/index.php)
11
12 www.deakin.edu.au/research/acqol/instruments/wellbeingindex/index.php
13
14
15
16 Lance, C.E., Butts, M.M., & Michels, L.C. (2006). The sources of four commonly reported
17
18 cut-off criteria: What did they really say? *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 202
19
20 220. doi: 10.1177/1094428105284919
21
22
23 Lau, A. L. D., Cummins, R. A., & McPherson, W. (2005). An Investigation into the
24
25 Cross-Cultural Equivalence of the Personal Wellbeing Index. *Social Indicators Research*,
26
27 72, 403–430.
28
29
30 Norris, P. & Inglehart, R. (2004). *Sacred and secular: Religion and politics worldwide*. New
31
32 York: Cambridge University Press.
33
34
35 Oishi, S. (2010). Culture and well-being: Conceptual and methodological issues. In: E. Diener, J.
36
37 F. Helliwell, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *International differences in well-being* (pp. 34-69).
38
39 Oxford University Press.
40
41
42 Piedmont, R.L., & Friedman, P. (2012). Spirituality, religiosity and subjective well-being. In:
43
44 K. C. Land, A. C. Michalos, & M. J. Sirgy, (Eds.), *Handbook of social indicators and*
45
46 *quality of life research* (pp.313-329). Netherlands: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-
47
48 2421-1
49
50
51
52 Ponizovsky, Y., Dimitrova, R., Schachner, M. K., & Van de Schoot, R. (2013). The satisfaction
53
54 with life scale: measurement invariance across immigrant groups. *European Journal of*
55
56 *Developmental Psychology*, 10, 526-532. doi: 10.1080/17405629.2012.707778
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Sarriera, J. C., Casas, F., Alfaro, J., Bedin, L., Strelhow, M. R., Abs, D., Valdenegro, B., Garcia,
2
3 C., & Oyarzun, D. (2014). Psychometric properties of the Personal Wellbeing Index in
4
5 Brazilian and Chilean adolescents including spirituality and religion. *Psychology/ Psicologia*
6
7 *Reflexão e Crítica, 27*, 710-719. doi: 10.1590/1678-7153.201427411
8
9
- 10 Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (1994). Corrections to test statistics and standard errors in
11
12 covariance structure analysis. In: A. von Eye, C. C. Clogg (Eds.), *Latent Variables*
13
14 *Analysis: Applications for developmental research* (pp. 399–419). Thousand Oaks, CA:
15
16 Sage.
17
18
- 19 Sirgy, M.J. (2012). *The psychology of quality of life. Hedonic well-being, life satisfaction, and*
20
21 *eudaimonia*. New York, London: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-4405-9.
22
23
- 24 Tomy, A. J., Norrish, J. M., & Cummins, R. A. (2011). The subjective wellbeing of
25
26 indigenous Australian adolescents: Validating the personal Wellbeing Index – School
27
28 Children. *Social Indicators Research, 103*, 405-411. doi: 10.1007/s11205-011-9970-y
29
30
- 31 Werner, S. (2012). Subjective well-being, hope, and needs of individuals with serious mental
32
33 illness. *Psychiatry Research, 196*, 214-219. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2011.10.012
34
35
- 36 Widaman, K. F., Ferrer, E., & Conger, R. D. (2010). Factorial invariance within longitudinal
37
38 structural equation models: Measuring the same construct across time. *Child*
39
40 *Development Perspectives, 4*, 10–18.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8

Table 1

Sample information and internal consistency coefficients for PWI-8 in 26 countries

