CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The objective of the present study was to study the role of self-esteem, social anxiety, locus of control and vanity in the relationship between peer pressure and materialism among male and female adolescents belonging to low and middle socio-economic status. The present investigation aimed to study the relationship between various variables by understanding the correlation, assessing the gender differences and socio-economic status differences and investigating the moderators in the relationship between peer pressure and materialism.

Individuals who were high on materialistic tendencies were more likely to acquire possessions and to assign a higher priority to material goods. We are living in an era where a large section of the society desires goods to enhance their status (O’Cass & McEween, 2004).

Peer pressure and materialism

Peer relations have become increasingly complex in late adolescence as adolescents begin to interact with peers from different backgrounds. Adolescents spent a lot of quality time with their peers and were strongly influenced by their opinions. In today’s era, the youth are growing up in a world where there is an easy access to myriad forms of communication. They take their decisions based on peer influence (Brown & Cantor, 2000).

Adolescence is a time in which there is an increased susceptibility to peer pressure (Blakemore & Mills, 2014). Positive relationship of peer pressure and materialism has been supported by several studies. Achenreiner (1997) stated that susceptibility to peer influence was positively associated with materialistic attitudes. Consumer socialization literature provides abundant support for the positive impact of peer influence on consumption knowledge of adolescents (John, 1999).

When adolescents make purchase, they tend to solicit product information, evaluation and recommendations from peers (Gershoff et al., 2001). There was an
impact of peer pressure on the attitudes of the adolescents towards luxury brands
(Heaney, Goldsmith, & Jusoh, 2005). In adolescents, materialistic pursuits were very
high (Bristol & Mangleburg, 2005).

Lawrence (2003) discovered that “the brand is king” for adolescents and they
have become extremely brand conscious. Nowadays, many clothing marketers are
employing peer-to-peer marketing strategy to create market demand keeping the
adolescents as their main target group (Spero & Stone, 2004; Dotson & Hyatt, 2005).
Individuals high on materialism desired uniqueness and conformity both when making
purchasing decisions (Park, Rabolt, & Jeon, 2008).

The young adolescents preferred to buy clothes with their peers rather than
parents as peer approval was the utmost for them (Bakewell, Mitchell, & Rothwell,
2006). Social comparisons played a central role in the lives of the adolescents as they
are setting benchmarks for themselves. They formed their self-concepts based on the
opinions of their peers (Isaksen & Roper, 2008).

Peer influence played a crucial role in their choice of brands as it was
considered to be important in the socialization process (Fernandez, 2009). The peers
were influential to consumption decisions and peer approval replaced family approval.
The learned how to attach meanings and symbols to different types of brands (Roper
& La Niece, 2009). The acceptance and approval given by the peers was seen as the best
way to gain confidence (Isaksen & Roper, 2012). Sun and Guo (2013) carried out a
study and the findings revealed that fashion involvement was a function of exposure to
peer pressure and social media.

Davila, Casabayo, and Singh (2017) stated that peer interactions had an effect
on attitude towards imitation of celebrities and advertisements that resulted in an
increase in materialistic pursuits.

Self esteem and materialism

Individuals who were high on materialistic orientations reflected a negative
attitude and viewed possessions for their symbolic self-completion and self-definition
(Dittmar, Beattie, & Friese, 1996).
Dittmar and Drury (2000) conducted in-depth interviews with both non-compulsive buyers and compulsive buyers. Excessive shoppers were motivated to possess materialistic goods to boost their self-image and they reported a greater self-discrepancy also. It was seen that accumulating material goods boosts one’s identity and happiness.

Previous studies have shown an inversely proportional causal relationship between self-esteem and materialism. As self-esteem increased, materialistic pursuits decreased (Christopher & Schlenker, 2004). The luxurious brands helped to shape one’s self-identity and self-worth (Jenkins, 2004). Chaplin and John (2007) conducted a study on adolescents and found self esteem to be a partial mediator of the relationship between peer pressure and materialism.

Yurchisin and Johnson (2004) carried out an investigation on 305 undergraduates and the results of the study revealed that adolescents with low self-esteem felt the need to depend on the materialistic possessions to feel good about them.

An individual maintained his or her self-identity all the way through purchase and use of products (Shrum et al., 2013). Individuals accumulated possessions and indulged in maladaptive consumption when faced with existential security threats. Such persons were prone to feeling insecure compensate for such insecurity through material goods (Ruvio, Somer, & Rindfliesch, 2013; Zhang & Kim, 2013). Peer rejection boosted materialism in the adolescents by lowering implicit self-esteem (Jiang et al., 2015).

