The Karma of Consumption: Role of Materialism in the Pursuit of Life Satisfaction

Roy, Rajat
Rabbanee, Fazlul
Chaudhuri, Himadri R
Menon, Preetha

Abstract

Purpose – This paper examines how social comparison and belief in karma encourage materialism and promote consumers' life satisfaction.

Design/methodology/approach – Two studies were conducted with Indian middle-class consumers to test the basic premises of the current research. The first one employed a survey (N=247), while the second one used an experimental design (N=206).

Findings – The survey results showed that social comparison and belief in karma promoted materialism amongst Indian consumers and further enhanced their life satisfaction. Findings from the experiment revealed a novel two-way interaction, in that the karma–materialism relationship was moderated by the underlying motivation for materialism.

Research limitations/implications – Future research may validate and extend our findings using different samples to increase external validity.

Practical implications – By explaining the interactive effects of materialism, its underlying motivation and belief in karma, managers will gain better understanding of why consumers in an emerging market like India purchase conspicuous products.

Originality/value – This is the first paper to study how the karma–materialism relationship influences life satisfaction amongst consumers in the world's fastest rising economy. Furthermore, no prior research has reported a boundary condition for the karma–materialism relationship studied here. The findings contribute to an extremely limited body of literature on karma and consumption.

Keywords: Karma, materialism, life satisfaction, motivation

Introduction

Materialism has received considerable academic attention due to its influence on consumers' psychological well-being and consumption behaviour (Belk, 1983; Burroughs and Rindfleisch, 2002; Wang, 2016; Xiao and Kim, 2009). The dominant view of materialism focuses on individualism and a self-prioritized lifestyle led by money, possessions and status, which may seemingly conflict with collective and prosocial goals (Awanis *et al.,* 2017). Extant research, in general, shows that the pursuit of materialism can diminish well-being amongst consumers (Burroughs and Rindfleisch, 2002; Dittmar *et al*., 2014; Ryan and Dziurawiec, 2001).

Despite the broad finding that materialism can negatively influence well-being (Dittmar *et al*., 2014), previous works show that, in certain situations, it can enhance life satisfaction. For example, when people have previously been through economic deprivation, or when materialism served instrumental needs (e.g., security, nurturing a family), it has promoted life satisfaction (Biswas-Diener and Diener, 2001; Srivastava *et al*., 2001). Moreover, while materialism correlated negatively with well-being in developed countries such as the United States (USA) and Japan, it was found to enhance well-being in developing countries like Thailand (Wong *et al*., 2003). Extant research argues that the concept of materialism in emerging economies (e.g., China, India) is nuanced, and recommends more work to understand the congruence of material and societal values (Awanis *et al*., 2017). Further, despite the rise of materialism in emerging countries in general (Cleveland *et al.,* 2009; Sharma, 2011), and the splurge of consumer spending amongst more than 1.2 billion Indians (Dheer *et al.,* 2015), evidence regarding the influence of materialism on the life satisfaction of Indian consumers is scant (Gap 1).

In the current work, we posit that the pursuit of materialism amongst India's middle class[1] is encouraged through normative social processes such as comparison with similar others. Comparison is ubiquitous in social domain (Garcia *et al.,* 2013) as consumers commonly seek to achieve a superior position than others in a variety of contexts from daily social situations to organizational settings and market transactions (De Botton, 2004; Podolny, 2005). Besides, empirical evidence in support of the influence of social comparison in promoting material possessions among the Indian consumers is relatively sparse, with scholars recommending more work in the context of emerging economies (Chakravarti, 2006; Hill *et al.,* 2012) (Gap 2). The basic notion of social comparison has been emphasized across multiple theoretical paradigms, such as social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954); value theory (Khaptsova and Schwartz, 2016; Sagiv and Schwartz, 2000; Schwartz, 1992), and person–environment congruence theory (Dittmar *et al*., 2014). Building on these paradigms, we theorize that social comparison encourages the adoption of material values in an emerging economy like India. Furthermore, consumers' adoption of the prevalent and normative material values can enhance their life satisfaction.

Besides the role of social processes in promoting material values, we also propose that karmic belief can encourage materialism. The concept of *karma*, originating in ancient Indian scriptures, preaches the consequences of being 'good' and 'bad', and is also prevalent in Western societies (Chatterjee *et al*., 2013). Karma, originally rooted in religious text, plays an important role in India and is capable of influencing consumer purchase decisions (Kopalle *et al.,* 2010).While paradigms such as value theory predict that an individual's material values will clash with his/her religious and spiritual values (Burroughs and

---

[1] By middle class, we refer to the 'new' middle class, that is, people who are educated and professional white-collar staff (Fuller and Narasimhan, 2007). This middle class started to grow in India from 1991 when the policy of economic liberalization began. The size and prosperity of India's middle class have already grown considerably, making them a very attractive consumer market for different companies, including multinational corporations (Wessel, 2004).

Rindfleisch, 2002), a growing number of studies argues that religion can incorporate the paradoxical views of materialism (Minton *et al.*, 2016; Sinha, 2014; Choudhury, 2014; Sinha, 2014; Faure and Fang, 2008). Some scholars even argue that Indians have learned to reconcile the contradiction between spiritual beliefs and materialism (Minton *et al.*, 2016; Sinha, 2014). Despite this growing body of literature, it is still unknown whether karmic belief influences material values amongst Indian consumers (Gap 3). Marketing scholars have since recommended more research to study how key aspects of culture (e.g., belief in Karma in India) can affect consumer behaviour (Kopalle *et al.*, 2010).

As the next step in our work, we explore the boundary condition for the karma–materialism relationship. The limited body of work collectively shows that the underlying motivation for human behaviour can be influenced by karmic belief (Kulow and Kramer, 2016; Converse *et al.*, 2012; Kopalle *et al.*, 2010). Building on this body of literature, we propose that the influence of karma in promoting material values can be further moderated by the underlying motivation for materialism. Although the extant literature (Sirgy *et al.*, 2013; Srivastava *et al.*, 2001) shows that material values can be encouraged by positive motivation (e.g., nurturing a family) as well as negative motivation (e.g., flaunting one's wealth), the moderating role of motivation on the karma–materialism link has not previously been proposed and empirically tested (Gap 4). While Kulow and Kramer (2016) report reduced pro-social behaviour in presence of karmic belief and self-gain cues, the current work extends this limited line of research to show that the underlying motivation promoting material values (key moderator of this work) can explain such self-focused behaviour.

In summary, we propose a model in which social processes and karmic belief influence life satisfaction through material values. This model is first tested through a correlational design by conducting a survey amongst Indian consumers. We further provide causal evidence (through an experiment) for how the karma–materialism path is moderated

by the underlying motivation for material pursuit. In doing so, we explore the following research questions:

RQ1: Do social comparison and belief in karma promote material pursuit and life satisfaction amongst Indian middle-class consumers?

RQ2: Does motivation underlying material pursuit moderate the relationship between karma and materialism?

The current work therefore explores the novel karma–materialism–life satisfaction relationship along with its boundary condition. A growing body of findings is now showing that religious thoughts can promote materialism (Minton *et al*., 2016; Sinha, 2014; Choudhury, 2014; Sinha, 2014; Faure and Fang, 2008). However, scholars are increasingly encouraging more research in this area (Choudhury, 2014; Faure and Fang, 2008). Moreover, although karma resonates with many people, an extremely limited amount of work has been undertaken on influence of karmic belief in consumer behaviour (Kulow and Kramer, 2016), something which is addressed in the current work. By exploring the relationship between materialism and life satisfaction, the current work enlarges the limited body of work that supports the positive role of materialism (Srivastava *et al*., 2001; Biswas-Diener and Diener, 2001). Finally, following recommendations from extant scholars (Sirgy *et al.,* 2013; Srivastava *et al.,* 2001), the current work seeks to enquire into the more nuanced role of materialism by studying its underlying motivation as the moderator.

In the following section, we outline the relevant theory that guides our key hypotheses, following which we report the results from a survey and an experiment, both conducted with Indian middle-class consumers. The findings and implications are then discussed, followed by presentation of the study's limitations and directions for future research.