Country N Female Age SES Language Procedure Cronbach's % M α

Armenia	223	48	19.00	4.98	Armenian	Paper-pencil	.84	Brazil	225	64	20.50	4.38	Portuguese	Online	.82
Bulgaria	197	66	23.70	4.66	Bulgarian	Paper-pencil	.82	Chile	241	52	22.00	4.34	Spanish	Paper-pencil	.82
Estonia	289	68	22.22	4.37	Estonian	Online	.79	Hungary	206	69	21.01	n/a	Hungarian	Paper-pencil	.81
India	200	69	22.59	4.37	English	Paper-pencil	.76	Indonesia	200	50	21.38	4.70	Indonesian	Online	.89
Iran	201	50	21.28	4.46	English	Paper-pencil	.75	Israel	200	40	24.58	4.88	Hebrew	Online	.82
Japan	202	23	18.91	4.14	Japanese	Paper-pencil	.82	Kenya	161	53	23.39	4.07	English	Paper-pencil	.90
Nepal	199	51	22.70	4.08	English	Paper-pencil	.74	Panama	176	32	22.03	4.13	Spanish	Online	.88
Poland	258	60	21.85	4.69	Polish	Paper-pencil	.86	Portugal	187	77	22.79	4.11	Portuguese	Online	.82
Puerto Rico	300	43	20.26	4.16	Spanish	Paper-pencil	.84	Romania	210	48	21.49	4.72	Romanian	Paper-pencil	.85
Russia	227	83	21.03	3.11	Russian	Online	.87	Serbia	199	61	22.46	3.77	Serbian	Paper-pencil	.84
Slovakia	202	72	21.13	4.76	Slovakian	Paper-pencil	.77	S. Africa	188	67	20.17	4.45	English	Paper-pencil	.79
S. Korea	215	55	22.20	3.90	Korean	Paper-pencil	.83	Spain	196	51	21.20	4.01	Spanish	Online	.72
UK	302	81	19.44	4.21	English	Online	.84	Vietnam	259	53	20.52	4.25	Vietnamese	Paper-pencil	.86

Note. SES = Subjective economic status of family (1-7). Due to technical error data for socio-economic status of family are not available for Hungary.

Table 2

Mean Square of Approximation, SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.

Scaling Correction Factor for Satorra-Bentler χ^2 , CFI = Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root

Note. S-B χ^2 = Satorra-Bentler chi-square (df = 20), *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$; SCF =

Vietnam	44.88**	1.37	.956	.070	(.042-.097)	.041
UK	33.69*	1.71	.973	.048	(.016-.075)	.033
Spain	86.24***	1.30	.756	.131	(.104-.160)	.076
South Korea	99.00***	1.35	.844	.137	(.111-.164)	.064
South Africa	37.82**	1.57	.917	.069	(.034-.103)	.056
Slovakia	33.80*	1.49	.939	.059	(.020-.092)	.051
Serbia	47.56**	1.38	.927	.084	(.053-.115)	.051
Russia	40.46**	1.85	.935	.077	(.042-.111)	.047
Romania	48.18***	2.17	.898	.084	(.054-.115)	.060
Puerto Rico	71.21***	1.69	.908	.092	(.070-.116)	.051
Portugal	32.57*	1.62	.949	.058	(.014-.094)	.050
Poland	65.24***	1.40	.904	.103	(.076-.131)	.053
Panama	55.70***	1.51	.932	.101	(.070-.133)	.045
Nepal	35.05*	1.47	.916	.064	(.025-.098)	.055
Kenya	28.99	3.14	.962	.055	(.000-.096)	.053
Japan	26.22	1.73	.975	.042	(.000-.082)	.046
Israel	37.49*	1.57	.931	.067	(.032-.100)	.050
Iran	33.88*	1.15	.953	.059	(.020-.092)	.045
Indonesia	60.52***	1.35	.931	.101	(.072-.130)	.047
India	23.17	1.65	.981	.028	(.000-.070)	.044
Hungary	53.97***	1.47	.883	.091	(.062-.121)	.061
Estonia	55.76***	1.35	.902	.079	(.055-.104)	.054
Chile	34.81*	1.39	.966	.056	(.022-.086)	.036
Bulgaria	47.66**	1.24	.924	.084	(.053-.115)	.050
Brazil	51.72***	1.35	.912	.089	(.059-.119)	.052
Armenia	59.03***	1.67	.901	.095	(.068-.124)	.056

