Correlational Study of Materialism and Quality of Life among Adults

Sandeep

Research Scholar

Department of Applied Psychology

Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar (Haryana).

Abstract

In recent years, materialism has arisen as a significant point to research in human sciences. Materialism is in a simple language considered as the worth system put on the assortment of material gains. We live on occasions when one of the main qualities has come to be the owner of assets and material merchandise. Materialism is growing at a worldwide level. One specific perspective identified with utilization that has increased boundless consideration is – materialism. Previous research considered materialism as evil as well as worth. Materialism is correlated with other variables to a different degree. There are few studies conducted in this area particularly from an Indian perspective. The present research is a correlation study that wants to investigate the relationship between materialism and quality of life.

Keyword: Materialism, quality of life, age, gender and adult.

Review of Related Literature

Every day, many people have been seen in ads that have possessions of an asset, have good money, have good image, and have remained happy, successful, and valuable in their life (Dittmar, 2008, Kasser & Kanner, 2004). Collins dictionary defined materialism as the attitude of a person who gives a lot of attention to wealth and values a lot of material objects. Oxford English Dictionary defines materialism as "devotion to material desires and needs, to the neglect of spiritual matters; a way of opinion, tendency, and life-based entirely on material interests." Richins and Dawson (1992) defined materialism as "a value that guides people's choices and conduct in a variety of situations, including, but not limited to, consumption arenas." They constructed a materialism scale. Working on this line of context for measurement of materialism from a different perspective, Trinh and Phau (2012) presented a new materialism scale that assesses four concepts of materialism namely "material success, material happiness, material essentiality, and material distinctiveness."

Quality of Life and Materialism

Quality of life denotes one's psychological and physical well-being in all spheres of life. Quality of life is a wider concept than well-being. It means sound health physically and psychologically, adequate sources in terms of education, family, employment, and in all contexts of life. Quality of life is a wider term than well-being, so we should not confuse these two similar terms. "Quality of life is a subjective, multidimensional experience of well-being that is culturally constructed as individuals seek safety and security, a sense of integrity and meaning in life, and a sense of belonging in one's social network" (Kagawa et al., 2010). Many factors affect a person's quality of life. Such as income bodily health, mental well-being, societal life as well as all aspects of environs in which a person survives.

Sirgy (1998) attempted to make a base for the theory of materialistic qualities and quality of life. This assumption purposed that contentment with the standard of living has a partial role in overall life satisfaction. The evaluations of a person's real standard of living and compared to an imagined goal or standard of living have a role in life satisfaction. Non-materialistic experiences more noteworthy fulfillment with their way of life than materialists. Because of this dissatisfaction materialists experience disappointment with overall life. People who are materialists set their pattern of living unrealistically far above the ground and exaggerated because of this, they experience dissatisfaction with the way or pattern of life. The standard of life of materialists is more prejudiced by model and require based outlook compared to thought expectations as precedent, ability, and predictive. Materialists ideal based expectations are more affected by social comparisons like distant referents and standard of living imposed by situations. Perception of money, profits, and material ownership of acquaintances, neighbours, and family are all examples of situation-based yardstick of life. When materialistic use benchmark living that is rooted on equality comparison that involves the examples of standard for the life of others in one's society, state, country, neighbourhood, and way of life of others that is based on age, education, race, work, gender, and social category. When materialists use social comparison and equality comparison these make their expectations of the way of living very unrealistic and inflated. The standard of living expectations of materialists is affected by engagement inequality comparison that also involves income and occupation. Materialists have a feeling of inequity, injustice, anger, and envy because of equality comparison in which one has more money

and less work hard than others. Emotions generated from these comparisons led the way for the unrealistically high and inflated yardstick of life. Materialists' pattern of living is also affected by the inclination to spend more and earn less income. This tendency of more spend and less earn is also partially accountable for materialists' exaggerated and value-based outlook for their life of pattern.

