

Research Articles | Behavioral/Cognitive

Striatal and Behavioral Responses to Reward Vary by Socioeconomic Status in Adolescents

<https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1633-23.2023>

Received: 26 August 2023

Revised: 11 December 2023

Accepted: 13 December 2023

Copyright © 2024 the authors

This Early Release article has been peer reviewed and accepted, but has not been through the composition and copyediting processes. The final version may differ slightly in style or formatting and will contain links to any extended data.

Alerts: Sign up at www.jneurosci.org/alerts to receive customized email alerts when the fully formatted version of this article is published.

Striatal and Behavioral Responses to Reward Vary by Socioeconomic Status in Adolescents

Abbreviated title: Reward Responses Vary By Adolescent Socioeconomic Status

Alexandra L. Decker¹, Steven L. Meisler^{1,2,3}, Nicholas A. Hubbard⁴, Clemens C.C. Bauer^{1,2,5},
Julia Leonard⁶, Hannah Grotzinger⁷, Melissa A. Giebler⁸, Yesi Camacho Torres¹, Andrea Imhof⁹,
Rachel Romeo^{#10}, and John D. E. Gabrieli^{#1,2}

¹ McGovern Institute for Brain Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA

² Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA

³ Program in Speech and Hearing Bioscience and Technology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

⁴ Department of Psychology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE

⁵ Department of Psychology, Northeastern University, Boston, MA

⁶ Department of Psychology, Yale University, New Haven, CT

⁷ Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA

⁸ Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY

⁹ Department of Psychology, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR

¹⁰ Departments of Human Development & Quantitative Methodology and Hearing & Speech Sciences, and Program in Neuroscience & Cognitive Science, University of Maryland College Park, Baltimore, MD

22 # co-senior authors

23 Corresponding author: Alexandra Decker; alexandraleerdecker@gmail.com

24 Number of Pages: 39

25 Number of Figures: 6; Number of Tables: 0

26 Conflict of interest statement: the authors declare no competing interests

27 Competing interest statement: The authors declare no competing interests.

28

29 Key Words: Socioeconomic Status, Adolescence, Reward, Striatum, Decision-Making,

30 Response Time

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

Abstract

Disparities in socioeconomic status (SES) lead to unequal access to financial and social support. These disparities are believed to influence reward sensitivity, which in turn, are hypothesized to shape how individuals respond to and pursue rewarding experiences. However, surprisingly little is known about how SES shapes reward sensitivity in adolescence. Here we investigated how SES influenced adolescent responses to reward, both in behavior and the striatum—a brain region that is highly sensitive to reward. We examined responses to both immediate reward (tracked by phasic dopamine) and average reward rate fluctuations (tracked by tonic dopamine) as these distinct signals independently shape learning and motivation. Adolescents (n=114; 12-14 years; 58 female) performed a gambling task during functional magnetic resonance imaging. We manipulated trial-by-trial reward and loss outcomes, leading to fluctuations between periods of reward scarcity and abundance. We found that a higher reward rate hastened behavioral responses, and increased guess switching, consistent with the idea that reward abundance increases response vigor and exploration. Moreover, immediate reward reinforced previously rewarding decisions (win-stay, lose-switch) and slowed responses (post-reward pausing), particularly when rewards were scarce. Notably, lower-SES adolescents slowed down less after rare rewards than higher-SES adolescents. In the brain, striatal activations covaried with the average reward rate across time, and showed greater activations during rewarding blocks. However, these striatal effects were diminished in lower-SES adolescents. These findings show that the striatum tracks reward rate fluctuations, which shape decisions and motivation. Moreover, lower SES appears to attenuate reward-driven behavioral and brain responses.

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90

Significance statement

Lower socioeconomic status (SES) is associated with reduced access to resources and opportunities. Such disparities may shape reward sensitivity, which in turn, could influence how individuals respond to and pursue rewarding experiences. Here, we show that lower-SES adolescents display reduced reward sensitivity in the brain and behavior. The striatum—a brain region that is highly sensitive to reward—showed greater activations during periods of high reward and tracked fluctuations between reward-rich and reward-scarce task phases. However, lower SES correlated with smaller reward-driven striatal responses, and reduced response slowing after rare rewards. These findings link lower SES to reduced reward responses, which could trigger a cycle of reduced reward pursuit, leading to fewer positive experiences, which could further diminish reward sensitivity.

Introduction

Adolescents from lower socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds have less access to enriching opportunities and resources than their higher-SES peers (Farah, 2017). These disparities may influence reward sensitivity, which in turn, could shape how adolescents respond to or pursue rewarding experiences (Amir et al., 2018). Such a cycle could explain how SES—by modulating reward responses and related processes—is associated with many consequential developmental outcomes (Farah, 2017). Here, we examined how SES relates to reward-driven responses in behavior and the brain in adolescents, focusing on the striatum because of its high sensitivity to reward (Schultz, 1993).

Rewards powerfully influence motivation, learning, and decision-making. Immediately rewarding outcomes, signaled by fast phasic striatal responses, are thought to serve as a learning signal to maximize rewards (Day et al., 2007). Rewarding outcomes strongly reinforce

prior actions that led to rewards (Hamid et al., 2016) and induce “post-reward pausing” in behavior (Schlinger et al., 2008). Individuals are also sensitive to the overall amount of reward available in their environment. The average environmental reward rate (tracked by tonic dopamine and estimated from past reward history) influence moment-to-moment shifts in response time and exploration (Hamid et al., 2016; Niv et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2021). A high environmental reward rate boosts response speeding, in theory, by increasing the cost of time (slower responses forfeit more rewards) (Beierholm et al., 2013; Niv et al., 2006, 2007; Otto & Daw, 2019; Wang et al., 2013, 2021) and increases exploration, in theory, due to the high likelihood of attaining rewards in the environment (Constantino & Daw, 2015; Niv et al., 2007; Sukumar et al., 2021). Interestingly, these distinct reward signals also interact: reward scarcity heightens sensitivity to immediate reward, amplifying both phasic dopamine firing following rewards (Bayer & Glimcher, 2005; Hamid et al., 2016) and behavioral pausing after rewarding outcomes (Schlinger et al., 2008).

How SES influences responses to these distinct reward signals in adolescents in the brain and behavior remains unclear. Previous research suggests that lower SES may increase sensitivity to *immediate* reward, as lower-SES individuals tend to choose small immediate rewards over larger, delayed ones (Oshri et al., 2019). This is hypothesized to adaptively enable individuals to quickly seize scarce reward opportunities to meet basic needs (Frankenhuis et al., 2016; Frankenhuis & Nettle, 2020; Pepper & Nettle, 2017). Lower SES environments can also be less predictable (Evans, 2004), meaning past reward history may poorly predict future outcomes (Behrens et al., 2007; Ross & Hill, 2002). Based on this research, lower-SES adolescents may be highly responsive to *immediate* reward, but less responsive to past reward history, which could lead to contextually sub-optimal behavior.

This hypothesis, however, contrasts with two studies that found that lower SES in adolescents correlated with *reduced* responses to rewarding cues in the parietal (White et al., 2022) and frontal (Palacios-Barrios et al., 2021) cortices. Notably, however, both studies linked

lower-SES to poorer behavioral learning of cue-reward associations (Palacios-Barrios et al., 2021; statistical trend White et al., 2022), which may have altered expectations of reward when viewing reward-predicting cues. The present study therefore eliminated learning demands.

In the present study, we examined behavioral and striatal responses to reward and reward rate fluctuations in adolescents from diverse SES backgrounds. Adolescents performed a gambling task during functional magnetic resonance imaging in which they won or lost on each trial. Unbeknownst to participants, we manipulated trial outcomes, leading to alternating periods of reward scarcity and abundance. We examined how immediate reward and average reward rate fluctuations shaped vigor (response times or RTs) and choices differently by SES. We also examined SES-related differences in the influence of reward and average reward rate fluctuations on striatal responses. Our results support influential theories of decision that argue the striatum tracks average reward rate fluctuations, as well as theories that suggest that lower SES reduces behavioral and striatal reward sensitivity.

