

A study on greed and status essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Contents

- 4. 2 Discussion, restrictions and recommendations

Abstraction

So, how many wickednesss have you committed today? Take a long shower with no consideration for your household members? Or did you harmlessly lied to a homeless individual? That you did n't hold any alteration?

This thesis attempts to specify the consequence of position on greed.

Unfortunately there was n't one universe wounded theory about greed.

Hence, it was attempted to near the topic by looking at related concepts.

The chosen concepts were self-interest, philistinism and desire for money.

Prior the research, it was already concluded that position is a comparative variable. Therefore, it was necessary to happen the comparative portion in the concepts of greed. Theory of opportunism shows that finally people are seeking for advantage over others. The same thing is concluded by philistinism. Materialistic individuals measure their ain success by the figure of ownerships and they besides compare their ownership with people in their environment. Further, desire for money besides appears to be comparative because people use money as a tool for beaming wealth, income, societal show or societal communicating. All these decisions are consistent with the findings of position. It was concluded that people merely feel fortunate when they have every bit much or a little more than the people in their environment. Besides, because we continually compare ourselves with people of our mention group. Striking is, that this is the same decision that is drawn by the concepts of greed. It therefore can be concluded that position

has many similarities with greed and that position has a strong consequence on the latter.

Table of content

1. The Seven Deadly Sins

The Seven Deadly Sins have provided chitchat, amusement and secret plans for about 15 centuries (Solomon, 1999) . The Seven Deadly Sins, besides known as the Capital Vices or Cardinal Sins, have ever been popular.

However, figure seven and the doubtful “ lifelessly ” have caused many guessss (Solomon, 1999 p. 7 foreword) . Pope Gregory the First instituted the authoritative enfranchisement. His list of seven was confirmed and subsequently modified by Saint Thomas of Aquinas and has been used of all time since. The list survived several centuries and now consists of the following Seven Sins: Wrath, Greed, Sloth, Pride, Lust, Envy and Gluttony (Solomon, 1999 p. 2) .

A recent survey concluded that The Sins are still encountered in our day-to-day lives, despite their being for all this clip (Frank, 2001) . Chiefly because they are so profoundly rooted in our human nature, that non merely they are about wholly ineluctable but people can ne’er look to restrict themselves (Frank, 2001) . In order to reenforce these statements, a extremely recognizable illustration of Sloth: Imagine a^ One fabulous tardily dark with your household and there it is. At 07. 00 ante meridiem your best friends presents itself, the dismay clock. Now, who will non press the snooze button one time or twice before dragging oneself out of bed?

This is merely a harmless illustration, but wickedness can besides do more significant effects. Presently parliamentarians, journalists and outstanding concern work forces have been showing greed as one of the chief causes for the current recognition crunch (Bernasek, 2010 ; Trouw: section Economicss, 2009 ; Staps, 2008) . Another survey even claims that greed is the primary motivation factor behind civil wars (De Soysa, 2002) .

Despite the fact that these unwanted state of affairss, like recognition crunches and civil wars re-appear, comparatively small clip is devoted to this topic in academic research. The chief inquiry that machinations me is: why do people ever want more? Because finally, worlds and non these wickednesss are responsible for doing these unwanted state of affairss. Harmonizing to Wenzel (1968) , greed arises due to the nature of Earth. He stated that the Earth is cold and dry and hence people who lack heat and humidness are extremely avaricious. Though, besides other definitions are known. When looking at ancient clip, greed was known as a signifier of self-deceit and it was chiefly focused on stuff wealth (Wachtel, 2003) . This while these yearss greed is stated as a signifier of enlightened self-interest (Wachtel, 2003) .

In order to sort the many significances of greed, the undermentioned definition will be utilized throughout this thesis: greed is an inordinate desire to get or possess more than one needs or deserves[1].

