ChatGPT

Inner Orientation and Psychological Well-Being

Internal Locus of Control, Mindfulness, and Resilience

Research consistently shows that an **internal locus of control** – the belief that one's own actions shape outcomes – is linked to better mental health and resilience. For example, among anxiety disorder patients, those with an *external* locus (believing life is dictated by outside forces) had significantly higher anxiety and depression levels than those with an *internal* locus [1]. In contrast, people with a strong internal locus tend to cope better with adversity. One economics study found that individuals high in internal control were **"psychologically insured"** against stresses like illness or injury, suffering less emotional pain from these shocks [2] [3]. Internal locus of control also correlates with proactive behaviors (healthy lifestyle, saving money, investing in education) that build resilience [4]. Key findings include:

- **Resilience:** Internal locus is a top predictor of resilience. In one survey, it explained more variance in coping with major life events than any other trait [5]. People who feel in control persist longer in tough times, whereas feeling powerless breeds stress.
- **Anxiety:** External locus of control is associated with *higher* anxiety. In a clinical study, externally oriented patients showed greater state and trait anxiety (and more symptoms like indecisiveness and fatigue) than internals [1]. Believing you *can't* influence outcomes fuels worry, while a sense of control buffers it.
- **Life Satisfaction:** An internal locus and mindful mindset markedly improve life satisfaction. A 2024 study of 250 adults found that **38% of the variance in life satisfaction** was predicted by just two inner traits: locus of control and mindfulness [6]. Participants with a more internal locus and higher mindfulness scores reported significantly greater satisfaction with life [7].

Mindfulness in particular contributes to mental clarity and reduced anxiety. Mindfulness-based therapies have a moderate but meaningful impact on anxiety reduction (effect size ~0.63 in meta-analyses) [8]. In clinical trials, 8-week mindfulness meditation courses have performed *as well as* standard anti-anxiety medication in reducing anxiety symptoms, moving patients from moderate anxiety to mild levels [9]. Higher trait mindfulness also correlates with higher psychological resilience – studies show people with more mindfulness report being better able to handle stress and bounce back (e.g. one meta-analysis found a significant positive correlation, r ~0.45, between mindfulness and resilience) [10]. Essentially, mindfulness cultivates an inner orientation of calm and present-moment awareness that protects against anxiety and burnout.

Finally, **living by one's personal values** – having "inner orientation" in the form of value-congruence – is linked to greater well-being. Psychology research calls this *psychological congruence*: when people's actions align with their core values, it boosts life satisfaction and mental health [11]. Conversely, constantly compromising one's values creates inner conflict and stress. One article noted that *"congruence boosts psychological well-being and is associated with greater life satisfaction"* [11]. In practical terms, trusting your own values and purpose can reduce anxiety: people who take a stand according to their beliefs rather than staying neutral out of fear tend to feel more integrity and less worry in the long run [11]. Thus, an inner orientation grounded in personal values, mindfulness, and a sense of control fortifies **psychological resilience**, lowers chronic anxiety, and enhances fulfillment.

CEO-to-Median Employee Pay Ratios and Workplace Outcomes

Extreme gaps between CEO and worker pay don't just raise eyebrows – research suggests they can erode **employee trust, motivation, and company performance**. Since U.S. firms began disclosing CEO-to-median employee pay ratios, analysts have observed clear patterns. **High pay ratios** are often associated with: lower employee morale, higher turnover intentions, and distrust in leadership. For instance, one study found companies reporting very high CEO-vs-worker pay had subsequent declines in employee morale and productivity [12]. Employees perceive huge pay inequity as fundamentally unfair, which can breed cynicism. In fact, internal documents and public comments have warned that **"extreme CEO-to-employee compensation ratios are linked to lower employee motivation and productivity, increased turnover and…negative impact on overall performance."** [13] When workers see a CEO making hundreds of times their wage, it can corrode their organizational commitment and engagement.

Specific findings on pay ratios include:

- **Trust and Fairness:** Surveys indicate employees view large pay gaps as unjust. A study of Fortune 100 companies noted a *significant inverse relationship* between a high CEO/worker pay ratio and employees' perceived trust in leadership (i.e. bigger gaps = *lower* trustworthiness ratings of management) [14] [15]. Likewise, public opinion in the UK overwhelmingly believes pay gaps should be far smaller – one poll found **29% of Britons say CEOs should make no more than 5× the average worker**, and virtually no one finds 100×+ justifiable [16]. These perceptions matter: perceived unfairness undermines workers' identification with the company.
- **Employee Motivation & Turnover:** Large internal pay disparities can demotivate employees. Classic research showed that when frontline employees feel top executives are overpaid relative to them, they may withhold effort – one famous finding was that wider pay gaps were associated with lower product quality, presumably because disgruntled employees were less willing to go above and beyond [17] [18]. High CEO pay can also spur higher turnover among regular staff. In contrast, a sense of pay equity tends to improve morale and retention. (Notably, some economists point out that *moderate* differentials can motivate ambition via "tournament" effects – employees might strive for promotions if the top job offers a big prize. But if the gap is **too** large, it backfires by feeling unattainable and unfair, leading to disengagement.)
- **Company Performance:** The relationship between pay ratios and overall firm performance is complex. **No consensus** exists – studies diverge. Some research in the UK found a *positive* correlation between higher CEO-to-employee pay ratios and financial performance metrics like return on equity (ROE) and productivity [19]. The argument is that high CEO pay could reflect talent and incentivize the whole company (so long as the ratio isn't astronomically high) [20]. However, other analyses support the opposite: a Campbell review (2024) notes fairness theory predicts that excessive pay gaps hurt performance due to employee resentment and lower cooperation [17]. Indeed, one classic study found companies with more equitable pay structures had better product quality, linking very high pay disparities to *lower* performance via employee disengagement [18]. In practice, context matters – **extremely high** ratios (hundreds-to-1) appear detrimental to workplace climate and may not yield further gains in CEO effort. Even proponents of high CEO pay acknowledge it can **"corrode trust and leave employees disengaged."** [21]

Overall, while competitive CEO pay can reward skill, there is evidence that when the **CEO-to-median employee ratio soars** (e.g. 300:1 or more), it undermines the social contract within the company. Transparency helps somewhat – one study found that if leaders clearly explain *why* executive pay is high and ensure employees feel their own pay is fair, anger is mitigated [22]. But the take-home message is that **structural equity** matters: more balanced pay structures tend to foster stronger employee trust, motivation, and retention, which in turn support better organizational performance. In short, huge internal pay gaps carry internal costs, not just PR issues.

Generational Wealth: Practices for Intergenerational Financial Security

Building **generational wealth** – assets and financial stability passed from one generation to the next – requires both smart financial practices and structural support. Wealth transmission is heavily influenced by family habits like investing, education, and planning. It's also subject to a sobering statistic: approximately **70% of wealthy families lose their wealth by the second generation, and 90% by the third** [23]. This often-cited "shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves" phenomenon happens when fortunes aren't actively preserved through financial literacy and planning. However, certain practices greatly improve the odds of sustaining wealth across generations:

- **Education and Human Capital:** Education is one of the most powerful engines of intergenerational wealth mobility. Better-educated parents tend to earn more and invest more in their children's development, leading to higher earning children. For instance, U.S. data show the median net worth of families headed by a college graduate is around **$464,000**, versus only ~$38,000 for those without a high school diploma [24] [25]. Higher education not only boosts income but also correlates with smarter financial behaviors (college grads are far more likely to own stocks, retirement accounts, and other appreciating assets) [26] [27]. Across generations, parental wealth significantly increases children's educational attainment, which in turn facilitates greater wealth accumulation in adulthood [28]. In short, families that prioritize education often see financial benefits that echo down the lineage. (Many countries recognize this – for example, Nordic research finds that even in Sweden's egalitarian system, grandparent wealth still had a detectable effect on grandkids' educational success [29].)
- **Investing, Homeownership, and Businesses:** Strategic asset-building is key to generational wealth. This includes **homeownership**, prudent investing, and entrepreneurship. Homeownership has long-term wealth benefits: owning property builds equity that can be tapped or left to heirs. Parents with means often help children buy their first home, giving them a head-start on wealth accumulation [30]. Owning a family business or other investments is another route – having capital to start a business greatly increases one's net worth potential, and parental wealth often facilitates children's entry into self-employment or business ownership [31]. Notably, *bequests and gifts* from older generations account for over **half of total net worth** in the U.S., and studies in Sweden and Denmark have found that inheritances explain the majority of the parent–child wealth correlation [32]. This underscores how critical **financial planning** (wills, trusts, etc.) is: effective estate planning ensures assets are preserved and transferred with minimal erosion from taxes or family disputes. Families that openly discuss inheritance and prepare the next generation tend to maintain wealth far better than those that keep it secret [33] [34].
- **Financial Literacy and Planning:** Teaching each generation how to manage money might be the *most* crucial practice. Many fortunes dissipate simply because heirs lack financial skills or motivation. Successful multigenerational families often emphasize transparency and money education early. They involve children in financial decisions, instill values of saving and investing, and set up structures (like trusts with trustees or family councils) to steward the wealth [35] [36]. As one report noted, families who sustain wealth **"communicate with the next generations in a very straightforward manner"** – they hold regular conversations about assets, goals, and responsibilities [34]. This helps prevent the common pitfalls of entitlement or mismanagement that plague heirs who only see the *trappings* of wealth without understanding the effort behind

it. Moreover, professional guidance (financial advisors, estate attorneys) can impose discipline and impartial oversight, increasing longevity of the assets [37] .

Equally important is recognizing structural factors: **intergenerational wealth transmission is not purely meritocratic**. Society-wide, wealth is highly concentrated and persistent. Studies find that about one-third to one-half of economic advantage is passed to the next generation. For example, the **intergenerational wealth correlation** in the United States is around 0.4 on average (where 0 would be no inheritance effect and 1 would be identical wealth ranks) [38] [39] . In practical terms, nearly half of children born to top-wealth parents remain in the top tier as adults, and a similar fraction of those born to low-wealth parents stay stuck at the bottom [40] . This means starting conditions and family resources play a big role in one's financial outcomes. However, by employing the practices above – education, wise investments, careful planning – families can improve mobility and **create a lasting legacy**. The connection between *inner experience* and *external structure* is evident here: cultivating financial discipline, knowledge, and values (inner attitudes) within a supportive economic framework (external opportunities like education and property ownership) yields resilient generational wealth.

Social Media "Wealth Spectacle" and Mental Health in Low-Income Users

On today's social media, users are inundated with curated images of luxury lifestyles – mansions, sports cars, lavish vacations. For **low-income viewers**, this constant exposure to others' wealth can powerfully shape mental well-being, usually for the worse. The phenomenon is explained by social comparison and relative deprivation: seeing affluent lives on Instagram or TikTok makes economically struggling individuals more aware of what they *lack*, potentially breeding envy, depression, or disillusionment. Key insights include:

- **Upward Social Comparison & Envy:** Studies confirm that social media amplifies upward comparisons. People tend to compare themselves to those "above" them (wealthier, more attractive, etc.), and platforms like Instagram provide an endless highlight reel of others' successes. This often triggers feelings of inferiority. A 2023 systematic review found a *consistent link* between social media envy and depression – users who reported more envy while browsing had higher depressive symptoms and lower self-esteem [41] [42] . Notably, those already struggling (e.g. with low self-worth or financial stress) are *most* vulnerable. Seeing peers' glamorous posts can create a vicious cycle: envy leads to feeling worse about one's own life, which can deepen anxiety or depressed mood [43] .
- **Relative Deprivation in Low-Income Users:** For low-income individuals, luxury content can sharpen a sense of relative deprivation – the perception of being deprived compared to others. Psychological theories of social comparison say that when the reference group one sees is far better off, dissatisfaction grows [44] [45] . Indeed, research in economics and public health has noted that widening wealth gaps produce negative emotions among those at the bottom: **jealousy, resentment, and pessimism** about one's situation [45] . On social media, even one's *peers* (friends or influencers of similar age) might appear far better off, which can be especially demoralizing. A controlled experiment in a social media context found that **exposure to a peer's luxurious Instagram posts lowered viewers' self-esteem and sense of social status** relative to seeing more ordinary posts [46] . In essence, low-income users start to feel "poor by comparison," even if their absolute situation hasn't changed. This mindset – constantly measuring one's life against online others – is associated with reduced life satisfaction.
- **Mental Health Outcomes:** Excessive exposure to idealized wealth content has been tied to higher rates of depression, anxiety, and financial stress. One **NerdWallet** survey reported that nearly *3 in 5 Americans* have felt jealous of someone else's finances, and over half of those

experiencing such “money envy” said it negatively affected their mental health [47]. Importantly, 65% of respondents in that survey believed **social media** contributes to overspending and unhealthy financial comparisons [47]. Among lower-income groups, these effects may be heightened: feeling pressure to “keep up” can lead to risky financial behavior (like unnecessary luxury purchases or debt) in an attempt to match the lifestyles seen online [48] [49]. On the flip side, some evidence suggests that simply reducing social media use or curating one’s feed can improve mood for those feeling disadvantaged – essentially by removing the constant trigger of comparison.

It’s worth noting that not all comparisons lead to despair; sometimes seeing success can motivate ambition (a concept called benign envy). However, when there’s a **large gap** and a feeling that “people like me can never have that,” the outcome skews negative. Low-income youth who spend more time on social media report lower self-evaluated *financial satisfaction*, likely due to these unattainable reference points [50] [51]. In cross-cultural contexts, similar trends emerge: whether in developing countries or wealthy nations, exposure to the *global* rich on social platforms can make local poverty feel even more acute. The **inner experience** (feelings of worth, contentment) is thus strongly shaped by this **external structural exposure** (social media’s highlight reel of wealth). Managing this impact may require digital literacy interventions – e.g. educating users that social media presents a biased, curated reality – and encouraging mindfulness or gratitude practices to counteract the negative comparisons. In summary, while social media can connect people, its relentless showcase of luxury lifestyles often leaves lower-income viewers with diminished self-worth and happiness, by inflating their sense of relative deprivation.

Critical Thinking, Frame Awareness, and Misinformation Resilience

In the era of “fake news” and viral misinformation, **critical thinking skills** and **frame awareness** (recognizing how information is presented or biased) have emerged as vital defenses. Put simply, people who can think analytically and spot manipulative framing are far less likely to fall for false or misleading information in social, political, or economic domains. Research across many countries supports this:

- **Analytical Thinking as a Shield:** Numerous studies show that individuals who engage in reflective, critical thinking are less susceptible to conspiracy theories and fake news. A meta-analysis of 31 studies (2023) covering tens of thousands of participants found that **lower analytic reasoning ability was consistently associated with higher misinformation susceptibility** [52]. In fact, belief in fake news correlates with traits like dogmatism and cognitive rigidity, and *inversely* with critical reasoning ability [52]. In one experiment, people who scored high on a simple cognitive reflection test (which measures tendency to think deliberately rather than go with gut intuition) were significantly better at discerning false headlines from real ones. This aligns with findings that **deliberation reduces gullibility** – when we pause and fact-check rather than accept claims at face value, we catch more errors. As one paper summarized, *“critical thinking is an essential skill for identifying fake news,”* and it recommended information literacy training in schools specifically to boost critical evaluation of online content [53].
- **Education and Misinformation:** Formal education tends to improve critical thinking, and data show it also reduces vulnerability to misinformation. A recent global study spanning 24 countries (66,000 participants) used a “Misinformation Susceptibility Test” and found that those with higher **education levels scored best** at detecting fake news [54]. Participants with graduate degrees were the least susceptible, whereas those with only high school were among the most easily deceived [54]. Education likely imparts both knowledge and habits of skeptical inquiry (like

checking sources, understanding statistics) that help people question dubious claims. Cross-cultural evidence echoes this: countries or regions with higher average education/media literacy tend to have populations that are less prone to believe rumors and propaganda. **Frame awareness** – being conscious of how information can be slanted – is another aspect often cultivated through education (for instance, learning history from multiple perspectives). People skilled at recognizing framing techniques (such as emotional appeals, one-sided narratives, or misleading graphs) can mentally "re-frame" an issue and thus are less swayed by any single biased presentation.

- **Interventions and Skills:** Encouragingly, even brief interventions to spark critical thinking can make a difference. One study showed that a simple 15-minute online module teaching participants about misinformation tactics (like deepfakes, clickbait, logical fallacies) significantly improved their ability to spot false stories later [55]. Likewise, practicing *"lateral reading"* – cross-checking information with credible sources – is a teachable strategy that reduces belief in false news. Frame awareness can be improved by training people to ask key questions: "Who is the source? What's their agenda? What's left out of this frame?" By habitually **considering context**, individuals are less likely to be misled by sensational or one-sided framing. For example, if a political meme presents an issue in an outrage-inducing frame, a frame-aware person might recognize the lack of nuance and seek additional facts before forming an opinion.

On the flip side, lacking critical thinking leaves one at the mercy of biases and misinformation. Studies during the COVID-19 pandemic found that people with lower scientific literacy and analytical skills were more likely to believe and spread COVID misinformation (e.g. hoax cures, conspiracy theories) [56] [57]. Similarly, those who are unaware of cognitive biases or framing effects might not realize when their opinion is being manipulated by how news is packaged (for instance, focusing on extreme cases to generalize a false trend). In sum, fostering an *inner* habit of critical inquiry and an *awareness of external frames* significantly immunizes individuals against false social/political/economic narratives. It empowers them to maintain clearer judgment even amid the cacophony of misleading information in the external environment.

The "Lone-Wolf" Success Myth vs. Social Capital and Collaboration

The romantic notion of the self-made "lone wolf" – the idea that individual genius or hard work alone is responsible for success – is largely a myth. In reality, **social capital, mentorship, and collaborative support structures** play an outsized role in most individual success stories. Research in organizational behavior, entrepreneurship, and psychology all point to the same conclusion: people succeed *together*. Connections, networks, and teamwork provide critical advantages that solitary effort cannot easily replicate. Consider the following evidence debunking the lone-wolf myth:

- **Mentorship and Career Advancement:** The vast majority of high achievers credit mentors or advisors for their success. In one survey, **75% of executives said mentors had been key to their career** accomplishments [58]. Another study showed that 90% of employees who have a career mentor report being more satisfied in their job and advancing more quickly [58]. Mentors provide knowledge, connections, and confidence boosts. They help mentees navigate challenges that would be hard to overcome alone. Companies with formal mentoring programs see better retention and promotion rates; for example, one corporate study found **employees with mentors had a 50% higher retention rate** than those without [59]. The influence of mentorship is cross-industry and global – whether it's a young researcher learning from a senior scientist, or an aspiring CEO being groomed by a predecessor, the transfer of tacit knowledge and social capital is invaluable. It's telling that **three-quarters of successful entrepreneurs have a**

mentor or supportive network, compared to only ~14% of entrepreneurs who failed in business having had such support [60]. Clearly, going it alone is the exception; guided development is the norm for success.

- **Networking and Social Capital:** "It's not just what you know, but *who* you know." This adage is backed by data: a large portion of opportunities come through connections. Estimates suggest **65%–85% of jobs are obtained through networking rather than direct applications** [61] [62]. Those informal referrals and introductions dramatically increase one's chances – a strong social network opens doors that sheer individual merit might not. Social capital also provides support in crises (friends offering help, colleagues sharing information). Studies on social mobility find that individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds who manage to succeed often cite *gatekeepers* or advocates who lent them social capital along the way – e.g. a teacher who connected them to scholarships, or a community leader who provided an internship. Conversely, lack of networks can stall even talented people. That's why programs to foster networking (such as alumni networks, professional associations, incubators for startups) greatly enhance participants' outcomes. In short, **collaborative networks amplify individual potential** by linking people to resources, feedback, and opportunities beyond their personal reach.
- **Collaboration and Team Performance:** Far from hindering individual success, *the right team* can propel a person to heights they could never reach alone. Innovation and problem-solving are often team endeavors. As one expert put it, *"Behind every genius is a team."* Albert Einstein, for example, refined many ideas through discussions with peers [63]. Scientific and business breakthroughs increasingly come from collaborative groups rather than solo inventors. Experiments have shown that groups outperform even the smartest lone individuals on complex tasks: **teams of 3–5 people solved problems more effectively than the best solo problem-solver** in the group, by pooling their knowledge and correcting each other's errors [64]. Teams also spur creativity – diverse teams (mixing backgrounds, skills, perspectives) are more innovative and produce better solutions on average than any single member would have produced [65] [66]. This doesn't diminish individual excellence; rather, it shows excellence thrives in a *collaborative context*. High-performing organizations structure work in teams and collaborative projects because they know it leads to superior outcomes. Even at the individual level, collaboration provides learning and growth. Teamwork allows people to learn from others' strengths and feedback, building skills much faster than isolated work. As one article noted, working in a team can reveal your blind spots and push you to improve in ways solo work might not [67] [68].

In terms of **social capital**, research in sociology indicates it's a strong predictor of upward mobility. Communities with tight-knit support, mentoring programs, and professional networks tend to produce more successful individuals (controlling for other factors) compared to communities where people are isolated. The lone-wolf myth often glosses over these advantages. The reality is that external structures – like quality schooling, mentorship availability, peer networks, even family emotional support – deeply affect one's likelihood of "making it."

To emphasize the connection between inner and outer: an individual's **inner drive and talent** are certainly important, but they flourish best within enabling external structures (mentors, teams, networks). Conversely, external support can ignite latent inner potential. Success is thus a **co-production of personal effort and collective input**. The story of the lone genius toiling in isolation is more legend than fact; most real success stories are networks of wolves, not lone wolves. By building social capital and engaging in collaboration, individuals create a reinforcing cycle of growth – an external web of support that bolsters internal development, leading to far greater fulfillment and achievement than isolated effort could yield.

---

1 Locus of control in chronic anxiety disorders - PubMed
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/4083058/

2 3 4 Can having internal locus of control insure against negative shocks? Psychological evidence from panel data - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5510663/

5 Internal vs External Locus of Control: 7 Examples & Theories
https://positivepsychology.com/internal-external-locus-of-control/

6 7 Predictors of Life Satisfaction: The Role of Mindfulness and Locus of Control | Journal of Personality and Psychosomatic Research (JPPR)
https://journals.kmanpub.com/index.php/jppr/article/view/2200

8 The Effect of Mindfulness-Based Therapy on Anxiety and Depression
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2848393/

9 Can mindfulness help anxiety? Trial suggests yes. — Harvard Gazette
https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2023/02/can-mindfulness-help-anxiety-trial-suggests-yes/

10 [PDF] The association between mindfulness, resilience, and academic ...
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1446460/pdf

11 Building Psychological Congruence for Mental Well-Being | Psychology Today
https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/202401/building-psychological-congruence-for-mental-well-being

12 13 haslam.utk.edu
https://haslam.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Spinning-the-CEO-Pay-Ratio-Disclosure-Boone-1.pdf

14 16 19 20 21 22 CEO-employee pay ratios matter – but not as much as you might think
https://www.raconteur.net/talent-culture/executive-pay-hr

15 A Quantitative Analysis of Fortune 100 Companies in the United States
https://search.proquest.com/openview/bf9e1e63f7c0fce08601f1943a147af9/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

17 18 PROTOCOL: Is the CEO/employee pay ratio related to firm performance in publicly traded companies? - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11534641/

23 33 34 35 36 37 Generational Wealth: Why do 70% of Families Lose Their Wealth in the 2nd Generation? | Nasdaq
https://www.nasdaq.com/articles/generational-wealth%3A-why-do-70-of-families-lose-their-wealth-in-the-2nd-generation-2018-10

24 25 26 27 Useful Stats: Educational attainment and financial health | SSTI
https://ssti.org/blog/useful-stats-educational-attainment-and-financial-health

28 29 30 31 32 38 39 40 Generations of Advantage. Multigenerational Correlations in Family Wealth - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6296851/

41 42 43 Envy, Social Comparison, and Depression on Social Networking Sites: A Systematic Review - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9955439/

44 45 The impact of household wealth gap on individual's mental health | BMC Public Health | Full Text
https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-023-16871-6

46 How exposure to peers' Portrayal of luxury lifestyles on social media ...
https://www.academia.edu/104156976/How_exposure_to_peers_Portrayal_of_luxury_lifestyles_on_social_media_hurts_the_self

47 50 Survey: 54% Who Feel Money Envy Say It Harms Their Mental Health - NerdWallet
https://www.nerdwallet.com/article/finance/survey-money-envy-is-common-and-54-who-feel-it-say-it-harms-their-mental-health

48 How social media envy inspires overspending - MassMutual Blog
https://blog.massmutual.com/planning/social-media-spend

49 How visual wealth exposure on social media increases relative ...
https://cyberpsychology.eu/article/view/38097

51 New study shows that people envy other people's social status more ...
https://www.reddit.com/r/psychology/comments/kwshy2/new_study_shows_that_people_envy_other_peoples/

52 Insight problem solving ability predicts reduced susceptibility to fake ...
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13546783.2022.2146191

53 The Use of Critical Thinking to Identify Fake News: A Systematic Literature Review - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7134234/

54 57 Global Study Reveals Who’s Most Vulnerable to Misinformation
https://www.psychiatrist.com/news/global-study-reveals-whos-most-vulnerable-to-misinformation/

55 Critical thinking and misinformation vulnerability - Oxford Academic
https://academic.oup.com/pnasnexus/article/3/10/pgae361/7821167

56 Susceptibility to online misinformation: A systematic meta-analysis of ...
https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2409329121

58 A Better Approach to Mentorship
https://hbr.org/2023/06/a-better-approach-to-mentorship

59 Mentoring Statistics You Need to Know - 2025 - Mentorloop
https://mentorloop.com/blog/mentoring-statistics/

60 Mentoring Statistics 2025: Tomorrow's Blueprint - Mentorink
https://www.mentorink.com/blog/mentoring-statistics/

61 Career Capstone Jeopardy - JeopardyLabs
https://jeopardylabs.com/compile/career-capstone-jeopardy8

62 News Archives | NAIT Nugget
https://thenuggetonline.com/category/news/page/39/?amp&et_blog

63 64 65 66 67 68 What is teamwork and why is it important? - Work Life by Atlassian
https://www.atlassian.com/blog/teamwork/the-importance-of-teamwork