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Mindsets to face adversity

1. **Stay focused.**
   - Executive functioning
2. **Keep your eyes on the prize.**
   - Self-regulation
3. **Look on the bright side.**
   - Maintenance of positive affect
4. **Lean on others.**
   - Social trust
5. **Believe in yourself.**
   - Perceived control
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Mindsets to face adversity

→ Addressing the behavioral dimension of poverty

1. *Stay focused.*
   • Executive functioning

2. *Keep your eyes on the prize.*
   • Self-regulation

3. *Look on the bright side.*
   • Maintenance of positive affect

4. *Lean on others.*
   • Social trust

5. *Believe in yourself.*
   • Perceived control
Socio-ecologies of poverty

Material & Social Adversity Shape Decision-making Processes
Outline

1. Executive functioning in socioecological context
2. Self-regulation in socioecological context
3. Positive affect in socioecological context
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6. Stepping back: Mindsets in ideological context
7. Intervening upstream through social solidarity
Stay focused.

1. Executive Functioning in Socioecological Context

Key empirical reference point: Mani et al., 2013; Shah et al., 2012.
1. a) Material adversity modulates executive functioning

• All participants fast for 12 hours
• Half eat breakfast
• Cognitive measures
  • Food v. non-food stimuli
    • Short-term memory task, words matched for length and frequency
    • Visual search task, images matched for visual complexity and familiarity

FOOD   EMOTION   NEUTRAL
chocolate  vacation  satellite
pizza    worry      candle
sandwich weakness  hallway
pie      win       toe
cookie  horror     basket

Sheehy-Skeffington, Price, Scott, & Pound, 2024
1. a) Material adversity modulates executive functioning

Mixed ANOVA $2_{\text{btwn}}$ (hungry v. sated) $\times 2_{\text{wthn}}$ (food v. nonfood): $F(1,198) = 3.98, p < .05, n_p^2 = .02$

Sheehy-Skeffington, Price, Scott, & Pound, 2024
1. a) Material adversity modulates executive functioning

Pooled arrays:
Stimulus type moderates the impact of hunger on visual search speed: $F(1,199) = 2.95$, $p = .088$.

Preferential processing of food items by array size:
- 16-item array: $t = 2.19$, $p = .03$
- 24-item array: $t = .15$, $p = .30$
- 36-item array: $t = .40$, $p = .69$
1. b) Social adversity modulates executive functioning
1. b) Social adversity modulates executive functioning

Status * Relevance interaction on working memory updating: F(1,300) = 3.042, p < .05

Status * Relevance interaction on concentration: F(1,120) = 7.45, p < .01

Low Relevance: executive functioning linked to brain function
High Relevance: executive functioning linked to later gains in SES
Keep your eyes on the prize.

2. Self Regulation in Socioecological Context

Key empirical reference points: Kidd et al., 2013; Ruggeri et al., 2022
2. a) Material adversity shifts self-regulation

Preregistered analyses of Understanding Society (UK Household Longitudinal Study), Wave 8, n = 21,892, of which 3,722 smokers. Replicates over time (Waves 5-11)

Indirect effect $b = -0.14$, 95% C.I (-0.24, -0.06)

Analyses hold controlling for:
- Sex
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Employment status
- Partner status

Indirect effect $b = 0.89$, 95% C.I (0.87, 0.91)
2. a) Material adversity shifts self-regulation

The predictive power of financial adversity is observable longitudinally, on whether (OR = 2.43, p < 0.01) and how much (b = 1.28, p < 0.11) one smokes, with some evidence of Granger causality:

Random Intercept Cross-Lag Panel Model of the relationship between Financial Adversity and Number of Cigarettes Smoked/Day, Among Smokers (n=96)
Look on the bright side.