Theoretical Framework

Social Comparison

People tend to compare themselves with others in their society. These 'others' may often include people who are highly relevant and similar to themselves (Festinger, 1954), for example, neighbours. Social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954) argues that consumers are innately driven to evaluate themselves and their abilities against others within groups, especially in the absence of available objective standards. Undertaking social comparisons help them reduce uncertainty and create meaning and mental happiness (Suls and Wheeler, 2000). Such social comparisons are pervasive and often encouraged through everyday lifestyle such as media advertisements, where material values and idealized images are promoted on a routine basis (Richins, 1991; Schiffman and Kanuk, 2004). Thus, social comparison is a reality and is a central feature of our everyday life (Buunk and Gibbons, 2007). Research on consumer behaviour shows that conspicuous consumption can be driven by this type of comparison, and the associated status that comes with such consumption (Ordabayeva and Chandon, 2011). Enhancement through consumption can be satisfying, especially when individuals are driven by social competition goals (Dittmar *et al.,* 2014). Furthermore, with conspicuous consumption, social competition goals are triggered in individuals as one tries to 'keep up with the Joneses' (Ordabayeva and Chandon, 2011).

The role of values and goals has been further recognized across different societies. According to Schwartz (1992), human beings are driven by a set of values that can be associated with trans-situational goals. These values are further structured in ways that help individuals with their attitudes and behaviour. For example, values can help individuals attain personal or social goals related to, amongst others, self-enhancement, growth and security (Schwartz *et al*., 2012). The values adopted by people can be more congruent or can conflict with the ones promoted by their society (Schwartz *et al*., 2012; Schwartz, 1992).

6

The role of social comparison can be further understood through examining how human beings compare their values with those of similar others in their society. Theoretical paradigms like value congruence and person–environment congruence support the notion of social comparison (Khaptsova and Schwartz, 2016; Sagiv and Schwartz, 2000). People tend to compare themselves with their reference groups, such as members from a similar ethnicity, background or occupation (Khaptsova and Schwartz, 2016). The group values such as average attitude, behaviour and values (e.g., income levels) can, in turn, become the descriptive norm and reference for comparison (Sagiv and Schwartz, 2000; Burroughs and Rindfleisch, 2002).

When a person's values match the dominant norm in their environment, the individual may be satisfied with his/her current position; for example, it may be reassuring to know that an individual's income aligns with the income distribution of his/her peers (Sagiv and Schwartz, 2000). Social comparison that underlies consumption can further enhance life satisfaction if one is able to attain the comparison group's prevailing normative standards (Khaptsova and Schwartz, 2016; Ordabayeva and Chandon, 2011). In the following section, we discuss how materialism is encouraged amongst the Indian middle class through social comparison.

Social Comparison and Material Values

Materialism has been regarded by scholars as an important life value (Richins and Dawson, 1992; Richins, 1987; Belk, 1985). Richins (1987) describes materialism as a "set of centrally held beliefs about the importance of possessions in one's life". Based on the extant literature, one can conceptualise materialism as individual differences in people's long-term endorsement of values, goals and associated beliefs that centre on the importance of acquiring money and possessions (Dittmar, 2008; Richins, 2004; Sirgy, 1998). According to Belk (1985), the term 'materialism' can be described as how much a consumer values his/her

material items, dislikes sharing his/her possessions and feels jealous when other consumers acquire similar or additional material items.

In today's society, the overtly active market system often tends to legitimize and normalize the adoption of material values. Advertising, endorsements and images tend to progress the message of the insecure consumer who is forced to think of himself/herself as inadequate, especially when compared to others (Kasser and Ahuvia, 2002). Furthermore, people may internalize these widely promoted material values as they try to keep up with others in their society (Chan and Prendergast, 2007; Richins, 1995). Consumers compare themselves with what others have and use this comprehension to set their own consumption benchmarks, i.e. emulate 'standards' of a good life and constantly weigh the reality of their lives against those set standards (Michalos, 1985).

Consumers adopt materialistic values through social learning, e.g. by observing consumptions of peers and family members (Kasser *et al.*, 2004). Research in the context of different countries, such as China and the USA, shows that social influence can indeed motivate material aspirations (Schroeder and Dugal, 1995; Chan and Prendergast, 2007). The adoption of material values has been strongly endorsed by collectivist cultures like China, where social hierarchies are present (Wong and Ahuvia, 1998). As social hierarchy is legitimate and conformity to group norms is widely practiced in the Indian society, social comparison of material possessions as a means to locate an individual's position in the hierarchy is encouraged. Owning of material goods to improve personal visibility within the social hierarchy is likely to be supported in India. In fact, the Ipsos (2013) survey of Indian consumers highlighted that 58% measured their success based on their material possessions. Based on the above theory, we posit the following:

H1: Social comparison tendency has a positive influence on materialism.

Role of Karmic Belief in Promoting Material Values

One of the key ideas underlying the concept of belief in karma is that an individual's future state is determined by the consequences of his/her present actions (Kulow and Kramer, 2016; Kopalle *et al*., 2010). Good (bad) deeds through present actions and their future outcomes are conveniently correlated using karma which is well ingrained in the value system of the Indian civilization (Kopalle *et al.,* 2010). Karma originates in the scriptures of ancient India and preaches the moral law of causation as well as the consequences of being 'good' and 'bad'. However, the concept of karmic belief is also prevalent in Western civilization with common sayings such as "you sow what you reap" or "what goes around comes around" (White, Baimel and Norenzayan 2017; Kulow and Kramer, 2016; Chatterjee *et al.,* 2013). According to Kulow and Kramer (2016), karmic belief shares similarities with other peculiar irrational beliefs like fate and magical thinking.

The existing literature on value congruence argues that religious values are self-transcendent and, therefore, may clash with material values (Kasser and Ahuvia, 2002; Burroughs and Rindfleisch, 2002). Subsequently, the motives underlying material values (e.g., acquisition, self-centredness) may conflict with motivations, such as selflessness, that underlie religious values (Kasser and Ahuvia, 2002; Burroughs and Rindfleisch, 2002). Interestingly, scholarly studies have started to report that religious values can embrace the paradoxical views underpinning materialism, consumerism and spiritual beliefs (Choudhury, 2014; Sinha, 2014; Faure and Fang, 2008).

Building on this perspective, interviews with followers of Nichiren Buddhism indicate that followers can chant for whatever they want (e.g. job, car) and link it to happiness for the self (Choudhury, 2014). Similarly, a spiritual belief like Feng shui can be invoked to justify the purchase of a luxury property (Faure and Fang, 2008). In the context of India, several researchers posit that the contradiction between spiritual beliefs and materialism has been reconciled in the Indian mindset (Minton *et al.,* 2016; Sinha, 2014).

Researchers indicate that Indians, knowing that a material life is indispensable, tend to seek spirituality while leading an earthly life (Minton *et al.,* 2016; Sinha, 2014). For instance, millions of Hindu Indians invoke the Goddess Lakshmi when praying for wealth and well-being (Minton *et al*., 2016).

Recent research shows that a religious upbringing can make people less generous and more self-focused (Kirchmaiera *et al*., 2018; Decety *et al.*, 2015). For example, in their research, Decety *et al.* (2015) asked children to participate in an experimental dictator game. The findings showed that children from a religious family were less likely to share a reward (e.g., stickers) with another child from the same school and ethnic group. Similarly, religious adults were also likely to be selfish compared to non-religious people when they had to share monetary payments in an experimental dictator game (Kirchmaiera *et al*., 2018). In summary, based on research on religion, it is likely that people can accommodate contradictory values or even act selfishly when cued with material gains.

