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Abstract

The purpose of this study has been to explore the relationship between financial socialization, perceived norms and materialism of college students when controlling for socio-economic characteristics. The research was conducted at a state university in Ankara. Data was collected during spring of 2010 using a web survey of college students (2199 female and 1726 male). Regression results confirmed that, perceived norms, social learning opportunities, and socialization agents were significantly related to materialism. It was found that perceived more frequency of negative credit card usage behavior of parent’ and friend’ were positively related to materialism. It was also found that, more frequently discussed finance with parents was positively related to materialism. On the other side, observed financial behavior of parents was negatively related to materialism. Mothers as a socialization agent significantly affect students to be less materialistic compared to fathers. However, friends as a socialization agent significantly affect students to be more materialistic than fathers.
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Introduction

Materialism is widely viewed as an important life value (Kasser and Ryan, 1993; Mick, 1996; Richins and Dawson, 1992). As defined by Rokeach (1968, p. 161), a value is "a centrally held, enduring belief which guides actions and judgments across specific situations and beyond immediate goals to more ultimate end-states of existence." Building off Rokeach's conceptualization, Richins and Dawson (1992, p. 308) define materialism as a "set of centrally held beliefs about the importance of possessions in one's life." In other words, materialism can be viewed as the value a consumer places on the acquisition and possession of material objects.

Materialism in economic psychology and consumer research has been defined as “the importance a consumer attaches to worldly possessions” (Belk, 1985, p.265), or as “an orientation which views material goods and money as important for personal happiness and social progress” (Ward and Wackman, 1971, p. 422). When a culture places a strong emphasis on individual economic accomplishments, people tend to develop extrinsic aspirations involving financial goals, materialistic assets and acquisitions, and success with social recognition (Kasser and Ryan, 1993). Under the influence of norms, people are likely to place excessive value on monetary success and material possessions. By definition, materialists view acquisition of wealth and possessions as central to their lives, essential for their happiness, and crucial in the definition of success (Richins and Dawson, 1992; Tybout and Artz, 1994). They also tend to value financial success significantly more than other life goals such as community, social affiliation, and self-acceptance (Kasser and Ryan, 1993).

The popular notion of materialism equates materialism with conspicuous consumption, in which product satisfaction is derived from audience reaction rather than utility in use. Not only are materialists viewed as “driven” to consume more, but they are also seen to focus on the consumption of “status goods” (Fournier and Richins, 1991; Mason, 1981) or unique consumer products (Lynn and Harris, 1997). On the other hand, views on the development of materialistic values are based mainly on two perspectives—the sociological perspective and the psychological perspective. The former puts emphasis on socialization agents (especially family, peers, and mass media) as sources of development of materialistic values. The impact of these agents is assumed to be stronger in cultures where possessions are viewed as desirable norms and goals to pursue in life. In contrast, the psychological perspective
attributes the development of these values to family circumstances that create emotional states that either deter or promote the development of materialistic values (Benmoyal-Bouzaglo and Moschis, 2010).

Previous research on the influences of socialization agents on materialistic values has focused primarily on the effects of mass media (television in particular) and has produced mixed results. For example, the relationship between television viewing and materialism has been supported by data from samples of Chinese and Australian consumers but not by Turkish and Canadian samples (Sirgy et al., 1998). Results from the United States have been mixed (for a review, see Kwak, Zinkhan, and Dominick, 2002).

Considerably less attention has been devoted to the influences of family and peers. For example, early studies of financial socialization have found certain family communication environments to promote the development of materialistic values (e.g., Moschis, 1985), but there is limited investigation of such influences outside the United States (Flouri, 1999). Furthermore, it is not clear whether specific socialization agents and family environments can instill materialistic values in people within cultures that do not consider materialism a desirable norm.

The need to study materialism in different cultures has been suggested by previous researchers (e.g., Burroughs and Rindfleisch, 2002) in part because consumers who hold materialistic values tend to respond differently to marketing stimuli (Clarke and Micken, 2002). Differences in consumer responses to marketing stimuli in different cultures, including Turkey, would suggest the need for different strategies. (Benmoyal-Bouzaglo and Moschis, 2010). Thus, current study aims to build on this line of research by exploring perceived norms and financial socialization influence on the materialism among university students. In the current study, in addition to earlier research, we explored perceived norms of credit card usage, may contribute to materialism.