3. Positive Affect in Socioecological Context

Key empirical reference point: Haushofer & Fehr, 2014
3. b) Social adversity induces negative affect through the shame of failing to meet expectations

\[ \beta = -0.223^{***} \]  
\[ \beta = -0.308^{***} \]  
\[ \beta = -0.162^{**} \]  
\[ \beta = -0.239^{***} \]  
\[ \beta = 0.168^{**} \]  
\[ \beta = 0.276^{***} \]  
\[ \beta = -0.129^{*} \]  
\[ \beta = 0.021 \text{ (ns)} \]  

Indirect ideal: \( \beta = -0.037^{*} \) 

Indirect ought: \( \beta = -0.085^{***} \) 

Indirect feared: \( \beta = -0.021 \text{ (ns)} \)
Lean on others.

4. Social Trust in Socioecological Context

Key empirical reference point: Jachimowicz et al., 2017
4. a) Material adversity modulates social trust

World Values Survey Wave 6, n = 89,565

**Radius of Trust** = \( \frac{(B_{\text{outgroup}} - B_{\text{ingroup}}) + 1}{2} \)

Delhey et al., 2011

**B** = .22, \( p < .001 \)*

*holds controlling for individualism, GINI

**Ingroup Trust Bias** = \( \frac{(\text{Mean}_{\text{ingroup}} - \text{Mean}_{\text{outgroup}}) + 1}{2} \)

**B** = -.002, \( p < .001 \)*

*holds controlling for community engagement, institutional confidence, gender, age
Socioeconomic Strain

- Scarcity
  - Material Resources
- Unpredictability
  - Social Resources

Socioecological Cues

Conscious Perceptions

Perceived Personal Control

Stay Focused

Keep your eyes on the Prize

Look on the Bright Side

Lean on Others
Believe in yourself.

5. Perceived Control in Socioecological Context

Key empirical reference point: Lachman & Weaver, 1998
Perceived Control

Self efficacy
= the extent to which one feels in control of one’s actions
≈ perceived competence

Response efficacy
= the extent to which one feels one’s actions have an impact on important outcomes
≈ perceived efficaciousness

If I made a plan, I would be certain I can make it work.
I feel that there is nothing that I can do well. (r)

What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me.
I have little control over the things that happen to me. (r)
Sheehy-Skeffington & Sidanius, 2016

5. a) Material adversity dampens perceived control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Efficacy</th>
<th>Sense of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.68***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All coefficients are unstandardized

Indirect effect $b = 0.37$, bias-corrected 95% CI: $0.22, 0.54$. * $p < .05$, *** $p < .0001$
5. b) Social adversity dampens perceived control

Please indicate your income:

___ Above $1m
___ Between $500 000 and $1m
___ Between $250 000 and $500 000
___ Between $100 000 and $250 000
___ Between $80 000 and $100 000
___ Less than $80 000
5. c) Perceived control mediates the link between material adversity and lowered self-regulation

Indirect effect via control: $b = -0.18$, 95% C.I (-0.27, -0.09)

Understanding Society (UK Household Longitudinal Study), Waves 5 and 8, $n = 3,722$ smokers
5. c) Perceived control mediates the link between social adversity and negative affect

\[ \beta = .349 *** \]

\[ \beta = .206 *** \]

\[ \beta = -.277 *** \]

\[ \beta = .206 *** \]

\[ \beta = -.277 *** \]

\[ \beta = .126 *** \]

\[ \beta = -.428 *** \]

\[ \beta = .653 *** \]

\[ \beta = .161 ** \]

\[ \beta = .223 *** \]

\[ \beta = -.223 *** \]

\[ \beta = -.223 *** \]

\[ \beta = -.223 *** \]

\[ \beta = -.223 *** \]

\[ \beta = -.223 *** \]

Cross-lag preregistered replication over 2 years, second wave n = 291
A psychological shift model of decision-making under socioeconomic strain (see Sheehy-Skeffington, 2019)

**Socioeconomic Strain**

- **Material Resources**
  - Scarcity
- **Social Resources**
  - Unpredictability