**Social anxiety and materialism**

There exists a positive association between materialism and social anxiety. Persons who were high on materialism were often the ones with a pessimistic attitude and they were likely to have social anxiety, frustration and mood swings (Richins & Dawson, 1992). In order to avoid social disapproval and to lower their anxiety in social relationships, an individual indulged in materialistic possessions (Schroeder & Dugal, 1995). Highly materialistic individuals exhibited high self-monitoring, high social anxiety and low self-esteem (Chatterjee & Hunt, 1996; Burroughs & Rindfliesch, 2002; Christopher & Schlenker, 2004).
Social comparisons with other persons resulted in an increase in materialism and high consumption behaviour (Ogden & Venkat, 2001). Materialists tend to monitor themselves socially as compared to non-materialists (Browne & Kaldenberg, 1997; Cass, 2001). Such persons became more involved with possessions that bolstered their societal roles (O’Cass, 2004).

Also, materialists predicted that they would experience more negative affect and contemplated more about finances as compared to non-materialists; greater materialistic strivings resulted in negative emotions and diminished well-being (Hartnett & Skowronska, 2008).

Materialistic pursuits were positively associated with fear of social disapproval. This status oriented consumption enabled individuals to fit in a particular social group (Goldsmith & Clark, 2012). If a person’s sense of self-evaluation was dependent upon how he/she looks, then they experienced social anxiety issues (Neff & Vonk, 2009; Baker, Moschis, Ong, & Pattanapanyasat, 2013; Brouskeli & Loumakou, 2014).

Materialistic adolescents witnessed heightened needs for interpersonal security and acceptance and they were the ones who had experienced a stressful childhood (Weaver, Moschis, & Davis, 2011; Grougiou & Moschis, 2015). Individuals had a strong urge to purchase due to intrinsic factors such as stress and anxiety (Easterbrook, Wright, Dittmar, & Banerjee, 2014; Simanjuntak & Rosifa, 2016).

**Locus of control and materialism**

Previous studies found that materialistic persons induced greater faith in luck, chance or destiny. The locus of control scores were associated with college students' credit card attitudes (Henry, Weber, & Yarbrough, 2001; Pirog & Roberts, 2007).

Persons with an external locus of control were believed to have more positive attitudes toward money and credit (Luna-Arocas & Tang, 2004; Joo, Durband, & Grable, 2008) and were more likely to shop compulsively (Lea, Webley, & Walker, 1995) as compared to individuals with an internal locus of control.

Christopher, Morgan, Marek, Keller, and Drummond (2005) suggested that materialistic persons had a low self-esteem; they were insecure and had an external
locus of control. Individuals who had high level of addictive buying had a low self-esteem, low conscientiousness and an external locus of control (Rodriguez-Villarino, 2006). Fashion followers had an external locus of control whereas fashion change agents were more likely to have an internal locus of control (Workman & Studak, 2007).

Watson (2009) assessed the behavioural differences between internal locus of control and external locus of control. Consumers with external locus of control were high on compulsive buying behaviours. Gil, Kwon, Good, and Johnson (2012) conducted a study on 558 adolescents between the ages of 12 and 19 to investigate how adolescents' self-concepts can influence social consumption motivation. Adolescents who gave less attention to external sources had a strong tendency to resist social motivations to consume.

Previous studies showed materialism to be linked with lack of self-control, as materialistic persons tend to lose control over their consumption decisions and get trapped into the loop of materialism (Sivanathan & Pettit 2010; Pieters 2013). Materialism was found to have a positive association with an external locus of control (Donnelly, Ksendzova, Howell, Vohs, & Baumeister, 2016).

**Vanity and materialism**

Krantz (1987) ascertained that physical vanity was linked with consumers who desired good physical appearance for the sake of power, self-esteem and social benefits. Highly materialistic persons were concerned with more self-presentation concerns (Belk, 1985). There was a cause and effect relationship between physical vanity and consumer behavior (Karpova, 2007).

It was found that the female college students with a physical view were likely to have possession-defined success and were likely to purchase personalized goods (Chang, Liu, Lin, & Wen, 2008). The women with higher materialistic tendencies reported an interest in a higher number of cosmetic surgery procedures (Henderson-King & Brooks, 2009). Adolescents were motivated to purchase the branded products that were termed as superior, rich, or fashionable (Rhee & Johnson, 2012).

