

## Relative income and its relationship with mental health in UK employees: a conceptual and methodological review.

Bethany Croak<sup>1,2</sup>, Laura E. Grover<sup>2</sup>, Simon Wessely<sup>2</sup>, Kalpa Kharicha<sup>3</sup>, Danielle Lamb<sup>4\*</sup> and Sharon A.M. Stevelink<sup>1,2\*</sup>

1. Department of Psychological Medicine, King's College London, London, UK
2. King's Centre for Military Health Research, King's College London, London, UK
3. Health & Social Care Workforce Research Unit, The Policy Institute, King's College London, London, UK
4. Department of Primary Care and Population Health, UCL, London, UK

\*Joint senior authors

Corresponding author: Bethany Croak ([bethany.croak@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:bethany.croak@kcl.ac.uk))  
Department of Psychological Medicine  
Room 3.16, Floor 3, Weston Education Centre  
King's College London, London, UK, SE5 8AB

### Competing Interest Statement

BC, LEG and DL have no competing interests.

SW is a non-executive director at NHS-England.

KK is the deputy director and part funded by the NIHR Policy Research Unit in Health and Social Care Workforce.

SAMS is supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR), Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and the National Institute for Health and Care Research NIHR Advanced Fellowship (Dr Sharon Stevelink NIHR300592).

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the ESRC, the NHS or the NIHR.

### Funding Statement

This work is part of a PhD nested within the NHS CHECK study and funded by the ESRC (ES/P000703/1).

This report is independent research supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research ARC North Thames. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Institute for Health and Care Research or the Department of Health and Social Care.

LEG is funded by the Armed Services Trauma Rehabilitation Outcome (ADVANCE) Charity. Key contributors to this charity are the Headley Court Charity (principal funder), HM Treasury (LIBOR Grant), Help for Heroes, Nuffield Trust for the Forces of the Crown, Forces in Mind Trust, National Lottery Community Fund, Blesma - The Limbless Veterans and the UK Ministry of Defence.

For the purposes of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Accepted Author Manuscript version arising from this submission.

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the expert group who kindly gave their time to review the protocol and for their constructive and helpful feedback on the conceptual framework. We would also like to thank Dr Eirini-Christina Saloniki for her guidance in interpreting the literature and support with the manuscript preparation.

## **Abstract**

The relative income hypothesis theorises that one's earnings relative to others exert a greater influence on subjective wellbeing than absolute income. Understanding the relationship between relative income and mental health could contribute to employee wellbeing. This review narratively synthesised the defining features and measurement of relative income, and its impact on mental health among UK employees. Systematic searches of qualitative and quantitative research evidence identified 13 studies. A conceptualisation of relative income revealed that an income comparison is either researcher-defined using averages or self-assessed based on a person's perception. Having a lower income than the reference group was commonly associated with diminished wellbeing, though moderating factors (gender, income inequality and composition of reference group) are discussed. Implications for practice and policy are considered amidst the UK's 'cost of living crisis' and ongoing pay disputes in various sectors.

## **Key words**

Employment, life satisfaction, mental health, pay, relative income

### **1. Background**

Can money buy happiness? This debate has long-fuelled dinner parties and academic discussions alike. A core catalyst of this debate was Easterlin's paper (Easterlin, 1974) and the subsequently coined phrase 'The Easterlin Paradox', describing the contrasting relationship between income and happiness on the individual and macro level. On an individual level, wellbeing was strongly positively associated with income rises. However, on a macro level, a country's income growth (often

measured by Gross Domestic Product (GDP)) over time did not correspond to rises in the average population levels of happiness.

Many have attempted to address this paradox, and a widely cited theory is the 'Relative Income Hypothesis' (Clark et al., 2008) states that an individual's attitude to saving and consumption is influenced more by their income in relation to others than by their actual income in its own right (Duesenberry, 1949). The application of this theory has been expanded beyond saving and consumption behaviour to utility (i.e. happiness, satisfaction, or pleasure) or what in the broader literature has come to be known as subjective wellbeing (SWB).

SWB captures a wide range of factors, including physical health, satisfaction with one's job and home life, personal safety, and mental health (What works wellbeing, n.d.). There is a strong socioeconomic gradient in SWB, such as physical health, as demonstrated by Marmot's seminal Whitehall Study (Marmot et al., 1991). Whilst many domains of satisfaction, such as job, family, and life satisfaction, have been the focus of relative income research, mental disorders specifically have been neglected somewhat in the literature. Poor mental health is the leading cause of disability worldwide (Vigo et al., 2016) and the relationship between poverty and mental health is well established; for example, those in the lowest 20% income bracket in Great Britain are two to three times more likely to develop mental health problems (Marmot et al., 2010). However, income and wealth are meaningful to all individuals, and not just to those in poverty. To our knowledge, no previous work has summarised the literature on relative income and its relationship with wellbeing and mental health in employed persons in the UK.

In addition to the burden poor mental health can put on health services and the economy, poor satisfaction with pay, working conditions and job security can have implications for industries and public services. In the UK, pay and income have become a particularly pertinent subject amid the 'cost of living crisis' (Harari et al., 2023) and ongoing industrial action across several sectors, such as the National Health Service (NHS) (Campbell, 2024) and rail companies (RMT Press Office, 2023). Policymakers and corporations tend to approach these negotiations through the lens of absolute pay with policies such as the National Living Wage (UK Government, 2024). However, unions and employees focus on pay changes over time and pay in relation to other employees and industries (Unison, 2024). Therefore, understanding relative income and its impact on wellbeing may help develop more informed policies such as pay deals for public sector workers and taxation thresholds.

This review aims to summarise the defining features of relative income in relation to mental health and how it is measured in the literature. In addition, it seeks to explore the relationship between relative income and mental health in those currently employed in work in the UK. Mental health is defined in this review to encapsulate mental disorders and subjective wellbeing (including life satisfaction).

## **2. Method**

### **2.1. Design**

This systematic review was conducted following Cochrane methodology and PRISMA guidelines (Supplementary file 1). Prior to commencing the review, the protocol was registered with PROSPERO ([CRD42023408657](https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-2389.158657)).