Methods

Participants

We recruited 127 adolescents from diverse SES backgrounds as part of a larger project examining the relationship between SES, brain development, and cognition. Eligible participants were in the 7th or 8th grade, proficient in English, had no MRI contraindications, were not diagnosed with autism or a neurological disability, and were not born premature (<34 weeks). Thirteen children did not complete the MRI, resulting in a sample of 114 adolescents (age range=12-14; mean (SD)=13.46 (0.68), $n=56$ female). Five participants with excessive movement during scanning (average framewise displacement (FD) of more than 0.6 mm) were retained only for behavioral analyses, leaving 109 for the neuroimaging analysis (*correlation between FD and SES* among the included participants: $\beta = 0.005$, $SE = 0.01$, $t(107) = 0.35$, $p = .730$, $r = 0.03$). Of note, the findings remained unchanged with a more conservative limit of movement (average FD of < 0.3mm). All children and their legal guardians provided assent and consent. The study was approved by the MIT Committee on the Use of Human Subjects. Participants received compensation for their time.

Before collecting data, we targeted a sample of at least 100 participants based on studies reporting medium-to-large effects (i.e., Cohen's d of 0.5-0.8) on the relationship between SES and cognitive performance (Finn et al., 2017; Leonard et al., 2019; Noble et al., 2007), brain structure (Decker, Duncan, et al., 2020; Romeo et al., 2018), and brain function (Finn et al., 2017). A sensitivity analysis revealed that our sample size provided 80% power to detect medium effects (d of 0.53 or Pearson's r of 0.25) in two-tailed between subject analyses.

Measure of socioeconomic status (SES)

Participants' caregivers reported their annual household income ($range=\$2k-\$1.25m$) and the number of years of schooling they had completed ($range=7-20$ years). Our primary measure of SES incorporated both these variables. We averaged the z-scores of the maternal

education, paternal education, and the z-score of the log-transformed income measures (*Figure 1A depicts the SES distribution*). The log transformation on income accounts for the greater impact that gains have for lower-SES individuals. Two participants were missing one of the three measures, so their SES index was the average of the two others.

Experimental Design

Participants performed a variant of Delgado et al.'s card guessing task (Delgado et al., 2000; Hubbard, Romeo, et al., 2020; Hubbard, Siless, et al., 2020); *Figure 1B*). On each trial, adolescents guessed if an upcoming number, with a possible value from 1-9, would be larger or smaller than 5. They then received immediate feedback based on the accuracy of their guess. Participants were told that accurate guesses would be financially rewarded as wins, and inaccurate guesses would be financially punished as losses, and that the sum of wins and losses would be calculated for an additional payment. Unbeknownst to participants, trial-by-trial gains and losses were predetermined, and fixed across trials, with numbers generated to match the predetermined outcome for each trial. Outcomes were therefore unrelated to participant guesses, which equalized uncertainty across participants, and ensured everyone had the same experience of winning and losing.

Each trial began with a question mark, during which participants had 1.5 seconds to register a guess (smaller than 5=index finger; larger than 5=middle finger; *Figure 1B*). A number was then displayed for 500ms, followed by 500ms of feedback. Feedback indicated whether participants had won or lost money, or neither won nor lost money. Positive feedback, which followed correct guesses, consisted of a green arrow pointing up and the text “+\$1”; negative feedback, which followed incorrect guesses, consisted of a red arrow pointing down and text displaying “-\$0.5”; neutral feedback, which followed the number 5, consisted of a light green

double-sided arrow. If participants did not register a guess, they received neutral feedback. This happened rarely (3.1 trials or 4.5% of trials on average per participant; relationship between missed responses and SES: $\beta = 0.27$, $SE = 0.29$, $t(114) = 0.95$, $p = .35$). Participants viewed a fixation cross for 1 second before a new trial began.

The task, in total, across both runs, consisted of 8 blocks of 8 trials each, with 4 blocks of mostly positive outcomes ('reward blocks') and 4 blocks of mostly negative outcomes ('loss blocks'). Each of the 2 runs contained 2 reward and 2 loss blocks and each block was approximately 28 seconds. This block design maximized the ability to detect striatal responses to reward, while also leading to alternating periods of monetary reward scarcity and abundance, allowing us to examine the influence of fluctuations in average reward rate across time (Figure 1D). To keep participants unaware of the fixed outcomes, there was no delay between blocks, and blocks contained a few trials of the opposite type (Figure 1C depicts trial outcomes in a representative reward and loss block). Reward blocks included 6 reward trials interleaved with two of either loss or neutral trials. Loss blocks included 6 loss trials interleaved with two of either reward or neutral trials. All participants received \$10 in bonus money after the task.

[insert figure 1]

Image acquisition

Participants practiced the gambling task and completed a mock scanning session to acclimate to the MRI environment, which improves compliance (de Bie et al., 2010; Gao et al., 2023). They then completed 2 runs of the gambling task inside the scanner and watched a movie while we acquired a T1-weighted (T1w) anatomical scan. Images were acquired using a 3T Siemens Prisma Fit scanner with a 32-channel head coil. Whole-brain functional BOLD

images were acquired using an EPI sequence (TR=0.8s, TE=37s, Flip Angle=52°, voxel size=2mm isotropic, multi-band factor=8). The two runs were acquired with reversed phase encoding to support distortion correction. High resolution T1w images were acquired with an MP-RAGE sequence (TR=2.4s, T₂=2.18ms, Flip Angle=8°, voxel size=0.8mm isotropic).

Image preprocessing

Preprocessing of anatomical and functional data was performed using *fMRIPrep* version 22.1.1 (Esteban et al., 2019).

Anatomical preprocessing

The anatomical T1w image was corrected for intensity non-uniformity with N4BiasFieldCorrection (Tustison et al., 2010) distributed with ANTs 2.3.3 (Avants et al., 2008) and used as T1w-reference throughout the workflow. The T1w-reference was then skull-stripped using ANTs workflow with OASIS30ANTs as target template. Brain tissue segmentation of gray-matter, white-matter, and cerebrospinal fluid was performed on the brain-extracted T1w using fast (FSL 6.0.5.1:57b01774, RRID:SCR_002823), (Zhang et al., 2001). Brain surfaces were reconstructed using recon-all from FreeSurfer version 7.2.0 (Dale et al., 1999), and the brain mask estimated previously was refined with a custom variation of the method to reconcile ANTs-derived and FreeSurfer-derived segmentations of subcortical gray matter including striatal subregions (Fischl et al., 2002). Volume-based spatial normalization to one standard space was performed through nonlinear registration, using brain-extracted versions of both the T1w reference and T1w template. *FSL's MNI ICBM 152 non-linear 6th Generation Asymmetric Average Brain Stereotaxic Registration Model* (Evans et al., 2012), RRID:SCR_002823; TemplateFlow ID: MNI152NLin6Asym] was selected for spatial normalization.

259

260 *Functional preprocessing*

261 A skull-stripped reference volume was generated using a custom methodology of
262 *fMRIPrep*. Head-motion parameters were estimated using *mcflirt* (FSL 6.0.5.1:57b01774,
263 (Jenkinson et al., 2002). The estimated fieldmap was aligned with rigid-body registration to the
264 target EPI reference run. Field coefficients were mapped onto the reference EPI using the rigid-
265 body transform. BOLD runs were slice-time corrected using *3dTshift* from *AFNI* (Cox & Hyde,
266 1997) RRID:SCR_005927). The BOLD reference images were co-registered to the T1w
267 reference using *bbregister* (*FreeSurfer*; (Greve & Fischl, 2009), with six degrees of freedom.
268 Noise regressors were estimated based on the preprocessed BOLD. Framewise displacement
269 (FD) was computed using two formulations following Power (Power et al., 2014), and Jenkinson
270 (Jenkinson et al., 2002). Physiological regressors were extracted from eroded cerebrospinal
271 fluid and white-matter volumes for use in subsequent, component-based noise corrections
272 (*CompCor*, Behzadi et al. 2007). The BOLD time-series were resampled into standard space in
273 a single interpolation step by composing all the pertinent transformations (i.e., head-motion
274 transform matrices, susceptibility distortion correction, and co-registrations to anatomical and
275 output spaces). Volumetric resamplings were performed using ANTs, configured with Lanczos
276 interpolation to minimize the smoothing effects of other kernels (Lanczos 1964).