Another stream of research that indirectly supports the view that karma may promote materialism comes from the consumer behaviour literature (Kulow and Kramer 2016; Kopalle *et al*., 2010). The amount of literature in this research stream is however limited. For example, Kulow and Kramer (2016) argue that belief in karma may encourage more self-focused thoughts to maximize gains for the self. Kopalle *et al*. (2010) find that karma may promote higher product expectations amongst Indian consumers. Past research shows that materialistic purchases are encouraged by self-focused thoughts (Burroughs and Rindfleisch, 2002; Lee and Shrum, 2012). Similarly, a significant motivation for luxury consumption is based on expectations of higher product performance (Hudders and Pandelaere, 2012). Kopalle et al. (2010) posit that belief in karma can have significant influence on consumer purchase decisions amongst Indians. Therefore, we argue that religious values can indeed support material values, and that a belief in karma can encourage

material consumption as it promotes self-focus and product expectations. Based on the literature, we therefore argue that:

H2: Belief in karma will have a positive effect on materialism.

Materialism and Life Satisfaction

Several studies demonstrate that materialism reduces satisfaction with life (Burroughs and Rindfleisch, 2002; Kasser and Ahuvia, 2002; Ryan and Dziurawiec, 2001). The major notion underpinning this finding is that materialistic people are less satisfied with their possessions in comparison to their non-materialistic counterparts and that this, in turn, reduces life satisfaction (Sirgy, 1998). Evidence shows that when people have unrealistic material goals, this can lead to diminished life satisfaction (Sirgy *et al*., 2013). Similarly, when people are extremely pre-occupied with material values to the point that they start neglecting other important life domains (e.g., social relationships), this can, in turn, lead to reduced life satisfaction (Kasser and Ryan, 2001).

However, under certain circumstances, materialism can also lead to positive outcomes. Previous research reports that a rise in income through windfall gains can lead to a higher level of well-being (Gardner and Oswald, 2007). It is also possible that materialistic people may set ability-based goals for themselves and that realising these material goals can, in turn, lead to a higher level of life satisfaction (Sirgy, 1998). Similarly, when materialistic aspirations help to achieve instrumental goals like providing for and nurturing their family, this can enhance well-being (Srivastava *et al*., 2001).

The context of our research, that is, an emerging economy also plays a role. For example, extant research shows that a higher income can lead to subjective well-being in the context of developing (versus developed) economies (Biswas-Diener and Diener, 2001). Corroborating this line of argument, previous evidence shows that materialism reduced the

level of subjective well-being in the USA and Japan, but enhanced it in Thailand (Wong *et al.*, 2003).

A similar argument can also be drawn from the values literature. When individuals perceive themselves to be like others, especially their peers or reference groups, this enhances their life satisfaction (Khaptsova and Schwartz, 2016; Sortheix and Lonnqvist, 2015). With this comparison, people consider how they stand relative to what is normative in their reference group (Sortheix and Lonnqvist, 2015). According to Khaptsova and Schwartz (2016), Russians reported a higher level of life satisfaction when they perceived themselves to be like others in terms of important values (e.g., achievement, security).

We have previously argued that material values are encouraged through social processes (e.g., comparison), thus leading to our first hypothesis. Indians are increasingly adopting these material standards for reasons that are evident. Firstly, prior work shows that socio-economic deprivation at an early life stage can promote materialism later in life (Gardner and Oswald, 2007). Consumers of an emerging economy like India are likely to have experienced economic deprivation prior to the country's economic liberalization and, as the economy has become more affluent, have adopted materialistic values (Abramson and Inglehart, 1995). Comparing and adopting the value system (e.g., materialism) of an individual's reference group (Indians who are similar) may therefore promote life satisfaction (Khaptsova and Schwartz, 2016). In summary, we propose that social and religious beliefs would enhance material values leading to increased life satisfaction. Therefore, we posit the following hypotheses:

H3: Materialism will have a positive influence on life satisfaction.

H4: The influence of (a) social comparison and (b) karma on life satisfaction will be mediated by materialism.

Boundary Condition for Belief in Karma–Materialism Relationship

Thus far, we have argued that belief in karma will influence life satisfaction through materialism. However, extant research shows that different motivations can underlie materialism (Sirgy *et al.,* 2013; Sirgy, 1998). Similarly, materialism can also be driven by one's aspirations, that is, whether one has realistic or fantasy-based expectations of materialism. Realistic expectations can be achieved based on one's ability (e.g., qualifications, background, etc.), while fantasy-based expectations might not be realised (Sirgy *et al.,* 2013).

In the current study, we argue that the underlying motive for materialism can act as the moderator in the belief in karma–materialism relationship. Srivastava *et al.* (2001) argue that people can pursue materialism with positive motivation, for example, to meet their security needs or to provide for their family. On the other hand, people pursue materialistic aspirations for extrinsic reasons (also perceived as negative), such as proving their self-worth or showing off to others (Srivastava *et al*., 2001).

Participants' motivation to undertake an action was influenced by karmic beliefs as shown in prior work (Converse *et al*., 2012). Similarly, the motivation to evaluate a product (e.g., product expectancy) was moderated by karmic belief (Kopalle *et al*., 2010). More related to our study is how belief in karma influences motivation when participants are thinking of self-gains. Previous work shows that karmic belief promotes self-related thoughts and encourages selfish behaviour, especially in the presence of cues that signal self-gains (Kulow and Kramer, 2016). In particular, these authors argue that when material gains are cued, belief in karma promotes self-focused thoughts at the expense of selfless behaviour, such as a donation to charity (Kulow and Kramer, 2016).

In studies 2 and 3 of Kulow and Kramer (2016), participants were primed with karmic belief (vs. karmic belief absent). Following this, they were exposed to charity messages which either framed as self-gain (vs. gaining others). Interestingly, for those cued

with karmic belief, pro-social behaviour (e.g., intention to donate time for charity) was reduced in the presence of self-gain messages. In contrast, no such effect was observed when belief in karma was absent. These authors postulate that self-gain cues actually caused consumers to focus attention on themselves, in the presence of karmic belief. Past research shows that when people are driven by the need to be noticed and draw attention towards themselves, they resort to conspicuous consumption (Lee and Shrum, 2012). Conspicuous consumption has been long posited to be self-focused, with an inherent intention to impress others by calling attention to the self (Lee and Shrum, 2012; Veblen, 1994). Based on this, it is expected that karmic belief would indeed promote self-focused thoughts in presence of materialistic cues, especially when the underlying motivation is to fulfil an inherent need to show-off to others. This effect should diminish in the absence of belief in karma. Based on this, we posit the next hypothesis:

H5: The relationship between belief in karma and materialism leading to life satisfaction is strengthened (weakened) when the underlying motivation guiding material pursuit is negative (positive).

The conceptual framework, presented in Figure 1, showcases the above hypotheses. To test these hypotheses, we ran two studies: Study 1 and Study 2. Study 1 based on a survey was conducted to test H1–H4. To further explore the boundary condition for the belief in karma–materialism relationship (H5), we conducted an experiment under Study 2. The details of both the studies are discussed below.

[Figure 1 is about here]

14

Study 1

Method

The data for Study 1were collected through a structured survey conducted in a large Indian city. A total of 247 responses were collected from middle-class consumers using convenience sampling. The average age of respondents was approximately 36 years, with an average monthly income of 32,500 Indian rupees (Rs.) (approx. US$457). Of the respondents, 55.1% were male and 90.8% had either a graduate or postgraduate degree. In all, 42.4% of respondents were either government or private job holders whereas 17.7% were self-employed professionals. The survey instrument had two sections. In the first section, respondents were asked to recall one of their material purchases. This was followed by a series of questions covering the scale items of the constructs used in the study, that is, social comparison, belief in karma, materialism and life satisfaction. The second part of the questionnaire comprised demographic information from respondents.