### **2.2. Search Strategy**

Nine electronic databases were searched in February 2023 and updated in March 2024: PubMed (including MEDLINE and PubMed Central), PsycINFO, Scopus, Web of Science, Global Health, JSTOR, Business Source Complete (EBSCO), ScienceDirect and Emerald. All databases were searched using pre-defined terms related to (1) relative income, (2) mental health, and (3) working populations. See Supplementary file 2 for the full search strategy. In addition, grey literature was searched using the OpenGrey database and key organisations' websites.

The search included all original, peer-reviewed work and high-quality grey literature that captured both or either: i) a conceptualisation or clear definition of relative income; and ii) an exploration of the relationship between relative income and mental health. Restrictions were placed on the population only to include studies of those in employment in the UK (referred to as UK employees) and those over 18 years of age. In the UK, individuals can be employed from 16 years old but by law they still need to be in training (apprenticeship) or education until they are 18 (Department for Education, 2024). As such, it was deemed appropriate to restrict the search to studies which included those over 18 years of age.

In addition, PROSPERO was searched to identify planned or ongoing systematic reviews and meta-analyses of relevance; no duplicate reviews were identified. Further, backwards and forwards citation checking of the included studies was used. An expert group was consulted to identify further literature, consisting of academics whose research focuses on pay and reward, employment, economics and health inequalities.

### **2.3. Study selection criteria**

#### Inclusion Criteria

- Original peer-reviewed research and grey literature limited to high-quality reports from recognised institutions (e.g. government reports), written in English.
- Contained either a conceptualisation or clear definition of relative income from which a succinct summary could be extracted or reported on the relationship between relative income and mental health.
- Presented a model or framework of relative income.
- Qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods studies. Quantitative studies could include both randomised trials and non-controlled observational studies, including cohort and case-control studies.
- Studies that focused on adults (aged 18+)

#### Exclusion criteria

- Studies conducted outside of the UK or written in a non-English language.
- Studies that did not include a full or partial sample of individuals in paid employment (e.g. pensioners, those receiving unemployment benefits).
- Studies that did not focus on adults (18+).
- Literature which was not available to access.
- Conference proceedings, case studies, editorials, systematic reviews, book chapters and PhD dissertations were excluded.

### **2.4. Screening and data extraction**

Following an initial search, all identified studies were captured in EndNote 20 (The EndNote Team, 2020), and duplicates were removed. BC independently reviewed the titles and abstracts of all studies. The full text of studies deemed relevant were then screened. A second reviewer (LEG) independently reviewed 10% of the search results at each screening stage to check for interrater reliability.

The reviewers (BC and LEG) independently decided which studies met the eligibility criteria to be included in the review and, at the full-text screening stage, noted any reasons for exclusion. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Interrater reliability was 94% at the title/abstract and 100% at the full-text screening stage.

The following data were extracted independently by BC for all included studies, where available: general information (e.g. title, lead author) and study characteristics (e.g. design, sample size). The definitions of relative income and how it was measured were summarised and informed the conceptualisation of relative income. There was a large amount of heterogeneity in the statistical analysis used for the relative income effect on mental health. The coefficients reported were not meaningful on their own as the marginal effects of regressors often needed to be interpreted (e.g. with a probit regression). In addition, this review included both quantitative and qualitative literature. Therefore, it was not considered appropriate to do a meta-analysis or report the coefficients in this review but to summarise the main conclusions (qualitative themes and regressor effects of relative income) of the literature using a narrative synthesis (Popay et al., 2006). Although coefficients are not reported, where more intuitive interpretations are provided by authors, such as percentage increases, these are reported.

### **2.5. Quality Assessment**

BC carried out a quality assessment of each included study using the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) checklist (National Heart, 2019) for quantitative studies and grey literature, and the CASP (Qualitative) Checklist (Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP), 2018) for qualitative studies. LEG carried out an independent quality assessment on 50% of the included studies, and any discrepancies were discussed until an agreement was reached. Studies were not excluded based on quality assessment results, but the assessment provided an understanding of the quality of research in the field.

## **3. Results**

Overall, 4506 studies were identified, of which 936 duplicates were removed (Figure 1). The PRISMA diagram includes the original search and the update. The title/abstracts of 3570 studies were screened, of which 199 were retained for full-text screening. Experts in the field identified no additional studies, nor the cross-referencing of included studies. A further paper was identified through a grey literature search. Overall, 13 studies met the inclusion criteria (Supplementary file 3) and are discussed in detail in this review.

---FIGURE 1 HERE----

### **3.1. Study characteristics**

Included studies had a range of study designs; the majority were longitudinal studies (n=6) (Becchetti et al., 2011, FitzRoy and Nolan, 2022, FitzRoy et al., 2014, Lorgelly and Lindley, 2008, Yu, 2019, Brown et al., 2015). Other designs included cross-sectional studies (n=4) (Becchetti et al., 2022,

Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004, Theodossiou and Zangelidis, 2009, Parker et al., 2011), a randomised controlled trial (n=1) (Fumagalli and Fumagalli, 2022), a qualitative study using focus groups (n=1) (Davidson et al., 2006) and grey literature (n=1) (Francis-Devine, 2022).

The studies often explored multiple exposures, such as income rank (person's position within an income distribution (Boyce et al., 2010)), income inequality (how unevenly income is distributed within a population), and relative income. Table 1 lists only the main exposure of interest: relative income. A more detailed summary of how this has been conceptualised and measured is provided below in section 3.3. Similarly, for the purpose of this paper, only the data source and designs relevant to the aim of the review are described in Table 1.

---TABLE 1 HERE----

### **3.2. Quality assessment**

Of the 13 studies included in the review, most studies received a quality assessment score of ‘good’ (n=8) (Becchetti et al., 2011, FitzRoy and Nolan, 2022, FitzRoy et al., 2014, Lorgelly and Lindley, 2008, Yu, 2019, Davidson et al., 2006, Francis-Devine, 2022, Brown et al., 2015) with some scoring fair (n=4) (Becchetti et al., 2022, Parker et al., 2011, Theodossiou and Zangelidis, 2009, Fumagalli and Fumagalli, 2022) and one paper scoring ‘poor’ (Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004). Common reasons for scoring ‘fair’ or ‘poor’ in the quality assessment included absence of a sample size justification or power calculation and, as many were cross-sectional, the exposure not being assessed prior to the outcome being measured.