Arndt et al. (2004) described that when people think of materialism as an intrinsic oriented goal in the dominant cultural view, then people's measurement of well-being is decreased. A significant amount of research studies are consistent with this result for high materialists. Belk (1985) found in his studies that satisfaction and happiness in their life are negatively correlated with the trait of envy, possessiveness, and non-generosity. Dawson (1992) discovered a reverse correlation between materialism and contentment with profits, marital life, and entire general life. The study also showed an established reverse association involving self-esteem and materialism. Sirgy (1998) argued about these results that materialists tend to involve in comparison in which materialists have a high standard of living that also has remote referents. By this comparison, materialists lead a life of dissatisfaction in general life also because of this unrealistically high standard of living. Studies also show that people who are motivated by social achievement, societal identification, and attractive look experience a lower level of wellbeing than an attachment, neighbourhood belief, and other intrinsic goals. Mick (1996) considered materialism a "dark side" trait. There is another argument that the impact of materialism is on the individual but also society. Burroughs and Rindfleisch (2002) explained that collective values of society were opposite to materialistic values so persons who encompass these principles would feel a decreased level of well-being. Kahle et al. (1986) discovered in their study that materialistic people give less importance to interpersonal relations and give more importance to personal financial security. Researchers categorized two sorts of personal well-being or QOL. One aspect of well-being is related to the individual directly and another aspect is related to the community that also affects the individual indirectly. Sen (1999) argued about economic growth and civilizing expansion. He also argues that cultural development is an essential state for economic development.

Roberts and Clement (2007) examined the connection among the three components of materialism and eight elements of QOL. It was discovered that general materialism was contrarily related to all components of QOL. Exceptionally materialistic individuals feel low happiness with their entire area of life. The principle of living is decided by the utilization of the criterion of examination in a person's life. If the norm of comparison expands, individuals rate their way of life adversely prompting disappointment throughout everyday life (Atay et al., 2009). Rakrachakarn et al. (2015) examined in their study a social correlation of materialism among the "Malaysians, Chinese, and Indians" it was seen that there were solid negative connections between materialism and life fulfillment, notwithstanding, Indians didn't indicate any huge relationship. This study also revealed that materialistic people feel elevated before purchasing any goods, wishes however after the buy is made; their desires are not met driving in lessened good feelings. To keep up the optimistic feelings, a materialistic individual at that point scans another article for procurement; this enduring disappointment with the obtaining of items brings about reduced evaluation of prosperity (Richins, 2013). Individuals with convictions, for example, owing material merchandise will cause joy frequently experience miscreant life satisfaction and positive feelings, joined by high negative feelings (Lipovcan et al., (2015). Marlatt et al. (1997) showed a high level of self-efficacy was helpful to prevent addiction behavior and high self-efficacy was also helpful in the quitting process. Materialistic people have a low level of perceived self-efficacy (Flouri, 2005; Watson, 2004). Lee and Cheng (2018) found those people who have a lower level of self-efficacy and a higher level of social anxiety are more likely to get possession of smartphones.

Rationale of the Study

In developed and developing countries, there is the development of money and wealth; everyone wants to spend their money to get happiness and satisfaction in their life. India is facing the influence of western modernization. Previous research considered materialism as evil as well as worth. Materialism is correlated with other variables to a different degree. There are few studies conducted in this area particularly from an Indian perspective. The present research is a correlation study that wants to investigate the relationship between materialism and quality of life.

Objectives

1. To study the association between materialism and quality of life.
2. To study gender differences on variables of quality of life among adults.
3. To study age differences on variables of quality of life among adults.

Hypotheses

1. It is expected that there will be an inverse relationship between quality of life and materialism.
2. It is expected that there will be differences between males and females on the variable of

quality of life.

3. It is expected that quality of life will enhance with growing age.

Methodology

Sample and Population

The sample of this research consists of 400 adults from Hisar and adjoining districts. Out of these 400 will be male, 400 will be female. These are further divided into two groups on the basis of age group.

New Materialism Scale (Trinh & Phau, 2012)

This scale was developed by Trinh and Phau in 2002. This scale is based on the idea of the materialism of Richins and Dawson. Richins and Dawson (1992) define "materialism as acquisition centrality, acquisition as the pursuit of happiness and possession-defined success."

WHO Quality of Life Brief (World Health Organization, 1996)

This test was developed from the WHO QOL-100, to assess the mental health of a person. It is a shorter version of the original scale. This scale has 26 items and has 4 dimensions.

