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# Introduction (preliminary)

The role of market institutions and principles has been pivotal in shaping the evolution of social policy regimes in highly unequal contexts such as Latin America (Huber & Stephens, 2012). From the 1970s onward, neoliberal reforms—marked by deregulation and privatization—transformed the institutional architecture of the Latin American institutions, reinforcing the centrality of contractual relations in the marketplace, and extending market logic to social domains that previously were mainly attended by the state (Arrizabalo, 1995). In consequence, the role of public provision was reduced and counterbalanced with a stronger presence of market actors in the provision of social services (Harvey, 2020). From a moral economy perspective, the role of the market mechanisms in the allocation of resources has coexisted with principles of economic redistribution and reciprocity crystalized welfare state institutions and family roles, in conjunction with their manifestation in popular views on each of these domains (Koos & Sachweh, 2019). In the literature, the set of principles and norms related to how the public embraces individual effort and productivity as the central criteria for resource allocation has been addressed under the concept of market justice (Kluegel, Mason, & Wegener, 1999; Lane, 1986). As these principles emphasize self-reliance and minimal government intervention, they function as a legitimizing mechanism of economic inequality by framing it as the result of fair competition (Svallfors, 2007).

The empirical distributive justice literature has shown that market justice attitudes are particularly salient in contexts of high inequality and modest public provision of welfare where the capacity of citizens to contribute or pay largely constrains access to welfare services (Immergut & Schneider, 2020; Lindh, 2015; von dem Knesebeck, Vonneilich, & Kim, 2016). Under these circumstances, individuals in structurally advantaged positions in the labor market tend to be more supportive of market justice principles compared to those in occupations with greater labor market risk, low-demanded skills, and lower-income (Castillo, Salgado, Carrasco, & Laffert, 2024; Lee & Stacey, 2023).

In addition, beyond individual labor market situation, the literature on attitudes toward economic inequality has recently discussed the role of social networks in preference formation. These studies have theorized that as interpersonal networks provide information and experiences of other individuals (Lin, 2001), this can affect attitudes in the form of a social influence mechanism which is contingent to the composition of these ties (Lindh, Andersson, & Völker, 2021). Empirically, studies have shown that class profiles – understood as single ties to certain occupational-class categories can affect inequality perception and support for redistribution (Cobo-Arroyo, 2022; Lindh et al., 2021). Moreover, research suggests that being connected to a diverse range of socioeconomic positions within interpersonal networks is linked to more critical perspectives on economic inequality (Otero & Mendoza, 2023; Paskov & Weisstanner, 2022). Specifically, it has been argued that socioeconomic diversity in interpersonal networks—defined as the extent to which individuals are connected to others in different socioeconomic positions (e.g., occupations)— provides a broader window through which individuals learn about others’ life conditions and views on economic inequality.

Recently, longitudinal studies have argued that theories of class-based attitude explanation have mainly relied on cross-sectional studies. The theoretical relevance of this claim is that the hypotheses on attitude formation have underscored the role of “class experiences” – understood as the socialization processes that respond to individual changes within the class structure across the life course (Ares, 2020; Helgason & Rehm, 2024; Langsæther, Evans, & O’Grady, 2022) These studies have shown that preference formation is neither completely shaped by the class of destination nor origin, showing that, indeed, those immobile in their class positions are much more aligned with class-based economic interests than the economically mobile. In this regard, one argument is that mobile individuals “class-experiences”

In addition, little is known about how simultaneously being connected to different socioeconomic positions can influence these attitudes. Here it is argued that cross-class embeddedness contribute to preference formation as it brings different views in contrast to opinions

Chile provides an illustrative case: despite being one of Latin America’s more prosperous nations, it remains highly unequal, with a welfare model heavily reliant on private provision. Understanding how socioeconomic status and network diversity influence attitudes toward market justice in such a setting can offer new insights into the changing views on inequality and market justice.

This paper explores how changes in individual socioeconomic status and the diversity of social networks affect support for market justice principles in Chile. Using longitudinal data from the Chilean Longitudinal Social Survey (ELSOC, 2016–2023). I hypothesize that upward changes in socioeconomic status with stronger support for market justice, while greater network diversity—exposing individuals to varied socioeconomic perspectives—reduces it. My goal in this paper to shed light on the longitudinal effects of individual changes in ‘socioeconomic experiences’ are associated with market justice attitudes. Against this backdrop, the main question of this paper is: to what extent do individual changes in socioeconomic status and network diversity influence changes in market justice preferences? This study contributes to the literature by providing evidence from a Latin American late-industrialized country, emphasizing how socioeconomic mobility and personal networks shape market justice preferences over time.