### **3.3. Conceptualisation of Relative Income**

Relative income was broadly understood by all included studies to be one’s income in comparison to another individual or group’s income (known as the reference group).

Methods of measurement were divided into researcher-led and self-assessed. For the researcher-led methods, the most common way of calculating how someone compared was to use a binary measure of an individual being above or below the group mean income (FitzRoy et al., 2014, FitzRoy and Nolan, 2022, Lorgelly and Lindley, 2008). Socioeconomic status was used in one paper as a proxy for relative income; status increases as the individual outperforms the mean income achieved amongst their reference group (Parker et al., 2011). Similarly, ratio was used, for example, the ratio of the individual’s income to the region income per capita (Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004). The median was also used as a proxy, for example by the UK government, who defined relative low income as, “an individual is in relative low income (or relative poverty) if they are living in a household with income below 60% of median household income in that year” (Francis-Devine, 2022).

Self-assessed measurement was done by asking participants how they perceived their income in relation to the reference group. For example, one study asked participants the following question in a survey: “Compared to the financial situation of your neighbours/most of your friends/work colleagues, would you say your household is...” with responses on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “much better off” to “much worse off” (Yu, 2019). A second study used a similar approach and asked participants to self-assess their relative income status compared to “individuals of similar professional standing and characteristics” (Theodossiou and Zangelidis, 2009).



In addition, the current review identified qualitative descriptions of relative status. In the study by Davidson et al. (2006), reference groups in the context of socioeconomic status emerged, represented by a “language of division” with participants using terms such as “us” and “them” when discussing different socioeconomic classes. Individuals in this study appeared to identify with one class or group of people and had an awareness of where they were placed in social hierarchies. Examples such as buying a branded loaf of bread compared to a supermarket-own bread were used by participants to distinguish different wealth levels.

The various measurements of relative income as well as the reference groups used were synthesised and a conceptual framework on relative income was developed (Figure 2).

----FIGURE 2 HERE----

#### **3.4. Relationship between relative income and mental health, wellbeing and satisfaction**

The included studies reported a range of mental health and wellbeing measures (Table 1). The most widely used was life satisfaction (alone or in addition to another measure) (n=10) (Becchetti et al., 2022, Becchetti et al., 2011, Brown et al., 2015, FitzRoy and Nolan, 2022, FitzRoy et al., 2014, Fumagalli and Fumagalli, 2022, Yu, 2019, Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004). The most common way of evaluating life satisfaction was not by a validated measure but by using a single question in which individuals are asked to rate how satisfied they are with their life on a scale of 1-10, but this did vary slightly between studies (see Table 1). Other types of satisfaction were used as an outcome, including family satisfaction (n=1) (Parker et al., 2011), health satisfaction (n=1) (Fumagalli and Fumagalli, 2022), income satisfaction (n=1) (Fumagalli and Fumagalli, 2022) and satisfaction with the amount of leisure time (n=1) (Fumagalli and Fumagalli, 2022). Some studies (n=2) asked individuals to rate their own health (including mental health) (Lorgelly and Lindley, 2008, Theodossiou and Zangelidis, 2009). One study asked individuals to rate their happiness (Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004). One study (Brown et al., 2015) used a validated mental health measure, the general health questionnaire (GHQ-12), which is commonly used to examine psychological distress (Goldberg et al., 1988). Similarly, a UK government report included mental health as an outcome; this was from secondary data taken from the Family Resources Survey and HBAI dataset (2018/19) and Understanding Society (2014/15 – 2017/18), which used the GHQ-12 too (Francis-Devine, 2022).

Two main effects were described in the literature; the comparison effect whereby individuals compared themselves to others and, if they did not earn as much or perceived themselves to earn less than this was dissatisfactory (negative effect); and an information or aspirational effect (positive) in which individuals saw a higher income in the reference group as satisfactory, as they used the comparison income of the reference group to form expectations about their own future income (Senik, 2004). From this point onwards, these two effects are noted as negative and positive, respectively.

Of the studies that quantitatively assessed the relationship between relative income and satisfaction/mental health (n=12), six studies found a negative effect (if an individual's income was below that of the reference group, wellbeing decreased) (Becchetti et al., 2022, Becchetti et al., 2011, Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004, Francis-Devine, 2022, Theodossiou and Zangelidis, 2009, Yu, 2019). Five studies found mixed effects dependent on different factors (e.g. gender, reference group) (Brown et al., 2015, FitzRoy and Nolan, 2022, FitzRoy et al., 2014, Fumagalli and Fumagalli, 2022, Parker et al., 2011) and one study found no effect (Lorgelly and Lindley, 2008). The main conclusions and effect direction for the quantitative studies are summarised in Table 2, and the direction of effect and moderating factors are summarised in Figure 3.

Qualitative descriptions of emotions were reported by Davidson et al. (2006) when participants were prompted to think about their relative socioeconomic status and its importance. Beyond some feelings of guilt about their relative privilege, there seemed to be no psychological consequence for those in the higher socioeconomic status groups. Conversely, those from lower socioeconomic groups described strong emotive reactions when considering their relative socioeconomic status including feelings of being judged by others, shame, or embarrassment. They also felt unheard and ignored by national and local governments.

----TABLE 2 HERE-----

----FIGURE 3 HERE ----

#### 3.4.1. Income inequality

Income inequality is defined as the extent to which income is evenly distributed within a population (often measured by the Gini index). The literature described this as distinct to relative income and the two were listed as separate variables in analysis. However, income inequality was identified as a moderating variable in the relationship between relative income and mental health; Becchetti et al. (2022) found that negative relative income effects were stronger in areas where inequality was higher.