**Socioecological Cues**

- Scarcity
- Unpredictability

**Perceived Personal Control: Lower Response Efficacy**

**Conscious Perceptions**

- **Affective Calibration**
  - Negative affect
  - Anxiety
  - Shame
  - Anger
- **Cognitive Specialisation**
  - Reward tuning (prioritisation)
  - Stimulus tuning (ecologically-relevant content)
  - Process tuning (ecologically-relevant executive functions)
  - Concrete information-processing
- **Regulatory Shift**
  - Inhibition orientation
  - Proximal focus: Here, Now, Close, Actual

**Psychological Shifts**

- Public risk-taking
- Spending on status goods
- Coping-focused political behaviour
- Damaging financial decisions & academic performance
- Present-biased health & other decisions
- Private risk aversion

**Decisions & Behaviours**

- Present-biased health & other decisions
- Damaging financial decisions & academic performance
- Coping-focused political behaviour
- Spending on status goods
- Public risk-taking
7. Stepping back: Mindsets in ideological context
Market thinking: from economics to subjectivity

1. From the LSE to Mont Pélérin
   - Market as the method and discourse

2. Neoliberal governmentality as self-surveillance
   - Entrepreneurial self
   - Personal growth imperative
   - Affect management
   - Radical abstraction from context
     (see Adams et al., 2019; Ratner, 2019; Girard et al., 2021)
   - Market cognition in social relations
     (see Fiske, 1992; Sheehy-Skeffington & Thomsen, 2023; Zaki et al., 2021)
The Marketized Self Scale

20-item alpha = .80-0.87 (higher in representative samples)

1. Self-optimisation ($\alpha = .48-.67$)
   - “I try to maximise productivity by watching how I manage my time.”

2. Self-enhancement ($\alpha = .65-.74$)
   - “I want to keep re-inventing myself to stay on top of market trends.”

3. Affect regulation ($\alpha = .61-.71$)
   - “I try to spend more time thinking about positive things than negative things.”

4. Marketised social relations ($\alpha = .57-.64$)
   - “Investing in friends is like investing in anything: you need to think about whether the cost is worth the benefit.”

5. Self-accountability ($\alpha = .50-.68$)
   - “It is my duty, and my duty alone, to make the right choices in my life.”

Sheehy-Skeffington, Paiwand, & Baron, 2024

Quasi-representative UK samples, n = 559
National probability US samples, n = 2,848
Endorsing the Marketized Self predicts perfectionism and social media addiction over time

Linear regressions, panel data from two waves, $N = 171$, *$p < .05$, ***$p < .001$
Endorsing the Marketized Self may enhance the marginalization of those low in SES

Subjective SES*NLS Interaction:
\[ B = -0.14, t = -2.67, p = .008 \]

Subjective Social Class*NLS Interaction:
\[ B = 0.58, t = 3.56, p < .001 \]

Neoliberal Subjectivity
(95% CI)

Mean-1·SD
Mean
Mean+1·SD

Sheehy-Skeffington, Paiwand, & Baron, 2024
7. Intervening upstream through social solidarity
Welfare solidarity buffers the impact of poverty on perceived control, where it is well implemented.

World Values Survey, prioritizing the poor in social welfare schemes

UK, implementation & salience of the Energy price Guarantee

Cano & Sheehy-Skeffington, 2024
Welfare solidarity can take many forms

- Communal Sharing
- Equality Matching
- Authority Ranking
- Market Pricing

Sheehy-Skeffington & Thomsen, 2020, 2023; drawing on Fiske, 1991

Buzan, Madsen, & Sheehy-Skeffington, 2024
Each Month

1. Contribute 20% points to (shared) insurance pot

2. Choose to plant short corn (20 now) or tall corn (40 later)

3. 25% probability of experiencing a shock between 10 and 30 points

4. If shocked, insurance payout according to basic relational model

5. Threshold penalty (less than 80 short corn = 50 point deduction)

Welcome to Orchedia!
Each Month

1. Contribute 20% points to (shared) insurance pot

2. Choose to plant short corn (20 now) or tall corn (40 later)

3. 25% probability of experiencing a shock between 10 and 30 points

4. If shocked, insurance payout according to basic relational model

5. Threshold penalty (less than 80 short corn = 50 point deduction)
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Each Month