**Literature Review**

**Financial Socialization Framework**

The process by which children and adolescents acquire skills, knowledge, and attitudes relevant to their functioning as consumers in the marketplace is defined as consumer socialization (Ward, 1974). Children learn consumer behavior patterns from various socializing agents including parents, peers, schools, stores, media (Moschis, 1987). The two principal interpersonal sources from which children and young people learn about products and their consumption habits are parents and peers (Anderson et al., 2001). Previous research noted that parents and peers play an important role in financial socialization (Gutter, Garrison,
and Copur, 2010). During childhood, parents are children’s role models (Anderson et al., 2001). Parents are probably the most instrumental in teaching young people the basic rational aspects of consumption, such as, understanding price-quality relationships, handling money wisely, and obtaining appropriate information before making purchases (e.g. McNeal, 1987; Ward, Wackman, and Wartella, 1977).

Due to the combination of rapid body growth and puberty, the early self-identity formed in childhood is no longer appropriate, and teenagers enter a period of identity crisis (Erikson, 1980). During this phase, young people need to formulate a new identity and establish autonomy from their parents. As a result, young people tend to seek personal relationships that give value to their perspectives and ensure that their feelings are understood. Consequently, young people prefer to identify with their peer groups. The interaction with peers, which is even more frequent than with parents, can lead to, peers becoming the primary socializing agents for consumption values (Choi and La Ferle, 2004; La Ferle, Edwards, and Lee, 2000; Moschis, 1987; Shim, 1996).

Several studies have shown how young people learn the symbolic meaning of goods or expressive elements of consumption from their peers at school and at play (Moschis and Churchill, 1978; Moschis and Moore, 1982). Peers play an important role in the development of young consumers’ preferences for stores, products, brands of selected products, media, and television programs. In this research, financial socialization used an aspect of consumer socialization.

Financial Socialization and Perceived Norms Influences on Materialism: Parents and Peers

Economic psychology and consumer research have stressed the role of financial socialization in the development of materialistic values (Belk, 1987, 1989; Belk and Dodson, 1997; Cummings and Taebel, 1978; Furnham and Stacey, 1991; Rindfleisch, 1994; Ward, 1974). One of the best structural models of materialism was offered by Churchill and Moschis (1979) as a part of their broader model of adolescent consumer learning. They explored the effects of both social structural constraints (the social variables, such as social class, sex, and birth order, that can have an effect in socialization by influencing learning processes) and socialization agents (that is, family, peers, and television,) on the criterion variables of economic motivation for consumption (the cognitive orientation concerning the importance of functional and economic features of the products), social motivation for consumption (the cognitive orientation emphasizing conspicuous consumption and its importance to self-expression), and materialistic values.
Socialization theory and research have shown that young people learn the expressive aspects of consumption from television and their peers (e.g., Moschis, 1987), the greater strength of materialistic values reported by adults who have experienced disruptive family events may well be due to their heavier interactions with these socialization agents during their adolescent years. Some other earlier research showed that materialism in particular seems to be associated with peer influence (Achenreiner, 1997; Schroeder and Dugal, 1995). Previous studies also found that those who communicate frequently with their peers and those who are more susceptible to the influence of peers were also known to be more materialistic (Achenreiner, 1997; Moschis and Churchill, 1978). Susceptibility to peer influence reflects a willingness to comply with the wishes of others (normative influence) and a willingness to accept and internalize information from others (informative influence). This susceptibility also reflects a person’s need to identify or enhance one’s image with significant others through material possessions (Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel, 1989). Young people who perceived higher peer influence were more likely to engage in social comparison of possessions and became more materialistic (Chan and Zhang, 2007). Rindfleisch, Burroughs, and Denton’s (1997) study showed that peer interactions and television (viewing socialization processes) were positively related to materialism and to mediate the relationship between disruptive life events and materialistic attitudes. Flouri (1999, 2004) found that materialism in adolescents is positively related to peer influence and is negatively related to satisfaction with one’s mother and financial socialization. La Ferle and Chan (2008) found that perceived peer influence were positive predictors of materialistic consumption values for young people. Benmoyal-Bouzaglo and Moschis’ (2010) study also supports the relationship between exposure to peer communication about consumption during one’s adolescent years and materialistic values held by a young adult and results confirmed the expectation that young people may acquire symbolic consumption norms from socialization agents such as television and peers. O’Guinn and Shrum (1997) also saw television’s influence in the socialization of children as a cause for the increase of materialism in young people.