#### 3.4.2. Sub-groups

Some included studies looked at gender differences. In one study, women with income above the mean of their occupational class had a 53% increase in the probability of reporting themselves to be 'completely satisfied with family life', whereas no effect of relative income on family satisfaction was found in men (Parker et al., 2011). Relatedly, gender differences were tested in a randomised controlled trial (Fumagalli and Fumagalli, 2022). In a survey question, participants were randomly assigned to two conditions. Participants were prompted to evaluate their subjective wellbeing (measured as satisfaction with health, income, amount of leisure time and life overall) by comparing themselves with the same gender (treatment group) or to answer without reference to an explicit reference group (control). Increases in income and leisure satisfaction were found when women compared to women but no or little effect was found when comparing men in the treatment group to men in the control group. The authors interpret this as meaning women compare themselves to at least some men when unprompted and believe they are worse off than men. There was no difference in men's reported satisfaction when asked to compare themselves to other men or when the comparison group was not specified so the authors conclude men do not compare themselves to women. In addition, the authors also explored the impact of gender pay gaps; they found that this effect in women was larger for those who worked in industries which had larger gender pay gaps (Fumagalli and Fumagalli, 2022).

In addition to gender, studies also stratified by age group. FitzRoy et al. (2014) found a positive effect in those under 45 years old; they found that if the reference group had a higher income, they would have higher life satisfaction. FitzRoy and Nolan (2022) found a similar effect with an age split of 49 years. This is coined the "tunnel effect", first introduced by Hirschman and Rothschild (1973). They

suggested that observing other people's faster progression or higher income can be positive if one interprets this as a sign that they will also achieve this income or progression soon. They use the analogy of a tunnel: in a tunnel, a driver sees cars in the adjacent lane start to progress towards the exit while their lane is still immobile during a traffic jam.

### 3.4.3. Asymmetry

An asymmetrical effect was found in that self-perceived relative income has an impact on life satisfaction but the decline in life satisfaction is much more significant due to perceiving a lower relative income in comparison to the rise in life satisfaction because of perceiving a higher relative income (Yu, 2019).

### 3.4.4. Reference group

Various reference groups were used by studies (summarised in table 1). Due to the heterogeneity of relative income definitions and statistical analyses, comparison of results by reference group across studies was not possible. However, two studies conducted such a comparison within their own analyses. Brown et al. (2015) compared relative income effects when the reference group comprised of individuals with similar demographic characteristics such as age, education and gender and a spatial reference group which used the average income of those in your local authority district. They found negative relative income effects with the individual reference group and positive relative income effects with the spatial reference group (although these effects are less pronounced).

Yu (2019) found negative relative income effects across all types of reference group: friends, neighbours and work colleagues. However, of the reference groups, friends and neighbours appeared to have a larger impact. The magnitude of the coefficients when participants compared themselves to friends and neighbours were 0.5 points larger in absolute value than the coefficients found when comparisons were made to colleagues.

## 4. Discussion

This is a conceptual review of 'relative income' followed by a systematic review the relationship between relative income and mental health among UK employees. Although the literature on relative income and wellbeing is vast, a small number of studies focused on UK employees met our criteria to be included in this review. Fortunately, the review included literature was mostly of good quality.

### **Summary of findings in relation to previous literature**

Various definitions of relative income were used, but they broadly followed the same thread: it is the measure of one's income when compared to another person, or groups of individuals. This was either researcher-led (e.g. individuals divided based on whether they were below or above the mean income of the reference group) or self-assessed, where individuals were asked how they perceived their income in comparison to a reference group.

All but one study concluded that there was a relationship between relative income and mental health. This effect was frequently found to be negative (lower relative income compared to reference group was associated with poorer wellbeing). This aligns with a recent meta-review (Dougall et al., 2024) which found that lower subjective social status was associated with poorer mental health.

Income inequality at the regional or national level moderated the relationship between relative income (referred to in the paper in question as subjective social status) and life satisfaction (Becchetti et al., 2022), in that in areas with larger inequality, where individuals view themselves in terms of social status becomes more important and so relative status has a larger impact on life satisfaction in areas with high levels of income inequality. This is similar to findings by Schneider (2019). They argue that income inequality mediates the relationship between relative income and wellbeing in that income inequality lowers the self-perception of social status and, in turn, the overall wellbeing of individuals.

### **Suggestions for future research**

This review explored the relationship between relative income and mental health. Most of the included studies did not specify mental health disorders but used subjective wellbeing (SWB) measures such as life satisfaction. Primary research including validated mental health measures, namely the GHQ-12, were used in one study (Brown et al., 2015). Although validated measures would have been preferred, low life satisfaction has been correlated on an individual level with self-reported poor mental health (Lombardo et al., 2018) and on a population level, low life satisfaction has been correlated with increased suicide rates and psychiatric hospital admissions (Bray and Gunnell, 2006). Whilst direct measures would have been preferable, life satisfaction still provides a good insight into the relationship between relative income and mental health.

There was limited sub-analysis in the included studies. There were studies which provided a comparison between genders and age but none that stratified by occupational factors such as job

role or industry. Given that public sector workers appear to be more dissatisfied with their pay than those in the private sector (CIPD, 2023), understanding relative income effects in this industry may offer some insight into why that difference exists. Industry might also be important for the reference group, for example, Frijters et al. (2004) found that the higher the expected private sector wage relative to the NHS salary, the more likely nurses were to leave the NHS.

Similarly, whilst important moderating variables such as the reference group were identified, workplace conditions that might help mitigate low relative income were not explored. Pay does not exist in a vacuum and many factors make up workplace experience such as environment, working relationships and workload. Indeed, a systematic review of satisfaction, wages and retention within the NHS (Bimpong et al., 2020) found that higher pay would not compensate for other motivations to leave such as lack of recognition, discrimination and high workload.

Further qualitative work might help to map the effect of relative income and the interplay of these other factors that make up employee wellbeing. There was only one qualitative paper identified in the review (Davidson et al., 2006) so this is a methodological gap that is yet to be addressed.

### **Strengths and limitations**

A strength of this review was a rigorous search strategy, co-developed with a data librarian. Nine databases were searched using a broad search strategy outlined in an a priori PROSPERO approved review protocol. Additionally, a second, independent reviewer screened and assessed the quality of a proportion of the studies with high inter-rater reliability.