Hennigs and Kilian (2016) examined the relationship between consumer vanity and luxury consumption in individualistic and collectivist cultures. The findings of their study supported the predicted relationships between consumer vanity and luxury consumption in both individualistic and collectivist cultures. Physical vanity and materialism were positively related among female adolescents (Vinayak & Arora, 2018b).

There was a significant association between achievement vanity and possession success (Netemeyer et al., 1995). Paying high prices for greater sense of superiority among people revealed a relationship between materialism with achievement vanity (Lichtenstein, Ridgway, & Netemeyer, 1993).

Materialistic pursuits such as acquiring luxury goods like cars, gadgets and homes helped to experience comfort from doubt regarding one’s social position (Roberts & Pirog, 2004). Materialistic individuals seemed to emphasize more utilitarian concerns such as appearance and status concerns (Richins, 2004). Mandel, Petrova, and Cialdini (2006) witnessed that there was a rise in the scores of materialism after an individual read about their highly successful peers.

Jeon and Park (2006) found out that achievement vanity was significantly related with underlying dimension of materialism and fashion orientation. Materialists purchased highly visible things to put emphasis on their appearance and to convey richness and prosperity (Fitzmaurice, 2008).

Chadha and Husband (2007) found out that Indian consumers engaged in consumption of luxurious goods as they believed that these possessions act as symbols of modernity and economic prosperity. Highly priced branded items were designed to showcase a high status symbol, prestige, affiliation, and wealth (Chang et al., 2008).

A materialistic person desired for things that they viewed would raise their status in the eyes of other people (Chaudhuri, Mazumdar, & Ghoshal, 2011; Turunen &
Laaksonen, 2011). Mady, Cherrier, Lee, and Rahman (2015) found out that people who were high on achievement orientation were prestige-conscious, and purchased only expensive products to feel superior and attract other’s attention.

Both physical vanity and achievement vanity had a significant relationship with purchase intention (Mamat, Noor, & Noor, 2016). Watson (2016) investigated the relationship between dominance, prestige and materialism was with self-report in a sample of 438 university students. Materialism was associated with social dominance orientation rather than opposition to equality. There were significant correlations between relevant dimensions of the money attitudes scale, materialism, and vanity (Durvasula & Lysonski, 2010).

The materialists focused on profit and not on the societal benefit (Kashyap & Iyer, 2009; Kolodinsky, Madden, Zisk, & Henkel, 2010). Achievement vanity was found to have a moderate impact on the purchase intention of luxury brand consumers (Hung et al., 2011).

**Self-esteem and peer pressure**

Positive relationships with peer groups have been linked with high levels of self-esteem (Hirsch & DuBois, 1991), and rejection by peers had been associated with low self-esteem (Demo & Savin-Williams, 1992). Weiss and Ebbeck (1996) stated that peer groups allowed opportunities for self-esteem affirmation and emotional support. Adolescents with less supportive peers had low self-esteem which led to an increase in materialistic tendencies in them. Jackson and Bracken (1998) found that children who were rejected by their peers had low scores on self-esteem.

Ricciardelli and McCabe (2001) examined the effect of socio-cultural influences on body dissatisfaction. The findings revealed that males with lower self-esteem were influenced by the socio-cultural pressures. Furthermore, girls who were considered as popular by their peers engaged in disordered eating and had lower body esteem (Lieberman, Gauvin, Bukowski, & White, 2001).

Neighbors, Larimer, Geisner, and Knee (2004) found out positive associations between controlled orientation towards peer pressure and experiencing a lack of choice
in one’s behaviours and drinking. Social approval enhanced the drinking motives. Wild, Flisher, Bhana, and Lombard (2004) investigated associations among self-esteem and risk behaviours related to bullying, suicides, substance use and sexuality in adolescents. The distortion was caused by the influence of peer group on the likelihood of anorexia, and the influence of self image on individual weight.

De Bruyn and van den Boom (2005) stated that self-esteem and sociometric popularity was connected through the reduction of peer role strain levels. Smith and Leaper (2006) found out that peer acceptance partially mediated the relationship between self-worth and self-perceived gender typicality.

Popular adolescents among peers were described as good-looking, confident and sociable (Cillessen & Marks, 2011). Self-efficacy expectations were higher in those adolescents who were experiencing low levels of peer influence than in adolescents (Kiran-Esen, 2012).

Uslu (2013) analysed 500 high school students to investigate the relationship between self-esteem and peer pressure degrees in adolescents across gender and socio-economic status. It was found that the magnitude of peer pressure in adolescents was viewed according to their level of income. A significant positive correlation between their self-esteem degree and indirect peer pressure was found.