1. 1 Problem statement

Wachtel ' s psychoanalytic research (2003) is one of the few hints within the topic of greed. He tries to understand the difference between the person,

who strives restlessly but does not see satisfaction and the person for whom insatiability is an expletive and the desire for money and wealth is a hungriness that can not be slaked (Wachtel, 2003) . Harmonizing to his theory greed is merely driven by the desire for stuff wealth and money but Frank (1999) concluded that “ common influence ” is another of important dimension as good. Common influence means that our picks and purchases are influenced by neighbours and household (Frank, 1999) . In order to explicate this construct, he suggest to see the perceptual experience of what “ looks right ” in vesture. Simply by populating in the society, people come to hold an automatic sense about how broad a jacket should be. But when manner alterations over clip, their perceptual experience alterations every bit good. Wachtel (2003) made a similar comparing. He said that the enviousness towards the bigger boat is non reduced by increasing the mean size of the vass. Because when all boats get larger, the mean individual ‘ s assets still feels like “ merely a boat ” .

So, seemingly people continuously compare their ownerships with others and seek for blessing from household, friends and their environment (Wachtel, 2003 ; Frank, 1999) . But why is “ position ” of import for people? And what sort of effects does it hold? In a antediluvian survey, Veblen (1899) concluded that the concern for societal position induces people to prosecute in conspicuous ingestion merely in order to signal wealth and there a more surveies who confirmed these findings. Similarly, Duesenberry (1949) argued that a concern for position causes people to copy the ingestion criterion of those above them in the income hierarchy. But why is this “

position thing ” of import? And what sort of effects does it hold on greed? In hopes of happening, the job definition is stated as follows:

What is the consequence of position on greed?

1. 2 Research inquiries

In order to reply the job definition three research inquiries have been formulated:

What is greed?

What is position?

Does position influence greed?

1. 3 Conceptual theoretical account

After the job definition and the research inquiries the undermentioned conceptual theoretical account has been made:

Greed

Status

Status = One ' s place in the universe (De Botton, 2004) .

Greed = An inordinate desire to get or possess more than one demands[2] .

1. 4 Academic relevancy

There have been several surveies about The Seven Deadly Sins but merely a few about greed (Frank, 2001 ; Solomon, 1999 ; Wenzel, 1968 ; Wachtel, 2003) . However, there are surveies about related subjects such as

<https://assignbuster.com/a-study-on-greed-and-status-essay/>

conspicuous ingestion, philistinism and opportunism (Arrow & A ; Dasgupta, 2009 ; De Botton, 2004 ; Khan, 2004 ; Krahmer, 2006 ; Frank, 1999 ; Rege, 2006 ; Richins, 1994 ; Rucker & A ; Galinsky, 2009 ; Veblen, 1899) . In none of these surveies is “ greed ” linked to position. In my sentiment is position a losing variable in the construct, which potentially could be the implicit in motivation for people to maintain purchasing material goods. This makes the survey academically relevant due to the fact that it will lend to the farther apprehension of greed and the impact it has on consumer behaviour.

1. 5 Managerial relevancy

This thesis attempts to lend to the farther apprehension of greed. With this obtained cognition it is possible to antagonize unwanted developments caused by greed, such as a recognition crunches or civil wars. It could besides raise concern and set this topic on the docket, in order to be able to protect consumers in the hereafter.

2. Greed

This thesis attempts to near greed by looking at related concepts. The chosen concepts are self-interest, philistinism and desire for money. These concepts come from different theories, whereas Wachtel ‘ s psychoanalytic analysis (2003) is one of the most of import hints (e. g. Wachtel, 2003 ; Wenzel, 1968 ; Richins, 1994 ; Rege, 2006 ; Khan, 2004 ; Arrow & A ; Dasgupta, 2009) . The lone ‘ difficulty ‘ with analysing concepts is that in order to give an appropriate decision, all the concepts should be examined at the same degree. Chiefly, this thesis focuses on whether there is a relationship between greed and position. Status is hence the dependant variable and research has shown that this construct is comparative (see <https://assignbuster.com/a-study-on-greed-and-status-essay/>

chapter 3) . This implies that for making consistence in this thesis, it is necessary to look at the related concepts in both an absolute as a comparative manner. Whereby, the absolute description accommodates the account of the concept and the comparative description the nexus with position. Now, in this chapter the three related concepts of greed will be discussed. Presently, it is assumed that these three concepts wholly contribute greed (Wachtel, 2003) . Therefore, these concepts will be aggregated into one chapter. After each chapter, a short decision is given for palingenesis and elucidation.