There is evidence to suggest that financial attitudes such as materialism concerning financial behaviors are transmitted through peers, school, family, and the media (Fox, Bartholomae, and Gutter, 2000; Lee and Hogarth, 1999; Shim et al., 2008; Xiao et al., 2007), with family being the primary socializing agent. Children learn financial knowledge through observation of, and participation in, financial behaviors and through their parents’ instruction, which can directly and indirectly impact their financial dispositions (Mandell, 1997; McNeal, 1987; Moschis, 1987).
Some earlier literature also suggests that most of the effects of parental loss are indirect, operating via ineffective socialization and poor quality of social relationships (Elder, George, and Shanahan, 1996). Kasser et al., (1995) found that materially oriented adolescents had mothers who tended to value conformity more than self-direction Moore-Shay and Berchmans (1996) studied the role of the family environment in the development of shared consumption values and found that conflict between parents and children about consumption issues emerged as a key indicator of children’s materialistic tendencies associated positively with a child’s level of materialism, whereas children’s perceptions of their parents as incompetent financial managers significantly predicted children’s level of materialism.

Manning (2005) hypothesized that a broader perception that “everyone’s doing it” can lead to an increased likelihood that an individual will engage in particular behaviors—an idea referred to as environmental press. Peer pressure and the media are two examples of presses that often impact one’s attitude, such as materialism, and behavior. Gutter and Garrison (2008) concluded that the role of parental modeling may be particularly important in forming financial behaviors, and to a lesser, but also important extent, so may be beliefs about peer behavioral norms.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

Materialism is an important consumption value because material possessions are often used by young people as an expression of the extended self (Belk, 1988). The adoption of materialistic values among young people will affect the balance between private and public choices children make throughout life (Goldberg et al., 2003). Past research examining materialism among adolescents has focused on the relationship of personality traits and consumption patterns (Achenreiner, 1997; Goldberg et al., 2003).

Materialism in this study is defined as the degree to which a person believes that the acquisition and possession of material objects are important to achieve happiness in life, as well as an indicator of his or her success in life (Richins and Dawson, 1992). The current study focuses on Turkish youth responses to perceived norms (negative credit card usage of parents and peers) as well as the financial socialization (parents and peers) and socialization agents on the development of materialism. Furthermore, we examine a possible link between financial socialization, perceived norms and materialism. There has been some speculation that perceived social acceptability of debt may contribute to negative credit card usage behaviors (Manning, 2005). Specifically, the following research questions are presented to guide the study:
1. How do college students in Ankara respond to perceived norms, social learning opportunities, and socialization agents?

2. How are responses to levels of perceived norms, social learning opportunities, and socialization agents influence associated with the endorsement of materialism?

Based on findings from earlier research (e.g., La Ferle and Chan, 2008; O’Guinn and Shrum, 1997) current study hypothesized that students who perceived negative credit card usage behavior by parents and peers would be more materialistic. This study also hypothesized that social learning opportunities and socialization agents would affect to be materialistic. Furthermore, students who communicate with parents related to financial matters would be less materialistic however; students who perceive a higher peer influence would be more materialistic. Parents, peers, school, mass-media would influence to be materialistic of college students.

**Method**

**Data and Sample**

The research was conducted at a state university in Ankara (Hacettepe University). Hacettepe University is a large, comprehensive university with nearly 28,000 undergraduate and graduate students and highly selective admissions (Hacettepe University, 2010). Data was collected during spring of 2010 in Ankara using a web survey of college students. The survey included 3983 students (2199 female and 1726 male) who were mostly of traditional college age (mean = 20.4 years, SD = 2.47). The characteristics of students in survey are summarized in Table 1. The vast majority of students were freshman (34.9%).