The review does have limitations. As with all systematic reviews, the findings of this review are subject to publication bias. This review did attempt to mitigate this by widening the search to grey literature so that not just peer-reviewed literature was included. However, even grey literature is subject to publication bias and was restricted to 'reputable sources'. Book chapters were excluded as they are often not freely available, but this could have widened the search given that book chapters are a popular output in the field of economics. Additionally, the studies included adjusted for a wide range of moderating variables, and these were included in the narrative synthesis, but it is possible that some were not considered to the same extent as others.

### **Implications for policy and practice**

The findings of this review have implications for policy and practice. Firstly, the way relative income is defined is pertinent. Except for self-assessed relative income, researchers used mean, median or ratio to split the sample into above/below the reference group income. Notably, the UK government uses median to define relative low pay (or deprivation) and subsequently this division is used to compare the outcomes of those in and out of poverty and develop policies to mitigate these outcomes (Francis-Devine, 2022). As determined in the review, the different measurements and reference group can result in differing effects on satisfaction, either a negative or positive effect (Brown et al., 2015). This demonstrates the importance of the measurement method and policymakers should consider the various methods of measuring relative poverty. These are should not be mutually exclusive, and collectively can help build a better picture about poverty, sentiments echoed by the Chair of the UK Statistics Authority (Rohan, 2020).

Income inequality was not the direct focus of this review but often featured in the multivariate analysis conducted by the included authors. It is clear from this review that income inequality is intrinsically linked to relative income. For instance, Becchetti et al. (2022) concluded that aspirational effects are only possible if individuals believe they live in a context of high social mobility. This is particularly relevant in the 'cost of living crisis' where the price of food, rent, mortgage and bills increases quicker than average income rises. Income inequality in the United Kingdom is already relatively large compared to other developed countries (The Equality Trust, 2022) and is expected to increase further to record levels (40.8% in 2027-28) (Brewer et al., 2023). This is partially due to rising interest rates which tend to benefit high earners as they likely have savings and investments which grow with high interest rates (Brewer et al., 2023). Governments are acutely aware of inflation and policies that successfully manage inflation and bring down living costs would also influence relative income effects identified in this review.

This review concluded that relative income effects exist and the most common direction was negative; where one's satisfaction is reduced if their peers earn more. In addition to thinking about how relative income is measured and defined, policies which aim to tackle these effects should consider barriers to social mobility also. This includes circumstances that prevent individuals from working, such as health and caring responsibilities. Social care in the UK is in a 'crisis' with long waiting lists and limited funding for services (The Health Foundation, 2024), and in England alone, there are 4.7 million unpaid carers. These systemic issues with social care have knock-on effects for other public services, such as the NHS (which is already experiencing significant wait times) and with

a 58% cut in government funding to social care reform (National Audit Office, 2023), these problems are likely to worsen.

## **Conclusions**

In conclusion, this review summarised the literature on relative income and mental health in UK employees and developed a conceptual framework for relative income. Relative income has an effect on mental health and this is most commonly, a negative effect for those who earn less than their reference group, particularly pertinent in a socio-political climate dominated by pay disputes and public sector retention challenges. We also highlighted important moderating factors that can influence this relationship such as gender, age and income inequality, emphasising the importance of policies which aim to close this wealth disparity and tackle poverty. Positive relative income effects identified in this review offer an opportunity for policymakers and private organisations alike to encourage social mobility and create fair and aspirational work environments. Further research is needed on the relationship between relative income and mental disorders, in addition to life satisfaction, to build on the wider wellbeing research. More qualitative research to understand whom individuals tend to compare themselves to and the other factors that play a part in employee wellbeing such as work conditions would be beneficial. This review, and future work, contributes to a field which can help to improve the experience and overall health of UK employees.

## **5. References**

- BECCHETTI, L., COLCERASA, F. & PISANI, F. 2022. When income differences hurt or excite: The nonlinear effect of regional inequality on subjective wellbeing. *Review of Income & Wealth*, 1.
- BECCHETTI, L., CORRADO, L. & ROSSETTI, F. 2011. The Heterogeneous Effects of Income Changes on Happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, 104, 387-406.
- BIMPONG, K., KHAN, A., SLIGHT, R., TOLLEY, C. & SLIGHT, S. 2020. Relationship between labour force satisfaction, wages and retention within the UK National Health Service: a systematic review of the literature. *BMJ Open*, 10, e034919.
- BLANCHFLOWER, D. G. & OSWALD, A. J. 2004. Well-being over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, 1359.
- BOYCE, C. J., BROWN, G. D. A. & MOORE, S. C. 2010. Money and Happiness: Rank of Income, Not Income, Affects Life Satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 21, 471-475.
- BRAY, I. & GUNNELL, D. 2006. Suicide rates, life satisfaction and happiness as markers for population mental health. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 41, 333-337.