# Theoretical views on market justice, socioeconomic position of individuals and social networks

## Attitudes toward market justice

While redistribution in market societies mainly focuses on the state's capacity to reallocate resources from those in more advantageous positions to those in greater vulnerability, market institutions also play a role in shaping the distribution of economic resources (Koos & Sachweh, 2019; Lindh & McCall, 2020). Hereby, the legitimacy of resource allocation based on market principles has been referred to in the literature as *market justice*. In his seminal work, Lane (1986) defines *market justice* as a distributive principle that mainly focuses on rewards based on "earned deserts," contrasting it with political justice, which prioritizes equality and need. He argues that individuals perceive market outcomes as fair because they reflect personal effort, fostering a sense of self-determination and responsibility (Lane, 1986). These principles advocate efficiency through competition, minimal government intervention, and voluntary transaction exchange. Additionally, market justice underscores the protection of individual rights, particularly property rights, allowing individuals to control resources and benefit from their labor.

Theoretically, *market justice* attitudes comprise economic beliefs and norms that legitimize inequality based on individual merit and productivity (Kluegel et al., 1999). In this sense, the market acts as a self-regulating arena, coordinating economic exchanges based on supply and demand, where rewards are distributed according to individual contributions and efforts (Kluegel & Smith, 1981). This idea is grounded in the belief that the market promotes procedural fairness, where everyone has equal opportunities to compete, yet individual capabilities determine the outcomes (Lane, 1986). Unlike systems based on political justice, which emphasize equality and need, market justice is seen as a process where justice is achieved through the fair competition of free agents (Lane, 1986). This notion of justice stems from the belief that outcomes are deserved, as they reflect personal effort and productivity, fostering a sense of fairness (Svallfors, 2007). However, achieving perceived fairness in market justice depends on maintaining open and responsive systems, where opportunities are accessible to all (Kluegel et al., 1999). Through this lens, inequalities are accepted—even seen as necessary—because they incentivize innovation and productivity, reinforcing societal prosperity by rewarding individual achievements and self-responsibility (Castillo, Madero-Cabib, & Salamovich, 2013). Thus, market justice values individual responsibility, linking economic rewards to personal contributions rather than redistributive mechanisms.

Research in empirical distributive justice has diversly addressed the study of the justification of economic inequality. In this landscape, it is possible to mention the literature on the justification of wage inequality based on occupations (Jasso, 1978; Kelley & Evans, 1993; Osberg & Smeeding, 2006; Wegener, 1987). Additionally, another part of the literature has underscored how the spheres of the market affect other social domains, such as how it is considered legitimate that the mechanisms that generate inequality in the market are transferred to other areas of society, such as access to social welfare such as education, healthcare, or pensions schemes (Castillo et al., 2024; Lindh, 2015). This suggests that social services are considered legitimate objects of commodification, ranging from market-driven to mixed or state-led provision, where services can be traded, evaluated, and priced (Busemeyer & Iversen, 2020).

There have been several ways in which scholars have conceptualized these attitudes. However, what they do have in common is the empirical measure which generally addresses the degree to which people support the statement that *“Is it just or unjust – right or wrong – that people with higher incomes can buy better [welfare service] than people with lower incomes?* which has been included in repeated cross-national studies as the International Social Survey Program. For instance, in studies on attitudes toward healthcare, Knesebeck et al. (2016) and Immergut and Schneider (2020) investigated “perceptions of fairness” in access to healthcare, to assess whether citizens find it fair that wealthier individuals receive better healthcare services. Additionally, for education, Lee and Stacey (2023) assessed Australian citizens' support for income-based access to schooling by gauging whether individuals consider it fair that higher-income parents can secure a better education for their children. Similarly, other cross-country comparative studies such as Lindh (2015) and Svallfors (2007) have combined both indicators as a general latent construct. A recent study by Castilo et al. (2024) scrutinized market justice preferences on the student population in Chile in the domains of education, healthcare, and pensions, as well as by employing a latent market justice measure. In this paper, I adopted the latter approach to empirically scrutinize market justice preferences.