(Insert Table 1 about here)

**Procedure**

The research used web survey questionnaire to assess students’ financial dispositions, financial socialization, financial knowledge, perceived norms, financial education, and financial behaviors. In the current study we used perceived norms, financial socialization, and financial disposition (materialism) variables. The questionnaire was originally developed in English and translated into Turkish (including back-translation to check for consistency and accuracy). The email students received, which contained an informed consent document, took them to the survey, where they had to affirm their assent to the informed consent statement prior to beginning the study.

**Measurement of Variables**

**Dependent Variable**
Materialism: The Materialism Scale (Richins and Dawson, 1992) examines three factors related to materialism: centrality, happiness, and success. The 18-item scale is measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree), such as “I admire people who own expensive homes, cars, and clothes” and “It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can’t afford to buy all the things I like.” We used to measure for college students materialism from Richins and Dawson’ (1992) scale. Participant can score from 18 to 90 on the scale. Some items were reverse-coded so that lower scores reflect lower levels of materialism and higher scores reflect higher levels of materialism. Coefficient alpha was calculated separately for the items comprising the three factors and for the 18 items as a single scale. The average “materialism” score for students was 48.5 (SD=10.47) which indicated that above moderate materialism. Validity and reliability tests for the scale have also been carried out in Turkish sample, where it has been to be statistically appropriate for use in data collection.

Principal Component Factor Analysis with a Varimax Rotation was used for validity analysis to determine model fit for Turkish sample. Initially, principal component factoring with a Varimax Rotation and a forced three factor solution was used to determine if the sample factor patterns matched those espoused in US. Before engaging in factor analysis, however, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was computed to see if the data would be appropriate for factor analysis. Since the Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2=5529.2$, $df=153$, $p<.001$) and KMO value for the inventory was found to be 0.84, it was concluded that factor analysis would be appropriate. Results indicated that a three-factor solution fit the data from Turkey. The factor loading of each item ranged between .45 and .73. All 18 items had positive loading on the factor. The maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis also performed for Materialism scale using the LISREL 8.80 program. Goodness- of-fit indices ($\chi^2=5324.08$, $df=132$, GFI=.89, CFI=.89, RMSEA=.099) suggest that the 3-factor model has fit for Turkish sample. These results can be accepted as proof for the validity of the items, and thus, of the scale. In order to test the reliability of the measure, Cronbach’s Alpha was selected. The seven-centrality items produced alpha coefficients of .63; for the six-item success subscale alpha was .67; and for the five happiness items, alpha was .73. When combined into a single scale, alpha for the 18 items was high for college students (alpha .81). This result suggests that the inner consistency of the inventory is acceptable.

Independent Variables

Socio-economic: The study involved college students’ socio-economic variables: age, gender, school rank, having financial aid, and percent of parental support.
**Perceived Norms:** Students were asked how frequently their parents and friends or typical students had done the following: “use credit cards for everyday expenses”, “maxed out their credit”, “been delinquent”, “go over the credit limit”, “do not fully pay off”, and “overdraw checking account”. Average scores were calculated using a 5-point scale, anchored with 1 as “never” and 5 as “always”; so higher scores indicated higher perceived frequency of a negative behavior by a reference group. The average “perceived parents norms” score was 15.8 (SD=9.52), and “perceived friends norms” 21.4 (SD= 8.54). The inter-item reliability was high for both perceived parents norm and perceived friends norms (Cronbach’s alpha = .95).

**Financial Social Learning Opportunities:**

The financial social learning opportunities score was a composite measure based on four dimensions: discussions with parents, discussions with peers, observing parents and observing peers. The score utilized responses to eight items representing these four dimensions. Scores for each dimension ranged from 8 to 40. This measure is based on the work of Gutter and Garrison (2008). That study used a small sample of college students to explore the relationship of financial social learning opportunities on perceived norms behaviors. The score accounts for the frequency of the observation or discussion across the various topics.

**Discussion:** Students were asked how frequently in the past five years they had discussed the following with their parents and friends or other students: managing expenses and avoiding overspending, checking their credit report, paying bills on time, saving and investing, working with a mainstream financial institution, and buying and maintaining health insurance, auto insurance and renters’ insurance. The students answered by using a 5 point scale from 1= never to 5= often. The average “discuss finances with parent” score for students was 17.6 (SD=7.56) and the average “discuss finances with friends” score was 15.7 (SD=6.20). In order to test the reliability of the measure, Cronbach’s Alpha was selected. Cronbach’s Alpha internal consistency reliability was calculated to be .81 for discussion with parents and .71 for discussion with friends. This result suggests that the inner consistency of the inventory is high.

**Observing:** Students were asked how frequently in the past five years they had observed their parents/caregivers and friends or other students involved in the following: managing expenses and avoiding overspending, checking credit report, paying bills on time, saving and investing,
working with a mainstream financial institution, and buying and maintaining health insurance, auto insurance, and renters insurance. The students answered by using a 5 point scale from 1= never to 5= often. The average “observing parents’ financial behavior” score was 24.6 (SD=9.50), and “observing friends’ financial behavior” 16.3 (SD= 7.80). The inter-item reliability was high for both observing parents (Cronbach’s alpha = .87) and observing friends (Cronbach’s alpha = .86).

Socialization agents: According to past research, the primary agents in the financial socialization process are parents, peers, schools, and mass media (Bush, Smith, and Martin, 1999; Moschis and Moore, 1984). For the purpose of this study also, parents, peers, school, and mass media were considered as socialization agents. In the present study socialization agents were measured with the question, “In general think about sources of information about financial matters.” The responses included 8 sources of information including mother, father, peers, school, radio-TV, internet, newspapers and magazines, and other.

Analyses

Data analysis began with calculating descriptive for all variables separately by gender. Independent sample t test was computed to compare means among age, categories of subjects on social learning opportunities, perceived norms and materialism by gender. We conducted crosstab analyses to compare school rank, having financial aid and parental support percent by gender. Finally, the relationships of the independent variables on materialism were determined using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis. For the regressions, some dummy variables had to be created for categorical variables. Before running regression, data were checked for assumption of regression analysis (multi-collinearity and autocorrelation) and were found fit for the procedure.

Results

Comparing Students’ Characteristics

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the students, including socio-economic characteristics, perceived norms, financial social learning opportunities, socialization agents and materialism. The sample was composed of 56% female and 44% male. Of these, 35.6% of female and 34.1% of male were freshman. Both male (62.9%) and female (64.0%) college students were more likely have financial aid. There were significant differences in age, parental support, social learning opportunities and socialization agents between male and female. Although the vast majority of both male (45.6%) and female (55.0%) had 100% parental support, there was significant parental support by gender. There are no significant differences between male and female college students related to perceived norms (p>.05). For
financial discussion with parents, females had an average score of 2.22 and males had an average score of 2.16 ($t=-1.52, p>.05$), indicating that females had more social learning opportunities where they discussed financial matters with their parents however, there were no significant differences between male and female on discussions with their parents. For financial discussion with peers, males had an average score of 2.00 and females had an average score of 1.93 ($t=2.23, p<.05$), indicating that males had significantly more social learning opportunities where they discussed financial matters with their peers. For observing parents’ financial behaviors, females had an average score of 3.19 and males had an average score of 2.90 ($t=-5.97, p<.001$), indicating that females had significantly more social learning opportunities where they observed their parents engaging in positive financial behaviors. For observing peers’ financial behaviors, females had an average score of 2.08 and males had an average score of 1.99 ($t=-2.17, p<.05$), indicating that females had significantly more social learning opportunities where they observed their peers engaging in positive financial behaviors. These $t$-tests indicate that, in general, female college students tend to have had more financial social learning opportunities than male college students, except discuss finance with friends on financial matters. For socialization agents, in general, college students’ sources of information related to financial matters were father (41.4%), internet (39.5%) and mother (32.4%). Females (46.3%) had significantly more information from their fathers than males (35.2%) ($\chi^2=49.73, p<.001$). Again, females (38.7%) had significantly more information from their mothers than males (24.4%) ($\chi^2=90.91, p<.001$). However, males (42.6%) had significantly more information from internet than females (37.1%) ($\chi^2=12.39, p<.001$). Although male ($M=2.73$) college students more likely to materialistic than female ($M=2.67$) students, there were no significant differences between male and female related to materialism ($p>.05$).

**Relationship between Financial Socialization, Perceived Norms and Materialism**

OLS regression analysis was used to examine the relationship between level of students’ materialism and perceived norms, financial social learning opportunities, and socialization agents, when controlling for socio-economic characteristics. Table 2 summarizes the results of OLS regressions predicting materialism. As seen in the table 2, socio-economic characteristics did not predict materialism (model a). When perceived norms, social learning opportunities and socialization agents were added to the equation, the step was significant ($F = 2.27; p < .001$). The $F$ change was also significant and with the addition of perceived norms, social learning opportunities and socialization agents, an increased percentage of the
variance was explained by the step. As expected, perceived norms, social learning opportunities, and socialization agents were related to materialism. Students who had higher perceived frequency of negative credit card usage behaviors of parents and friends norm were significantly more materialistic than those who had less perceived parents and friends norms. Students who had observed financial behaviors of their parents were significantly less materialistic than those who had not observed. However, students who had discussed financial management with their parents were significantly more materialistic than those who had not discussed.

(Insert Table 2 about here)

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The purpose of this study has been to explore the relationship between perceived norms, social learning opportunities, socialization agents and materialism of college students when controlling for socio-economic characteristics. The results of this study provide several key insights.

Overall, this study found a relationship between perceived norms, social learning opportunities, socialization agents and materialism of college students after controlling for socio-economic characteristics. Consistent with our expectation, perceived norms, social learning opportunities, and socialization agents were significantly related to materialism.

Our results indicate that the gender gap among Turkish students related to financial social learning opportunities, except in discussions of finance with parents. Female students more observed parents and friends behavior than male students, however male students more discussed finance with their peers than female students. But there is no gender gap among Turkish students related to perceived norms. There was also significant difference between female and male related to socialization agents: female students reported more information from their mothers and fathers than their male peers, however male students reported more information from internet than females, but there is no gender gap in materialism. However, previous study concluded that compared to female, male scored higher in materialism (Flouri 2004).

Generally, higher perceived frequency of negative credit card usage behavior of parent’ and friend’ were positively related to materialism. Materialism can be said to be “high” when students perceived negative norms related to credit card usage. This result consistent with earlier study, Moore-Shay and Berchmans (1996) found that children’s perceptions of their parents as incompetent financial managers significantly predicted children’s’ level of materialism.
Partly in contrast to developed hypothesis, our study found that discussed finance with parents was positively related to materialism. This indicates that students who more frequently discussed finance with their parents significantly were more materialistic than those who less frequently discussed finance with their parents. This result contrasts to previous finding e.g., Moore and Moschis (1981) indicated that children from households characterized by infrequent communication with parents are often more materialistic than children reared in families characterized by frequent. On the other side observed financial behavior of parents was negatively related to materialism. This indicates that parents as role model was affect on students to be less materialistic. This result confirmed findings of previous studies cited in the literature. For example, Ahuvia and Wong, 2002; Belk, 1985, Richins and Dawson, 1992 concluded that the more affective aspects of materialism stem from primarily to the role modeling of socialization agents. Contrary to previous researches (e.g., Achenreiner, 1997), communicate with peer (discussed and observed) about financial issue viewing could not predict materialism in this study. Materialism in particular seems to be associated with parents influence. Achenreiner (1997) and Moschis and Churchill (1978) indicated that those who communicate frequently with their peers were known to be more materialistic.

Mothers as a socialization agent was significantly affect students to be less materialistic compared to fathers. However, friends as a socialization agent were significantly affect students to be more materialistic than fathers. This result confirmed the expectation that the influence of two important socialization agents, parents (mother) and peers, on materialism of young Turkish students. This result is consistent with previous studies cited in the literature. Flouri (1999, 2004) found that materialism in adolescents is positively related to peers influence and is negatively related to one’s mother and financial socialization. Chan and Zhang (2007) also indicated that, young people who perceived higher peer influence were more likely to become materialistic.

Several limitations must be kept in mind in interpreting these findings. First, the respondents were not random samples of the country, so the observations cannot be generalized to the populations in general or to college students. The effort to use sample and method in Ankara, however, provides unique data and insights on distinct, university-based group which are theoretically important for its position at the vanguard of social change in society, especially Turkey. Further, our research represents a unique exploration effect of financial socialization and perceived norms on materialism among young adults in Turkey on a topic whose relevance will only increase as Turkey continues its rapid economic
development and closer integration with Europe. Further research is warranted using broader and more representative samples, especially including a wider range of socio-economic backgrounds and aspirations. Young adults who do not attend college are likely varying to be materialistic and financial socialization in Turkey. A second limitation is the absence of specific information on family structure (such as, income, level of parents’ education, single parents) which may effect on materialism. It would be interesting to explore the effect of family structures on materialism. However, despite such limitations, this study showed that research on materialism has a lot to benefit from approaches that view materialism from a financial socialization perspective. This research showed how parents and peers are associated with the relative strength of young adults’ materialism.
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Table 1. Characteristics of the University Students (Ankara).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Male (%44)</th>
<th>Female (%56)</th>
<th>Total (2.47)</th>
<th>Significance Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Economic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-mean (s.d)</td>
<td>20.5 (2.62)</td>
<td>20.3 (2.32)</td>
<td>20.4 (2.47)</td>
<td>2.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School rank (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory students</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid (%)</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Support (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%25</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%50</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%75</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%100</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Norms- mean (s.d)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived parent norms</td>
<td>1.76 (.106)</td>
<td>1.74 (.105)</td>
<td>1.75 (.105)</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived friend norms</td>
<td>2.45 (1.40)</td>
<td>2.37 (1.39)</td>
<td>2.40 (1.40)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Learning-mean (s.d)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss finance with parents</td>
<td>2.16 (.96)</td>
<td>2.22 (.94)</td>
<td>2.19 (.94)</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss finance with friends</td>
<td>2.00 (.82)</td>
<td>1.93 (.74)</td>
<td>1.96 (.77)</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing parents</td>
<td>2.90 (1.24)</td>
<td>3.19 (1.13)</td>
<td>3.07 (1.19)</td>
<td>-5.97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing friends</td>
<td>1.99 (1.02)</td>
<td>2.08 (.94)</td>
<td>2.04 (.97)</td>
<td>-2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization Agents (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>90.91***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>49.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio-Tv</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>12.39***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materialism- mean (s.d)</strong></td>
<td>2.73 (.58)</td>
<td>2.67 (.58)</td>
<td>2.69 (.58)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant differences were tested using t-test or chi-square.

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
### Table 2. OLS Regression Result for Materialism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Variables</th>
<th>Materialism</th>
<th>Materialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.004 (.010)</td>
<td>-.007 (.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (Female=reference)</td>
<td>.048 (0.040)</td>
<td>.009 (0.041)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory (Freshman=reference)</td>
<td>.043 (0.083)</td>
<td>.054 (0.082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>-.018 (.056)</td>
<td>-.004 (.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>.016 (0.059)</td>
<td>-.008 (0.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>-.008 (0.061)</td>
<td>-.036 (0.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/professional/other</td>
<td>-.044 (0.175)</td>
<td>-.120 (0.174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid</td>
<td>.011 (0.045)</td>
<td>.021 (0.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support %25 (0= reference)</td>
<td>-.017 (0.097)</td>
<td>-.047 (0.097)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support %50</td>
<td>-.069 (0.089)</td>
<td>-.048 (0.089)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support %75</td>
<td>.048 (0.084)</td>
<td>.057 (0.084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support %100</td>
<td>-.015 (0.077)</td>
<td>-.001 (0.077)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perceived Norms
- Perceived parent norms: 0.074 (.019)***
- Perceived friend norms: 0.031 (.015)*

### Social Learning
- Discuss finance with parents: 0.105 (.026)***
- Discuss finance with friends: -0.033 (.033)
- Observing parents: -0.054 (.021)**
- Observing friends: -0.011 (.027)

### Socialization Agents
- Mother (Father= reference): -.104 (.041)*
- Friends: 0.105 (.042)*
- School: -0.045 (.054)
- Radio-TV: 0.037 (.043)
- Internet: 0.027 (.043)
- Newspaper: -0.065 (.043)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>2.740 (.214)***</th>
<th>2.643 (.223)***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>