- BREWER, M., FRY, E. & TRY, L. 2023. The Living Standards Outlook 2023. Resolution Foundation.
- BROWN, S., GRAY, D. & ROBERTS, J. 2015. The relative income hypothesis: A comparison of methods. *ECONOMICS LETTERS*, 130, 47-50.
- CAMPBELL, D. 2024. Tens of thousands face NHS cancellations as six-day strike begins in England. *The Guardian*.
- CIPD 2023. CIPD Good Work Index 2023. *Summary report and practical guidance*.
- CLARK, A. E., FRIJTERS, P. & SHIELDS, M. A. 2008. Relative income, happiness, and utility: An explanation for the Easterlin paradox and other puzzles. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 46, 95-144.
- CRITICAL APPRAISAL SKILLS PROGRAMME (CASP). 2018. *Qualitative Checklist* [Online]. Available: <https://casp-uk.net/checklists/casp-qualitative-studies-checklist-fillable.pdf> [Accessed December 06 2023].
- DAVIDSON, R., KITZINGER, J. & HUNT, K. 2006. The wealthy get healthy, the poor get poorly? Lay perceptions of health inequalities. *Social Science & Medicine*, 62, 2171-2182.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION 2024. Participation of young people in education, employment or training: Statutory guidance for local authorities.
- DOUGALL, I., VASILJEVIC, M., WRIGHT, J. D. & WEICK, M. 2024. How, when, and why is social class linked to mental health and wellbeing? A systematic meta-review. *Social Science & Medicine*, 343, 116542.
- DUESENBERY, J. S. 1949. *Income, Saving, and the Theory of Consumer Behavior*, Cambridge and London, Harvard University Press.
- EASTERLIN, R. A. 1974. Does Economic Growth Improve the Human Lot? Some Empirical Evidence. In: DAVID, P. A. & REDER, M. W. (eds.) *Nations and Households in Economic Growth*. Academic Press.
- FITZROY, F. R. & NOLAN, M. A. 2022. Income Status and Life Satisfaction. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 23, 233-256.
- FITZROY, F. R., NOLAN, M. A., STEINHARDT, M. F. & ULPH, D. 2014. Testing the tunnel effect: comparison, age and happiness in UK and German panels. *IZA Journal of European Labor Studies*, 3.
- FRANCIS-DEVINE, B. 2022. Poverty in the UK: statistics. House of Commons Library: House of Commons.
- FRIJTERS, P., HAIKEN-DENEW, J. P. & SHIELDS, M. 2004. Money Does Matter! Evidence from Increasing Real Income and Life Satisfaction in East Germany Following Reunification. *American Economic Review*, 94, 730-740.
- FUMAGALLI, E. & FUMAGALLI, L. 2022. Subjective well-being and the gender composition of the reference group: Evidence from a survey experiment. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 194, 196-219.
- GOLDBERG, D. P., WILLIAMS, P. & UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INSTITUTE OF, P. 1988. *A user's guide to the General Health Questionnaire*, NFER-NELSON.
- HARARI, D., FRANCIS-DEVINE, B., BOLTON, P. & KEEP, M. 2023. Rising cost of living in the UK. House of Commons Library.
- HIRSCHMAN, A. O. & ROTHCHILD, M. 1973. The Changing Tolerance for Income Inequality in the Course of Economic Development. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87, 544-566.

- LOMBARDO, P., JONES, W., WANG, L., SHEN, X. & GOLDNER, E. M. 2018. The fundamental association between mental health and life satisfaction: results from successive waves of a Canadian national survey. *BMC Public Health*, 18, 342.
- LORGELLY, P. K. & LINDLEY, J. 2008. What is the relationship between income inequality and health? Evidence from the BHPS. *Health Econ*, 17, 249-65.
- MARMOT, M., ALLEN, J., GOLDBLATT, P., BOYCE, T., MCNEISH, D., GRADY, M. & GEDDES, I. 2010. The Marmot Review. *Fair society, healthy lives: Strategic review of health inequalities in England post 2010*. London: Institute of Health Equity.
- NATIONAL AUDIT OFFICE 2023. Reforming adult social care in England.
- NATIONAL HEART, L., AND BLOOD INSTITUTE (NHLBI), 2019. Study Quality Assessment Tools.
- PARKER, L., WATSON, D. & WEBB, R. 2011. Family fortunes: Gender-based differences in the impact of employment and home characteristics on satisfaction levels. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 40, 259-264.
- POPAY, J., ROBERTS, H., SOWDEN, A., PETTICREW, M. & ARAI, L. 2006. Guidance on the Conduct of Narrative Synthesis in Systematic Reviews. The ESRC Methods Programme.
- RMT PRESS OFFICE. 2023. *Tube Workers to Take Strike Action Over Pay* [Online]. Available: <https://www.rmt.org.uk/news/tube-workers-to-take-strike-action-over-pay/> [Accessed 04 Jan 2024].
- ROHAN, E. 2020. The trouble with measuring poverty. Available from: <https://osr.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/blog/the-trouble-with-measuring-poverty/> [Accessed 22 Feb 2024].
- SCHNEIDER, S. M. 2019. Why Income Inequality Is Dissatisfying-Perceptions of Social Status and the Inequality-Satisfaction Link in Europe. *EUROPEAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW*, 35, 409-430.
- SENIK, C. 2004. When information dominates comparison: Learning from Russian subjective panel data. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, 2099-2123.
- THE ENDNOTE TEAM 2020. EndNote. Philadelphia, PA: Clarivate.
- THE EQUALITY TRUST. 2022. *The Scale of Economic Inequality in the UK* [Online]. Available: <https://equalitytrust.org.uk/scale-economic-inequality-uk> [Accessed Feb 23 2024].
- THEODOSSIOU, I. & ZANGELIDIS, A. 2009. The social gradient in health: The effect of absolute income and subjective social status assessment on the individual's health in Europe. *Economics & Human Biology*, 7, 229-237.
- UK GOVERNMENT. 2024. *National Minimum Wage and National Living Wage rates* [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/national-minimum-wage-rates> [Accessed 25 July 2024].
- UNISON. 2024. *NHS pay 2024* [Online]. Available: <https://www.unison.org.uk/at-work/health-care/big-issues/nhs-pay/> [Accessed July 25 2024].
- VIGO, D., THORNICROFT, G. & ATUN, R. 2016. Estimating the true global burden of mental illness. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 3, 171-178.
- WHAT WORKS WELLBEING. n.d. *What is wellbeing?* [Online]. Available: <https://whatworkswellbeing.org/about-wellbeing/what-is-wellbeing/> [Accessed 25 Jul 2024].
- YU, H. 2019. The Impact of Self-Perceived Relative Income on Life Satisfaction: Evidence from British Panel Data. *Southern Economic Journal*, 86, 726-745.

## **Author Biographies**

### **Bethany Croak**

Bethany Croak is a PhD student and researcher at the Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience at King's College London. Bethany worked in NHS mental health services before joining King's Centre for Military Health Research (KCMHR), King's College London, five years ago. Bethany has collaborated on various research projects focusing on the mental health of ex-Armed Forces personnel. Bethany's PhD focuses on the impact of COVID-19 on the mental health, well-being and occupational outcomes of lower-paid NHS staff. Bethany's research interests include occupational mental health and healthcare inequalities.

### **Laura E. Grover**

Laura is a PhD student working on the Armed Services Trauma Rehabilitation Outcome (ADVANCE) study at King's Centre for Military Health Research (KCMHR). She is researching social support and mental health in combat-exposed military personnel, with a focus on those who sustained a physical combat injury. Prior to joining KCMHR, Laura graduated from the University of Exeter with a BSc in Psychology in 2017 and in 2018 completed her MSc in Clinical Mental Health Sciences at University College London (UCL). She then worked as a research assistant investigating the psychiatric aspects of Parkinson's disease at the UCL Institute of Neurology.