2. 1 Self-interest

Once, Aristotle wrote “ the good adult male should be a lover of himself for he will both net income himself by making baronial Acts of the Apostless and will profit his chaps ” (Aristotle, 1987) . This statement implies that merely if person loves himself, he can assist others. Striking is that clip alterations values, sentiments and premises. Because Paul, Miller and Paul (1997) concluded that the concern for one ‘ s ain involvement is considered a nonmoral issue, while concerns for the involvement of others is considered obvious. Apparently, these yearss people are seeking to happen a proper balance between the chase of one ‘ s ain involvement and the good of others (Paul, Miller and Paul, 1997) . Furthermore, Van Dijk, De Cremer and Handgraaf (2004) claimed that in state of affairss of societal mutuality, people vary explicitly in their looks and Acts of the Apostless. For illustration, some people seldom collaborate truly. They merely help others when it strategically serves their self-interest (Van Dijk, De Cremer, & A ; Handgraaf,

2004) . Hereby, a individual ' s societal value orientation is an implicit in trigger.

2. 1. 1 Social value orientation

Social value orientation is defined as the single difference in the manner people evaluate results for themselves as opposed to others (Messick & A ; McClintock, 1968) . A figure of societal values have been identified but normally two opposing orientations are used viz. the proself and prosocial orientation (e. g. Declerck & A ; Bogaert, 2008 ; Knight & A ; Dubro, 1984) .

In 1978, Kelley and Thibaut presented an mutuality analysis about societal value orientation. They concluded that the difference between prosocial and proself are partly caused by societal interactions (Kelley & A ; Thibaut, 1978) . This is emphasized with the undermentioned practical illustrations from Van Lange, Otten, Bruin and Joireman (1997) . First, the prosocials tend to maximise results for both themselves and others. This is besides apparent in their behaviour because prosocials ever try to minimise differences between results for themselves and others (Van Lange et al., 1997) . In contrast, the proselfs tend to merely maximise results for themselves (Van Lange et Al. 1997) . Another of import difference between prosocials and proselfs is known as the trigon hypothesis. Hereby, Iedema and Poppe (1995) attempted to place how these two groups scope the societal universe. Their hypothesis suggests that prosocials have a more heterogenous range on the societal universe. These people assume that others can hold either the same or different societal value orientations. In contrast, proselfs tend to keep a more homogenous range on others. They

believe that all people have the same societal value orientation viz. prosself (Iedema & A ; Poppe, 1995) . Therefore, the proselves will do self-seeking picks as they believe that the people in their environment will make the same (Iedema & A ; Poppe, 1995) .

This thesis peculiarly focuses on the comparative portion of the concepts. It may be concluded from the text above, that proselves are more important for the survey as prosocials. This because they are more separately oriented. Therefore, this topic is farther analyzed in the approaching paragraph.

2. 1. 2 Status and rivals

In theories, the proselves are subdivided in two classes viz. ; individualists and rivals (e. g. Van Lange, Otten, Bruin & A ; Joireman, 1997) . The chief difference between these two classes is that individualists tend to maximise their ain results with small or no respect to others. However, rivals tend to compare their ain results to others (Van Lange et Al. 1997) . Based on these definitions, it seems that rivals are more attached with position than persons.

Van Lange, Otten, Bruin & A ; Joireman (1997) stated that rivals are finally seeking for comparative advantage over others. Both Kuhlman & A ; Marshello (1975) and Sattler & A ; Kerr (1991) concluded the same as Van Lange et Al. (1997) . They stated that rivals are non willing to prosecute in prosocial behaviour. Not even if they could profit themselves in the long draw. Besides, rivals do non react good to the wellbeing of others (Van Lange, Agnew, Harinck and Steemers, 1997) . This appears from the fact that rivals are non interested in long-run benefits. Therefore, they by and

large exhibit low degrees of forfeit and they are most concerned with non being exploited by their spouses (Van Lange, Agnew et al. , 1997) .

Reasoning that, rivals prefer results that are superior to those in their environment (Van Lange, Agnew et. al. , 1997) .

2. 1. 3 Decision

Although there is comparatively small known, it seems that rivals are largely affected by position. Rivals are chiefly focused on maximising their ain result compared to others and they besides seek for advantages over others (Van Lange, Otten, Bruin & A ; Joireman, 1997) . Therefore they prefer results that are superior to those in their environment (Van Lange, et al., 1997) .

Hereby viz. the portion “ maximising their ain result relation to other ‘ s result ” is decisive and related to position. Wachtel (2003) concluded that people experience enviousness when other people possess more. He besides stated that this feeling does non disappear by merely purchasing the same points. Because when everybody possess the same, it still feels like “ merely points ” (Wachtel, 2003) . It seems that rivals -partly- see these feelings because their chief motivational grounds for acting arises from the feeling of making comparative advantage over others. Therefore, the concept is bring forth a syrupy rhythm because people will ever go on to purchase e. g. merchandises and other points.

2. 2 Materialism

The message we receive today is that the chase and ownership of stuff goods, income and wealth is the path to increase quality of life (Kashdan & A ; Breen, 2007) . Even self-identity can be defined by ownerships and ingestion: “ I am what I have and what I consume ” (Fromm, 1976) .

2. 2. 1 Possessions and the ego

The term “ philistinism ” has several definitions. Belk (1985) defines philistinism as “ the importance a consumer attached to secular ownerships ” while Bredemeier and Toby (1960) refer to materialism as “ the worship of things ” . Additionally, mercenary people are characterized in theory by their inclination to specify their successes in life by the measure and quality of their extrinsic ownerships (Kashdan & A ; Breen, 2007) . However, the premise that people regard their ownerships as portion of themselves is non new (Belk, 1988) . William James (1890) , laid the foundation for the modern construct of the ego. His definition is stated as follows:

“ A adult male ‘ s ego is the sum sum of all that he can name his, non merely his organic structure and his psychic powers, but his apparels and his house, his married woman and kids, his ascendants and friends, his reputé and plants, his lands, and yacht and bank-account. All these things give him the same emotions. If they wax and prosper, he feels triumphant ; if they dwindle and die off, he feels cast down, -not needfully in the same grade for each thing, but in much the same manner for all ” (p. 291-292) .

So, the ego is non limited to objects but it besides includes individuals, topographic points and group ownerships (Belk, 1988) .

2. 2. 2 Materialism and money

Although materialists value ownerships for a assortment of grounds, money is the currency which enables one to get the merchandises that they need (Richins & A ; Rudmin, 1994) . So, Richins and Rudmin (1994) concluded that one can anticipate mercenary people to hold a different relationship

with money as those who are low in philistinism. They besides found a strong relationship between philistinism and coveted income (Richins & A ; Rudmin, 1994) . The claimed that the income that is necessary to fulfill the demands of a mercenary individual is about 50 per centum higher than for those low in philistinism. This due to the fact that, materialists view their ownerships as indexes of their success in life (Richins & A ; Rudmin, 1994) .

2. 2. 3 Status and philistinism

Peoples differ in the extent to which they interpret wealth as a mark of position (Lea & A ; Webley, 2006) . Fromm (1976) stated that mercenary individuals vow ownerships as the kernel of their lives. However it is non merely about buying merchandises. Richins and Dawson (1992) found a deeper motivational motivation to bring on philistinism. Harmonizing to them, mercenary people measure their ain success by the figure of ownerships (Richins & A ; Dawson, 1992) . Lapp goes for people in their environment since their grade of importance is besides judged upon their assets (Richins & A ; Dawson, 1992) . Prolonged, other surveies have shown the same decisions as good. Kashdan and Breen (2007) concluded that mercenary values were positively correlated with the significance of life, relatedness to others, feelings of competency and gratitude. This corresponds with the consequences of Kasser (2002) . He concluded that positive self-regard and self-acceptance is related to ownerships, money, power and image. Therefore, seemingly people identify themselves with ownerships. But do people make these feelings strictly for themselves? Wilson and Gilbert (2005) found that mercenary persons are sensitive to other people ' s sentiment and attending. And there a more surveies who

confirmed these findings. For illustration, Chang and Arkin (2002) concluded that there is a nexus between philistinism and personal insecurity. Their survey showed that diffidence is a important forecaster of mercenary orientations. Now, it can be concluded that philistinism is non merely the desire to possess material goods. It is an result that is driven by personal insecurity, diffidence and exposure (Chang & A ; Arkin, 2002) .

2. 2. 4 Decision

Literature surveies have shown that philistinism is linked to position every bit good. Materialistic individuals vary from those who are low in philistinism. The difference lies in the fact that mercenary individuals value their ownerships as everything (Fromm, 1976 ; Richins & A ; Dawson, 1992) . However, research showed that the motivational motivations to bring on in philistinism are deeper than “ merely roll uping material ” . Motivations are amongst others: personal insecurity, power, image and money (Chang & A ; Arkin, 2002 ; Kasser, 2002) . Literature besides showed that materialists are sensitive for other people ‘ s sentiment and attending (Wilson & A ; Gilbert, 2005) . Therefore, it could be possible to reason that philistinism is an result that is driven by personal insecurity, diffidence, exposure, image and other people ‘ s sentiment and attending.

2. 3 Desire for money

“ Money, money, money. Must be amusing. In the rich adult male ‘ s universe ” . This is a phrase that is originally descent from a popular vocal. The cardinal stated topic is evidently money. But what does “ must be funny in a rich adult male ‘ s universe ” mean?

2. 3. 1 History of money

A long clip ago, money as we know now did non be (Haydon, 2006) . In the early yearss, human existences moved from topographic point to topographic point following the animate beings they hunted (Haydon, 2006) . There were no stores or Bankss, alternatively people would interchange merchandises and services for other things (Haydon, 2006) . Finally, they composed a hypothetically “ monetary value ” for what they thought was a just exchange of their merchandises (Haydon, 2006) . However, people began to develop penchants for the exchange of merchandises. So, over clip people agreed on the value of these merchandises and this became the first type of money (Haydon, 2006) .

Mishkin (1992) claimed that money has three primary maps. He said that:

Whether money is shells or stones or gold or paper, in any economic system it has three primary maps: it is a medium of exchange, a unit of history and a shop of value. Of these three maps, its map as a medium of exchange is what distinguishes money from other assets such as stocks, bonds or houses (p. 21)

However besides other descriptions are known. For illustration, Lea and Webley (2006) did an extended research about money. Their research, money as a tool/ money as a drug, is one of the few surveies where money is highlighted from different angles (Lea & A ; Webley, 2006) .

<https://assignbuster.com/a-study-on-greed-and-status-essay/>

2. 3. 2 Tool theory

Economists stated since the earliest yearss that when two people exchange scarce resources, the exchange can increase the wealth of both parties (Smith, 1776/1908) . Hereby, Lea and Webley (2006) concluded that money is the most efficient means yet discovered of doing such exchanges possible. In order to understand their Tool Theory, it is merely necessary to understand money in a limited sense (Lea & A ; Webley, 2006) . Since, evidently money is a tool merely in a metaphorical sense. The Tool Theory defines money as a agency with lone indirect value to procure other inducements. Hereby, it is concluded that money has three maps: it serves as a unit of history, a shop of value every bit good as a agency of exchange (Lea & A ; Webley, 2006) .

2. 3. 3 Drug theory

Certain chemical substances, such as intoxicant and nicotine can all go strong inducements (Lea & A ; Webley, 2006) . These merchandises are strong incentives and are able to do a individual addicted (Lea & A ; Webley, 2006) . But how is it possible that such dependences originate? These dependences are able to look because they produce physiological provinces in the encephalon (Lea & A ; Webley, 2006) . The same, in lesser extent, applies for money. The quickly spread outing research field of neuro-economics (Glimcher, 2003) has already shown that specific encephalon centres are activated when being in the presence of money. Hereby, Vohs, Mead and Goode (2006) suggested that ideas of money activate feelings of autonomy. For case that money can work out jobs and carry through

demands. As portion of the drug theory, assorted surveies show the same sort of decisions. For illustration, it is stated that there is a possibility that money is used for intents such as societal show, societal communicating (Buchan, 1997) and societal protection (Doyle, 1998) . Besides, Zhou, Vohs and Baumeister (2009) concluded that money can bring forth societal popularity. Hereby it is stressed that money is an of import marker of position in modern societies (Lea & A ; Webley, 2006) . To some extent money even serves as a stenography for beaming wealth, income, ownerships and ingestion (Lea & A ; Webley, 2006) .

2. 3. 4 Money and comparative awards

Money is a inducement which maps as a agency of exchange (Hsee, Li & A ; Shen, 2009) . For illustration, it could be used for buying points (Hsee et al. , 2009) . However, when money is an option, people tend to concentrate on its face value and overlook the ultimate end (Hsee et al. , 2009) . Hsee et Al. (2009) tested this premise in their research. In a survey with undergraduate pupils they tested the consequence between comparative award and cold-hard-cash. They stated that the participants of the survey should take between having 50 dollar and a movie-star buss. The survey revealed that 70 per centum of the participants preferred the 50 dollar.

Furthermore, Hsee, Yu, Zhang and Zhang (2003) asked the participants to take between two undertakings. One would present them with 60 points and the other with 100 points. Hereby, it was mentioned that the awarded points had no value. The lone difference was that the 60 points would entitle the participants to a pail of vanilla ice pick while 100 points would entitle them to a pail of Pistacia vera ice pick (Hsee et al. , 2003) .

Most participants of the research chose the 100-point option, while they afterward overpoweringly stated that they usually would take the vanilla. So, it is possible to reason that the participants focused on the immediate wages alternatively of the option that would pay more points afterwards (Hsee, Yu, Zhang & A ; Zhang, 2003) .

2. 3. 5 Decision

Vohs, Mead and Goode (2006) suggested that ideas of money activate feelings of autonomy. To some extent money serves as a stenography for general wealth, ownerships and ingestion. However, most significantly money is a tool for beaming people ' s wealth or income (Vohs, Mead & A ; Goode, 2006) . It is besides stated that there is a possibility that money is used for intents such as societal show, societal communicating (Buchan, 1997) and societal protection (Doyle, 1998) . Therefore, money is used for several intents and it seems that the desire for money is a comparative concept every bit good.

3. Status

Differentiation and position are amongst others the stronger motives of human behaviour (Truys, 2010) . The importance of differentiation as a cardinal moral force was underlined by Darwin (1871) . He introduced sexual choice as choice tool. He concluded that in order to distribute the population, people non merely necessitate to last in their natural and societal environment but they besides need to be a more attractive spouse than their same sex rivals (Truys, 2010) . This is besides emphasized in more recent research. For illustration in sociology, Bourdieu (1979) pointed

societal differentiation and position as a important moral force of the societal life.

3. 1 Dependence

In traditional societies, high position may hold been hard to get but it was besides difficult to lose (De Botton, 2004) . De Botton (2004) for illustration stated that person can non halt with being a Godhead, due to the fact that it is a rubric that has been given to you. What mattered was one ' s individuality at the phase of birth. In that clip, people did non care about one ' s accomplishment (De Botton, 2004) . This in contradiction with the present clip. De Botton (2004) stated that these yearss, position seldom depends on person ' s individuality. Alternatively it depends on person ' s public presentation in the universe. (De Botton, 2004) . He besides concluded that due to the nature of the economic system, the most apparent motivation to accomplish position is uncertainness. For illustration, people hereby tend to look at the hereafter in the recognition that they could miss the demand of endowment (De Botton, 2004) .

3. 2 Social position

In order to understand societal position, it is necessary to first define position. Harmonizing to De Botton (2004) position is one ' s place in the universe. Hereby, the universe refers to one ' s legal or professional standing within a group (e. g. married) . Entirely, this is a more narrow sense of position. Since in a broader sense it means one ' s value and importance in the eyes of the universe (De Botton, 2004) . The term societal position is an expansion of this theory. Weber (1922) defined societal position as an effectual claim to societal regard in footings of positive or negative

privileges. Similarly, De Botton (2004) concluded that the effects of high position are pleasant. It could include resources, freedom and a sense of being cared for through invitations, flattery, respect and attending (De Botton, 2004) . So, the definition of position implies a hierarchy of wages. Hereby, higher position has greater entree to desirable feelings, such as grasp (Griskevicius, Tybur & A ; Van den Bergh, 2010) . Sloman and Dunham (2004) stated that position besides tends to increase a individual ' s assurance. This while perennial failure can sabotage a individual ' s assurance (Sloman & A ; Dunham, 2004) .

3. 4 Search for position

It is non surprising that people are looking for position, due to the fact that it has pleasant effects. In one of his surveies, Wright (1994) refers to this as the “ profoundly human hungriness for position ” . Harmonizing to him, people are ever looking for accomplishing high position in society (Wright, 1994) . But, how do people make this desired desire? De Botton (2004) stated that people could bring forth high position due to their importance, accomplishment and income. This is besides emphasized in the survey of Griskevicius, Tybur and Van den Bergh (2010) . They stated that high position could be achieved through laterality or prestigiousness (Griskevicius et al. , 2010) .

In an early survey, Duesenberry (1949) concluded that finally everyone is looking for position. For illustration, he stated that households non merely care about their ain ingestion degree but besides about their ingestion degree relative to others (Leibenstein, 1950) .

Harmonizing to De Botton (2004) , Duesenberry (1949) and Leibenstein (1950) people merely feel fortunate when they have every bit much or a little more than the people they grow up with, work aboard or have as a friend. For illustration, when all people are little they will non be troubled by the inquiries of size (De Botton, 2004) . But if others are taller, people are eligible to experience disgruntled (De Botton, 2004) . It therefore can be concluded that people merely envy members of their mention group (De Botton, 2004) . Therefore, we continually compare ourselves with people who are environing us (Duesenberry, 1949) . This is besides emphasized in a figure of literature surveies, while utilizing experiments called “ declared penchant research ” .

3. 5 Stated penchant

Stated penchant research puts respondents on a conjectural topographic point and asks them to province their penchant for the option they believe would maximise their ain involvements (Truys, 2010) . For illustration, Solnick and Hemenway (1998) asked their respondents to take between two companies. A is the more comparative company, in which the respondent is worse off in absolute footings but better away than the others. While B is the more absolute company, where one is better off in absolute footings but worse away than others. Solnick and Hemenway (1998) made the undermentioned differentiation:

A: Your annual income is \$ 50, 000 ; others earn \$ 25, 000

Bacilluss: Your annual income is \$ 100, 000 ; others earn \$ 200, 000

After the experiment, it could be concluded that 80 % of the respondents prefer the comparative instance A (Truyts, 2010) .

A similar experiment was attempted by Tversky and Griffin (1991) . They let respondents take between occupations at a magazine. Hereby one earns at magazine C, a wage of \$ 35, 000 and others \$ 38, 000. By magazine D one earns \$ 33, 000 and others \$ 30, 000. Tversky and Griffin report that 85 % of the respondents prefer magazine C, but that in a 2nd experiment 64 % believe to be happier at magazine D. Hereby, an of import difference between the two surveies is that Solnick and Hemenway (1998) enclosed all people while Tversky and Griffin (1991) merely considered co-workers.

Part of the grounds above suggests that we enjoy position for the interest of position itself. Truyts (2010) hereby concluded that societal position can be the ultimate motivation for human behaviour. Because finally, people care about their achieved position because high societal position induces many stuff and non-material benefits (Truyts, 2010) .

3. 6 Decision

Harmonizing to De Botton (2004) , uncertainty is the most obvious motivation to accomplish position. Several researches have concluded that the effects of high position are desirable. It could include resources, freedom and grasp (Griskevicius, Tybur & A ; Van den Bergh, 2010 ; De Botton, 2004) . But it could besides increase the individual ' s assurance (Sloman & A ; Dunham, 2004) . This is besides mentioned in surveies such as De Botton (2004) and Duesenberry (1949) . They stated that people merely feel fortunate when they have every bit much or a little more than the people in

their environment. It therefore can be concluded that people merely envy members of their mention group. The ground why they want to accomplish position is because it may connote stuff and non-material benefits (Truys, 2010) .

4. Decisions, treatment, restrictions and recommendations

After researching literature surveies, it is possible to subtract the decisions which will be described in the first paragraph. The recommendations, restrictions and treatment will be discussed in the 2nd paragraph. I have intentionally chosen to set these three topics into one paragraph, since otherwise my recommendations would be duplicated three times in a row.

4. 1 Decisions

Despite the fact that the Seven Sins have been bing for centuries, small academic research has been done about greed. This was non desirable since this thesis tries to reply the undermentioned job statement: what is the consequence of position on greed? Due to the fact that there is non one world-renowned theory, it is attempt to specify greed with the aid of three related concepts. Namely, self-interest, philistinism and desire for money. Because this research is concentrating on a comparative variable (position) , it is besides attempted to near these three related concepts in a comparative manner. This in order to make a sustainable base for the decisions. Up following are the decisions per variable, with finally the reply to the job statement.

Status

For mentions see chapter 3

<https://assignbuster.com/a-study-on-greed-and-status-essay/>

Status is per definition relation and uncertainty is the most apparent motivation to accomplish position. Striking is, that this motivation has besides been found in the related concepts of greed. Several researches have concluded that the effects of high position are pleasant. It could include resources, freedom and grasp. But it could besides increase the individual's assurance. This is besides concluded in other surveys. It is stated that people merely feel fortunate when they have every bit much or a little more than the people in their environment. It therefore can be concluded that people merely envy members of their mention group. The ground why they want to accomplish position is because it may connote stuff and non-material benefits.

Self-interest

For mentions see paragraph 2. 1

Although there is not much known in literature, it can be concluded that rivals have most fondness with position. This because, rivals are chiefly focused on maximising their aim result relation to other people. Hereby viz. the portion "maximising their aim result relation to other people" is decisive and related to position. Due to the fact that their chief motivational grounds for acting arises from the feeling of making comparative advantage over other people and preferring results that are superior to them.

Materialism

For mentions see paragraph 2. 2

Materialistic individuals value their ownerships as everything. However, research showed that the motivational motivations to bring on philistinism are deeper than “merely rolling up material”. Motivations are amongst others: personal insecurity, power and image. But there is more because mercenary people measure their aim success by particularly the figure and quality of ownerships. Remarkable is that, mercenary individuals besides seem to compare their ownership with others. Which is the same decision that is drawn by opportunism. Prolonged, literature besides shows that materialists are sensitive for other people’s sentiment and attending. Overall it is possible to reason that philistinism is a result that is driven by personal insecurity, diffidence, exposure, image and other people’s sentiment and attending.

Desire for money

For mentions see paragraph 2. 3

To some extent money serves as stenography for general wealth, ownerships and ingestion. However, most significantly money is a tool for beaming people’s wealth or income. It is besides stated that money is used for intents such as societal show, societal communicating and societal protection. Thus, money is used for several intents and it seems a comparative concept every bit good. Particularly since it appears that it is a tool for beaming wealth, income and societal show.

Answer to job statement

The job statement of this research is to analyze the consequence of position on greed. Prior this research, it was already concluded that position is a comparative variable. Hence, it was necessary to happen the comparative portion in the concepts of greed. After reading the decisions of the concepts, it can be stated that they all have one thing in common. Namely, the concepts are all comparative. Theory of opportunism shows that finally people are seeking for advantage over others. The same thing is concluded by philistinism. Materialistic individuals measure their aim success by the figure of ownerships and they besides compare their ownership with people in their environment. Precisely the same, as what was concluded by the theory of opportunism. Further, desire for money besides appears to be comparative because people use money as a tool for beaming wealth, income, societal show or societal communicating.

All these decisions are consistent with the findings of position. It was concluded that people merely feel fortunate when they have every bit much or a little more than the people in their environment. This is clearly shown by the declared penchant researches. After all, 80 % of the respondents preferred the company where they earn more compared with their co-workers.

So, we continuously compare ourselves with people of our mention group. Striking is, that this is the same decision that is drawn by the concepts of greed. It therefore can be concluded that position has many similarities with greed and that position has a strong consequence on the latter. I even think that all concepts are so similar, that they overlap each other. However, there is n't an academic theory yet, to confirm this idea.

4. 2 Discussion, restrictions and recommendations

As stated before, there was non much information available about greed. Therefore related constructions where introduced in order to specify greed. The pick for the three concepts is based on two articles. So it could be possible that there are other concepts which besides should be included in the research. Further, there was non much information available about the chosen concepts of greed. Sometimes, it was really hard to happen a theory which suited the job statement best. I therefore used books (which are non academically substantiated) or comparatively old theories, since I had to accept every nexus available. As stated in the thesis, greed can do several terrible crises such as recognition crunches and wars. But besides the ordinary consumer is susceptible for greed. Therefore I believe it is inevitable to make more research on this topic. Because, it may lend to the farther apprehension of greed and protect consumers in the hereafter.