Results & Discussion

	Males			Females				
Variables	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**t**	**Significance**
Success	12.43	5.37	400	12.43	5.46	400	-.20	.984
Happiness	13.29	5.20	400	13.12	5.12	400	.45	.656
Essentiality	14.04	5.32	400	13.84	5.59	400	.57	.572
Distinctiveness	13.46	5.51	400	13.82	8.26	400	-.14	.891
Overall Quality and General Health	7.70	1.51	400	7.83	1.27	400	-1.32	.189
Physical Health	24.08	4.10	400	24.82	3.84	400	**-2.61***	.009
Psychological Health	22.57	3.99	400	22.17	3.49	400	1.52	.129
Environment	28.92	4.90	400	29.27	3.98	400	-1.11	.268
Social Relationship	11.60	2.83	400	11.91	1.86	400	**-3.17****	.002

Comparison of Males and Females on Tested Variables

Table 1.1

** significant at p< .01 level, * significant at p<.05 level

Hypothesis about no difference in male and female on all measures of materialism is accepted. The t-value is not significant for any of the dimensions of materialism. This is consistent with the study of Sindhu and Foo (2015) that showed Singaporean males and females are equal in their materialistic qualities. But many studies contrast this, as Parasher and Jain (2017) pointed out in their study that men were found to be more materialistic than women in materialistic values. Previous studies show the difference between male and female likewise Moschis and Churchill (1978) directed an examination to inspect the connection between man and woman and whether they differ in their materialistic qualities. The result revealed that young men were caught in the trap of materialism. Moore and Moschis (1981) led an investigation with youths to look at family and friend correspondence, and whether gender had any impact on materialism. The outcomes showed males had a more grounded direction towards materialistic mentalities when contrasted with the female. Hypothesis about the difference in male and female on all dimensions of quality of life is partiality accepted because only two dimensions physical health and the social relationship has significant t-value for male and female.

Intercorrelations among Tested Variables

The aim of the study was to study materialism concerning the quality of life. And the hypothesis related to this objective was that *there will be an inverse relationship between quality of life*. Pearson product-moment method was applied to all variable and all separately for males and females. For the sake of convenience and meaningful presentation, the bivariate correlation is shown in Table 1.2 for males and Table 1.3 for females. These have been discussed under the following headings:

Table 1.2 Intercorrelation Matrix (Male)

	Success	Happiness	Essentiality	Distinctiveness	Overall Quality and General Health	Physical Health	Psychological Health	Environment	Social Relationship
Success	1	**.52****	**.46****	**.53****	.02	.03	.12	.08	.04
Happiness		1	**.69****	**.59****	.06	-.03	-.08	.06	-.03
Essentiality			1	**.58****	.02	.04	-.04	.01	-.11
Distinctiveness				1	.01	.02	-.02	.04	-.10
Overall Quality and General Health					1	**.54****	**.66****	**.45****	**.39****
Physical Health						1	**.62****	**.58****	**.51****
Psychological Health							1	**.59****	**.46****
Environment								1	**.39****
Social Relationship									1

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Intercorrelations between the measures of Materialism and the measures of Quality of Life

First objective of the study was to study the materialism in relation with quality of life. And the hypothesis related to this objective was that *it is expected that there will be an inverse relationship between quality of life and materialism.* For this purpose, correlational analysis was performed. Table 1.2 shows the results of these correlational analyses.

Table 1.2 shows a correlation between materialism and quality of life that none of the dimensions of materialism and quality of life is correlated with each other in the males.

Hypothesis about the inverse relationship between both variables is rejected. This finding is consistent with earlier studies. The expression “Quality of life” comprises a person's appraisal of how great his life is as far as different parts of his life. Kahle et al. (1986) discovered in their study that materialistic people give less importance to interpersonal relations and give more importance to personal financial security. Wright and Larsen (1993), in their meta-study, found that there is a steady, not so high negative relationship. Many scholars argued that there is an inverse link between materialism and life fulfillment that can be clarified through the intervention impact of self-assessments on the way of life.