1 *Goodness-of-fit indices for PW18 one-factor model (no error covariances)*

2	Country	S-B χ^2	SCF	CFI	RMSEA (90% CI)	SRMR
3	Armenia	59.03***	1.67	.901	.095 (.068-.124)	.056
4	Brazil	51.72***	1.35	.912	.089 (.059-.119)	.052
5	Bulgaria	47.66**	1.24	.924	.084 (.053-.115)	.050
6	Chile	34.81*	1.39	.966	.056 (.022-.086)	.036
7	Estonia	55.76***	1.35	.902	.079 (.055-.104)	.054
8	Hungary	53.97***	1.47	.883	.091 (.062-.121)	.061
9	India	23.17	1.65	.981	.028 (.000-.070)	.044
10	Indonesia	60.52***	1.35	.931	.101 (.072-.130)	.047
11	Iran	33.88*	1.15	.953	.059 (.020-.092)	.045
12	Israel	37.49*	1.57	.931	.067 (.032-.100)	.050
13	Japan	26.22	1.73	.975	.042 (.000-.082)	.046
14	Kenya	28.99	3.14	.962	.055 (.000-.096)	.053
15	Nepal	35.05*	1.47	.916	.064 (.025-.098)	.055
16	Panama	55.70***	1.51	.932	.101 (.070-.133)	.045
17	Poland	65.24***	1.40	.904	.103 (.076-.131)	.053
18	Portugal	32.57*	1.62	.949	.058 (.014-.094)	.050
19	Puerto Rico	71.21***	1.69	.908	.092 (.070-.116)	.051
20	Romania	48.18***	2.17	.898	.084 (.054-.115)	.060
21	Russia	40.46**	1.85	.935	.077 (.042-.111)	.047
22	Serbia	47.56**	1.38	.927	.084 (.053-.115)	.051
23	Slovakia	33.80*	1.49	.939	.059 (.020-.092)	.051
24	South Africa	37.82**	1.57	.917	.069 (.034-.103)	.056
25	South Korea	99.00***	1.35	.844	.137 (.111-.164)	.064
26	Spain	86.24***	1.30	.756	.131 (.104-.160)	.076
27	UK	33.69*	1.71	.973	.048 (.016-.075)	.033
28	Vietnam	44.88**	1.37	.956	.070 (.042-.097)	.041

29 *Note.* S-B χ^2 = Satorra-Bentler chi-square (df = 20), *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$,
30 Scaling Correction Factor for Satorra-Bentler χ^2 , CFI = Comparative Fit Index,
31 Mean Square of Approximation, SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Country S-B χ^2 SCF CFI RMSEA (90% CI) SRMR

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8

		df	SCF	CFI	RMSEA (90% CI)	SRMR	Error Covariances
1		20					
2							
3							
4	Armenia	19	1.62	.983	.041 (.000-.077)	.041	6-8
5	Brazil	19	1.27	.953	.067 (.032-.099)	.043	5-7
6	Hungary	19	1.45	.932	.071 (.038-.103)	.055	4-6
7	Indonesia	19	1.36	.963	.075 (.043-.107)	.041	3-7
8	Panama	19	1.55	.948	.090 (.058-.124)	.043	4-5
9	Poland	18	1.36	.966	.064 (.029-.097)	.039	5-7, 4-6
10	Puerto Rico	19	1.69	.942	.075 (.051-.100)	.043	4-5
11	Romania	19	2.18	.940	.066 (.030-.099)	.047	1-2
12	South Korea	18	1.35	.928	.098 (.069-.128)	.048	1-3, 3-7
13	Spain	19	1.33	.925	.074 (.041-.108)	.052	4-5
14							
15							
16							
17							

Table 3.

Goodness-of-fit Indices for PWI8 One-factor Solution, modified measurement models Country S-B χ^2 df SCF CFI RMSEA (90% CI) SRMR Error Covariances

Note. S-B χ^2 = Satorra-Bentler robust chi-square (df = 20), *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$; SCF = Scaling Correction Factor for Satorra-Bentler χ^2 , CFI = Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean Square of Approximation, SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Residual.