1. Contribute 20% points to (shared) insurance pot

2. Choose to plant short corn (20 now) or tall corn (40 later)

3. 25% probability of experiencing a shock between 10 and 30 points

4. If shocked, insurance payout according to basic relational model

5. Threshold penalty (less than 80 short corn = 50 point deduction)

Communal Sharing based on need (progressive social insurance)
- farther below threshold, great support; farther above threshold, lesser support
\[
\frac{\text{shared insurance pot}}{(\text{current round number} \times n \text{ players})} \times \text{threshold multiplier}
\]

Equality Matching based on equal share of the pot from this round (universal basic insurance)
- 1/4 of the total gained by the pot this round after being increased by the multiplier
\[
\frac{\text{personal insurance pot}}{\text{current round number}}
\]

Market Pricing based on previous contribution (proportional social insurance)
- average monthly contribution to a shared insurance pot, increased by multiplier
\[
\frac{\text{shared insurance pot}}{\text{current round number}} \times \text{player’s percent contribution to shared insurance pot}
\]

Personal Insurance based on previous contribution
- average monthly contribution to their personal insurance pot, increased by multiplier
\[i.e., \frac{\text{personal insurance pot}}{\text{current round number}}\]
Each Month

1. Contribute 20% points to (shared) insurance pot

2. Choose to plant short corn (20 now) or tall corn (40 later)

3. 25% probability of experiencing a shock between 10 and 30 points

4. If shocked, insurance payout according to basic relational model

5. Threshold penalty (less than 80 short corn = 50 point deduction)
Strong welfare solidarity increases the optimality of long-term choices in a temporal decision task

Agent-based model with NetLogo

Buzan, Madsen, & Sheehy-Skeffington, 2024
We as a group of farmers have control over how well we do in this game.

I feel a sense of community with the other farmers in Orchedia.

We as farmers depend on each other to do well in this game.

I feel I am in control of how well I do in this game.

I feel like the seed bank prioritizes protecting farmers in need.

I feel like the seed bank neglects those most in need.

Online multiplayer experimental game in UK, n = 351
Strong welfare solidarity increases optimal choices in a temporal decision task

Online multiplayer experimental game in UK, n = 351
Summary

• Decision-making in poverty should be viewed as responsive to socio-ecological context.

• Material and social adversity predict:
  • Selective executive functioning
  • Re-prioritized self-regulation
  • Selective trust
  • Lower perceived control
  • Lower positive affect

• The mindsets we prescribe have an ideological origin, and can go into overdrive in the form of the ‘marketized self’.

• Interventions that go beyond the individual, to engender strong social solidarity, can improve decision-making (and group outcomes).
Thank You!
4. a) Material adversity modulates social trust

Understanding Society (UK Household Longitudinal Study), Wave 8, n = 21,892

8-item (α = .89) Buckner Neighbourhood Cohesion, e.g.,
I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood.
I borrow things and exchange favours with my neighbours.
I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood.
I regularly stop and talk with people in my neighbourhood.

B = .04***

Analyses hold controlling for:
Sex
Age
Ethnicity
Employment status
Partner status

Buzan & Sheehy-Skeffington, 2024
5. c) Perceived control mediates the link between financial strain and aspirations

Complete Mediation

54% of the effect is mediated via sense of control
25% of the effect is mediated via family connections
Interventions should focus on the socio-ecological context

2. Systemic Understanding?
   - Critical stance to the social system can buffer the association between SES and shame

   Interaction $b = -0.133$, $SE = 0.044$, $p = .003$, $n = 672$

6 items ($\alpha = .89$) adapted from the General System Justification Scale (Kay and Jost, 2003), e.g.,