Arndt et al. (2004) described that when people think of materialism as an intrinsic oriented goal in the dominant cultural view, then people’s measurement of well-being is decreased. Roberts and Clement (2007) examined the correlation between the three material properties and the eight QOL components. It was found that materialism and contentment were consistently related to all components of QOL. Rakrachakarn et al. (2015) examined the correlation in their study between life satisfaction and materialism among “Malaysians, Chinese, and Indians.” It became clear that there was a strong connection amid materialism and life fulfillment; notwithstanding, Indians didn't indicate any huge relationship.

Table 1.3

Intercorrelation Matrix (21-30 Female: N= 100)

	Success	Happiness	Essentiality	Distinctiveness	Overall Quality and General Health	Physical Health	Psychological Health	Environment	Social Relationship
Success	1	**.66****	**.60****	**.57****	.00	**-.23***	-.10	-.16	-.13
Happiness		1	**.73****	**.63****	.02	**-.32****	-.18	**-.24***	-0.8
Essentiality			1	.69	.04	**-.27****	-.10	-.17	.02
Distinctiveness				1	.05	-.10	-.03	-.08	.12
Overall Quality and General Health					1	**.33****	**.41****	**.45****	.16
Physical Health						1	**.50****	**.59****	**.36****
Psychological Health							1	**.59****	**.20***
Environment								1	**.31****
Social Relationship									1

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), ** Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Intercorrelations between the measures of Materialism and the measures of Quality of Life

First objective of the study was to study the materialism in relation with quality of life. And the hypothesis related to this objective was that *it is expected that there will be an inverse relationship between quality of life and materialism.*.

Table 1.3 shows that success is significantly and negatively correlated with physical health (r= -.23, p<.05 level) measures of the quality of life in females. Essentiality is negatively and significantly correlated with physical heath (r=-.27, p<.01 level).

Happiness is negatively and significantly related to physical heath (r=-.32, p<.01 level) and environment (r=-.24, p<.05 level) in females. Females may have in good physical conditions, active in daily activities and free from substance abuse, they may have freedom, physical safety, and security, good home environment. They may fewer chances of females to engage in material thought that property is essential to satisfaction and well-being in life.

Hypothesis about the inverse relationship is partially accepted. This result is consistent with early findings as Wright and Larsen (1993), in their meta-study, found that there is a steady, not so high negative relationship. Arndt et al. (2004) described that when people think of materialism as an intrinsic oriented goal in the dominant cultural view, then people's measurement of well-being is decreased. Roberts and Clement (2007) analyzed the association between the three parts of materialism and eight components of QOL. It was discovered that general materialism and satisfaction were contrarily related to all components of QOL. Rakrachakarn et al. (2015) examined in their study a social correlation of materialism among the "Malaysians, Chinese, and Indians" it was seen that there were strong negative associations among materialism and life contentment, in any case, Indians didn't show any gigantic relationship.

Comparison of Different Groups on Different Variables (ANOVA)

Different age groups of participants were compared on different measures included in the current study. For this purpose one-way ANOVA was employed. Another objective of the investigation was to study age and gender differences in the variables of quality of life among participants. The hypothesis is related to this objective as it is expected that there will be difference in male and female on quality of life. It will make a difference for men and women on quality of life' Therefore the use of 2 X 4 ANOVA is justified to see if there is a difference in male and female and to study age difference on current study variables.

Table 1.4

Two way ANOVA results on Quality of Life (Overall Quality and General Health)

Variable		M	SD		N
Gender	**Male**	7.70	1.518		400
	Female	7.83	1.266		400
Age group	**21-30**	7.71	1.530		200
	31-40	7.51	1.601		200
	41-50	7.78	1.248		200
	51-60	8.06	1.112		200
Source		**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean of Square**	**F**
Gender		3.380	1	3.380	1.75
Age group		31.295	3	10.432	5.427**
Gender*Age group		5.720	3	1.907	.992
Error		1522.360	792	1.922	
Total		49830.000	800		

**significant at p<.01level, *significant at p<.05 level

Table 1.4 indicates the results of 2 X 4 ANOVA on Overall quality and general health (Quality of Life). It is evident that F Value [F = 5.427, p<.01] is significant at .01 levels. That means four groups of age have a significant difference in the Overall Quality of Life dimension. The mean score of the 51 to 60 years old age group has the highest score while the mean score of the 31 to 40 years old age group has the lowest score on this dimension. That means 51-60 age group participants have better overall quality and general health of life.

Table 1.5

Two way ANOVA results on Quality of Life (Physical Health)

Variable		M	SD		N
Gender	**Male**	24.08	4.108		400
	Female	24.82	3.843		400
Age group	**21-30**	24.08	3.940		200
	31-40	23.25	4.006		200
	41-50	24.61	3.498		200
	51-60	25.85	4.074		200
Source		**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean of Square**	**F**
Gender		108.045	1	108.45	7.25**
Age group		714.570	3	238.190	15.99**
Gender*Age group		112.465	3	37.488	2.52*
Error		11800.920	792	14.900	
Total		490978.000	800		

**significant at p<.01 level, *significant at p<.05 level

Table 1.5 shows 2 X4 ANOVA results on the physical health dimension of quality of life. The F value for gender (male and female) [F= 7.25, p< .01] and F value of age groups [F= 15.99, p< .01] are significant. The two groups of gender and four groups of age have differences in physical health (Quality of Life). The mean score of the male is 24.08 and the females are 24.82. Females have better physical health than males. The mean score for the 21-30 years old age group is 24.08, for the 31-40 years old age group is 23.25, for the 41-50 years old age group is 24.6 and for the 51-60 years old age group is 25.85. This shows that the 51- 60 years old age group has a higher score and 31 to 40 years old people have a lower mean score. That means, the 51 to 60 years old age group people have good physical health.They are more active in daily living and do not depend on medical drugs and medical aids. They feel more energetic and have a normal sleep pattern. The interaction effect of gender (male and female) and age group [F= 2.52, p< .01] is significant. Further gender and age groups together have an impact on physical health (Quality of Life).

Table 1.6

Two way ANOVA results on Quality of Life (Psychological Health)

Variable		M	SD	N
Gender	**Male**	22.57	3.991	400
	Female	22.17	3.489	400
Age group	**21-30**	21.44	3.964	200
	31-40	22.06	3.873	200
	41-50	22.38	3.517	200
	51-60	23.60	3.308	200

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Square	F
Gender	32.401	1	32.401	2.407
Age group	495.424	3	165.141	12.268**
Gender*Age group	57.144	3	19.048	1.415
Error	10661.250	792	1.461	
Total	411535.000	800		

**significant at p<.01 level, *significant at p<.05 level

Table 1.6 shows that the F value for the age groups [F= 12.268, p < .01] is significant on the psychological health dimension of quality of life. F value is significant for four age groups on psychological health. That means four age groups significantly differ on the psychological health dimension of quality of life. The mean score for the 21-30 years old age group is 21.44, for the 31-40 years old age group is 22.06, for the 41-50 years old age group is 22.38 and for 51-60 years, old age group is 23.60. The table shows that the 51-60 years old age group participants have a high score and the 21-30 years old age group participants have a low score on this dimension. That means the 51-60 years old age group participants have high psychological health conditions than other age groups. They feel normal about body image and appearance. They have positive emotions and have normal memory. They have normal learning patterns and have personal beliefs. Similarly Girolamo et al. (2000) revealed in their study that no significant gender difference in the psychological health dimension of quality of life.

Table 1.7

Two way ANOVA results on Quality of Life (Environment)

Variable		M	SD	N
Gender	**Male**	28.92	4.904	400
	Female	29.27	3.984	400
Age group	**21-30**	27.46	4.669	200
	31-40	28.20	4.448	200
	41-50	29.75	3.796	200
	51-60	30.97	4.084	200

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Square	F
Gender	24.500	1	24.500	1.354
Age group	1491.295	3	497.098	27.469**
Gender*Age group	104.600	3	34.867	1.927
Error	14332.760	792		
Total	693052.000	800		

**significant at p<.01 level, *significant at p<.05 level

Table 1.7 reveals F value for age groups [F = 27.469, p<.01] is significant. Thus, four age groups of participants differ in the environmental dimension of quality of life. The table shows that four age groups significantly differ in the environmental dimension of quality of life. The mean score for the 21-30 years old age group is 27.46, for the 31-40 years old age group is 28.20, for the 41-50 years old age group is 29.75 and for the 51-60 years old age group is 30.97. That means the 51-60 years old age group participants have a high score and 21-30 participants have a low score on this variable. That means the 51-60 years old age group participants have a high tendency toward the environmental dimension of quality of life. They have opportunity, actual wellbeing, and security. They have great availability or quality for wellbeing and social consideration. They have a decent home climate and openings for securing new data and abilities. They can participate and have fun / recreation opportunities. These findings are consistent with Girolamo et al. (2000) revealed in their study that there is no significant gender difference in the quality of life on psychological health dimension.

Table 1.8

Two way ANOVA results on Quality of Life (Social Relations)

Variable		M	SD	N
Gender	**Male**	11.43	2.230	400
	Female	11.89	1.790	400
Age group	**21-30**	11.25	2.243	200
	31-40	11.47	2.299	200
	41-50	11.90	1.810	200
	51-60	12.02	1.618	200

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean of Square	F
Gender	40.951	1	40.95	10.247**
Age group	77.564	3	25.855	6.469**
Gender*Age group	20.014	3	6.671	1.669
Error	3165.310	792	3.997	
Total	112045.000	800		

**significant at p<.01 level, *significant at p<.05 level

Table 1.8 portraits the result of two-way ANOVA on the social relationship (quality of life) based on two groups of gender and four groups of age. The table shows that the F value for gender [F = 10.247, p<.01] and F value for age groups [F = 6.469, p<.01] is significant. For gender, the two differ on the social relationship dimension of quality of life. That means females have a high score on social relationships and males have a low scored on social relationships. The table shows that four age groups of participants significantly differ in social relations. The mean score for the 21-30 years old age group is 11.25, for the 31-40 years of age group is 11.47, for the 41-50 years of age group is 11.90 and for the 51-60 years of age group is 12.02. That implies the 51-60 years of age group members have the highest score on social relations and the 21-30 years old age group participants have the lowest score on social relationships. The 51 to 60 years old age group people have good quality social relationships in society. They are in good personal relationships and social support. Similarly Li et al. (2011) showed in their study that societal activity and quality of life were weaker among women as compare to men.

One of objectives of this study is that there is age difference in the variables of quality of life among adults. Hypothesis related to this objective is that it is expected that quality of life will enhance with growing age. Overall, the findings support hypothesis since 4 out 5 analyses are in favour of the proposed hypothesis.

Materialism is a growing field in India. The present study has contributed to the field of consumer behavior by examining the different dimensions of materialism concerning psychological variables. Notwithstanding, most investigations on materialism were led generally in the Western societies, leaving space for theories on the advancement of materialistic propensities and tendency among youthful grown-up buyers in Eastern societies, especially in nations, for example, India. This current investigation was an endeavor to give data that could be important to assist advertisers with improving comprehension of their objective customers, especially as far as their qualities, on how different age gatherings and sex will, in general, devour items and administrations. It is critical to remember that materialism as a worth is straightforwardly identified with utilization patterns of people. Materialism is a significant idea, which is important to academicians, strategy creators, and economic analysts.

References

1. Arndt, J., Solomon, S., Kasser, T., &. Sheldon, K.M. (2004). The urge to splurge: A terror management account of materialism and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 14*(3), 198-212.
2. Atay, E. G., Sirgy, M. J., Cicic, M., & Husic, M. (2009). Extending the research in relation to materialism and life satisfaction. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 3, 225-232.
3. Belk, R.W. (1984). Three scales to measure constructs related to materialism: Reliability, validity, and relationships to measures of happiness. In: Kinner TF (Ed.) (291-297). Advances in Consumer Research, Ann Arbor MI: Association for Consumer Research.
4. Belk, R.W. (1985), "Materialism: Trait aspects of living in the material world", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12(3), 265-280.
5. Burroughs, J. E., & Rindfleisch, A. (2002). Materialism and well-being: A conflicting values perspective. *Journal of Consumer research*, *29*(3), 348-370.
6. Dittmar, H. (2008). Consumer culture, identity, and well-being: The search for the "good life and the "body perfect." Hove, England: Psychology Press.
7. Flouri, E. (2005). Adult materialism/postmaterialism and later mental health: The role of self-efficacy. *Social Indicators Research*, 73, 1–18.
8. Girolamo, G., Rucci, P., Scocco, P., Becchi, A., Coppa, F., D'Addario, A., & Soldani, L. (2000). Quality of life assessment: validation of the Italian version of the WHOQOL-Brief. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, *9* (1), 45-55.
9. Hunt, J. M., Kernan, J. B., & Mitchell, D. J. (1996). Materialism as social cognition: People, possessions, and perception. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *5*(1), 65-83.
10. Kagawa, M., Padilla, G. V., & Giwa, K. (2010). Health-related quality of life and culture. *Seminars in oncology nursing* (Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 59-67). WB Saunders.
11. Kahle, L., Beatty, S. E., & Homer, P. (1986). Alternative measurement approaches consumer values: The list of values (LOV) and values and lifestyle (VALS). *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13, 405–409.
12. Kasser, T., & Kanner, A. D. (2004). Psychology and consumer culture: The struggle for a good life in a materialistic world.
13. Lee, Y.-K., Chang, C.-T., Cheng, Z.-H., & Lin, Y. (2018). How Social Anxiety and Reduced Self-Efficacy Induce Smartphone Addiction in Materialistic People. *Social Science Computer Review*, 36(1), 36–56.
14. Li, Y. P., Lin, S. I., & Chen, C. H. (2011). Gender differences in the relationship of social activity and quality of life in community-dwelling Taiwanese elders. *Journal of Women & Aging*, *23*(4), 305-320.
15. Lipovcan, L. K., Larsen, Z., & Brkljacic, T. (2015). Materialism, affective states, and life satisfaction: the case of Croatia. *Springer Plus*, 4(1), 699.
16. Marlatt, G. A., Baer, J. S., & Quigley, L. A. (1997). Self-efficacy and addictive behavior. *Self efficacy in changing societies*, 289-315.
17. Mick, D. G. (1996). Are studies of dark side variables confounded by socially desirable responses? The case of materialism. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 23, 106–119.
18. Moore, R. L., & Moschis, G. P. (1981). The Effects of Family Communication and Mass Media Use on Adolescent Consumer Learning. *Journal of Communication,* 31, 42- 51.
19. Moschis, G.P., & Churchill, G.A. (1978). Consumer socialization: A theoretical and empirical analysis, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 599–609.
20. Parashar, S., & Jain, S. (2017). Effect of demographics on materialism: An empirical study. *Pacific Business Review International*, *10*(2), 124-132.
21. Rakrachakarn, V., Moschis, G. P., Ong, F. S., & Shannon, R. (2015). Materialism and life satisfaction: The role of religion. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 54(2), 413-426.
22. Richins, M. L., & Dawson, S. (1992). A consumer values orientation for materialism and its measurement: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(3), 303–316.
23. Richins, M. L. (1999). "Material Values," in The Elgar Companion to Consumer Research and Economic Psychology, eds. Peter E. Earl and Simon Kemp, Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar, 374–80.
24. Roberts, J. A., & Clement, A. (2007). Materialism and satisfaction with the overall quality of life and eight life domains. *Social Indicators Research*, 82(1), 79-92.
25. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. New York: Knof.
26. Sidhu, J. K., & Foo, K. H. (2015). Materialism: The road to happiness and life satisfaction among Singaporeans. *Journal of Happiness and Well-Being*, *3*, 77-92.
27. Sirgy, M. J. (1998). Materialism and quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*,43, 227–260.
28. Trinh, V. D., & Phau, I. (2012). A new set of measurements for the materialism scale. In *2012 ANZMAC Annual Conference Proceedings, University of South Australia, Australia*.

29. Twitchell, J. B. (1999). Lead us into temptation: The triumph of American materialism. Columbia University Press.
30. Ward, S., & Wackman, D. (1971). Family and media influences on adolescent consumer learning. *American behavioral scientist*, *14*(3), 415-427.
31. Watson, D. C. (2014). A Model of the Materialistic Self. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *16*(137-157).
32. Wright, N. D., & Larsen, V. (1993). Materialism and life satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior*, *6*(1), 158-165.