## Does time matter? The role of (changes in) individual structural position and networks in attitudes towards inequality

### Socioeconomic status and attitudes toward inequality

Most of the studies point out that individual socioeconomic position is an important predicting factor of market justice preferences. This has been explained mainly – but not exclusively by self-interested motivations on the expected desirability of market-based distributions over state-based redistribution among the socioeconomically advantaged groups (Lindh & McCall, 2020). Higher-status individuals, with higher educational credentials in better-paying and secure labor market positions, are less likely to challenge market-based distribution, as they justify to a greater extent that access to welfare should be determined by one's ability to pay, compared to those with disadvantaged labor market positions (Svallfors, 2007). Empirically, it has been consistently demonstrated that those in socioeconomically advantaged positions endorse the idea that those with higher incomes should be able to pay more for better social services in the domains of education (Lee & Stacey, 2023), healthcare (Immergut & Schneider, 2020; von dem Knesebeck et al., 2016) and old age pensions (Castillo et al., 2024). Similarly, Lindh (2015) argues that upper-class individuals support market-based social service distribution because they benefit from systems that align with their financial independence, without relying on public support. In contrast, working-class individuals, often dependent on public services, prefer equitable access rather than market-driven systems. Hereby, market-based social insurance and services can be appealing to higher-income individuals as an alternative as they involve no redistribution (Busemeyer & Iversen, 2020). Another argument is that higher-income and educated individuals, who often benefit from market-based distributions, are more likely to view income inequality as fair and merit-based (Kluegel et al., 1999; Svallfors, 2007). Also, higher educational credentials are associated with greater acceptance of meritocratic ideals and the belief that the market rewards personal achievement (Castillo et al., 2013, 2024) as well as more financial stability given their highly valuable skills in the labor market (Häusermann, Kurer, & Schwander, 2015)

An important fact is that most of the theoretical approaches in attitudes, including attitudes toward public and private alternatives to social welfare (Lindh & McCall, 2020) and the justification of economic inequality (Janmaat, 2013) have been conceived as theories that aim to explain between-group differences instead of being theories of individual change. It is also recognizable that there are certainly extensions of the self-interest model that have included a dynamic component on preference formation where the consequences of economic prospects and intergenerational mobility on attitudes toward inequality have grasped the possible consequences of *changes* in socioeconomic conditions over time (Jaime-Castillo & Marqués-Perales, 2019). However, it is essential to note that most theories focus on group-level distinctions rather than on changes at the individual level over time. Indeed, while upward socioeconomic mobility typically results in greater individual well-being (Reche, König, & Hajek, 2019), the impact of such intragenerational changes on attitudes toward inequality remains underexplored.

The main theories on political attitude formation offer distinct perspectives on how changes in socioeconomic positions shape political attitudes over time. In a recent study, Helgason & Rehm (2023) reviewed and empirically scrutinized how different income mobility profiles differed in their “core political values” over time in Britain. They differentiate between five possible expectations according to the current self-interest-based mechanism – prospective income mobility or income expectations (Benabou & Ok, 2001; Rueda & Stegmueller, 2019), as well as preference formation based on informational updates (Druckman, 2000, 2016). In their perspective, political attitudes can be explained through (i) *socialization,* which posits early-life stability; (ii) *anticipation*, where attitudes can be aligned with expected future income; (iii) *myopic self-interest, which* focuses on immediate income effects; (iv) *learning* highlights cumulative changes from past and current experiences; and (v) *status maximization* links attitudes to the highest structural position achieved over time. Also, they argue attitude change is a slow process of change and can be gradual and accumulative when it comes to learning and updating, showing that cross-sectional differences in political attitudes tend to be stronger than within-individual differences over time (Helgason & Rehm, 2024). Empirically, longitudinal evidence hints that as individuals experience rising structural positions, particularly through occupational class and income, they become more conservative in their political views and demand less redistribution as they benefit more directly from unequal distributions (Helgason & Rehm, 2023; Langsæther et al., 2022; Stegmueller, 2013). It is also noteworthy that mobile individuals show more nuanced preferences when compared to those with homogenous-stable working or upper-class mobility trajectories (Helgason & Rehm, 2024). Similarly, in the British case, it has been shown that upwardly mobile individuals are more prone to vote for the conservative party, known for its pro-market stances in terms of welfare provision (Helgason & Rehm, 2023). Although this evidence has not directly addressed market justice preferences, it provides some clues as to how their relationship with market justice preferences can be expected.

In line with the above, I expect that individuals who increase their socioeconomic status support market justice preferences to a greater extent (*market legitimacy*). Thus, the hypothesis read as follows:

H1: increasing changes in socioeconomic status increase support for market justice.

### Network structure and attitudes towards economic inequality

Theoretically, a stronger justification of inequality is not solely explained by individual self-interest or normative value-driven explanation (Kulin & Svallfors, 2013; Maldonado, Olivos, Castillo, Atria, & Azar, 2019). In this regard, the literature has argued that social networks also contribute to attitude formation in different manners. Recently, it has been scrutinized the role of network class profiles – understood as the share of ties toward specific social classes has found that those with higher ties to the upper-middle class hold lower redistributive preferences and connected to working-class positions are associated with higher perceived income inequality (Cobo-Arroyo, 2022) and stronger support for inequality reduction (Lindh & Andersson, 2024). Additionally, other studies have taken a step forward with the single class-profile approach and have shown that being connected *simultaneously* to diverse socioeconomic status positions is associated with more critical views on economic inequality. In particular, socioeconomic diversity in interpersonal networks (*diversity* onwards)— understood as the degree of connectedness to dissimilar socioeconomic positions (e.g., occupations) has been brought into the discussion of how networks contribute to the formation of attitudes toward economic inequality (Otero & Mendoza, 2023). In this sense, networks can shape attitudes and political preferences through social influence implying that individuals adjust their views accordingly based on the diverse information received through their network ties (Lindh et al., 2021). At the same time, dissimilarity within networks refers to cross-cutting social circles that implies to have access to diverse life experiences and broader information to be exposed to (Blau, 1977). In this sense, one argument is network ties act as inferential spaces (Mijs & Roe, 2021), which can leverage the connection between economic inequality and labor market rewards as cross-class contact provides more diverse information and life experiences of others that may foster empathy toward those in economic despair (Sachweh, 2012) or, conversely, legitimize inequality as cross-class contact fades (Vargas Salfate & Stern, 2023).

Empirically, the claim that diversity is associated with more critical views on economic inequality has received empirical support. For instance, Paskov & Weisstanner (2022) found that more diverse networks lead to dis-aligned class-based redistributive preferences, where working-class individuals with parental and partner ties to the upper-middle classes nuance their preferences compared to “pure” working-class connections. By contrast, upper-middle-class individuals with more ties toward the working class are more likely to support redistribution. More straightforwardly, Otero & Mendoza (2023) found that more socioeconomically diverse acquaintance networks are associated with higher perceived inequality, higher economic egalitarianism, and more critical views on the current equality of opportunities and meritocracy. Here I argue that being connected to a diverse range of social positions can significantly broaden exposure to different experiences with market-based inequality. Hereby, individuals with extensive – and possibly cross-cutting social ties are more likely to receive information about labor market processes such as job seeking and wage differences from diverse sources (Contreras, Otero, Díaz, & Suárez, 2019; Svallfors, 2006). This can be also linked to the attributed importance of structural or non-meritocratic factors, such as inherited wealth or social connections in the process of getting ahead in life in contexts of rising or (high) economic inequality (McCall, Burk, Laperrière, & Richeson, 2017). As follows, I expect that network diversity nurtures greater skepticism toward the fairness of market mechanisms (*market skepticism hypothesis*) in distributing resources as well as the legitimacy of market-based distribution of welfare.

Little is known about whether political attitudes are affected by changes in network composition, particularly concerning the socio-economic diversity of those networks. From the perspective of individual change, social networks, by providing access to information—in this case, diversity—likely contribute to social learning processes (Druckman & Lupia, 2000; Lin, 2001). Theoretically, networks represent a “social convoy” (Kahn and Antonucci, 1980) of social relationships understood as a structure where information and support are embedded (Hollstein, 2023). In addition, ties within this convoy can be modified according to life-course events, such as changes in labor market status, marital status, or geographic position (Rözer et al., 2020; Völker, 2020). At the same time, it is usually assumed that acquaintanceship ties tend to change more and be nurtured from more diverse social positions in contrast to the more stable strong ties, such as family (Granovetter, 1973).

There are different explanations for how individual changes in network diversity might influence attitudes toward economic inequality and, more specifically, toward market distributions. One argument posits that those changes in the socioeconomic composition of sociability spaces nurture constraints and opportunities to meet and create new ties that contribute to diversity (Feld, 1981). For instance, it has been shown desegregation in schools explains changes in the socioeconomic composition of friendship ties and can cause changes in attitudes towards inequality, in line with greater skepticism regarding the fairness of labor market outcomes and opportunities for social mobility (Londoño-Vélez, 2022). Another aspect is that social mobility processes may expose individuals to different class positions relative to their class of origin. This increased exposure to diverse social ties and ideas could challenge the culture and values of the class of origin and lead to changes in political attitudes (Ares, 2020). In addition, political attitudes may evolve through socialization processes as individuals acquire new "class experiences" within a different social milieu (Helgason & Rehm, 2024). These experiences may provide (i) new perspectives and (ii) more accurate insights into their own class of origin, as well as the values and interests associated with other class positions.

In line with the above, I argue that changes in network diversity can nurture changes in political attitudes as they reflect the influence of new social contexts and the information they provide. As individuals encounter different life experiences, they may develop critical views on the fairness of market distributions and support for market-based access to social welfare. Over time, greater network diversity allows individuals to accumulate a variety of experiences and learn from new information. Therefore, the following hypothesis read as follows:

H2: the greater the changes in the diversity of the network, the less support market justice

# Case of Chile

Chile provides a valuable case study for exploring the dynamics between poverty, inequality, and welfare state models (Ferre, 2023). Despite economic growth, it remains one of the most unequal countries in the OECD, with a high Gini index and concentrated wealth among the top deciles (Rodríguez Weber, 2017). Since the neoliberal reforms of the 1980s, Chile’s welfare system has leaned heavily on private provision, where services are often privatized and only accessible to those who can afford them (Arrizabalo, 1995). This "crowded-out" welfare model benefits higher-income groups, leaving lower-income individuals to rely on limited public options. In 2019, widespread protests highlighted the demand for greater equality and better public services, underscoring a public shift toward a "crowded-in" welfare model, with expanded state involvement (Somma, Bargsted, Disi Pavlic, & Medel, 2021). Chile illustrates how high inequality within a market-based welfare system shapes both public demands and potential policy shifts toward greater social inclusion.

# Data, variables, and method

# Data

The primary data source is the Chilean Longitudinal Social Survey (ELSOC, 2022) from 2016 to 2023, including four time measures[[1]](#footnote-2), designed to annually assess how individuals think, feel, and behave regarding social issues related to conflict and cohesion in Chile. Using a probabilistic, stratified, clustered, and multistage sampling design, the survey covers major urban centers (Santiago, Valparaíso, and Concepción) and smaller cities. The first wave included 2,927 participants aged 18 to 75, representing populations in the north and south, covering 77% of Chile’s total population and 93% of the urban population, with a response rate of 62.4% (Centre for Social Conflict and Cohesion Studies, 2022). After listwise deletion, the analytical sample includes 6,651 observations nested within 2,190 individuals. The changes in sample size due to attrition and missing values are presented in Table X. In 2018 (Time 2), a refreshment sample was added to the study, consisting of 1,519 cases, while 2,229 cases corresponded to the original sample from 2016 (Time 1). I decided to exclude this refreshment sample to focus on longer-term trends. In the subsequent waves, attrition rates were 23.8% at time 2 (N = 2,229), 21.9% at time 3 (N = 1,739), and 0.01% at time 4 (N = 1,737). Overall, the total attrition from time 1 to time 4 was 45.9%.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table X: Summary of the original sample. | | | |  |  |
|  | Time 1 | Time 2 | Time 3 | Time 4 | Total |
| Full sample | 2927 | 2229 | 1739 | 1737 | 8632 |
| Analytical sample | 1984 | 1941 | 1349 | 1577 | 6851 |
| Missing (%) | 47.53 | 14.84 | 28.91 | 10.15 | 25.36 |

# Variables

*Market justice preferences*

The main dependent variable of this study is *market justice preferences*: ‘It is fair that people with higher incomes have better pensions than people with lower incomes’, ‘It is fair that people with higher incomes have access to better education for their children than people with lower incomes’, and ‘It is fair that people with higher incomes can access better healthcare than people with lower incomes’. These items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Completely disagree) to 5 (Completely agree). The Cronbach alpha is close to 0.8 in all time points (αt1 =.82, αt2=.86, αt3=.79, αt4=.83). Here, higher values indicate stronger support for market justice principles (M = 2.06, SD = 0.86).

*Socio-economic status*

For measuring socioeconomic status (SES), I use the International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status (ISEI) (Ganzeboom, 2010). This indicator assigns continuous scores to occupations based on their required education and associated income levels. The ISEI synthesizes information on occupational hierarchies, educational attainment, and earnings to reflect the socioeconomic positioning of individuals within the labor market. The ISEI scores range from 16 (lowest status) to 88 (highest status). Following Langsæther et al. (2022, p. 963). I argue that including other socioeconomic factors, such as income, can be considered a post-treatment variable in a longitudinal context as it results from occupational mobility. Therefore, all model specifications include ISEI scores based on occupations as the main SES measurement. I categorized the ISEI scores in quartiles to represent low, middle-low, middle-high, and high groups, as well as an additional category of missing information.

*Network socioeconomic diversity*

In this study, respondents were asked about the socio-economic diversity of their acquaintances in Chile. An acquaintance was defined as someone they could recognize by name and could converse with if encountered in public. The answers are categorized based on occupational status and grouped by the International Socio-Economic Index (ISEI). These categories included higher-status occupations (e.g., doctors, attorneys, university professors), medium-status occupations (e.g., accountants, shop assistants, preschool teachers), and lower-status occupations (e.g., waiters, car mechanics, taxi drivers). Respondents were asked to approximate the number of people they knew in each occupation.

The network diversity index was calculated to capture the socio-economic diversity of respondents’ networks. Following recommendations in network analysis literature (Otero & Mendoza, 2023; Sapin, Joye, & Wolf, 2020), a single dimension was used to represent network diversity, incorporating four indicators: the index of qualitative variation (IQV), cross-class (number of different occupational groups known), standard deviation of ISEI scores, and extensivity (number of different occupations known). Higher values on this index indicate greater socio-economic diversity in respondents' networks. The fit indices for the diversity index measurement model were strong, with a chi-square of 13.03, CFI of 0.99, TLI of 0.99, and RMSEA of 0.02.

# Method

I estimated fixed-effects linear models (Andreß, Golsch, & Schmidt, 2013) to examine the extent to which changes in socioeconomic status (SES) and network diversity predict market justice preferences. I analyzed these data using R and the “plm” package. In the context of panel data, within-person effects capture how changes in individual-level variables (e.g., SES and network diversity) between waves are associated with preferences for market justice while controlling by the influence of time-invariant characteristics. Coefficients are presented as standardized coefficients.

# Longitudinal results on network diversity and market justice attitudes

The results from the fixed effects models are presented in Table X. Model 1 shows how to change from Low ISEI (references category) or middle-low (β = 0.22, p<0.001) and middle-high (β = 0.21, p<0.001), occupational status increase support for market justice preferences. It is noticeable that these effects represent almost one-quarter of the standard deviation for those who experience occupational mobility from the lowest to the middle-status groups. At the same time, undergoing changes from the lowest to the highest occupational status group shows an increase by non-significant changes in their support for market justice (β = 0.08, p>0.05). These results align with the expectations drawn from the theoretical assumptions stated in the *market legitimacy* hypothesis (H1). At the same time, it implies that experiencing upward occupational mobility motivates adjustments in support of market principles, in line with previous evidence that has argued that upwardly mobile individuals tend to adjust their attitudes according to the dominant attitudes in the position of destination (Ares, 2020; Langsæther et al., 2022).

In Model 2, after including the variable of changes on individual SES, I introduce network diversity to account for how changes in the socioeconomic diversity of acquaintance networks affect market justice preferences. The results indicate that one standard deviation of increase in diversity drives a decrease of -0.38 standard deviations in market justice principles (β = -0.38, p<0.001). This implies that individuals who have increased the socioeconomic diversity of acquaintance networks also show more critical views of market justice principles, in line with the *market skepticism* hypothesis (H2).

| Table X: Fixed effects regression for market justice preferences and network diversity | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** | **Model 6** |
| ISEI (ref.= Low) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-low | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| Mid-high | 0.21\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* |
|  | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) |
| High | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
|  | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) |
| Missing | 0.14\*\* | 0.14\*\* | 0.14\*\* | 0.14\*\* | 0.13\*\* | 0.13\* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| Network diversity |  | -0.38\*\* | -0.46\*\*\* | -0.33\* | -0.37\*\* | -0.41\*\* |
|  |  | (0.13) | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.13) | (0.14) |
| Network status |  |  | 0.03\* |  |  | 0.03\* |
|  |  |  | (0.02) |  |  | (0.02) |
| Network size |  |  |  | -0.02 |  | -0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.02) |  | (0.02) |
| HH Income |  |  |  |  | -0.03· | -0.03· |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| University Degree |  |  |  |  | -0.02 | -0.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Unit FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Time FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Num. obs. | 6851 | 6851 | 6851 | 6851 | 6851 | 6851 |
| \*\*\*p < 0.001; \*\*p < 0.01; \*p < 0.05; ·p < 0.1; Standard errors in parentheses. Standardized coefficients. Models include age as control. | | | | | | |

# Discussion (preliminary)
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