### **Prof Sir Simon Wessely**

Simon Wessely is a psychiatrist and epidemiologist. He is the first ever Regius Chair to be appointed at KCL, and the first Regius Chair of Psychiatry in this country. He established the King's Centre for Military Health Research in 1996, and remains the Co-director, and since 2013 has been the Director of the PHE NIHR Health Protection Unit for Emergency Response and Preparedness. He is a Past President of the Royal College of Psychiatrists and the Royal Society of Medicine. Between 2017 -19 he led the Independent Review of the Mental Health Act.

### **Dr Kalpa Kharicha**

Kalpa has over 25 years' experience as a social science researcher, mostly gained at the Centre for Ageing Population Studies, Research Department of Primary Care & Population Health, UCL. Her main research interests include ageing and care across the trajectory of later life and in under-researched groups, wider determinants of health, well-being and inequalities, and loneliness and isolation across the life course and in different contexts. Most recently, she was Head of Research, Policy and Practice at the Campaign to End Loneliness, part of the What Works Centre for Wellbeing.

### **Dr Danielle Lamb**

Danielle's primary research area is occupational mental health. She also has an interest in acute mental health service research, and third wave psychological therapies including Acceptance and Commitment Therapy. After completing a BA and MA in Philosophy at the University of Leeds (1997-2002), she worked for several years supporting and carrying out pedagogical research of philosophy in UK higher education. She then completed an MSc in Psychology at the University of Glasgow (2011-2012), and joined UCL in 2012 for her PhD (passed in 2017). She is currently a member of the North Thames Applied Research Collaborative.

### **Dr Sharon Stevelink**

Dr Sharon Stevelink is a Reader in Epidemiology at the Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience at King's College London. She formally trained in Epidemiology at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Sharon joined King's College London in September 2012. Over the years, she has built up a comprehensive research portfolio exploring work and mental health. Sharon holds a NIHR Advanced Fellowship exploring the impact of the welfare system on mental health service users in the UK. In 2023, she was appointed by the Government as a scientific member of the Industrial Injuries Advisory Council.

Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart




Table 1. Characteristics of included studies (n=14)

Paper	Design	Data source	Year/waves	Total sample (n) or observations*	Exposure of interest	Reference Group (RG)	Outcome
Becchetti et al. (2011)	Longitudinal. Individuals are followed over 14 waves.	British Household Panel Survey (BHPS).	Waves 1-14: 1991-2005.	n = approximately 10000 (71228 observations).	1. Relative personal income (mean).  2. Relative job income (mean).	1. Peer groups based on gender, education, location and age cohorts. 2. Peer groups based on gender, age cohorts and working environment.	Life satisfaction: Participants are asked to evaluate their overall level of life satisfaction on a 1–7 scale.
Becchetti et al. (2022)	Repeated cross-sectional.  Cross-sectional data at the individual level over a period of seven waves. Individuals are not followed across different waves.	European Social Survey (ESS).	Waves 3-9: 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016 and 2018.	Observations = 165270.	Relative income (mean).	Regional sample population.	Life satisfaction: Participants are asked “How much are you satisfied with your life as a whole?”. The answers range from 0 (not satisfied at all) to 10 (really satisfied).
Blanchflower and Oswald (2004)	Repeated cross-sectional.  Cross-sectional data at the individual level for each year in	The Eurobarometer Survey.	1973-1998.	n = approximately 55000	Relative income (ratio).	Regional population.	Life satisfaction: Participants are asked “on the whole, are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or

	the time period. Individuals are not followed over time.						not at all satisfied with the life you lead?"
Brown et al. (2015)	Longitudinal. Unbalanced panel.	Understanding Society Study.	Waves 1-3: 2009-2013.	n = 40335 (99430 observations).	Relative Income (mean).	Test two reference groups:  1. RG was comprised of individuals with similar characteristics: age, education, and gender. 2. The RG is based on a spatial definition: the average in the local authority district.	Life satisfaction: "Please tick the number which you feel best describes how dissatisfied or satisfied you are with your life overall". Measured on a 7 point scale; 1 indicates "completely dissatisfied", 7 "completely satisfied".  General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) (Goldberg et al., 1988)
Davidson et al. (2006)	Qualitative focus groups	N/A	January 1999-February 2000.	n = 76.	"Do they consider relative socioeconomic status to be important, and do they compare themselves to, or feel judged by others?"	Not specified.	Qualitative descriptions.
FitzRoy and Nolan (2022)	Longitudinal – panel data	BHPS and Understanding Society Study	BHPS Waves 6-18: 1996-2009  BHPS harmonised with	n = 27262 (207907 observations).	Relative income rank.  Household income is used.	RGs based on similar characteristics: age, sex, education, region and survey wave.	Life satisfaction: exact question not specified.

			Understanding Society Study, Waves 2-7: 2010-2017				
FitzRoy et al. (2014)	Longitudinal – panel data	BHPS	Waves 6-10 and 12-18: 1996-2008.	n = 25681 (153189 observations).	Household income measures real household income, using the Consumer Prices Index as deflator. Comparison income measures the average real household income within a reference group.	RGs defined based on similar characteristics: age, sex, education and region.	Life satisfaction: Self-reported life-satisfaction is measured on a 7-point scale, 1 being the lowest value, while 7 is reported by individuals who are very satisfied with their life overall.
Francis-Devine (2022)	Report (grey literature).	Secondary data summarised – mental health information taken from Family Resources Survey and HBAI dataset (2018/19) and Understanding Society (2014/15 - 2017/18), SMC analysis.	Time period: 2014, 2018 and 2019.	N/A - Secondary data summarised.	Relative low pay: An individual is in relative low income (or relative poverty) if they are living in a household with income below 60% of median household income in that year.	UK population.	Mental health (validated self-report measure used: GHQ-12).
Fumagalli and Fumagalli (2022)	Randomised Controlled Trial.	Added two questions (treatment or control) to wave 5 of the Understanding Society Study.	Wave 5: 2012.	n = 1224 households.	How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with your (domain)?	Treatment Group: RG is same gender. Control group: No RG is specified.	Satisfaction with 4 domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Health</li> <li>▪ Household income</li> <li>▪ Amount of leisure time</li> </ul>