**Peer pressure and social anxiety**

Socially anxious adolescents succumbed to peer pressure to improve their social status and be accepted by the peer group (La Greca & Lopez, 1998; Morris, 2001; Storch & Masia-Warner, 2004; Prinstein, Boergers, & Spirito, 2001). LaGreca and Harrison (2005) explored interpersonal functioning, including general peer relations, qualities of friendships in adolescents as predictors of social anxiety. The results revealed that socially anxious individuals were vulnerable to peer influence. The young adults with higher social anxiety reported using more alcohol in response to their perceived peer pressure (Buckner, Mallott, Schmidt, & Taylor, 2006).

Stewart, Morris, Mellings, and Komar (2006) conducted a study on 157 undergraduate drinkers and the findings of their study revealed that fear of negative
evaluation was positively related to drinking behaviors in order to cope with negative emotions and to comply to peer pressure.

Teachman and Allen (2006) examined the fear of negative evaluation and the emotional intensity of close peer interactions in adolescents and it was found out that the lack of perceived social acceptance predicted social anxiety in adolescents.

Mack, Strong, Kowalski, and Crocker (2007) analyzed the role of peer group influence on social physique anxiety. It was seen that females experienced more peer pressure to alter their physique as compared to the males.

Social anxiety was significantly connected with decreased peer acceptance and negative evaluations in friendships predicted high social anxiety (Erath, Flanagan, & Bierman, 2007). When individuals had low self-esteem, then they wanted social approval and acceptance to feel better (Silvera, Lavack, & Kropp, 2008).

Peer rejection led to long-term negative consequences that resulted in the development of anxiety and depression (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998; Perren & Alsaker, 2009). Blote, Miers, and Westenberg (2016) carried out a study to understand the relationship between social anxiety and substance use in adolescents, particularly the role of susceptibility to peer pressure. The results revealed that social anxiety was linked to susceptibility to peer pressure.

**Peer pressure and locus of control**

Avtgis (1998) studied internal and external locus of control with persuasability, social conformity and social influence in his research. It was hypothesized that individuals who had an external locus of control would be more socially influenced as compared to individuals with an internal locus of control. The results revealed that locus of control scores were correlated with scores on social influence and conformity.

Georgiou and Stavrinides (2008) investigated the attributions for their peer violence. It was found that bully-victims were more isolated socially and more temperamental than the other three groups. Also, the members of bully-victims group tended to use external attributions for explaining the causes of peer violence.
Ugokwe-Ossai and Ucheagwu (2011) analyzed the effect of the peer relations and locus of control on spending patterns among university students. Results showed an interaction of locus of control and peer relations on spending styles. Those who were externals showed an increase in spending money to maintain appropriate peer relations. In addition, those who were internals with appropriate peer relations showed reduced spending than those who had inappropriate peer relations.

Jhaveri and Patki (2016) examined the relationship between locus of control, peer influence on dieting, media exposure and body image satisfaction. The finding revealed that external locus of control scores was positively associated to peer group influence.

**Peer pressure and vanity**

Social pressure influenced achievement vanity in adolescents (Durvasula et al., 2001). Blowers, Loxton, Grady-Flesser, Occhipinti, and Dawe (2003) investigated the relationships among socio-cultural pressures to be fit and thin, and body dissatisfaction in young girls. Socio-cultural factors and peer influences were significantly associated with internalization of the thin ideal. Peers promoted the construction of beauty norms and standards and highlighted the role of appearance.

In adolescents, socialization agents enhanced appearance related norms through direct and indirect peer interactions (Phares, Steinberg, & Thompson, 2004). Adolescents who were engaged in more frequent conversations about appearance issues with their peers were more likely to internalize a thin ideal (Jones, Vigfusdottir, & Lee, 2004).

Clark and Tiggemann (2006) found out that preadolescent girls were also exposed to appearance ideals which were manifested among peers, resulting in an increase in physical vanity. Clark, Zboja, and Goldsmith (2007) suggested that material accomplishments helped individuals to impress others and thereby gain social acceptance.

Lawler and Nixon (2010) examined 239 adolescents on measures of body dissatisfaction, peer appearance conversations and peer criticism. The findings revealed
that peer appearance criticism emerged as predictors of body dissatisfaction. Helfert and Warschburger (2011) showed that peer influences affected gender specific body image concerns by leading to muscle concerns in boys and body weight concerns in girls.