Measures

The scale items used in the study were adopted from the existing literature. "Social comparison" was measured using scale items adopted from Gibbons and Buunk (1999). The scale items for "belief in karma" and "materialism" were adopted from Kopalle *et al.* (2010) and Richins (1987), respectively. "Life satisfaction" was measured using scale items adopted from Diener *et al.* (1985). All the construct measures were anchored in 7-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

Scale Assessment

All the scale items used in this study were assessed for their uni-dimensionality, reliability and validity through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (Anderson and Gerbing, 1982). We started by testing the measurement model with CFA using AMOS 22.0. The goodness-of-fit

measures for the measurement model show a good fit ($\chi^2 = 170.39$; $df = 79$; $\chi^2/df = 2.15$; RMSEA = 0.07; CFI = 0.94; TLI = 0.93; NFI = 0.90; and SRMR = 0.06), with the scores of all the fit indices close to the recommended cut-off values (Hu and Bentler, 1999). All the parameter estimates are high (ranging from 0.55–0.92; see Table 1) and load significantly ($p < 0.001$) on their respective expected latent constructs, showing a high degree of convergent validity. Table 1 shows all the scale items, their factor loadings and descriptive statistics. The minimum value of composite reliability is 0.84 for "life satisfaction", showing high internal consistency of the scale items. All the scales also show discriminant validity as the minimum value of average variance extracted (AVE) is 0.57 (for "life satisfaction") and the AVE of each factor exceeds the square of its correlations with all the other constructs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Table 2 shows the correlations and psychometric properties of the constructs used in the study.

We adopted different measures to minimize the effects of common method variance. We carefully crafted a cover letter for the survey instrument assuring respondents of their anonymity and requesting their honest responses. This helped us to reduce respondents' evaluation apprehension and, thus, controlled for possible sources of common method bias (Podsakoff *et al.,* 2003). In addition, based on Harman's single-factor test, the un-rotated factor solution was run for all the items used in the study. This generated more than a single factor and lent support to the fact that common method bias was not an issue for this study (Podsakoff *et al.,* 2003). Although it is difficult to identify the exact source(s) of common method bias, these procedural steps helped us to minimize its effect (Roy and Rabbanee, 2015).

Insert Table 1 and Table 2 about here

Results

The hypotheses of the study were tested through structural equation modelling (SEM) using AMOS 22. The fit indices of our structural model showed an acceptable fit with the data (χ^2 = 222.44; df = 96; χ^2/df = 2.31; RMSEA = 0.07; CFI = 0.93; TLI = 0.91; NFI = 0.89; and SRMR = 0.06). The structural path relationships and corresponding coefficients are shown in Table 3 and Figure 2.

Insert Table 3 about here

Hypotheses H1, H2 and H3 were supported with a p-value of less than 0.05. The standardized β coefficients of the links between "social comparison" and "materialism"; "belief in karma" and "materialism"; and "materialism and life satisfaction" were 0.50, 0.28 and 0.35, respectively, with a p-value lower than 0.01 for all the links. Therefore, "social comparison" and "belief in karma" positively influence "materialism" which ultimately influences "life satisfaction".

We tested whether "materialism" mediated the relationships between "social comparison" and "belief in karma" with "life satisfaction". Following Reimann *et al*. (2010), we examined both the direct effects (from "social comparison" and "belief in karma" to "life satisfaction") and the indirect effect (from "social comparison" and "belief in karma" to "life satisfaction" via "materialism") to check for full/partial mediation. While the direct effect of "social comparison" (β = -0.07; p = 0.42) on "life satisfaction" was found to be non-significant, the indirect effect (β = 0.16; t = 2.28) via "materialism" was found to be significant. Hence, "materialism" fully mediates the relationship between "social comparison" and "life satisfaction". On the other hand, both the direct effect (β = 0.17; p = 0.03) and indirect effect (β = 0.08; t = 2.0) of 'belief in karma" on "life satisfaction"

were found to be significant. Hence, "materialism" partially mediates the relationship between "belief in karma" and "life satisfaction".

Discussion

The first study conducted a survey among middle-class Indians, with the findings showing that H1–H4 were supported. In the context of an emerging economy like India, the susceptibility to normative social influence promotes materialism. It is therefore likely that social forces promote material values amongst the Indian middle class. Indians are obviously trying to 'keep up with the Joneses' which, in turn, is leading the way toward material consumption. Furthermore, belief in karma has a positive influence on materialism. This is supported by the extant literature that found religious beliefs influence materialistic orientation (Choudhury, 2014). Moreover, the current study shows that materialism mediates the effects of socio-normative and karmic belief influences on life satisfaction. Although the extant literature argues that materialism can have both positive and negative effects, the current findings demonstrate that, in the context of the Indian middle class, materialism has a positive effect on life satisfaction.

Study 1 uses hypotheses which are grounded in the extant literature to make predictions. The positive karma-materialism relationship in study 1 seems to suggest that Indian middle class is increasingly embracing conspicuous consumption, which is further driving life satisfaction. However, the nature of Study 1 is correlational, rather than causal. To identify the boundary condition of the link between "belief in karma" and "materialism", we pursued an experimental design to conduct our second study. Study 2 was therefore used to primarily examine H5 and to provide causal support for some of the relationships we established in Study 1. In order to ensure the robustness of our analysis, we measured "materialism" with the scale developed by Richins (2004). This is a more recent scale

consists of three dimensions: success, centrality and happiness. The details are outlined under Study 2 below.

Study 2

Method

In Study 2, we conducted an experiment with executive Master of Business Administration (MBA) students of the business school of a large Indian city. A total of 206 respondents (average age 35.4 years, 49.5% were female; average monthly income of Rs. 50,575 [approx. US$711]; 83.5% had either a bachelor or Master's degree; 53.4% were either a government or private job holder; and 14.6% were business owners) took part in a 2 ("belief in karma": absent versus present) x 2 ("motivation": positive versus negative) between-subjects' experiment. On arrival, respondents (subjects) were randomly allocated to each condition. The instrument for the experiment was divided into three parts. In the first part, "belief in karma" was manipulated by stating the concept of karma and asking respondents to describe two situations in their lives where karma had influenced them to act in a specific way. For comparison, respondents in the control condition were asked to describe two routine activities in their daily lives. They then answered a manipulation check item ("I believe in karma") for "belief in karma" on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The manipulation was adapted from Kopalle et al. (2010).

In the second part of the questionnaire, through using scenarios, we manipulated the underlying motivation. We asked respondents to imagine that they were working towards a degree and hoping to achieve material success (acquire luxury products, a house, cars, etc.) to support their family (positive motivation) versus to show off wealth (negative motivation). Respondents then completed the manipulation check questions ("Material success can be used to support family needs" and "Material success can be used to show-off to others") for

positive and negative motivation; both were measured on a 7-point Likert scale. The manipulation check items were based on the existing literature (Sirgy *et al.,* 2013; Srivastava *et al.,* 2001). Following this, the respondents answered question items for the key dependent variable "life satisfaction" followed by series of items for "social comparison" and "materialism". Finally, respondents completed the demographic items. We measured "social comparison" and "life satisfaction" using the same scale items that were used in Study 1. "Materialism" was measured using Richins' (2004) scale that consists of three dimensions: success, centrality and happiness.

We began the data analysis by checking the manipulations of the scenarios and also by testing the constructs for their reliability and validity. For the "belief in karma" manipulation, results of the one-way ANOVA showed that respondents (subjects) reported higher scores on the dependent variable in the "belief in karma" present versus absent condition (Ms of 5.67 vs. 4.56; F (1,205) = 43.3, p = 0.0001). Similarly, a one-way ANOVA showed that respondents (subjects) in the positive (vs. negative) "motivation" agreed that materialism can serve family needs (Ms of 5.99 vs. 5.39; F (1, 199) = 9.61, p = 0.002). Finally, respondents (subjects) in the negative (vs. positive) "motivation" subscribed to the view that materialism can be used to show-off to others (Ms of 4.65 vs. 4.02; F (1, 199) = 7.34, p = 0.007). Therefore, the manipulations for "belief in karma" and "motivation" were found to be successful.

In order to test the reliability and validity of the constructs, we ran both exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The EFA results revealed that most items, except for the centrality and happiness dimensions of "materialism", loaded highly on the respective construct. The EFA of the centrality and happiness dimensions of "materialism" revealed two cross-loaded items for each dimension, with these deleted and not considered for further analysis. This was in line with the approaches of previous studies

(e.g., Sin *et al.*, 2005). The descriptive statistics and factor loadings of the scale items corresponding to the constructs are shown in Table 4.