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8 21

Table 4

Fit indices for Multi-group Confirmatory Factor Analysis (MGCFA) models of the PWI8 across 26 countries

Model	χ^2	df	SCF	CFI	RMSEA (90 % CI)	SRMR								
Configural	975.95	508	1.57	.948	.066 (.060-.073)	.047	Metric	1316.10	683	1.53	.930	.067		
	(.061-.072)	.084	Partial	Metric	1237.03	677	1.52	.938	.063	(.057-.068)	.075	Scalar	3455.53	852
	1.22	.711	.121	(.111-.125)	.120	Partial	Scalar	1554.46	777	1.34	.914	.069	(.064-.074)	.079
Difference tests $\Delta\chi^2$ Δdf ΔCFI $\Delta RMSEA$ $\Delta SRMR$							Metric vs. Configural	340.47	175	.018	.001			
	.037	Partial metric vs. Configural	254.10	169	.010	.003	.028	Scalar vs. Partial metric	39298.62					
									175	.227	.058	.045		

Partial scalar vs. Partial metric 1669.61 100 .024 .006 .004 *Note.* Satorra-Bentler χ^2 , all $p < .001$. SCF = Scaling Correction Factor, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean Square of Approximation, SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. The list of error covariances included in the model is given in Table 2. The list of non-invariant loadings and intercepts is given in Table SI.1.

Observed Score	MGCFA Estimates					
<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Rank	<i>M</i>	Variance	Rank	
Romania	8.07	1.33	1	0.07	0.92	1
India	7.67	1.36	2	-0.27	1.23	2
Chile	7.25	1.37	8	-0.38	1.04	3
Slovakia	7.43	1.16	5	-0.40	0.75	4
Panama	7.31	1.69	6	-0.46	2.05	5
Spain	7.15	1.20	10	-0.47	0.64	6
Hungary	7.58	1.29	3	-0.50	1.10	7
Puerto Rico	7.29	1.62	7	-0.54	1.55	8
Armenia	7.52	1.55	4	-0.55	1.44	9
Brazil	7.13	1.46	11	-0.59	1.25	10
Israel	7.15	1.31	9	-0.67	1.00	11
Portugal	6.89	1.27	16	-0.87	0.93	12
Bulgaria	7.02	1.54	13	-0.92	1.38	13
South Africa	6.99	1.40	14	-1.01	1.09	14
Vietnam	6.78	1.42	19	-1.12	1.17	15
Estonia	7.10	1.21	12	-1.13	0.82	16
Poland	6.91	1.54	15	-1.14	1.27	17
Serbia	6.80	1.65	18	-1.14	1.63	18
Indonesia	6.45	1.60	20	-1.25	1.56	19
UK	6.85	1.38	17	-1.29	1.20	20
Russia	6.40	1.64	22	-1.30	1.74	21
South Korea	6.15	1.34	23	-1.61	1.07	22
Nepal	6.44	1.41	21	-1.62	1.08	23
Japan	5.38	1.45	26	-2.06	1.41	24
Kenya	5.86	2.15	24	-2.26	3.03	25
Iran	5.72	1.61	25	-2.33	1.28	26

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8

Table 5

Comparison of observed country mean scores and latent factor estimates

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8 23

Table 6

5	Configural	218.12*	40	.968	.040 (.035-.046)	.028
6	Metric	231.90*	47	.967	.038 (.033-.043)	.031
7	Scalar	265.05*	54	.962	.038 (.033-.043)	.035
9	Difference tests	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf	ΔCFI	$\Delta RMSEA$	$\Delta SRMR$
10	Metric vs. configural	6.03	7	.001	.002	.003
11	Scalar vs. metric	32.84*	7	.005	<.001	.004

Fit indices for Multi-group Confirmatory Factor Analysis (MGCFA) models of the PWI8 across gender

Model S-B χ^2 *df* CFI RMSEA (90 % CI) SRMR

Note. Satorra-Bentler χ^2 , * $p < .001$. CFI = Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean Square of Approximation, SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8