Seock and Merritt (2013) observed that perceived media pressure and peer criticism had significant negative influences on adolescent girls' body satisfaction. Peer criticism was a significant determinant of body concealing behavior.

Kim, Callan, Gheorghiu, and Matthews (2016) also found that social comparison process led people to believe they were relatively deprived and this deprivation further enhanced the drive for sense of achievement, resulting in more materialistic pursuits.

**Gender differences:**

(i) **Materialism**

Previous studies show mixed results in context of gender differences in materialism. Kasser and Ryan (1993) found out that males placed greater importance on financial success than women. Boys were found to be more materialistic than girls (Goldberg, Gorn, Peracchio, & Bamossy, 2003; Flouri, 2004; Kamineni, 2005).

Robert and Clement (2006) found that males were more likely to equate material possessions with happiness as compared to females. Sahdeva and Gautama (2007) examined the difference between males and females in their preferences on apparel purchase. Males reported a higher average score. Males were more materialistic than females.

Karabati and Cemalcilar (2010) examined the gender differences in materialism and it was found out that materialism scores in males and females were equal. Furthermore, females were higher on the centrality subscale and males were higher on success and happiness subscales.

The male fashion change agents had higher motivational attitudes towards impulsive shopping orientations as compared to female fashion change agents (Workman & Cho, 2012).
Handa and Khare (2011) investigated the role of gender as a moderator in the relationship of materialism and product involvement. Young men and women differed with respect to their involvement with fashion clothing as women reported a higher level of involvement.

(ii) **Peer Pressure**

There are mixed studies in context of gender differences in peer pressure. Previous research has also indicated that girls were more resistant to peer pressure than boys (Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986). The males were more susceptible to peer pressure as compared to their female counterparts (Santor, Messervey, & Kusumakar, 2000; Sim & Koh, 2003).

Female adolescents experienced a higher level of peer pressure as compared to male adolescents (De Rosier & Marcus, 2005) whereas male adolescents put more indirect peer pressure than female adolescents (Kumpulainen et.al., 1998).

Hay and Ashman (2003) investigated gender differences in peer influence and ascertained that the adolescent males were more concerned with establishing independence from their parents than females. Girls were more strongly affected by peer influences as compared to boys (Jones & Crawford, 2006).

The impact of peer pressure on substance use was greater for boys as compared to girls (Crockett, Raffaelli, & Shen, 2006). Females reported higher peer support and teasing from family about weight in comparison to their male counterparts (Ata, Ludden, & Lally, 2007).

Gorrese and Ruggieri (2012) studied gender differences in peer pressure and highlighted that females were significantly more attached to their peers than males.

Helfert and Warschburger (2013) analysed age, gender, and weight related fluctuations in the perception of appearance-related social pressure by the peers. It was found out that girls were more influenced by peer pressure as compared to boys.

Asher, Asnaani, and Aderka (2017) examined gender differences in peer pressure and found that girls were more sensitive to peer pressures to fit in and impress others in comparison to boys.
(iii) **Self-esteem**

Previous findings revealed mixed studies in context of gender differences in self-esteem. Females reported lower self-esteem in adolescence (Jindal & Pando, 1982; Quatman & Watson, 2001). Research has shown that support from adult figures was more important for the self-esteem of girls than that of boys (Burnett & Demnar, 1996).

Adolescent girls were low on self-esteem and had more negative evaluations of their intellectual abilities as compared to boys. Girls' self-esteem was significantly lower than boys' self-esteem (Thomas & Daubman, 2001). Quatman and Watson (2001) analyzed gender differences in self-esteem in adolescents and the boys scored more as compared to girls on global self-esteem. Females scored significantly higher on behavioural conduct self-esteem as compared to males (Bosacki, 2003).

The relationship between gender and self-esteem has been well explored in the previous studies and male adolescents had a higher self-esteem than female adolescents (Baldwin & Hoffmann, 2002; Frost & McKelvie, 2004; McMullin & Cairney, 2004).

A vast body of existing literature indicated a significant gender gap in self-esteem which revealed that males had a higher self-esteem than females (Khanlou, 2004; Trzesniewski, Donnellan, & Robins, 2003; Orth, Robins, & Widaman, 2012; Uslu, 2013).

Bleidorn et al. (2016) conducted a large-scale systematic cross-cultural examination of gender and age differences in self-esteem. They found age-related increases in self-esteem from late adolescence to middle adulthood and significant gender gaps, with males consistently reporting higher self-esteem than females.

**Social Anxiety**

Previous studies have shown that there was higher prevalence of social anxiety disorder in women than in men (Chapman, Mannuzza, & Fyer, 1995). Women were twice as likely as men to suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, unipolar depression, dysthymia, panic disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, social anxiety disorder, and phobias (La Greca & Lopez, 1998).
Adolescent females reported more fear of negative social evaluation than males (Puklek & Vidmar, 2000). Wittchen and Fehm (2001) found out that the onset of social phobia took place in early to mid-adolescence. Women reported more worry and more cognitive variables associated with worry than men (Robichaud, Dugas, & Conway, 2003).

Social anxiety was more prevalent in female adolescents (Kessler, Berglund, Demler, Jin, & Walters, 2005). Ham, Hayes, and Hope (2005) stated that women appeared to have different experiences related to social development and social support than men that resulted in more social anxiety in women as compared to men.

Ranta et al. (2007) investigated age and gender differences in social anxiety symptoms in adolescents. The results showed that girls scored higher on social anxiety symptoms than boys across the whole age range. Dell’Osso et al. (2014) explored gender differences in social anxiety spectrum in university students and it was more frequent in females than males.

Asher et al. (2017) reviewed gender differences in eight domains of social anxiety disorder and their findings indicated that women were more likely to have social anxiety and women report greater clinical severity as compared to men.

Results indicated that individuals scored high on anxiety and depressive symptoms and were also more likely to score high on fear of success. However, only depressive symptoms appeared to be a strong predictor of fear of success. Gender comparisons found that anxiety and depressive symptoms were higher for women (Dascal, 2017).

(iv) Locus of Control

Gender is one of the most essential factors that influence an individual’s locus of control. Sherman, Higgs, and Williams (1997) found out that females tend to be more external than males on locus of control measures. Internality appeared to be more related to achievement for males than females.

Manger and Eikeland (2000) examined the gender differences in locus of control measures and girls were found to have higher internal locus of control in
comparison to boys. Rubinstein (2004) investigated locus of control among bereaved parents. It was found that the mothers demonstrated significantly more external locus of control as compared to fathers.

Holland, Geraghty, and Shah (2010) investigated relationships in context of influence on the eight driving styles in young drivers. Gender differences were explored and it was seen that women drivers had more external locus of control than men drivers.

Significant differences were found between males and females in locus of control among entrepreneurs (Bengtsson, Sanandaji, & Johannesson, 2012).

Cakir (2017) explored perceived personal problem-solving competencies in relation to gender and internal-external locus of control. Their results revealed that male participants indicated a stronger internal locus of control than female participants.

Males scored higher on internal locus of control with an interaction effect of academic background and gender for external locus of control (Rapp-Ricciardi, Garcia, & Archer, 2018).

(v) Vanity

Women were higher on public body consciousness than men and they tend to spend more time on managing their appearance than did men (Miller, Murphy, & Buss, 1981; Aune & Aune, 1994).

Roberts and Gettman (2004) stated that women’s appearance anxiety scores were significantly different in the self-objectification and body competence conditions, whereas men’s were not. Further, women’s appearance anxiety was significantly higher than men’s in both the self objectification and control conditions.

Girls reported more appearance conversations whereas boys perceived more appearance pressure and teasing (Jones & Crawford, 2006). With the increasing social and media pressures on female than on male attractiveness, men had less opportunity to enhance their physical appearance as compared to women. Males demonstrated more
physical and achievement vanity orientation than females and these results were statistically significant (Cherrier, Rahman, Mady, & Lee 2009).

Women spent more money in buying luxurious goods to show off their status (Chui, Teo, & Sidin, 2011) and had more concerns about their physical appearance as compared to men (Thiyagarajan & Shanthi, 2012).

Previous studies in the literature have shown that achievement drive and professional success with higher wages goes hand in hand. It has been found that men considered themselves to be more achievement driven in terms of their competition dominance as compared to women who gave more importance to relationship building (Daymont & Andrisani, 1984).

There were gender differences in men and women in their self-perception of ability (Boggiano, Main, & Katz 1988; Beyer, 1990, Beyer & Bowden 1997). It was found that women as compared to men had lower expectancies of future performance in many areas of achievement than males (Harackiewicz & Elliot, 1993).

Thiyagarajan and Shanthi (2012) stated that women were less achievement oriented and were more concerned about the family and social setup considering the wide gender gaps in India.

Socio-economic Status differences:

(i) Materialism

Being brought up in a disadvantaged socio-economic environment resulted in high materialism in adolescents (Chang & Arkin, 2002). People with low income had high sense of insecurity and were sensitive. They felt inferior from high-income earners. They got trapped into the habit of acquiring possessions in order to confront and prevail over feeling mediocrity (Batra & Sinha, 2000). Goldberg et al. (2003) assessed that when families had lower income, adolescents became more materialistic.

Socio-economic variables exerted strong influences on foreign brand usage among Chinese consumers (Hung, Gu, & Yim, 2007). Materialistic individuals
came from low socio-economic backgrounds (Speck & Roy, 2008; Karabati & Cemalcilar, 2010).

When individuals grew up in a deprived economic set-up, they acquired a sense of economic insecurity which made them attribute greater importance to material possessions (Isaksen & Roper, 2012).

Individuals having low income had high materialism which deduced that high income stimulates materialism. Individuals who were engaged in self employment were more materialistic than those in service (Sheldon & Krieger, 2014).

Chaplin, Hill, and John (2014) conducted personal interviews with adolescents belonging to both poor and affluent families and the results revealed that impoverished youth were more materialistic than their wealthier counterparts.

Materialists reported feelings of deprivation. Thus, materialism resulted from economic insecurities that came by living in a relatively impoverished background (Ahuvia & Wong, 2002; Manchiraju & Son, 2014).

(ii) **Peer Pressure**

In context of peer pressure, not much empirical work related to the influence of socio-economic factors has been done. Poor children had fewer opportunities to develop supportive peer relationships as compared to the children coming from high income families (Weinger, 2000).

Barrera et al. (2002) found out that the children coming from the lowest socio-economic stratum were exposed to severe material stressors of poverty. The differences in the quality of friendships were explained by variations in socio-economic status (Elliott & Leonard, 2004).

Individuals with high SES showed lower resistance to peer influence as compared to their lower SES income counterparts (Steinberg & Monahan, 2007).
Van Ewijk and Sleegers (2010) investigated effects of peers’ socio-economic status on students’ test scores. They found significant socio-economic status differences on peer pressure, which resulted in a difference in test scores. A high economic resource attracts friends (Ridge, 2011).

(iii) Self-esteem

Some previous researches have shown the impact of SES on self-esteem. Children coming from higher SES families reported higher self-esteem than those coming from lower SES (Rhodes, Roffman, Reddy, & Fredriksen, 2004). Abell and Richards (1996) examined the SES differences in self-esteem and it was found that the upper class females would exhibit a stronger relationship between body shape satisfaction and self-esteem as compared to less affluent females. Zhang and Postiglione (2001) found similar results suggesting that the ones who belonged to higher SES families reported higher self-esteem.

Twenge and Campbell (2002) conducted a meta-analysis study and found out a small but significant relationship of SES with self-esteem. Higher SES individuals reported higher self-esteem.

Among socio-economic influences, family income was related with self-esteem in adolescents (Rhodes et al., 2004; Birndorf, Ryan, Auinger, & Aten, 2005). Occupational status influenced a person’s perception of his or her self-worth which determined one’s level self-esteem (Leary & Baumeister, 2000; Veselska et al., 2009). The socio-economic status of a person positively correlated with trait self-esteem, as does being admired by one’s peers (Huo, Binning, & Molina, 2009). von Soest, Wagner, Hansen, and Gerstorf (2017) found that lower socio-economic status was associated with lower levels of self-esteem.

(iv) Social Anxiety

Schneier, Johnson, Hornig, Liebowitz, and Weissman (1992) assessed socio-demographic factors influencing social phobia and found that social phobia was highest among persons who were less educated, younger and those who
belonged to lower socio-economic class. Low socio-economic status was linked with a high prevalence of psychiatric disorders among adolescents and adults (Kessler, Foster, Saunders, & Stang, 1995).

Low socio-economic status was both a cause and a consequence of mental illnesses. The low-income adolescents experienced feelings of social exclusion and face negative psychological experiences of living in disadvantaged set-ups (Miech, Caspi, Moffitt, Wright, & Silva, 1999). Increased levels of stress, anxiety and negative life events were present among those individuals belonging to lower socio-economic strata (Turner & Avison 2003).

Furthermore, the lower socio-economic status was associated with poor mental health (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Xue, Leventhal, Brooks-Gunn, & Earls, 2005; Hudson et al., 2009).