We tested the measurement model with AMOS 22.0 and found a satisfactory fit ($\chi^2 = 262.46$; $df = 131$; $\chi^2/df = 2.004$; RMSEA = 0.07; CFI = 0.90; TLI = 0.90; NFI = 0.83; and SRMR = 0.07). The convergent validity of the constructs was examined by checking the substantial factor loading of all items (Hair *et al.*, 1995) which all loaded significantly (at the 0.01 level) onto the respective latent construct. The average variance extracted (AVE) of the constructs was found to be greater than 0.50, thus supporting the convergent validity of the constructs of interest (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). The correlation values (see Table 5) between the constructs used in the study were found to be within the acceptable limit, thus supporting the discriminant validity of the constructs (Kline, 2005). The lowest value of construct reliability (CR) was 0.85 for the happiness dimension of "materialism", thus suggesting adequate internal consistency of the scale items used in the study. The AVE for each construct revealed that all exceeded the minimum cut-off point of 0.5 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Hair *et al.*, 2010).

Insert Table 4 and Table 5 about here

Results

Moderated Mediation Analysis

To analyse our moderated mediation hypothesis (H5), we employed Hayes' (2013) Model 7, using 5000 boot straps. In our model, "belief in karma" (0 = absent, 1 = present) was the independent variable, while "life satisfaction" served as the key dependent variable. The underlying "motivation" (0 = negative, 1 = positive) for "materialism" was used as the moderator. As we had used "social comparison" as an independent variable in Study 1, we

decided to control for this in Study 2. Finally, the three dimensions of "materialism", that is, success, centrality and happiness were used as mediators.

As can be seen from the topmost portion of Table 6A, "belief in karma" (in comparison to its absence) had a positive influence on the success dimension ($\beta = 0.83$, $t = 4.14$, $p = 0.00$), with this conditional on negative motivation. However, a change of underlying motivation from negative to positive reduced success (the two-way interaction between "belief in karma" and "motivation" was significant; ($\beta = -1.56$, $t = -5.52$, $p = 0.00$). The two-way interaction between "belief in karma" and "motivation" was not significant for either the centrality dimension ($\beta = -0.14$, $t = -0.43$, $p = 0.68$) or the happiness dimension ($\beta = 0.44$, $t = 1.51$, $p = 0.13$) (see middle and bottom portions of Table 6A). The control variable "social comparison" had a significant influence on the dimensions of success ($\beta = 0.29$, $t = 5.37$, $p = 0.00$), centrality ($\beta = 0.14$, $t = 2.14$, $p = 0.04$) and happiness ($\beta = 0.18$, $t = 3.08$, $p = 0.00$). Moreover, "belief in karma" had a significant influence on success ($\beta = 0.83$, $t = 4.14$, $p = 0.00$), centrality ($\beta = 0.62$, $t = 2.59$, $p = 0.01$) and happiness ($\beta = -0.48$, t $= -2.32$, $p = 0.02$). These findings replicated our results from Study 1, albeit through an experimental design.

As shown in Table 6B, we find that success has a further positive influence on "life satisfaction" (which is the dependent variable) ($\beta = 0.37$, $t = 5.33$, $p = 0.00$). To explore this further, we consider the indirect effect of "belief in karma" on "life satisfaction" through success, as shown in the bottom portion of Table 6B. We find that, under negative motivation, this indirect link is positive (conditional indirect effect = 0.30, 95% confidence interval does not straddle zero [0]), while this effect is negative under positive motivation (conditional indirect effect = -0.27, 95% confidence interval does not straddle zero [0]). The index of moderated mediation is significant at -0.57 with LLCI = -.95 and ULCI = -.26. In other words, we find support for Hypothesis 5 which proposed that the belief in karma–

materialism relationship is moderated by the underlying motivation. To be specific, under negative motivation, the belief in karma positively influences life satisfaction by enhancing the perception of material success. In other words, people seem to be more self-focused under karmic belief, especially in the presence of materialistic cues, and the resultant emphasis on conspicuous consumption drives life satisfaction. Although we posited this effect to weaken in the absence of karmic belief, our findings show a reversal. In the absence of belief in karma, such self-focused thoughts are no longer promoted especially when motivation to pursue materialism is driven by positive goals like nurturing the family.

Insert Table 6A and 6B about here

Overall Discussion

India is a vast South Asian country with a massive population of 1.34 billion, and a per capita gross domestic product (GDP) of US$1963.55[2] in 2017. The country's rising affluence will make it the third largest consumer market by 2025, with consumer expenditure projected to increase by three times to hit US$4 trillion (Rapoza, 2017). With rising incomes, multiplying global connections and the influx of new consumer goods, the new middle class across various cities in India has become the most viable market segment for multinational corporations (Upadhya, 2011). They also show a great deal of selfish materialism (Fuller and Narasimhan, 2007; Varma, 1999) and have become a "consuming class" (Fernandes, 2006). The current research employed two studies (Study 1 and Study 2) to understand how Indian consumers have embraced material consumption, especially given India's recent past deprivation and new-found economic success. The respondents of both studies reflected the characteristics of the 'new' Indian middle class in terms of their education, occupation and income level (Fuller and Narasimhan, 2007).

---

[2] https://tradingeconomics.com/india/gdp-per-capita

Study 1 of the current research proposed the notion that antecedents like social comparison and belief in karma encourage material values amongst the Indian middle class. This was based on existing paradigms, such as value theory which posits that normative social forces encourage the adoption of the values of comparison groups (e.g., similar others). Furthermore, it was proposed that material values would drive life satisfaction. This is in line with the limited number of available studies which predict the positive influence of materialism on satisfaction and well-being, although this has not been tested amongst Indian consumers. Finally, we posited a boundary condition for the belief in karma–materialism relationship based on a limited number of studies which show that belief in karma can influence the motivation underlying a behaviour.

Findings from Study 1 (a survey) showed that both social comparison and belief in karma promoted material values amongst Indian consumers. Furthermore, material values had a significant influence on life satisfaction. The results of mediation analyses showed that material values fully (partially) mediated the relationship between social comparison (belief in karma) and life satisfaction. We followed this further with an experiment in Study 2 where belief in karma was manipulated. In addition, we manipulated the underlying motivation for materialism and used three dimensions of materialism (Richins, 2004) to explore the more nuanced patterns of the relationships.

Study 2 was conducted mainly to explore the boundary condition for the belief in karma–materialism relationship as well as to provide causal support for direct effects from Study 1. The findings showed that the belief in karma–materialism relationship is reinforced positively (negatively) when people had negative (positive) motivation underlying materialism. In other words, when people wanted to show off, belief in karma influenced their perceptions of success positively leading to greater life satisfaction. This finding aligns well with studies that show that religious values and belief in karma can promote self-

centred thoughts that encourage material values (Decety *et al*., 2015; Choudhury, 2014). Through our results, we show that this happens amongst Indian consumers with respect to the success dimension of materialism. Our findings from Study 1 are also replicated, with results from Study 2 showing that belief in karma had a significant causal influence on the three dimensions of materialism.

Theoretical Implications

The findings of the current research have significant theoretical and managerial implications. The study contributes to the existing literature on materialism and karmic belief in several ways. Firstly, the limited body of literature available shows that materialism can enhance well-being under certain situations, for example, in cases of prior economic deprivation, in certain Asian economies (Wong *et al*., 2003; Srivastava *et al.*, 2001; Biswas-Diener and Diener, 2001). The current findings add to this literature and show that materialism can indeed enhance life satisfaction for Indians. This is important as materialism is on the rise amongst Indian consumers (Sharma, 2011) and no prior research in India has studied the influence of material values on life satisfaction. By doing so, the current work also addresses the need for more research (Chakravarti, 2006; Hill *et al.,* 2012) to study the role of social comparison and materialism in the context of emerging economies.

Another interesting contribution of the current study is karmic belief's influence amongst Indian consumers. Earlier findings show that religious values may conflict with a person's material values (Burroughs and Rindfleisch, 2002). A growing number of studies, however, argue that religious values can support paradoxical views underpinning materialism (Minton *et al*., 2016; Sinha, 2014; Choudhury, 2014; Faure and Fang, 2008). Our work contributes to this growing stream of literature and shows that belief in karma can indeed promote material values. The current study also contributes to a nascent and growing stream of research (e.g., Kulow and Kramer, 2016; Kopalle *et al.,* 2010) that has relatively

recently started to understand the role of belief in karma in influencing consumption behaviour.