277

278 **Statistical analyses**

279 Statistical analyses were conducted in R (version 4.2.2). Raw data, code, and extended
280 analyses and supplementary tables are available at the following link: <https://osf.io/pqtbty/>.
281 Unless stated otherwise, linear mixed effects regressions or general linear mixed effects
282 regressions were employed for data that repeated within participants (e.g., single-trial RTs).

Mixed effects models included random intercepts for each participant and random slopes for fixed effects that repeated within participants. In case of non-converging models, we followed recommendations in (Brown, 2021), iterating through the following until they converged: (1) using the "bobyqa" optimizer, (2) increasing the number of iterations, (3) forcing zero correlations among random effects, and (4) dropping random effects based on model comparison. RTs that fell 3 absolute deviations from an individual's median RT were excluded ($n=2$ on average per participant). Measures were mean centered within or across participants or effect-coded prior to model fitting.

Calculating trial-by-trial shifts in the moving average reward rate

We computed an exponentially weighted moving average (EWMA) of rewards and losses across trials (\$1, \$0.5, or \$0; See *Figure 1C-D* for a schematic). Each trial was assigned a value based on the recent reward and loss history. High values indicated more gains than losses, whereas low values indicated more losses than gains. We used an exponentially weighted (rather than simple) moving average to emphasize recent time points, which have a larger impact on psychological state, while still incorporating data points from farther in the past (Awtheda & Schwartz, 2016). We used the following update rule:

$$EWMA_t = \alpha \times r_t + (1 - \alpha) \times EWMA_{t-1}$$

In this formula, the $EWMA_t$ represents the EWMA at the current trial, t , α is the smoothing factor or learning rate parameter that determines the influence of the most recent observation on the moving average, and r represents the reward on the current trial, t . To prevent disproportionate

initial weighting and to ensure the average reward rate stabilized, the first 3 trials were omitted from the EWMA measure. To balance recent and historical data, α was based on an 8-period span, calculated as: $\alpha = 2/(N+1)$, where N was set to 8 to match the number of trials in each fixed reward and loss block. However, we found that using EWMA's derived from smoothing factors of 5- and 10-period spans did not alter the pattern of results.

As an exploratory analysis, we also tested whether individual differences in optimal learning rates for the average reward rate variable differed by SES. To do so, we fit a model that estimated the learning rate as a free parameter for each participant using R's base *optim* function with the L-BFGS-B algorithm. The algorithm identified the learning rate per participant that minimized that residual sum of squares (RSS) in a model predicting subsequent RTs from the Exponentially Weighted Moving Average of Reward for each participant.

Characterizing behavioral responses to rewards

We examined how immediate feedback (win versus loss outcomes) and fluctuations in the average reward rate shaped RTs and guesses. We first fit a model predicting RTs from the preceding trial's feedback (win, loss), the moving average of reward, and their interaction. We then re-fit this model after adding SES as a covariate and interaction term. We also examined the influence of immediate reward and average reward rate fluctuations on choices—specifically, how likely an individual was to repeat their prior guess or switch to a different guess (i.e., switched or stayed). Therefore, the dependent variable was whether an individual had repeated their prior choice (switched = 1; stayed = 0) and the independent variables were the preceding trial feedback (win, loss), the moving average of reward, and their interaction. We re-fit this model after adding SES as a covariate and interaction term. All models included trial number as a covariate to control for the general effects on time on task. Since there were only 8 neutral

trials per participant across the task, trials that followed neutral feedback were excluded from analysis.

The relationship between SES and striatal volumes

Three linear mixed effects models were fit to examine the association between SES and ROI volumes, separately for the caudate, putamen, and nucleus accumbens. Each model predicted volume from SES, hemisphere, and their interaction, to determine whether the influence of SES was stronger for one particular hemisphere. Age, sex, and intracranial volume were also included as covariates. ROIs with volumes that fell > 3 absolute deviations from the sample median were excluded (all regions for 1 participant, the caudate and right nucleus accumbens for another).

Examining reward-driven striatal responses to reward and average reward rate fluctuations across time

To ascertain if striatal activations during reward differed from loss blocks and to examine their covariance with average reward rate fluctuations, we conducted neuroimaging analyses with Nilearn. The scripts and data are publicly accessible (<https://osf.io/pqtby/>). The approach involved two separate general linear models (GLMs) applied to participant data within MNI coordinate space. The first model had distinct regressors for reward and loss conditions. The second model incorporated a regressor for the exponentially weighted moving average of reward, resampled at the fMRI's TR. Both models were convolved with SPM's hemodynamic response function and controlled for head movement and noise components (3 translation and rotation parameters, plus top 5 principal ACompCor components (defined in a combined white matter and cerebrospinal fluid mask)). This analysis yielded z-value effect size maps for each

subject. The maps were entered into a group-level analysis to identify striatal voxels that were sensitive to the distinct reward versus loss blocks or to the average reward rate. Sensitivity was defined by voxel significance within the anatomical striatal mask from the Harvard-Oxford Atlas (FDR-corrected $p < 0.05$, minimum cluster size of 10). For each analysis, we calculated the mean z value per participant across responsive voxels, separately for the caudate, putamen, and nucleus accumbens in each hemisphere. Participants therefore had 6 z values (1 per ROI) for each analysis. These values represented the average effect size for the differences in activations between reward and loss blocks and the relationship with the average reward rate.

To assess the degree to which these effect sizes deviated from zero, we fit 2 intercept-only linear mixed-effects models, predicting mean z values per ROI, controlling for age and sex, with random intercepts per participant to account for repeated measures across hemispheres. We excluded outlier values that fell 3 absolute deviations from the sample's median (1 value for the left putamen and 1 for the left caudate). Including outliers did not change the pattern of results.

Examining how reward-driven striatal responses differ by SES

Finally, we tested how SES related to activation level differences between reward and loss blocks, as well as the degree to which striatal activations covaried with fluctuations in the average reward rate. To this end, we fit 2 linear mixed effects models. The dependent variables were z values reflecting, either, activation level differences for reward and loss blocks or the covariance between striatal activations and average reward rate fluctuations. Both models included SES, hemisphere, and their interaction as independent variables, and covariates for age and sex.

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

Results

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

Average reward rate fluctuations influence RTs and post-reward pausing

394

395

396

397

398

Adolescents responded more slowly after winning than losing (i.e., post-reward pausing: $\beta = 0.02$, $SE = 0.005$, $t(262) = 4.68$, $p < .001$; Figure 2A). Furthermore, trial-by-trial RTs covaried with fluctuations in the average reward rate, such that a higher average reward rate led to faster RTs ($\beta = -0.04$, $SE = 0.02$, $t(98) = -2.32$, $p = .022$). Fluctuations in the average reward rate also interacted with immediate feedback to shape RTs: periods of reward scarcity amplified

post-reward pausing (*Reward Rate x Preceding feedback*: $\beta = -0.05$, $SE = 0.02$, $t(104) = -3.53$, $p < .001$, *Figure 2B*), indicating responses to immediate reward were amplified by a history of low rewards. In fact, post-reward pausing was only observed when rewards were scarce but not when they were plentiful (*effect of preceding feedback when the reward rate is centered at -1SD below the mean*: $\beta = 0.04$, $SE = 0.007$, $t(100) = 6.23$, $p < .001$; *above the mean*: $\beta = 0.003$, $SE = 0.008$, $t(104) = 0.43$, $p = .665$). These findings show that adolescents tracked fluctuations in the average reward rate, which shaped response times across time and modulated sensitivity and responses to immediate reward.