Supplementary Information

Table SI.1

Results of Partial Scalar Invariance Analyses: List of Non-Invariant Parameters

Country	Loadings, item #	($\Delta\chi^2$)
India	5	(9.12)
Indonesia	1	(11.38)
Iran	8	(15.21)
Israel	8	(15.21)
Japan	8	(15.21)
Kenya	8	(15.21)
Nepal	2	(9.74)
Panama	2	(9.74)
Poland	4	(19.12)
Portugal	4	(19.12)
Puerto-Rico	4	(19.12)
Romania	4	(19.12)
Russia	4	(19.12)
Serbia	4	(19.12)
Slovakia	4	(19.12)
S. Africa	4	(19.12)
S. Korea	4	(19.12)
Spain	4	(19.12)
UK	4	(19.12)
Vietnam	4	(19.12)
	3 (34.49), 4 (8.27), 5 (41.46), 6 (26.79), 7 (17.93), 8 (8.22)	
	5 (43.19), 6 (31.96), 2 (28.05), 8 (19.32)	
	8 (63.17), 5 (46.16), 4 (11.32), 7 (15.63), 5 (8.19)	
	3 (18.74), 8 (12.83), 2 (7.66), 6 (7.87), 3 (23.74), 4 (8.51)	
	2 (26.60), 4 (17.17), 3 (10.03), 1 (12.13), 6 (57.76)	
	8 (24.12), 3 (20.26), 7 (10.97), 7 (19.93), 8 (22.09)	
	3 (7.69), 4 (21.65), 8 (15.71), 6 (37.78), 5 (13.82)	
	4 (12.74), 5 (7.73), 1 (8.60), 7 (8.18), 7 (16.55)	
	6 (6.77), 6 (30.35), 5 (25.85), 1 (14.18), 3 (7.35)	
	4 (7.65), 3 (23.10), 2 (18.45), 1 (73.40), 4 (28.04)	
	2 (21.46), 7 (17.99), 3 (11.91), 8 (11.34), 4 (8.16)	
	2 (6.72), 6 (26.48), 8 (10.92), 7 (6.65), 1 (23.86)	
	3 (17.13), 7 (17.92), 5 (6.67), 4 (39.13), 6 (33.17)	
	7 (31.52), 8 (26.49), 6 (35.02), 5 (18.32), 1 (19.45)	
	7 (7.32), 7 (43.19), 3 (18.45)	
Armenia		
Brazil		
Bulgaria		
Chile		
Estonia		
Hungary	3	

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8

Table SI.2

Results of Alignment Analyses: List of Non-Invariant Parameters and Mean Estimates

Non-invariant parameters		Latent factor estimates	
	Loadings	Intercepts	Mean Variance
Armenia 3, 4	-0.15	1.25	Brazil 5, 8 -0.35 1.09
Bulgaria -0.43 1.17	Chile 5, 7* -0.33 0.94	Estonia 1*, 5, 8 -0.45 0.69	Hungary 5 -0.06 0.94
India 3, 8 0.00 1.00	Indonesia 3, 6* -0.95 1.42	Iran -1.32 1.20	Israel 6 -0.26 0.84
Japan 3, 8 -1.47 1.26	Kenya 2 7, 8 -1.52 2.58	Nepal 8 -0.95 0.89	Panama 6 -0.27 1.78
Poland 5 -0.51 1.06	Portugal 7 -0.53 0.92	Puerto Rico 5 -0.28 1.36	Romania 1 0.33 0.88
Russia -1.01 1.52	Serbia 1, 4 -0.51 1.43	Slovakia 6*, 8 -0.22 0.68	S. Africa 7, 8 -0.57 0.94
S. Korea 3, 7 -1.03 0.90	Spain 4 -0.31 0.61	UK 5 -0.69 1.04	Vietnam 3, 7 -0.67 1.03

Note. Non-invariant intercepts that were not discovered using the manual approach are marked with an asterisk.

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8 Table

SI.3

1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7	Armenia	18.70	3.28	0.47	123.06	79.32	1.60	Results of
8	Brazil	14.94	3.51	0.48	105.79	79.26	1.66	
9	Bulgaria	13.07	3.62	0.50	100.71	79.28	1.73	Mardia's test
10	Chile	9.06	3.00	0.40	102.50	79.44	1.57	
11	Estonia	9.18	2.44	0.34	99.03	79.49	1.38	for
12	Hungary	19.10	3.43	0.49	116.22	79.25	1.62	
13	India	25.06	3.48	0.49	132.86	79.24	1.71	multivariate
14	Indonesia	11.05	3.51	0.48	108.80	79.25	1.66	
15	Iran	5.93	3.49	0.49	83.04	79.25	1.78	normality
16	Israel	13.58	3.53	0.52	106.45	79.25	1.85	
17	Japan	9.60	3.54	0.73	102.73	79.08	2.19	Country
18	Kenya	47.77	4.69	0.70	183.93	79.06	1.90	
19	Nepal	13.28	3.84	0.55	104.81	79.31	1.79	Multivariate
20	Panama	18.63	3.72	0.67	115.45	79.12	1.89	
21	Poland	12.23	3.33	0.44	103.44	79.31	1.65	skewness
22	Portugal	11.40	3.75	0.61	100.21	79.19	1.75	
23	Puerto Rico	16.54	2.32	0.34	124.12	79.52	1.38	Multivariate
24	Romania	43.27	3.52	0.50	172.15	79.36	1.76	
25	Russia	8.05	3.85	0.69	101.90	79.22	1.80	kurtosis
26	S. Africa	12.33	3.82	0.59	108.91	79.28	1.77	
27	S. Korea	8.21	3.38	0.43	103.68	79.30	1.61	Sample M SD
28	Serbia	13.96	3.61	0.53	105.85	79.28	1.72	
29	Slovakia	19.75	3.45	0.49	113.64	79.25	1.81	statistic
30	Spain	14.23	3.63	0.50	106.72	79.28	1.72	
31	UK	7.78	2.18	0.41	103.59	79.47	1.51	Note. The
32	Vietnam	8.47	2.77	0.38	105.07	79.50	1.42	
33								statistics
34								
35								calculated by
36								
37								Mplus are
38								
39								based on Mardia, Kent, & Bibby (1979) definitions. All the sample statistics are significant at p < .001.
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								
50								
51								
52								
53								
54								
55								
56								
57								
58								
59								
60								
61								
62								
63								
64								
65								

based on Mardia, Kent, & Bibby (1979) definitions. All the sample statistics are significant at p < .001.

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8 Table

	PWI1	PWI2	PWI3	PWI4	PWI5	PWI6	PWI7	PWI8
1								
2								
3	PWI1							
4	Armenia	.67	.73	.72	.63	.63	.65	.58
5	Brazil	.68	.58	.73	.60	.59	.65	.63
6	Bulgaria	.69	.59	.71	.64	.63	.68	.61
7	Chile	.68	.52	.75	.68	.66	.63	.69
8	Estonia	.50	.48	.62	.53	.65	.59	.63
9	Hungaria	.61	.57	.49	.63	.70	.68	.57
10	India	.62	.54	.58	.61	.38	.63	.65
11	Indonesia	.78	.64	.74	.71	.74	.78	.75
12	Iran	.80	.45	.60	.55	.55	.56	.50
13	Israel	.61	.56	.69	.64	.66	.57	.66
14	Japan	.69	.55	.69	.62	.70	.68	.75
15	Kenya	.71	.72	.78	.68	.78	.80	.74
16	Nepal	.58	.51	.56	.52	.55	.51	.53
17	Panama	.81	.53	.86	.78	.78	.69	.77
18	Poland	.70	.54	.72	.68	.72	.67	.63
19	Portugal	.68	.56	.71	.60	.66	.60	.59
20	Puerto Rico	.75	.64	.75	.60	.67	.68	.68
21	Romania	.57	.60	.75	.87	.74	.70	.65
22	Russia	.76	.69	.76	.69	.73	.75	.67
23	S. Korea	.67	.52	.66	.72	.66	.75	.74
24	Serbia	.59	.58	.71	.71	.68	.67	.65
25	Slovakia	.59	.47	.64	.50	.58	.63	.60
26	South Africa	.53	.54	.64	.59	.55	.59	.65
27	Spain	.62	.53	.61	.59	.58	.56	.49
28	UK	.70	.61	.75	.62	.72	.72	.74
29	Vietnam	.60	.62	.71	.66	.71	.72	.74
30								
31								
32								
33								
34								
35								
36								
37								
38								
39								
40								
41	SI.4							
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								
50								
51								
52								
53								
54								
55								
56								
57								
58								
59								
60								
61								
62								
63								
64								
65								

Estimates of factor loadings based on partial scalar invariance model

Note. Non-invariant parameters are marked.

MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE OF THE PWI-8 Table

	PWI1	PWI2	PWI3	PWI4	PWI5	PWI6	PWI7	PWI8	
1									
2									
3	PWI1	PWI2	PWI3	PWI4	PWI5	PWI6	PWI7	PWI8	
4	Armenia	3.94	4.86	4.14	3.41	3.53	3.60	2.72	3.14
5	Brazil	4.27	4.10	4.20	3.73	2.94	3.48	2.89	3.26
6	Bulgaria	4.12	4.00	3.88	3.80	3.61	3.87	2.92	2.55
7	Chile	4.69	3.72	4.72	4.61	3.83	3.62	3.80	2.51
8	Estonia	3.91	4.23	4.44	4.22	5.34	4.36	3.94	4.75
9	Hungaria	4.11	4.28	5.19	4.14	4.74	4.27	2.84	3.76
10	India	3.94	3.61	2.97	3.81	3.85	3.57	3.28	3.61
11	Indonesia	4.40	4.05	3.44	3.70	4.00	4.15	3.37	3.22
12	Iran	3.79	3.69	3.70	3.75	3.28	3.31	2.50	2.44
13	Israel	4.29	4.44	4.44	4.43	4.42	2.99	3.70	3.53
14	Japan	4.09	3.66	3.28	3.63	3.97	3.79	3.36	2.65
15	Kenya	2.88	3.30	3.06	2.69	3.01	3.03	2.74	3.13
16	Nepal	3.97	3.89	3.48	3.85	3.58	3.28	2.85	3.75
17	Panama	4.01	4.59	3.88	3.51	3.42	2.59	3.00	3.13
18	Poland	4.64	3.81	4.11	4.15	4.63	3.97	3.39	2.77
19	Portugal	4.95	4.63	4.70	4.31	4.63	3.93	3.08	3.44
20	Puerto Rico	4.24	4.05	3.87	3.31	3.44	3.27	3.06	2.60
21	Romania	3.94	4.99	4.78	3.85	5.22	4.82	3.80	3.26
22	Russia	4.09	3.83	3.25	3.61	3.73	3.75	2.84	3.07
23	S. Korea	4.81	4.03	3.74	4.79	4.47	4.81	3.75	2.86
24	Serbia	2.66	3.97	3.59	4.25	3.60	3.45	2.83	2.85
25	Slovakia	4.80	4.13	4.39	3.77	4.52	4.80	3.45	4.13
26	South Africa	3.56	4.15	3.97	3.91	3.59	3.46	3.73	3.56
27	Spain	5.44	5.22	4.92	5.39	4.89	3.99	2.90	1.87
28	UK	4.83	4.40	4.38	3.94	4.82	4.16	3.94	2.94
29	Vietnam	3.92	4.53	3.92	4.25	4.43	4.43	4.17	3.49
30									
31									
32									
33									
34									
35									
36									
37									
38									
39									
40									
41	SI.5								
42									
43	<i>Intercepts based on partial scalar invariance model</i>								
44									
45									
46									
47									
48									
49									
50									
51									
52									
53									
54									
55									
56									
57									
58									
59									
60									
61									
62									
63									
64									
65									

Note. Non-invariant parameters are marked.