Specifically, our findings extend the work of Kulow and Kramer (2016) by showing that people become self-focused not only when cued with gains, but that belief in karma can also lead people on the material path. Finally, the current research explores the boundary condition of belief in karma–materialism relationship. Existing studies (Sirgy *et al*., 2013; Srivastava *et al*., 2001) argue that materialism can be driven by its underlying motivation and recommend that further investigation should be undertaken. In fact, Srivastava et al. (2001) posit that motivation to seek wealth may be driven by positive motives (e.g., providing security or support family) or negative motives (e.g., overcoming self-doubt and showing-off). Extending this work, our finding shows that karmic belief increases life satisfaction when people want to show-off their wealth to others (i.e., negative motivation). Such effect is reversed when people are driven by different motivation to accrue wealth, such as raising families (i.e., positive motivation).

Managerial Implications

Besides its theoretical contribution, this research also has significant practical implications. Its findings offer useful insights to the managers about the Indian middle class, especially on individual differences among the consumers in terms of their religious (karmic) beliefs, motivations for material consumption, and their life satisfaction. The current findings show that karmic belief promotes materialism, which eventually influences life satisfaction. Kopalle *et al.* (2010) show that belief in karma is associated with a long-term orientation in individuals. The notion of karma also puts forward the view that an individual is free to choose what to do in the present or future (King, 1999). Based on the current and previous findings, marketers can influence karmic belief amongst Indian consumers to encourage

them to work towards luxury acquisitions. An example would be an innovative long-term finance scheme that allows Indian consumers to work towards luxuries like iPhones.

Our findings regarding karma and underlying motivation has interesting implications too, especially in the context of marketing communications. For example, while promoting materialistic desires, marketers can engage persuasive appeals that highlight the underlying negative motivations (e.g., showing-off), while justifying such conspicuous consumption based on hard work. An appropriate vignette would be an individual boasting about his luxury car but attributing his/her success to individual efforts. Such positioning is likely to be effective if the right segment is targeted with the proposed marketing efforts.

Based on our findings, certain segments of the population are likely to nurture negative motivation to show off. Such negative motivation can be at work amongst educated Indian middle class or consumers who nurture high aspirations (e.g., people pursuing an MBA to make further progress in career and lives). They could further belong to either gender. As mentioned before, marketers can probably highlight acquiring of symbolic luxury goods in advertising messages to drive the notion of impressing others (e.g., peers). This proposed positioning, along with the innovative long-term finance scheme mentioned before, should help in increased market penetration amongst target consumers (middle class, high achievers).

In addition, drawing on our findings relating to social comparison and material values, marketers could communicate the notion of collective materialism (Awanis *et al.,* 2017) through their promotional campaigns (e.g., advertisements showing acceptance by one's peers based on the purchase of a specific car model). Similarly, luxury brand manufacturers (e.g. multinationals) can target the burgeoning Indian middle class with their products. Multinationals can promote their products by motivating people to believe in their

family orientations and self-aspirations (to consume luxury products), while working towards such goals.

Limitations and Future Research

The current study has its limitations. In our study, we found the positive effect of belief in karma and materialism on respondents' well-being and life satisfaction. This is contrary to previous findings (e.g., Dittmar *et al*., 2014) that materialism influences life satisfaction negatively. However, our work was restricted to the Indian middle class only. Based on the fact that karmic belief is accepted by other cultures (e.g., other Asian countries, Western society), our findings should generally hold. However, it would be interesting to empirically test our model amongst other developing countries (e.g., Thailand) where vast number of consumers are being created. Future work can also extend our study by looking at people who are living in poverty and are currently at the bottom of the societal pyramid, or it could look at the effect of karmic belief in the Western context. It is also possible that the relationship between materialism and life satisfaction is non-linear and that, beyond a certain point, materialism contributes negatively to life satisfaction. This could be investigated by future research. Finally, the current study was based on a single Indian metropolitan city, with this choice mainly driven by convenience. Future work could collect and analyse data from other Indian cities and from people from different social strata to enhance the study's external validity.

References

Abramson, P.R. and Inglehart, R. (1995). *Value change in global perspective*. Ann Arbour: University of Michigan Press.

Anderson, J.C. and Gerbing, D.W. (1982), "Some methods for respecifying measurement models to obtain uni-dimensional construct measurement", *Journal of Marketing Research,* Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 453-460.

Awanis, S., Schlegelmilch, B.B. and Cui, C.C. (2017), "Asia's materialists: Reconciling collectivism and materialism", *Journal of International Business Studies,* Vol. 48 No.8, pp. 964 - 991.

Belk, R.W. (1983), "Worldly possessions: Issues and criticisms," In R.P. Bagozzi and A. M. Tybout (Eds.), *Advances in consumer research (*pp. 514-519). Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.

Belk, R. W. (1985), "Materialism: Trait aspects of living in the material world", *Journal of Consumer Research,* Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 265-280.

Biswas-Diener, R. and Diener, E. (2001), "Making the best of a bad situation: Satisfaction in the slums of Calcutta", *Social Indicators Research,* Vol. 55, pp. 329–352.

Buunk, A. P. and Gibbons, F. X. (2007), "Social comparison: The end of a theory and the emergence of a field", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* Vol. 102, pp. 3 - 21.

Burroughs, J. E. and Rindfleisch, A. (2002), "Materialism and well-Being: A conflicting values perspective", *Journal of Consumer Research,* Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 348- 371.

Chakravarti, D. (2006), "Voices unheard: the psychology of consumption in poverty and development", *Journal of Consumer Psychology,* Vol. 16, pp. 363–376.

Chan, K. and Prendergast, G. (2007), "Materialism and social comparison among adolescents", *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal,* Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 213-228.

Chatterjee, S., Rai, D., and Chaudhuri, H.R. (2013), "Karma as a source of fairness judgments: how the weakening of karmic fairness affects consumer preferences", *Annual Winter Meeting: Society for Consumer Psychology,* San Antonio, Texas.

Choudhury, K. (2014). "Materialism, religion, and implications for marketing - An ethnographic study of Nichiren Buddhism", *Psychology & Marketing,* Vol. 31 No. 9, pp. 683-697.

Cleveland, M., Laroche, M., and Papadopoulos, N. (2009), "Cosmopolitanism, consumer ethnocentrism, and materialism: An eight-country study of antecedents and outcomes", *Journal of International Marketing,* Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 116–146.

Converse, B., Risen, J.L., and Carter, T. J. (2012), "Investing in Karma: When waiting promotes helping," *Psychological Science*, Vol. 23, No. 8 pp. 923-930.

De Botton, A. (2004). *Status anxiety*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Decety, J., Cowell, J. M., Lee, K., Mahasneh, R., Malcolm-Smith, S., Selcuk, B., and Zhou, X. (2015), "The negative association between religiousness and children's altruism across the world, "*Current Biology,* Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 2951-2955.

Dheer, R. J., Lenartowicz, T., and Peterson, M. F. (2015), "Mapping India's regional subcultures: Implications for international management", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 443-467.

Diener, E. D., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R. J., and Griffin, S. (1985), "The satisfaction with life scale", *Journal of Personality Assessment,* Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 71-75.

Diener, E., and Biswas-Diener, R. (2002), "Will money increase subjective well-being?", *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 57, pp. 119–169.

Dittmar, H. (2008), *Consumer culture, identity and well-being: The search for the "good Life" and the "body Perfect" (European Monographs in Social Psychology)* , Psychology Press, NY.

Dittmar, H., Bond, R. , Hurst, M., Kasser, T. (2014), "The relationship between materialism and personal well-being: A meta-analysis," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 107, pp. 879–924.

Faure, O' G., and Fang, T. (2008), "Changing Chinese values: keeping up with paradoxes", *International Business Review*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 194–207.