							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Life overall</li> </ul>
Lorgelly and Lindley (2008)	Longitudinal – panel data.	BHPS.	Waves 1-12: 1991–2002.	n = 8645.	Relative income - log of average income within each region.	Individuals in same region and survey year.	Self-rated health: Participants were asked “Compared to people of your own age, would you say that your health over the past 12 months has on the whole been excellent, good, fair, poor or very poor?”
Parker et al. (2011)	Cross-sectional.	British Social Attitudes (BSA) Surveys.	2004.	n = 1704.	Relative income – below or above mean of RG.	Similar occupational class (limited information on how this has been defined).	Family satisfaction: Participants were asked “All things considered, how satisfied are you with your family life”. Participants are given a choice of seven ordered responses, ranging from completely unsatisfied to completely satisfied.
Theodossiou and Zangelidis (2009)	Cross-sectional.	SOCIOLD research project.	2004.	Not stated.	Relative income status – self-assessed (no further details provided).	Individuals of similar professional standing.	Mobility score: participants were asked how difficult they found activities such as bathing and walking. Higher scores would reflect lower difficulty in mobility so better physical health.



							<p>Self-assessed health: Participants were asked to assess their own health on the whole over the last 12 months. Responses ranged from very bad (1) to very good (5).</p> <p>Mental health Participants were asked to comment on whether they have been feeling as if they are (a) enjoying the things they used to enjoy, (b) looking forward with enjoyment to things, (c) laughing and seeing the funny side of things, and (d) less irritable. Their answers ranged from much less than usual (1) to much more than usual (5).</p>
Yu (2019)	Longitudinal – panel data.	English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA).	Waves 2-5: 2004–2011.	Observations = 24502.	Self-perceived relative income: “Compared to the financial situation of your	Three RGs: Friends, colleagues, and neighbours.	Life satisfaction: Participants were asked to

					<p>Neighbours/ most of your friends/ work colleagues, would you say your household is....."</p> <p>Respondents may choose an answer among i) "much worse off," ii) "a bit worse off," iii) "about the same," iv) "better off," and v) "much better off."</p>		<p>report how much they agree or disagree with the following statement: "I am satisfied with my life." The choices included i) "strongly agree," ii) "agree," iii) "slightly agree," iv) "neither agree nor disagree," v) "slightly disagree," vi) "disagree," and vii) "strongly disagree."</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

\*For panel data, number of individuals per wave was not described. The n refers to the number of individuals included in the regression models and observations refers to the total sample size as opposed to individuals across the whole sample.

Figure 2. Conceptual framework of relative income




Table 2. Quantitative results for the relationship between relative income and mental health in UK employees.

Paper	Outcome	Main effect	Magnitude estimates
Becchetti et al. (2011)	Life satisfaction	Negative	The decrease of personal income with respect to that of the peers is related to significant decreases in life satisfaction.
Becchetti et al. (2022)	Life satisfaction	Negative	Negative relative income effects found and are relatively stronger when inequality is higher.
Blanchflower and Oswald (2004)	Life satisfaction	Negative	Individuals compare to the richest percentile and the closer they get to this, the happier they get.
Brown et al. (2015)	Life satisfaction and General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12)	Mixed	<p>The direction and significance of the relative income effect varies with reference group (RG) and estimation technique.</p> <p>For both life satisfaction and GHQ-12, when the RG is based on individual characteristics, significant negative relative income effects are apparent (if income is below the mean of the RG, life satisfaction and GHQ-12 values decrease) with the exception of the fixed effects estimates, where the effects are insignificant.</p> <p>When the RG is defined spatially, the estimated effects are all positive (happiness increases as RG income increases) but significance varies with estimation method.</p>
FitzRoy and Nolan (2022)	Life satisfaction	Mixed	<p>In aggregate data: lower income than the reference group is associated with lower satisfaction.</p> <p>In disaggregated data: positive relative income effects for under 45 year olds and negative relative income effects for over 45 year olds.</p>
FitzRoy et al. (2014)	Life satisfaction	Mixed	Positive relative income effects for under 49 year olds and negative relative income effects for over 49 year olds.
Francis-Devine (2022)	Mental health (secondary data, GHQ-12 used)	Negative	People in (absolute and relative) poverty are more likely to have poor physical and mental health, and low life and health satisfaction.

Fumagalli and Fumagalli (2022)	Satisfaction with 4 domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health</li> <li>Household income</li> <li>Amount of leisure time</li> <li>Life overall</li> </ul>	Mixed	When comparing themselves to other women on the four domains (listed in the second column), women report higher satisfaction.  No effects between treatment and control for men.
Lorgelly and Lindley (2008)	Self-rated health	None	No support for relative income hypothesis – relative income did not have an impact on health.
Parker et al. (2011)	Family satisfaction	Mixed	In men: “status” had no effect on family satisfaction.  In women: Women with income above the mean of their occupational class had a 53% increase in the probability of reporting they were ‘completely satisfied’ with their family life.  *status increases as the individual out-performs the income achieved amongst their reference group.
Theodossiou and Zangelidis (2009)	Self-reported mental and physical health	Negative	An increase in the subjective social status assessment by one standard deviation point improved the mobility score (a measure of how well individuals could do everyday tasks like bathing and walking; higher scores indicate better physical health) by 7.5%, the self-assessed health by 22.4% and mental health by 14.4%.
Yu (2019)	Life satisfaction	Negative	On average, individuals who perceive a bit lower or much lower income than their friends’ rate their life satisfaction 0.60 and 1.3 points lower, respectively.  The results show similar patterns when the reference groups are work colleagues and neighbours.  The magnitude of the coefficients of income comparison against friends and neighbours are larger than that when colleagues is the reference group. For example, the negative impact on people’s life satisfaction of perceiving much lower income than their friends’ is around 0.5 points larger in absolute value than that of perceiving much lower income than colleagues’.




Figure 3. Summary of review findings for the relationship between relative income and mental health