[insert figure 2]

Average reward rate fluctuations influence guess switching

Immediate feedback reinforced decisions on subsequent trials: when adolescents won, they were more likely to repeat their prior guess on the subsequent trial than if they had lost ($\beta = -0.31$, $SE = 0.04$, $z = -7.31$, $p < .001$; *Figure 2C*). A lower average reward rate also increased the likelihood of repeating a previously rewarded guess (i.e., increased win-stay, lose-switch effects (*Reward Rate x Preceding Feedback*: $\beta = 0.57$, $SE = 0.12$, $z = 4.73$, $p < .001$; *Figure 2D*). Indeed, win-stay effects were most prominent when the average reward rate was low, indicating a history of low rewards increased the tendency to stick with a rare rewarding option (*main effect of immediate feedback on choices when the average reward rate is centered at -1SD below the mean*: $\beta = -0.51$, $SE = 0.05$, $z = -9.64$, $p < .001$; *above the mean*: $\beta = -0.11$, $SE = 0.06$, $z = -1.75$, $p = .080$). In general, a history of high rewards (a higher average reward rate) also increased the likelihood of switching guesses across trials ($\beta = 0.68$, $SE = 0.15$, $z = 4.46$, $p < .001$), suggesting a greater tendency to make alternative exploratory decisions when rewards

were abundant. These findings suggest that a history of low reward increases the tendency to stick with a previously rewarding option, and reduces the tendency to explore alternatives for reward.

Reward rate fluctuations influence post-reward pausing more in higher-SES adolescents

Immediate reward and average reward rate fluctuations influenced choices similarly regardless of SES (*SES x feedback*: $\beta = 0.09$, $SE = 0.05$, $z = 1.73$, $p = .084$; *SES x average reward rate*: $\beta = -0.25$, $SE = 0.18$, $z = -1.40$, $p = .161$; *SES x feedback type x moving average*: $\beta = 0.18$, $SE = 0.15$, $z = 1.21$, $p = .225$; *Figure 3A*). Additionally, these distinct temporal dimensions of reward influenced RTs similarly, regardless of SES (*SES x feedback*: $\beta = -0.002$, $SE = 0.005$, $t(109) = -0.45$, $p = .651$; *SES x average reward rate*: $\beta = 0.02$, $SE = 0.02$, $t(100) = 1.04$, $p = .301$; *Figure 3A*).

However, reward-rate fluctuations modulated post-reward pausing more in higher- than lower-SES adolescents (*SES x feedback type x moving average*: $\beta = -0.04$, $SE = 0.02$, $t(105) = -2.54$, $p = .013$; *Figure 3B*). That is, higher-SES adolescents slowed more following rare rewards (main effect of SES when the reward rate is *centered at -1SD below the mean to reflect reward scarcity*: $\beta = 0.02$, $SE = 0.007$, $t(684) = 2.20$, $p = .028$; *Figure 3B*). When rewards were plentiful, higher-SES adolescents slowed less following rewards than lower-SES adolescents (*centered at +1SD above the mean to reflect reward abundance*: $\beta = -0.02$, $SE = 0.008$, $t(4949) = -2.05$, $p = .041$; *Figure 3B*) though neither group showed significant evidence of post-reward pausing when rewards were plentiful ($ps > 0.087$). Interestingly, SES was unrelated to individual differences in optimal learning rates ($\beta = 0.06$, $SE = 0.04$, $t(114) = 1.32$, $p = .189$), suggesting that heightened post-reward pausing was not driven by a greater tendency to update expectations in response to new information. These findings suggest that adolescents from

lower-SES backgrounds were less likely to adapt responses to immediate reward based on average reward rate fluctuations. Analyses reported in our extended analyses on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/9vhtw>) demonstrate these results are robust when using education and income to separately characterize SES.

[insert figure 3]

Lower SES correlates with smaller caudate volumes

Higher SES was associated with larger caudate volumes ($\beta = 96.61$, $SE = 37.65$, $t(103) = 2.57$, $p = .012$; *Figure 4*). In contrast, there were no significant associations between SES and the volumes of the putamen ($\beta = 32.78$, $SE = 49.74$, $t(103) = 0.66$, $p = .511$) or nucleus accumbens ($\beta = 1.94$, $SE = 7.26$, $t(104) = 0.27$, $p = .790$). Moreover, there were no SES x hemisphere interactions in any ROI (*all ps* > 0.590), demonstrating that SES-related differences in volumes did not differ by hemisphere.

[insert figure 4]

The striatum tracks fluctuations in the average reward rate

Across adolescents, mean activations were larger during reward than loss blocks in the caudate ($\beta = 0.50$, $SE = 0.07$, $t(106) = 6.74$, $p < .001$), putamen ($\beta = 0.61$, $SE = 0.08$, $t(106) = 7.83$, $p < .001$), and nucleus accumbens ($\beta = 0.77$, $SE = 0.08$, $t(107) = 9.87$, $p < .001$; *Figure 5A*). Furthermore, striatal activations covaried with the average reward rate, such that a higher

average reward rate led to greater activations in the caudate ($\beta = 0.77$, $SE = 0.08$, $t(105) = 9.60$, $p < .001$), putamen ($\beta = 0.66$, $SE = 0.07$, $t(105) = 8.94$, $p < .001$), and nucleus accumbens ($\beta = 1.32$, $SE = 0.09$, $t(103) = 14.07$, $p < .001$; Figure 5B). These findings show that the striatum not only responds more to reward than loss in general, but tracks moment-by-moment shifts in the average reward rate across time.

[insert figure 5]

Lower SES correlates with reduced striatal responses to reward

Lower SES correlated with smaller activation level differences between reward and loss blocks in the caudate ($\beta = 0.22$, $SE = 0.09$, $t(105) = 2.54$, $p = .013$) and putamen ($\beta = 0.25$, $SE = 0.09$, $t(104) = 2.73$, $p = .007$) and marginally in the nucleus accumbens (marginal effect: $\beta = 0.16$, $SE = 0.09$, $t(106) = 1.79$, $p = .077$; Figure 6A). None of these effects differed by hemisphere ($SES \times hemisphere$: all $ps > 0.29$). Furthermore, striatal activations covaried with average reward rate fluctuations more strongly in higher-SES adolescents in the putamen ($\beta = 0.17$, $SE = 0.09$, $t(104) = 2.02$, $p = .046$; Figure 6B), but not the caudate ($\beta = 0.08$, $SE = 0.10$, $t(104) = 0.88$, $p = .380$) or nucleus accumbens ($\beta = 0.02$, $SE = 0.11$, $t(101) = 0.18$, $p = .860$). None of these effects differed by hemisphere ($SES \times hemisphere$: all $ps > 0.21$). Of note, the relationship between SES and reward-driven activations also did not differ by striatal subregion ($SES \times subregion$ interaction: all $ps > 0.10$).

[insert figure 6]

Discussion

We asked how socioeconomic status in adolescence was related to reward-driven responses in the brain and behavior. Drawing on influential models of decision-making (Constantino & Daw, 2015; Niv et al., 2006, 2007), we examined how choices, response times, and striatal activations were shaped by immediate reward outcomes and previous reward history (average reward rate fluctuations across time). We found that, behaviorally, participants were more likely to repeat a guess if it had led to a win (win-stay, lose-switch effects) and responded more slowly after receiving a reward (post-reward pausing). Fluctuations in the average reward rate also shaped behavior: a higher reward rate hastened RTs and increased guess switching. Moreover, a low reward rate increased behavioral sensitivity to immediately rewarding outcomes, augmenting win-stay, lose-switch effects and post-reward pausing. Notably, compared to higher-SES adolescents, lower-SES adolescents exhibited reduced post-reward pausing when rewards were scarce. We also observed that across participants, striatal activations were larger during reward than loss blocks, and covaried with fluctuations in the average reward rate across time. However, relative to higher-SES adolescents, lower-SES adolescents displayed reduced activations during reward relative to loss blocks in the caudate and putamen, and marginally in the nucleus accumbens. And, putamen activations tracked average reward rate fluctuations less in lower-SES adolescents. These findings show that the striatum tracks average reward rate fluctuations, which shape choices and response times (Hamid et al., 2016; Niv et al., 2006, 2007; Wang et al., 2013, 2021). They also link lower SES in adolescence to reduced reward sensitivity, both in the brain and behavior.

We found that adolescents tracked fluctuations in the average reward rate across time, which influenced decisions and response times. When rewards were abundant, individuals were more likely to switch choices across trials. These findings align with studies in human adults (Constantino & Daw, 2015; Niv et al., 2007; Sukumar et al., 2021) and support theories of decision making (Constantino & Daw, 2015; Sukumar et al., 2021). These theories argue that when the average environmental reward rate is *lower* than an option's perceived value, it is

rational to ‘stay’ with a rewarding option due to the limited prospects of finding rewards elsewhere. Conversely, when the environmental reward rate is *higher* than the perceived value of an option, it makes sense to switch to explore alternative sources of reward. It is possible, then, that adolescents used the average reward rate as a threshold for whether to switch or stay with a previous choice. Future research could examine how the tendency to track average reward rate fluctuations develops—and whether adolescents—given their heightened sensitivity to reward (Cohen et al., 2010; Davidow et al., 2016; Galvan, 2010; Galvan et al., 2006) might be even more attuned to fluctuations in the average reward rate across time than adults.

A higher average reward rate also covaried with faster RTs. This finding is consistent with research in human adults (Beierholm et al., 2013; Otto & Daw, 2019) and supports theories arguing that fluctuations in the average reward rate shape the cost time (Niv et al., 2006, 2007). That is, when rewards are abundant, action delays are presumably more costly because one forfeits relatively more potential rewards, incentivizing faster responses. Interestingly, other researchers have theorized that rewards also govern the opportunity cost engaging effort and sustaining attention (Esterman et al., 2016; Esterman & Rothlein, 2019; Kurzban et al., 2013; Lin et al., 2022; Massar et al., 2016; Otto & Daw, 2019) raising the possibility that average reward rate fluctuations shape diverse aspects of cognition—such as fluctuations in attention (Decker et al., 2023, 2022; Decker & Duncan, 2020). Our findings therefore not only support theories linking reward rate fluctuations to motivation and decision-making and extend these ideas to human adolescents, but raise questions about the influence of reward rate fluctuations on other aspects of cognition.

Adolescents were also responsive to immediately rewarding outcomes, in line with previous research (Hamid et al., 2016; Reynolds et al., 2001): they were most likely to repeat a previous choice if it had led to a reward on the prior trial and responded more slowly after a reward outcome, a phenomenon known as “post-reward pausing” (Crossman, 1968; Felton &

Lyon, 1966; McMillan, 1971; Schlinger et al., 2008; Wallace & Mulder, 1973; Williams et al., 2011). Notably, these effects were amplified by a lower average reward rate. Our finding adds to a growing body of research suggesting the background average reward rate modulates sensitivity to immediate reward. Indeed, in animals and humans, post-reward pausing is prolonged when rewards are scarce (Schlenger et al., 2008). Furthermore, fewer recent rewards and lower tonic dopamine amplify phasic dopamine firing (Hamid et al., 2016)—a finding that potentially provides a neurobiological explanation for the increased rewards responsivity we observed here when reward were scarce. Slower responses after unexpected reward could also reflect surprise due to the infrequency of the event (Decker, Finn, et al., 2020) or heightened response caution that facilitated more deliberate decision-making (Schlenger et al., 2008, p. 50). Altogether, this finding shows that average reward rate fluctuations influenced responses to immediate outcomes, which shaped choices and RTs. When adolescents tune into the average environmental reward rate, they may make more adaptive decisions according to the overall rewards available in the environment.

We also observed that the extent of RT slowing after rare rewards varied by SES. Adolescents from higher-SES backgrounds showed greater post-reward pausing than lower-SES adolescents when rewards were scarce. This finding could reflect greater attunement to reward rate fluctuations among higher-SES adolescents, which would be expected to increase the saliency of receiving a rare reward when the reward rate was low. However, exploratory analyses showed that SES did not correlate with learning rates—the tendency to update the average reward rate in response to new outcomes. Thus, greater post-reward pausing may instead reflect a greater responsivity to rewards in reward-scarce contexts specifically, rather than a general tendency to more readily update the average reward rate.

Interestingly, reward rate fluctuations covaried with striatal activations in the caudate, putamen and nucleus accumbens, such that a higher reward rate led to greater activations in

these regions. These findings are consistent with animals studies showing that tonic dopamine fluctuations in the striatum track the average reward rate and in doing so shapes motivational vigor and decision-making (Hamid et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2013, 2021), and, as far as we know, is the first human fMRI study demonstrating this relationship.

Our results extend prior findings linking lower SES to diminished reward sensitivity in *neocortical* regions like the anterior cingulate cortex (Palacios-Barrios et al., 2021) and parietal cortex (White et al., 2022). Indeed, we observed that the extent of reward-driven activations in the striatum differed by SES. Higher-SES adolescents showed greater reward-driven activations than lower-SES adolescents in the putamen, caudate, and marginally in the nucleus accumbens. Moreover, putamen activations tracked average reward rate fluctuations less in lower-SES adolescents. Notably, prior studies employed incremental learning tasks in which adolescents learned the value of cues in predicting outcomes over time. Our focus on a reward task that did *not* involve learnable cue-outcome contingencies broadens the literature by showing that reduced reward sensitivity is even observed when eliminating learning demands.

Our findings support proposals that lower SES environments reduce reward sensitivity (Seligman, 1972). Past literature suggests that chronic stress diminishes the belief that actions have consequences rendering individuals less motivated to pursue rewarding outcomes (Seligman, 1972). It is therefore possible that chronic stress and reduced perceived control, which are more common among lower-SES individuals (Farah, 2018; Hackman et al., 2010; Hackman & Farah, 2009; McLaughlin et al., 2014) mediated the effects we observed here. Targeted research that employs direct measures of stress could directly test this mechanism.

The present findings offer insights into why cognitive performance (Noble et al., 2007) and emotional well-being (Reiss, 2013) are often reduced in lower SES adolescents. Reward

sensitivity plays a vital role in many aspects of cognition, influencing everything from the ability to learn important associations (Davidow et al., 2016) to the ability to remain attentive to important events (Esterman & Rothlein, 2019; Shenhav et al., 2013). Rewards boost motivation (Frömer et al., 2021; Schultz, 1993; Westbrook et al., 2021; Westbrook & Braver, 2016), and support success in short and long-term endeavors, such as academic and workplace pursuits. Disparities in reward sensitivity, therefore, may contribute to disparities in learning, attentional performance, and motivation. Given the intimate link between reward sensitivity and emotional well-being, reduced reward sensitivity may contribute to the higher rates of depression (Auerbach et al., 2022; Reiss, 2013) and lower life satisfaction observed in lower-SES groups (Kahneman & Deaton, 2010). On a broader level, these insights stress the importance of socioeconomic policies (Farah, 2018) aimed at reducing the burdens of poverty to foster cognitive and emotional well-being in society.

Data availability statement: Code and data can be found at the following link: <https://osf.io/pqgtby/>

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: A.D., N.A.H., R.R., C.C.C.B., J.L., J.D.E.G.; Data curation: A.D., S.L.M., A.I., M.A.G., H.G., Y.C.T., R.R.; Formal analysis: A.D.; Funding Acquisition: J.D.E.G.; Investigation: Y.C.T., A.I., M.A.G., H.G., R.R.; Methodology: A.D., C.C.C.B.; Project Administration: N.A.H., A.I., M.A.G., H.G., Y.C.T., R.R.; Resources: J.D.E.G.; Software: A.D., S.L.M., C.C.C.B.; Supervision: J.D.E.G.; Visualization: A.D.; Writing – Original Draft: A.D.; Writing – Review and Editing: all authors

Acknowledgements: We thank Hause Lin and Kenneth Harris for providing feedback on the neuroimaging analyses. This research was supported by the William and Flora Hewlett

Foundation (#4429 [J. D. E. G.]) and a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of
Canada Postdoctoral Fellowship [A.L.D.]

References

- Amir, D., Jordan, M. R., & Rand, D. G. (2018). An uncertainty management perspective on
long-run impacts of adversity: The influence of childhood socioeconomic status on risk,
time, and social preferences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 79, 217–226.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2018.07.014>
- Auerbach, R. P., Pagliaccio, D., Hubbard, N. A., Frosch, I., Kremens, R., Cosby, E., Jones, R.,
Siless, V., Lo, N., Henin, A., Hofmann, S. G., Gabrieli, J. D. E., Yendiki, A., Whitfield-

637 Gabrieli, S., & Pizzagalli, D. A. (2022). Reward-Related Neural Circuitry in Depressed
638 and Anxious Adolescents: A Human Connectome Project. *Journal of the American*
639 *Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 61(2), 308–320.
640 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2021.04.014>

641 Avants, B. B., Epstein, C. L., Grossman, M., & Gee, J. C. (2008). Symmetric diffeomorphic
642 image registration with cross-correlation: Evaluating automated labeling of elderly and
643 neurodegenerative brain. *Medical Image Analysis*, 12(1), 26–41.
644 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2007.06.004>

645 Awheda, M. D., & Schwartz, H. M. (2016). Exponential moving average based multiagent
646 reinforcement learning algorithms. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 45(3), 299–332.
647 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-015-9447-5>

648 Bayer, H. M., & Glimcher, P. W. (2005). Midbrain Dopamine Neurons Encode a Quantitative
649 Reward Prediction Error Signal. *Neuron*, 47(1), 129–141.
650 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2005.05.020>

651 Behrens, T. E. J., Woolrich, M. W., Walton, M. E., & Rushworth, M. F. S. (2007). Learning the
652 value of information in an uncertain world. *Nature Neuroscience*, 10(9), Article 9.
653 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1954>

654 Beierholm, U., Guitart-Masip, M., Economides, M., Chowdhury, R., Düzel, E., Dolan, R., &
655 Dayan, P. (2013). Dopamine Modulates Reward-Related Vigor.
656 *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 38(8), 1495–1503. <https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2013.48>

657 Brown, V. A. (2021). An Introduction to Linear Mixed-Effects Modeling in R. *Advances in*
658 *Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 4(1), 2515245920960351.
659 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245920960351>

- Cohen, J. R., Asarnow, R. F., Sabb, F. W., Bilder, R. M., Bookheimer, S. Y., Knowlton, B. J., & Poldrack, R. A. (2010). A unique adolescent response to reward prediction errors. *Nature Neuroscience*, 13(6), 669–671. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2558>
- Constantino, S., & Daw, N. D. (2015). Learning the opportunity cost of time in a patch-foraging task. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 15(4), 837–853. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-015-0350-y>
- Cox, R. W., & Hyde, J. S. (1997). Software tools for analysis and visualization of fMRI data. *NMR in Biomedicine*, 10(4–5), 171–178. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1492\(199706/08\)10:4/5<171::AID-NBM453>3.0.CO;2-L](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1492(199706/08)10:4/5<171::AID-NBM453>3.0.CO;2-L)
- Crossman, E. K. (1968). Pause relationships in multiple and chained fixed-ratio schedules. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 11(2), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jeab.1968.11-117>
- Dale, A. M., Fischl, B., & Sereno, M. I. (1999). Cortical surface-based analysis. I. Segmentation and surface reconstruction. *NeuroImage*, 9(2), 179–194. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1998.0395>
- Davidow, J. Y., Foerde, K., Galván, A., & Shohamy, D. (2016). An Upside to Reward Sensitivity: The Hippocampus Supports Enhanced Reinforcement Learning in Adolescence. *Neuron*, 92(1), 93–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.08.031>
- Day, J. J., Roitman, M. F., Wightman, R. M., & Carelli, R. M. (2007). Associative learning mediates dynamic shifts in dopamine signaling in the nucleus accumbens. *Nature Neuroscience*, 10(8), 1020–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1923>
- de Bie, H. M. A., Boersma, M., Wattjes, M. P., Adriaanse, S., Vermeulen, R. J., Oostrom, K. J., Huisman, J., Veltman, D. J., & Delemarre-Van de Waal, H. A. (2010). Preparing children

with a mock scanner training protocol results in high quality structural and functional MRI scans. *European Journal of Pediatrics*, 169(9), 1079–1085.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00431-010-1181-z>

Decker, A., Dubois, M., Duncan, K., & Finn, A. S. (2022). Pay attention and you might miss it: Greater learning during attentional lapses. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*.
<https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-022-02226-6>

Decker, A., & Duncan, K. (2020). Acetylcholine and the complex interdependence of memory and attention. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 32, 21–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.01.013>

Decker, A., Finn, A., & Duncan, K. (2020). Errors lead to transient impairments in memory formation. *Cognition*, 204, 104338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2020.104338>

Decker, Duncan, K., & Finn, A. S. (2023). Fluctuations in Sustained Attention Explain Moment-to-Moment Shifts in Children’s Memory Formation. *Psychological Science*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976231206767>

Decker, Duncan, K., Finn, A. S., & Mabbott, D. J. (2020). Children’s family income is associated with cognitive function and volume of anterior not posterior hippocampus. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17854-6>

Delgado, M. R., Nystrom, L. E., Fissell, C., Noll, D. C., & Fiez, J. A. (2000). Tracking the hemodynamic responses to reward and punishment in the striatum. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 84(6), 3072–3077. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.2000.84.6.3072>

Esteban, O., Markiewicz, C. J., Blair, R. W., Moodie, C. A., Isik, A. I., Erramuzpe, A., Kent, J. D., Goncalves, M., DuPre, E., Snyder, M., Oya, H., Ghosh, S. S., Wright, J., Durnez, J., Poldrack, R. A., & Gorgolewski, K. J. (2019). fMRIPrep: A robust preprocessing pipeline

for functional MRI. *Nature Methods*, 16(1), 111–116. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-018-0235-4>

Esterman, M., Grosso, M., Liu, G., Mitko, A., Morris, R., & DeGutis, J. (2016). Anticipation of Monetary Reward Can Attenuate the Vigilance Decrement. *PloS One*, 11(7), e0159741. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159741>

Esterman, M., & Rothlein, D. (2019). Models of sustained attention. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 29, 174–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.03.005>

Evans. (2004). The environment of childhood poverty. *The American Psychologist*, 59(2), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.77>

Evans, Janke, Collins, & Baillet. (2012). Brain templates and atlases. *NeuroImage*, 62(2), 911–922. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.01.024>

Farah, M. J. (2017). The Neuroscience of Socioeconomic Status: Correlates, Causes, and Consequences. *Neuron*, 96(1), 56–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.08.034>

Farah, M. J. (2018). Socioeconomic status and the brain: Prospects for neuroscience-informed policy. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 19(7), 428. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-018-0023-2>

Felton, M., & Lyon, D. O. (1966). The Post-Reinforcement Pause¹. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 9(2), 131–134. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jeab.1966.9-131>

Finn, A. S., Minas, J. E., Leonard, J. A., Mackey, A. P., Salvatore, J., Goetz, C., West, M. R., Gabrieli, C. F. O., & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2017). Functional brain organization of working memory in adolescents varies in relation to family income and academic achievement. *Developmental Science*, 20(5), e12450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12450>

- Fischl, B., Salat, D. H., Busa, E., Albert, M., Dieterich, M., Haselgrove, C., van der Kouwe, A., Killiany, R., Kennedy, D., Klaveness, S., Montillo, A., Makris, N., Rosen, B., & Dale, A. M. (2002). Whole brain segmentation: Automated labeling of neuroanatomical structures in the human brain. *Neuron*, 33(3), 341–355. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0896-6273\(02\)00569-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0896-6273(02)00569-x)
- Frankenhuis, W. E., & Nettle, D. (2020). The Strengths of People in Poverty. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(1), 16–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721419881154>
- Frankenhuis, W. E., Panchanathan, K., & Nettle, D. (2016). Cognition in harsh and unpredictable environments. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 7, 76–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.08.011>
- Frömer, R., Lin, H., Dean Wolf, C. K., Inzlicht, M., & Shenhav, A. (2021). Expectations of reward and efficacy guide cognitive control allocation. *Nature Communications*, 12(1), 1030. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21315-z>
- Galvan, A. (2010). Adolescent Development of the Reward System. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 4, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/neuro.09.006.2010>
- Galvan, A., Hare, T. A., Parra, C. E., Penn, J., Voss, H., Glover, G., & Casey, B. J. (2006). Earlier Development of the Accumbens Relative to Orbitofrontal Cortex Might Underlie Risk-Taking Behavior in Adolescents. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 26(25), 6885–6892. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1062-06.2006>
- Gao, P., Wang, Y.-S., Lu, Q.-Y., Rong, M.-J., Fan, X.-R., Holmes, A. J., Dong, H.-M., Li, H.-F., & Zuo, X.-N. (2023). Brief mock-scan training reduces head motion during real scanning for children: A growth curve study. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 61, 101244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2023.101244>

751 Greve, D. N., & Fischl, B. (2009). Accurate and robust brain image alignment using boundary-
 752 based registration. *NeuroImage*, 48(1), 63–72.
 753 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.06.060>

754 Hackman, D. A., & Farah, M. J. (2009). Socioeconomic status and the developing brain. *Trends*
 755 *in Cognitive Sciences*, 13(2), 65–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.11.003>

756 Hackman, D. A., Farah, M. J., & Meaney, M. J. (2010). Socioeconomic status and the brain:
 757 Mechanistic insights from human and animal research. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*,
 758 11(9), 651–659. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2897>

759 Hamid, A. A., Pettibone, J. R., Mabrouk, O. S., Hetrick, V. L., Schmidt, R., Vander Weele, C. M.,
 760 Kennedy, R. T., Aragona, B. J., & Berke, J. D. (2016). Mesolimbic dopamine signals the
 761 value of work. *Nature Neuroscience*, 19(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4173>

762 Hubbard, N. A., Romeo, R. R., Grotzinger, H., Giebler, M., Imhof, A., Bauer, C. C. C., &
 763 Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2020). Reward-Sensitive Basal Ganglia Stabilize the Maintenance of
 764 Goal-Relevant Neural Patterns in Adolescents. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*,
 765 32(8), 1508–1524. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01572

766 Hubbard, N. A., Siless, V., Frosch, I. R., Goncalves, M., Lo, N., Wang, J., Bauer, C. C. C.,
 767 Conroy, K., Cosby, E., Hay, A., Jones, R., Pinaire, M., Vaz De Souza, F., Vergara, G.,
 768 Ghosh, S., Henin, A., Hirshfeld-Becker, D. R., Hofmann, S. G., Rosso, I. M., ... Whitfield-
 769 Gabrieli, S. (2020). Brain function and clinical characterization in the Boston adolescent
 770 neuroimaging of depression and anxiety study. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 27, 102240.
 771 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2020.102240>

772 Jenkinson, M., Bannister, P., Brady, M., & Smith, S. (2002). Improved Optimization for the
 773 Robust and Accurate Linear Registration and Motion Correction of Brain Images.
 774 *NeuroImage*, 17(2), 825–841. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2002.1132>

775 Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional
 776 well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(38), 16489–16493.
 777 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011492107>

778 Kurzban, R., Duckworth, A., Kable, J. W., & Myers, J. (2013). An opportunity cost model of
 779 subjective effort and task performance. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(6).
 780 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X12003196>

781 Leonard, J. A., Romeo, R. R., Park, A. T., Takada, M. E., Robinson, S. T., Grotzinger, H., Last,
 782 B. S., Finn, A. S., Gabrieli, J. D. E., & Mackey, A. P. (2019). Associations between
 783 cortical thickness and reasoning differ by socioeconomic status in development.
 784 *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 36, 100641.
 785 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2019.100641>

786 Lin, H., Ristic, J., Inzlicht, M., & Otto, A. R. (2022). The Average Reward Rate Modulates
 787 Behavioral and Neural Indices of Effortful Control Allocation. *Journal of Cognitive*
 788 *Neuroscience*, 34(11), 2113–2126. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01905

789 Massar, S. A. A., Lim, J., Sasmita, K., & Chee, M. W. L. (2016). Rewards boost sustained
 790 attention through higher effort: A value-based decision making approach. *Biological*
 791 *Psychology*, 120, 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2016.07.019>

792 McLaughlin, K. A., Sheridan, M. A., & Lambert, H. K. (2014). Childhood Adversity and Neural
 793 Development: Deprivation and Threat as Distinct Dimensions of Early Experience.
 794 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 47, 578–591.
 795 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.10.012>

796 McMillan, J. C. (1971). Percentage reinforcement of fixed-ratio and variable-interval
 797 performances. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 15(3), 297–302.
 798 <https://doi.org/10.1901/jeab.1971.15-297>

799 Niv, Y., Daw, N. D., Joel, D., & Dayan, P. (2007). Tonic dopamine: Opportunity costs and the
800 control of response vigor. *Psychopharmacology*, 191(3), 507–520.
801 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-006-0502-4>

802 Niv, Y., Joel, D., & Dayan, P. (2006). A normative perspective on motivation. *Trends in*
803 *Cognitive Sciences*, 10(8), 375–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.06.010>

804 Noble, K. G., McCandliss, B. D., & Farah, M. J. (2007). Socioeconomic gradients predict
805 individual differences in neurocognitive abilities. *Developmental Science*, 10(4), 464–
806 480. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2007.00600.x>

807 Oshri, A., Hallowell, E., Liu, S., MacKillop, J., Galvan, A., Kogan, S. M., & Sweet, L. H. (2019).
808 Socioeconomic hardship and delayed reward discounting: Associations with working
809 memory and emotional reactivity. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 37.
810 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2019.100642>

811 Otto, A. R., & Daw, N. D. (2019). The opportunity cost of time modulates cognitive effort.
812 *Neuropsychologia*, 123, 92–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.05.006>

813 Palacios-Barrios, E. E., Hanson, J. L., Barry, K. R., Albert, W. D., White, S. F., Skinner, A. T.,
814 Dodge, K. A., & Lansford, J. E. (2021). Lower neural value signaling in the prefrontal
815 cortex is related to childhood family income and depressive symptomatology during
816 adolescence. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 48, 100920.
817 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2021.100920>

818 Pepper, G. V., & Nettle, D. (2017). The behavioural constellation of deprivation: Causes and
819 consequences. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 40, e314.
820 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X1600234X>

821 Power, J. D., Mitra, A., Laumann, T. O., Snyder, A. Z., Schlaggar, B. L., & Petersen, S. E.
822 (2014). Methods to detect, characterize, and remove motion artifact in resting state fMRI.
823 *NeuroImage*, 84, 320–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.08.048>

824 Reiss, F. (2013). Socioeconomic inequalities and mental health problems in children and
825 adolescents: A systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*, 90, 24–31.
826 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.04.026>

827 Reynolds, J. N., Hyland, B. I., & Wickens, J. R. (2001). A cellular mechanism of reward-related
828 learning. *Nature*, 413(6851), 67–70. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35092560>

829 Romeo, R. R., Christodoulou, J. A., Halverson, K. K., Murtagh, J., Cyr, A. B., Schimmel, C.,
830 Chang, P., Hook, P. E., & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2018). Socioeconomic Status and Reading
831 Disability: Neuroanatomy and Plasticity in Response to Intervention. *Cerebral Cortex*,
832 28(7), 2297–2312. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhx131>

833 Ross, L. T., & Hill, E. M. (2002). CHILDHOOD UNPREDICTABILITY, SCHEMAS FOR
834 UNPREDICTABILITY, AND RISK TAKING. *Social Behavior and Personality: An*
835 *International Journal*, 30(5), 453–473. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2002.30.5.453>

836 Schlinger, H. D., Derenne, A., & Baron, A. (2008). What 50 Years of Research Tell Us About
837 Pausing Under Ratio Schedules of Reinforcement. *The Behavior Analyst*, 31(1).
838 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2395348/>

839 Schultz. (1993). Socioeconomic advantage and achievement motivation: Important mediators of
840 academic performance in minority children in urban schools. *The Urban Review*, 25(3),
841 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01112109>

842 Seligman, M. E. P. (1972). Learned Helplessness. *Annual Review of Medicine*, 23(1), 407–412.
843 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.me.23.020172.002203>

- Shenhav, A., Botvinick, M. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2013). The Expected Value of Control: An Integrative Theory of Anterior Cingulate Cortex Function. *Neuron*, 79(2), 217–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2013.07.007>
- Sukumar, S., Shadmehr, R., & Ahmed, A. A. (2021). *Effects of reward history on decision-making and movement vigor* [Preprint]. Neuroscience. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.22.453376>
- Tustison, N. J., Avants, B. B., Cook, P. A., Zheng, Y., Egan, A., Yushkevich, P. A., & Gee, J. C. (2010). N4ITK: Improved N3 Bias Correction. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 29(6), 1310–1320. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2010.2046908>
- Wallace, R. F., & Mulder, D. W. (1973). Fixed-ratio responding with human subjects. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 1(5), 359–362. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03334372>
- Wang, Miura, & Uchida. (2013). The dorsomedial striatum encodes net expected return, critical for energizing performance vigor. *Nature Neuroscience*, 16(5), Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3377>
- Wang, Toyoshima, Kunimatsu, J., Yamada, & Matsumoto. (2021). Tonic firing mode of midbrain dopamine neurons continuously tracks reward values changing moment-by-moment. *eLife*, 10, e63166. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.63166>
- Westbrook, A., & Braver, T. S. (2016). Dopamine Does Double Duty in Motivating Cognitive Effort. *Neuron*, 89(4), 695–710. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.12.029>
- Westbrook, A., Frank, M. J., & Cools, R. (2021). A mosaic of cost-benefit control over cortico-striatal circuitry. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(8), 710–721. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.04.007>

- White, S. F., Nusslock, R., & Miller, G. E. (2022). Low Socioeconomic Status Is Associated with a Greater Neural Response to Both Rewards and Losses. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 34(10), 1939–1951. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01821
- Williams, D. C., Saunders, K. J., & Perone, M. (2011). Extended Pausing by Humans on Multiple Fixed-Ratio Schedules with Varied Reinforcer Magnitude and Response Requirements. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 95(2), 203–220. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jeab.2011.95-203>
- Zhang, Y., Brady, M., & Smith, S. (2001). Segmentation of brain MR images through a hidden Markov random field model and the expectation-maximization algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 20(1), 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.1109/42.906424>

887

888

889

890

Figure Legends

891 **Figure 1. SES score distribution, gambling task schematic, and trial-by-trial moving**
892 **average of rewards and losses.** (A) *Distribution of SES composite scores:* SES was
893 operationalized as the mean of the z-transformed maternal and paternal education variables
894 (years of schooling completed), and z-scored log of annual household income. The distribution
895 is displayed, with the y-axis representing sample proportions. (B) *Gambling task schematic:*
896 Participants guessed whether a forthcoming number would be greater or less than 5. Next, the
897 actual number was revealed, and participants received positive (top panel, green arrow),
898 negative (middle panel, red arrow), or neutral feedback (if the number was 5; bottom panel, light
899 green arrow) regarding their guess. A 1-second fixation cross (not depicted) preceded the next
900 trial. (C) *Calculating the moving average of reward:* An exponentially weighted moving average
901 of gains and losses quantified recent history of reward. This measure was used to examine
902 whether distinct task phases associated with reward scarcity or abundance influenced trial-by-
903 trial shifts in behavior (choices, RTs), and interacted with behavioral responses (choices, RTs)
904 to immediate feedback. (D) Schematic of reward rate fluctuations in a representative participant.
905 Grey shading represents loss blocks and non-grey areas represent reward blocks. Pink and
906 green colors denote periods in which the moving average of reward is above or below the
907 mean.

908

909 **Figure 2. Immediate reward and the moving average reward rate shape RTs and choices.**
910 (A) Adolescents responded more slowly after a win than a loss ($p < 0.001$). (B) A lower average
911 reward rate amplified post-reward slowing (*interaction: $p < 0.001$*) indicating heightened
912 behavioral responses to reward when rewards were scarce. (C) Adolescents were most likely to
913 repeat a guess when their guess had been rewarded on the previous trial ($p < 0.001$). (D) These
914 “post-reward stay” effects were amplified by a low average reward rate ($p < 0.001$). In all
915 figures, the mean and within-subject error bars are plotted. The moving average reward rate
916 was divided into low and high average reward rate using a median split for ease of visualization.
917 Note that we model the average reward rate continuously in all analyses.

918

919 **Figure 3. Reward rate fluctuations modulate post-reward pausing more in higher-SES**
920 **adolescents.** (A) Reward rate fluctuations influenced choice switching following immediate
921 reward similarly by SES. (B) Reward rate fluctuations modulated post-reward pausing more
922 among higher- than lower-SES adolescents. This led to greater RT slowing following rewards
923 when rewards were scarce among higher-SES adolescents. In all figures, we depict the mean


and within-subject error bars. The moving average reward rate and socioeconomic status were divided into low and high bins using a median split for ease of visualization. Note that we model these variables continuously in the analyses reported in the paper.

Figure 4. SES and striatal volumes. SES positively correlated with the volume of the caudate ($p = 0.012$), but not the putamen or nucleus accumbens ($ps > 0.510$). For ease of visualization, data points reflect the average volume of the left and right hemisphere, but the statistics reported in the text are from models that treat the left and right hemisphere as repeated measures within participants. Individual data points represent participant level data, and the grey shading reflects the standard error of the mean.


Figure 5. Striatal activations covary with reward and loss blocks and reward rate fluctuations across time. (A) Across the sample, activations in the striatum were greater during reward than loss blocks ($ps < 0.001$). (B) Moreover, the striatum tracked average reward rate fluctuations across time, even after FDR correction for multiple comparisons across every voxel in the striatum ($ps < 0.001$). In A and B, the color bar represents z-values and color intensity reflect the strength of the effect.

Figure 6. Lower SES correlates with reduced striatal activations to reward (A) Lower SES correlated with less activation differences between reward and loss blocks in the caudate and putamen and marginally in the nucleus accumbens. (B) The relationship between striatal activations and average reward rate fluctuations was stronger for higher- than lower-SES adolescents in the putamen ($p = 0.046$), but not in the caudate or nucleus accumbens ($ps > 0.37$). For ease of visualization, individual data points reflect mean z values across the left and right hemisphere. Statistics reported in the text model the left and right hemisphere separately as repeated measures. Individual data points represent participant data, and the grey shading reflects the standard error of the mean.

A. Distribution of Socioeconomic Status




B. Gambling task schematic




C. Calculating the moving average of reward

Potential outcomes during a **reward** and **loss** block




Exponentially weighted moving mean of gains and losses to determine the *average reward rate on each trial*


D. Reward rate fluctuations in a representative participant




A. Slower RTs after wins




B. Reward scarcity prolongs post-reward pauses




C. Wins reinforce prior choices




D. Reward scarcity increases post-win staying




A. The influence of reward on choices does not differ by SES



B. Reward rate fluctuations shape post-reinforcement pausing differently by SES




Lower SES correlates with smaller caudate volumes




A. Higher striatal activations in reward than loss blocks



B. The striatum tracks reward rate fluctuations across time



A. Lower SES correlates with smaller reward-driven activations



B. Putamen activations track reward rate fluctuations less in lower-SES adolescents