Fernandes, L. (2006), *India's New Middle Class; Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Festinger, L. (1954), *A theory of cognitive dissonance,* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fornell, C., and Larcker, D.F. (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research,* Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 39-50.

Fuller, C.J. and Narasimhan, H. (2007), Information Technology Professionals and the New-Rich Middle Class in Chennai (Madras), *Modern Asian Studies,* Vol 41 No. 1, pp. 121-150.

Garcia, S. M., Tor, A., and Schiff, T. M. (2013), "The psychology of competition: A social comparison perspective", *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, Vol 8 No. 6, pp. 634-650.

Gardner, J., and Oswald, A. J. (2007), "Money and mental wellbeing: A longitudinal study of medium-sized lottery wins", *Journal of Health Economics,* Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 49-60.

Gibbons, X.F., and Buunk, P.B. (1999), "Individual differences in social comparison: development of a scale of social comparison", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* Vol. 76 No. 1, pp. 129-142.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. and Black, W.C. (1995), *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*, 4th ed., Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Anderson, R.E. (2010), *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective*, 7th ed., Pearson Education, Upper Saddle River.

Hayes, A. F. (2013), *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis. A regression-based approach.* Guilford, New York.

Hill, R. P., Martin, K. D., and Chaplin, L. N. (2012), "A tale of two marketplaces: Consumption restriction, social comparison, and life satisfaction", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 731-744.

Hu, Li-T., and Bentler, M. P. (1999), "Cut-off criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives", *Structural Equation Modelling,* Vol 6, pp. 1-55.

Hudders, L., and Pandelaere, M. (2012), "The silver lining of materialism: the impact of luxury consumption on subjective well-being", *Journal of Happiness Studies,* Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 411-437.

IPSOS (2013). *A survey on Global Attitudes on Materialism, Finances and Family,* Retrieved from https://www.ipsos-na.com/download/pr.aspx?id=13284.

Kasser, T., and Ahuvia, A. (2002), "Materialistic values and well-being in business students", *European Journal of Social Psychology,* Vol. 32, pp. 137-146.

Kasser, T., and Ryan. R.M. (2001), "Be careful what you wish for: optimal functioning and the relative attainment of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. In P. Schmuck and K. M. Sheldon (Eds.) *Life Goals And Wellbeing: Towards A Positive Psychology Of Human Striving* (pp. 116-131). Gottingen, Germany: Hogrefe and Huber.

Kasser, T., Ryan, R. M., Couchman, C. E., and Sheldon, K. M. (2004). Materialistic values: Their causes and consequences. In T. Kasser and A. D. Kanner (Eds.), *Psychology and consumer culture.* Washington, DC: American Psychology Association.

Khaptsova, A., and Schwartz, S. H. (2016), "Life satisfaction and value congruence: Moderators and extension to constructed socio-demographic groups in a Russian national sample," *Social Psychology,* Vol. 47*,* pp. 163-173.

Kilbourne, W., and Pickett, G. (2008), "How materialism affects environmental beliefs, concern, and environmentally responsible behaviour", *Journal of Business Research,* Vol. 61, pp. 885-893.

King, R. (1999). *Indian Philosophy.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. Kirschmaier, I., Prüfer, J., and Trautman, S.T. (2018) , "Religion, moral attitudes and economic behavior," *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Oranization,* Vol. 148, pp. 282-300.

Kopalle, P.K., Lehmann, D. R., and Farley, J. U. (2010), "Consumer expectations and culture: the effect of belief of karma in India", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 251-263.

Kline, R. B. (2005), *Principles and practice of structural equation modelling*. The Guilford Press, NY.

Kulow, K., and Kramer, T. (2016), "In pursuit of good karma: when charitable appeals to do right and go wrong. *Journal of Consumer Research,* Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 334-353.

Lee, J., and Shrum, L. J. (2012), "Conspicuous consumption versus charitable behavior in response to social exclusion: A differential needs explanation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 530-544.

Martin, K. D., and Hill, R. P. (2012), "Life satisfaction, self-determination, and consumption adequacy at the bottom of the pyramid", *Journal of Consumer Research,* Vol 38, pp. 1155–1168.

Michalos, A.C. (1985), "Multiple Discrepancies Theory*" Social Indicators Research*, vol. 16, pp. 347-413.

Minton, E. A., Kahle, L. R., Jiuan, T. S., & Tambyah, S. K. (2016). Addressing Criticisms of Global Religion Research: A Consumption-Based Exploration of Status and

Materialism, Sustainability, and Volunteering Behavior. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* Vol. 55 No. 2, pp. 365-383.

Ordabayeva,N., and Chandon,P., (2011), " Getting ahead of the Joneses: When equality increases conspicuous consumption among bottom-tier consumers," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 38, No., 1, pp. 27-41.

Podolny, J. M. (2005). *Status signals: A sociological study of market competition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Lee, J.Y., and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003), "Common method biases in behavioural research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879-903.

Rapoza, K. (2017), "India poised to be third largest consumer economy", *Forbes,* May 21; can be found at https://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2017/03/21/india-poised-to-be-third-largest-consumer-economy/#19d86a571abe, accessed 10-11-2018.

Reimann, M., Schilke, O., and Thomas, S.J. (2010), "Customer relationship management and firm performance: the mediating role of business strategy", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Sciences,* Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 326-346.

Richins, M. (1987), "Media, materialism and human happiness", In M. Willendorf and P. Anderson (Eds.) *Advances in Consumers Research* (pp.352-356). Provo, UT: Association for Consumers Research.

Richins, M. L. (1991). Social comparison and the idealized images of advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol 18 (June), pp. 71-83.

Richins, M. (1995), "Social comparison, advertising, and consumer discontent", *American Behavioural Scientist,* Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 593-607.

Richins. M. (2004), "The materialism values scale: Measurement properties and development of a short form," *Journal of Consumer Research,* Vol. 31 No. 1, pp.209-219.

Richins, M., and Dawson, S., (1992), "A consumer values orientation for materialism and its measurement," *Journal of Consumer Research,* Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 303-316.

Roy, R., and Rabbanee, F. (2015), "Antecedents and consequences of self-congruity", *European Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 49 No. 3/4, pp. 444-466.

Ryan, L., and Dziurawiec, S. (2001), "Materialism and its relationship to life satisfaction", *Social Indicators Research,* Vol. 55 No. 2, pp. 185-197.

Sagiv, L., and Schwartz, S. H., (2000), "Value priorities and subjective well-being: direct relations and congruity effects," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 30, pp. 177-198.

Schiffman, L.G. and Kanuk, L.L. (2004) *Consumer Behavior.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schroeder, J.E. and Dugal, S. S. (1995) "Psychological correlates of the materialism construct", *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 243–253.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992), "Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries," In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1-65) , Vol. 25, New York: Academic Press.

Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., and Konty, M.

(2012), "Refining the theory of basic individual values," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 103, No. 4, pp. 663-688.

Sharma, P. (2011), "Country of origin effects in developed and emerging markets: Exploring the contrasting roles of materialism and value consciousness", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 285-306.

Sin, L.Y.M., Tse, A.C.B. and Yim, F. H. K. (2005), "CRM: conceptualization and scale Development", *European Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 39, No. 11/12, pp. 1264 - 1290.

Sinha J.B.P. (2014) *Spirituality and Materialism. In: Psycho-Social Analysis of the Indian Mindset.* Springer, New Delhi.

Sirgy, J.M. (1998), "Materialism and quality of life", *Social Indicators Research,* Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 227-260.

Sirgy, M. J., Gurel-Atay, E., Webb, D., Cicic, M., Husic-Mehmedovic, M., Ekici, A., Herrmann, A., Hegazy, I., Lee, D., and Johar, J.S. (2013)," Is materialism all that bad? Effects on satisfaction with material life, life satisfaction, and economic motivation", *Social Indicators Research,* Vol. 110 No. 1, pp. 349-367.

Sortheix, F. M., and Lonnqvist, J.E. (2015), "Person-group value congruence and subjective well-being in students from Argentina, Bulgaria and Finland: The role of interpersonal relationships," *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology,* Vol. 25, No. 1, pp.34-48.