Karlsen, Clench-Aas, Van Roy, and Raanaas (2014) explored the associations between social anxiety and mental health problems related to socio-economic status of one’s parents. Their findings revealed strong relationship between social anxiety and mental health problems in the group with low parental socio-economic status as compared with the group with high socio-economic status. Those who had higher socio-economic status had lower anxiety scores as compared to their counterparts (Pun, Manjourides, & Suh, 2018).

(v) **Locus of Control**

Previous literature has shown that a higher SES yielded an internal locus of control and a lower SES yielded an external locus of control (McLaughlin & Saccuzzo, 1997). Significant relationships were found between lower socio-economic status and external locus of control higher; and socio-economic status and internal locus of control on the other hand (Lefcourt & Ladwig, 1965).

Grebler, Moore, and Guzman (1970) found that among Mexican American adults, low-income respondents were more fatalistic than middle-income respondents. There are socio-economic inequalities in general health.
Furthermore, Butts and Chotlos (1973) also stated that socio-economic status was significantly correlated with locus of control scores. Internality was associated to socio-economic status, upper and middle SES being more internal. Maqsud and Rouhani (1991) investigated relationships between socio-economic status and locus of control and the findings revealed that SES was positively associated with internality, self-concept and academic achievement. It was found that socially disadvantaged groups had significantly more externals as compared to non disadvantaged groups. There was a higher prevalence of low control beliefs in lower socio-economic groups (Wardle & Steptoe, 2003).

Poortinga, Dunstan, and Fone (2008) found that the health locus of control scales were associated with individual and neighborhood socio-economic status. Furthermore, Grotz, Hapke, Lampert, and Baumeister (2011) found out that low socio-economic status was associated with higher health locus of control scores on the powerful others and chance dimension.

Gowda, Chalapathi, and Siddeshwarappa (2017) investigated the influence of socio-economic status on locus of control of sportsmen. The results revealed significant positive correlations between socio-economic statuses with locus of control of the sportsmen.

(vi) Vanity

The existing review of literature indicated that women of higher incomes were more concerned about their body image (Ogden & Thomas, 1999; Wardle & Griffith, 2001).

Andreoletti, Zebrowitz, and Lachman (2001) ascertained that SES was correlated with appearance concerns. Previous studies have shown socio-economic status differences on achievement vanity. Alam (2001) conducted a study on academic achievement in relation to socio economic status and found out a significant positive relationship between socio economic status and academic achievement.
Laaksonen, Rahkonen, Martikainen, and Lahelma (2005) ascertained that occupational class determined people’s access to material resources. The pressure to achieve the beauty standards was more in women belonging to low socio-economic strata because of the belief that physical attractiveness increased the chance of getting good jobs (Edmonds, 2007). Thiyagarajan and Shanthi (2012) found that social status influenced physical vanity because rich people had the adequate time and money to focus on their physical appearance.

Akanbi, Theophilus, and Augustina (2014) found out that there is there was a significant positive correlation between socio-economic status and achievement motivation. Kala and Shirlin (2015) stated that the basis of achievement was motive to achieve excellence. If a person had a greater degree of achievement motivation, he/she would have higher level of aspiration which led to greater achievement. The results revealed that a significant low positive correlation between socio economic status and achievement motivation of college students.

**Gaps in the literature**

Materialism is a profound desire for material objects that acquire a significant place in one’s life; it demonstrates individuality and brings satisfaction. The idea of materialism as a way of life remains valid. From the discussion of the relevant literature above, several research gaps have been identified.

Majority of the studies in context of materialism have been done in the Western countries. However, there are very few studies on materialism and its antecedents in the Indian context. Also, the existing studies have targeted on some of the psychological variables separately. Not many studies have explored the relationship between these variables altogether and thus, a conclusive result has not been reached regarding certain relationships.

There is a dearth of studies regarding the role of different moderators like self esteem, social anxiety, locus of control and vanity viz. physical vanity and achievement vanity which can influence the relationship between peer pressure and materialism in adolescents. Thus, there is a dire need to explore the moderators in the relationship
between peer pressure and adolescents in the vulnerable adolescent age, especially in the Indian context. More extensive and detailed research is needed to explore socioeconomic differences and gender differences in the variables of the study in the Indian context.

Exploring the moderators in the relationship between peer pressure and materialism would lay a foundation for further research and add more knowledge to the existing literature body of marketing and social sciences. Thus, the research gaps create an opportunity for this study to re-examine the existing theories and lay the foundation for future research on materialism in adolescents, especially in the Indian scenario.