- **In general, you find society to be fair.**
- **UK society needs to be radically restructured.**
- **Everyone has a fair shot at wealth and happiness.**
- **UK society is set up so that people usually get what they deserve.**
## Parameter Setting

### Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial points</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution multiplier</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot multiplier</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice amount: small</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice amount: large</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock: probability</td>
<td>0.25 (r3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock: min</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock: max</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold penalty</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graphs

![Graph showing proportion sooner by pot multiplier and threshold penalty](image)

**Legend:**
- **Initial points:**
  - 10
  - 30
  - 50

**Multiplier Pot:**
- 1.05
- 1.1
- 1.5
- 2
- 3

**Multiplier initial points (mean):**
- 90
- 100
Multiplayer ‘Corn Farming’ Game

Sample

\( n = 351 \)

**Sex:** 50% Female, 48% Male

**Age:** mean 43, min 20, max 74, st. dev. 12

**Median Income** (OECD Adjusted Household): 1264 GBP / month

**Ethnicity:** 86% White

Subjective SES (MacArthur)
(1 = low, 10 = high)
Strong welfare solidarity increases optimal choices in a temporal decision task

Online multiplayer experimental game in UK, n = 264

Buzan, Madsen, & Sheehy-Skeffington, 2024

CS (base MP): $b = 0.19$, CI (0.09, 0.29), St. Error = 0.05, $p = 0.00$
‘Optimal’ Choice: Present Orientation

CS (base PI): \( b = 0.10 \), CI (0.03, 0.19), St. Error = 0.04, \( p = 0.01 \)

CS (base MP): \( b = 0.00 \), CI (-0.07, 0.08), St. Error = 0.09, \( p = 0.92 \)

CS (base PI): \( b = 0.10 \), CI (0.00, 0.19), St. Error = 0.05, \( p = 0.07 \)

CS (base MP): \( b = 0.19 \), CI (0.09, 0.29), St. Error = 0.05, \( p = 0.00 \)

n=351
‘Suboptimal’ Choice

CS (base PI): \( b = -0.03, \ CI (-0.12, 0.06), \ St. \ Error = 0.05, \ p = 0.46 \)
CS (base MP): \( b = -0.1, \ CI (-0.22, -0.05), \ St. \ Error = 0.05, \ p = 0.00 \)

CS (base PI): \( b = -0.05, \ CI (-0.10, 0.00), \ St. \ Error = 0.03, \ p = 0.06 \)
CS (base MP): \( b = 0.05, \ CI (0.00, 0.10), \ St. \ Error = 0.03, \ p = 0.05 \)

n=351
Mid-Round Survey

**Risk Perception** *(1=Extremely unlikely, 7 = Extremely likely, 4=Neutral)*
You will have erosion damage at the end of this month?
You would have had erosion damage, if you had chosen the OTHER option?

**Agency** *(1=Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree)*
Personal control: I feel I am in control of how well I do in this game.
Collective agency: We as a group of farmers have control over how well we do in this game.
Interdependence: We as farmers depend on each other to do well in this game.
Identity: I feel a sense of community with the other farmers in Orchedia.

**Solidarity:**
I feel like the seed bank prioritises protecting farmers in need.
I feel like the seed bank neglects those most in need.
Final Survey

Falk (2016) Time Discounting (0 = “completely unwilling to give up something today”, 10 = “very willing to give up something today”)
In comparison to others, are you a person who is generally willing to give up something today in order to benefit from that in the future or are you not willing to do so?

Falk (2016) Risk (0 = “completely unwilling to take risks”, 10 = “very willing to take risks”)
How do you see yourself: are you a person who is generally willing to take risks, or do you try to avoid taking risks?

Falk (2016) Trust (0 = “does not describe me at all”, 10 = “describes me perfectly”)
How well does the following statement describe you as a person? As long as I am not convinced otherwise, I assume that people have only the best intentions.

Sense of Control (1 = Disagree, 2 = 3 = Neutral, 5 = 6 = 7 = Agree)
I feel I am in control of how things are going in my life.
I feel a strong sense of agency over my life outcomes.
What happens to me in the future does not depend on me.

Zero Sum Mindset (1 = Disagree, 2 = 3 = Neutral, 5 = 6 = 7 = Agree)
Life is such that when one person gains, someone else has to lose.

Demographics
Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Average monthly personal income
Subjective financial situation
The Marketised Self Scale

20-item alpha = .80-.87 (higher in representative samples)

**Self-enhancement (α = .65-.74)**
1. I want to keep re-inventing myself in response to emerging market trends.
2. I am always seeking new opportunities and ways to get ahead.
3. The most important thing I could be doing is working on skills that help me advance my career.
4. I don’t mind if I fall behind in the race for career advancement. (r)

**Self-optimisation (α = .48-.67)**
1. It is important to me to keep track of how well I am doing in my leisure pursuits.
2. Every decision in life is best made by measuring precisely the costs and benefits involved.
3. I try to maximize productivity by watching how I manage my time.
4. I am turned off by the idea of measuring everything I do. (r)

Other potential items:
- It is important to maximize performance in all areas of life.
- I try to cut out unnecessary activities to make the most of every minute I have in the day.
- There is always something I can work on to improve how I function on a day-to-day basis.
- I don’t feel right unless I am busy, doing something productive.
- I compare how I’m doing over time to ensure I’m developing into my best self.
- I don’t think it is necessary to assign tasks to every hour of my day. (r)
The Marketised Self Scale

**Self-accountability \((\alpha = .50-.68)\)**
1. (Any demands I make on an employer should depend on what I have contributed to them.) The many choices I make every day show just how free I am.
2. If I've made a choice to do something, I only have myself to blame if it goes wrong.
3. It is my duty, and my duty alone, to make the right choices in my life.
4. It is not my responsibility to fit into whatever the economy needs. \((r)\)

**Affect regulation \((\alpha = .61-.71)\)**
1. I try to spend more time thinking about positive things than negative things.
2. I try to focus on what makes me happy rather than thinking about what makes me sad.
3. I like to maintain a positive attitude at all times.
4. I find it important to give time to thinking about negative and difficult things. \((r)\)

**Marketised social relations \((\alpha = .57-.64)\)**
1. When choosing a life partner, it's important to check if what they can offer is more than what they expect from me.
2. Investing in friends is like investing in anything: you need to think about whether the cost is worth the benefit.
3. I see helping colleagues or classmates as an investment for receiving help later.
4. I never count the help that I have given a friend. \((r)\)

Other potential items:
- I prefer to take the blame when things don't turn out well in my life.
- Nothing makes me feel more like my true self than being able to spend money as I please.
- My choices are never completely free. \((r)\)
- I don't want to make life choices by myself. \((r)\)

Other potential items:
- I would love to be told a number that represents how socially influential I am.
- I often look for ways to help people anonymously. \((r)\)
- I would accept an unbalanced friendship as long as I have the resources to help them out. \((r)\)
- The value of a relationship cannot be represented with a number. \((r)\)
- The only thing that matters in a friendship is to look after each other. \((r)\)

20-item alpha = .80-.87 (higher in representative samples)
### The Marketized Self Scale: Factor pattern matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>[Method Dimension]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subdimension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor pattern matrix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis (AR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to spend more time thinking about positive things than negative things.</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to focus on what makes me happy rather than thinking about what makes me sad.</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to maintain a positive attitude at all times.</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it important to give time to thinking about negative and difficult things.</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect Regulation (AR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to me to keep track of how well I am doing in my leisure pursuits.</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every decision in life is best made by measuring precisely the costs and benefits involved.</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-0.484</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to maximize productivity by watching how I manage my time.</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.653</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Optimization (SO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to keep re-inventing myself in response to emerging trends.</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always seeking new opportunities and ways to get ahead.</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most important thing I could be doing is working on skills that help me advance my career.</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Enhancement (SE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t mind if I fall behind in the race for career advancement.</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Accountability (SA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any demands I make on an employer should depend on what I have contributed to them.</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I've made a choice to do something, I only have myself to blame if it goes wrong.</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my duty, and my duty alone, to make the right choices in my life.</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not my responsibility to fit into whatever the economy needs.</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialized Self Rel. (SSR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see helping colleagues or classmates as an investment for receiving help later.</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.743</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in friends is like investing in anything: you need to think about whether the cost is worth the benefit.</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.718</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When choosing a life partner, it's important to check if what they can offer is more than what they expect from me.</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>-0.759</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never count the help that I have given a friend.</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.277</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Endorsing the Marketized Self predicts problematic self-appraisals & behaviour among young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independent Self-Construal</th>
<th>Narcissism</th>
<th>Machiavellianism</th>
<th>Perfectionism</th>
<th>Body Objectification</th>
<th>Social Media Addiction</th>
<th>Social Media Image Projection</th>
<th>Depression</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketized Self Scale (20-item)</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Enhancement</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Optimisation</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.2**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.168**</td>
<td>0.144*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Accountability</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect Regulation</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.39**</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketised Social Relations</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Endorsing the Marketized Self predicts pro-capitalist political attitudes & behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Political Participation</th>
<th>Political Engagement</th>
<th>Community Collective Action</th>
<th>Support for Disruptive Protest</th>
<th>Protest Crackdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 303, UK</td>
<td>n = 303, UK</td>
<td>n = 1,451, USA</td>
<td>n = 290, UAE W1</td>
<td>n = 290, UAE W1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Subjectivity</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>-0.07*</td>
<td>-0.34** -0.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Subjectivity</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Opposition to Anti-Racist Efforts</th>
<th>Neglecting Migrant Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 296, UAE</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal Subjectivity</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-White Bias</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Conservatism</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Endorsing the Marketized Self and political action

1. **Prolific Wave 1**, oversampling Generation Z, November 2021 (n = 303), 20-item MSS

   **Predicts political participation**: $r = -0.13^{**}$ (also political efficacy/interest, $r = -0.18^{**}$)

   “There are different ways of trying to improve things in a country or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, how many times have you done any of the following? Contacted a politician, government or local government official; Worked in a political party or action group; Worn or displayed a campaign badge/sticker; Signed a petition; Taken part in a lawful public demonstration; Boycotted certain products; Posted or shared anything about politics online, for example on blogs, via email or on social media”

2. **WeAreNYUAD survey**, Aug-Sept 2021 (n = 290), Aug-Sept 2022 (n = 233), 5-item MSS

   **Does not predict political activism**: $r = -0.03/-0.04$ (nor efficacy, $r = -0.007/.07$)

   “How much have you participated in political activism (for example, attending political meetings and demonstrations, voting, writing and signing petitions, sending letters to government officials, going door-to-door or telephoning for a cause, etc.)?”

   **Predicts support for right to disruptive protest**: $r = -0.34^{**}/-0.22^{**}$

   “Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements: Street protests should never be disruptive of other people's daily life; Sometimes it is justifiable for protesters to damage property.”

3. **Data for Progress Survey 1**, July-Aug 2022 (n = 1,451), 20-item MSS

   **Predicts taking part in collective action**: $r = -0.07^{*}$

   “In the past year, have you gotten together informally with or worked with others in your community or neighborhood to try to deal with some community issues or problems?”

4. **Data for Progress Survey 2**, Aug-Sept 2022 (n = 1,276), 20-item MSS

   **Predicts support for cracking down on protest**: $r = 0.17^{***}$ (not support for unions having more influence, $r = 0.04$)

   “Should the government crack down especially hard on protests that disrupt the operations of businesses?”