Srivastava, A., Locke, E.A., and Bartol, K.M. (2001), "Money and subjective well-being: It's not the money, it's the motive", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* Vol. 80 No. 6, pp. 959-971.

Suls, J., and Wheeler, L. (2000), "A selective history of classic and neo-social comparison theory", In J. Suls & L. Wheeler (Eds.), *Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research* (pp. 3–22). New York, NY: Plenum.

Upadhya, Carol. 2011. Software and the "new" middle class in the "new India." In Elite and everyman: *The cultural politics of the Indian middle classes,* edited by Raka Ray and Amita Baviskar. New York: Routledge.

Veblen, Thorstein (1899/1994), The Theory of the Leisure Class, New York: Dover.

Varma, P. K. (1999), *The Great Indian Middle Class,* New Delhi: Penguin.

Wang, Y. (2016), "Social stratification, materialism, post-materialism and consumption values: An empirical study of a Chinese sample", *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics,* Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 580-593.

Wessel, M. V. (2004), "Talking About Consumption - How an Indian Middle Class Dissociates from Middle-Class Life", *Cultural Dynamics,* Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 93-116.

White, C., Baimel, A., and Norenzayan, A. (2017), "What are the causes and consequences of belief in karma?", *Religion, Brain and Behaviour,* Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 339-342.

Wong, N. Y., and Ahuvia, A. C. (1998), "Personal taste and family face: Luxury consumption in Confucian and Western societies", *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 423-441.

Wong, N., Rindfleisch, A., and Burroughs, J.E., (2003), "Do reverse-worded items confound measures in cross cultural consumer research? The case of material value scale," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 72-91.

Xiao, G., and Kim, J. (2009), "The investigation of Chinese consumer values, life satisfaction, and consumption behaviour", *Psychology & Marketing,* Vol. 26 No. 7, pp. 610-624.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics and factor loading of the scale items [Study 1]

Constructs and Items	Loading	Mean	SD
Social comparison			
1. I always pay a lot of attention to how I do things compared with how others do things.	0.83	4.29	1.63
2. If I want to find out how well I have done something, I compare what I have done with how others have done.	0.81	4.41	1.49
3. I often compare how I am doing socially (e.g., social skills, popularity) with other people.	0.80	3.95	1.64
4. I am the type of person who compares often with others.	0.81	4.31	1.53
Karma			
1. I believe in reincarnation where one becomes better (worse) due to good (bad) actions.	0.71	5.02	1.40
	0.92	5.81	1.37
2. I believe in karma.	0.61	5.01	1.16
3. The world was not formed by a once-for-all act of creation.			
Materialism			
1. It is important to me to have really nice things.	0.83	5.12	1.64
2. I would like to be rich enough to buy anything I want.	0.79	5.22	1.41
3. I'd be happier if I could afford to buy more things.	0.60	3.98	1.70
4. It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can't afford to buy all things I want.	0.59	4.66	1.64
Life satisfaction			
1. In most ways, my life is close to ideal.	0.86	5.70	0.94
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.	0.68	5.42	1.17
3. I am satisfied with my life.	0.55	5.51	0.90
4. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.	0.56	4.79	1.36

Note: SD means standard deviation

Table 2: Correlation matrix and psychometrics properties [Study 1]

Constructs	SC	KA	MAT	LS
Social comparison (SC)	1			
Karma (KA)	0.27**	1		
Materialism (MAT)	0.50**	0.33**	1	
Life Satisfaction (LS)	0.11	0.21**	0.28**	1
Composite Reliability (CR)	0.93	0.87	0.85	0.84
Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	0.77	0.69	0.59	0.57

Table 3: Standardized coefficients, t-values, and p-values of the model [Study 1]

Hypotheses	β	t-value	Conclusion
H1: Social comparison => Materialism	0.50	5.93	Supported
H2: Karma => Materialism	0.28	3.73	Supported
H3: Materialism => Life satisfaction	0.35	4.00	Supported
H4a: Social comparison => Life Satisfaction (Indirect effect via Materialism)	0.16	2.28	Supported
H4b: Karma => Life Satisfaction (Indirect effect via Materialism)	0.08	2.00	Supported

Table 4: Descriptive statistics and factor loading of the scale items [Study 2]

Constructs and Items	Loading	Mean	SD
Social comparison			
1. I always pay a lot of attention to how I do things compared with how others do things.	0.77	3.67	1.63
2. If I want to find out how well I have done something, I compare what I have done with how others have done.	0.82	4.26	1.72
3. I often compare how I am doing socially (e.g., social skills, popularity) with other people.	0.55	4.13	2.65
4. I am the type of person who compares often with others.	0.72	3.66	1.63
Materialism - Success			
1. I admire people who own expensive homes, cars, and clothes.	0.82	3.72	1.53
2. Some of the most important achievements in life include acquiring material possessions.	0.82	4.09	1.42
3. The things I own say a lot about how well I'm doing in life.	0.76	4.19	1.42
4. I like to own things that impress people.	0.65	3.55	1.49
Materialism – Centrality			
1. I usually buy only the things I need. (r)	0.87	3.33	1.72
2. I try to keep my life simple, as far as possessions are concerned. (r)	0.84	3.01	1.45
3. Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure.	0.55	3.85	1.72
Materialism – Happiness			
1. I have all the things I really need to enjoy life. (r)	0.65	3.27	1.45
2. My life would be better if I owned certain things I don't have.	0.82	4.59	1.44
3. I'd be happier if I could afford to buy more things.	0.72	4.26	1.46
Life satisfaction			
1. In most ways, my life is close to ideal.	0.74	4.38	1.33
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.	0.88	4.55	1.40
3. I am satisfied with my life.	0.89	4.68	1.39
4. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.	0.77	4.62	1.53

Note: SD means standard deviation; r refers to reverse coded item

Table 5: Correlation matrix and psychometrics properties [Study 2]

Constructs	SC	SUC	CEN	HAP	LS
Social comparison (SC)	1				
Materialism - Success (SUC)	0.33**	1			
Materialism - Centrality (CEN)	0.15*	0.20**	1		
Materialism - Happiness (HAP)	0.20**	0.15*	0.18*	1	
Life Satisfaction (LS)	-0.03	.27**	-0.04	-0.26**	1
Composite Reliability (CR)	0.87	0.91	0.87	0.85	0.94
Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	0.65	0.71	0.70	0.66	0.78

Table 6 A

Moderated mediation Hayes (2013) Model 7

Dependent Variable: Success

	Coefficient	se	t	p
Constant	2.20	0.25	8.75	0.00
Karma	0.83	0.19	4.14	0.00
Motivation	0.93	0.19	4.76	0.00
Karma x Motivation	-1.56	0.28	-5.52	0.00
Social comparison	.29	0.05	5.36	0.00

Dependent Variable: Centrality

	Coefficient	se	t	p
Constant	2.73	0.30	9.11	0.00
Karma	0.62	0.24	2.59	0.01
Motivation	-0.32	0.23	-1.37	0.17
Karma x Motivation	-0.14	0.33	-0.43	0.67
Social comparison	0.14	0.06	2.14	0.04

Dependent Variable: Happiness

	Coefficient	se	t	p
Constant	3.66	0.26	13.93	0.00
Karma	-0.48	0.21	-2.32	0.02
Motivation	-0.39	0.20	-1.95	0.05
Karma x Motivation	0.44	0.29	1.51	0.13
Social comparison	0.18	0.06	3.08	0.00

Table 6 B

Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction

	Coefficient	se	t	p
Constant	4.9	0.39	12.53	0.00
Karma	-0.26	0.15	-1.69	0.09
Success	0.37	0.07	5.33	0.00
Centrality	-0.03	0.06	-0.41	0.68
Happiness	-0.33	0.07	-4.67	0.00
Social comparison	-0.09	0.06	-1.45	0.15

Conditional Indirect effect:

Mediator	Motivation	Effect	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
Success	Negative	0.30	0.11	0.12	0.54
	Positive	-0.27	0.09	-0.48	-0.09

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework