

How Social Comparison Theory Shapes Self-Esteem in Indian Cultural Contexts: A Comprehensive Conceptual Review

Kartik Kadian¹, Khushi²

^{1,2}Student, Department of Psychology, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

Abstract

Social Comparison Theory (SCT) posits that individuals evaluate their abilities, achievements, and self-worth through comparisons with others. Although SCT has been extensively examined within Western, individualistic societies, its application within culturally diverse and rapidly transforming societies such as India remains theoretically underdeveloped. This comprehensive conceptual review critically synthesizes classical and contemporary literature from social psychology, cultural psychology, and Indian sociocultural research to examine how cultural context moderates the relationship between social comparison and self-esteem. Particular emphasis is placed on the urban–rural divide, the coexistence of collectivist and individualistic orientations, and the growing influence of digital and social media environments. The review proposes an integrative cultural–contextual framework explaining differential self-esteem outcomes of social comparison in India and highlights implications for mental health, education, and digital well-being. By situating SCT within India’s sociocultural realities, the paper aims to advance culturally sensitive theorizing and guide future empirical research.

1. Introduction

Social Comparison Theory (Festinger, 1954) remains one of the most influential frameworks for understanding self-evaluation processes. According to the theory, individuals possess a fundamental drive to evaluate their opinions, abilities, and personal worth, often in the absence of objective standards. These evaluations are frequently achieved through comparison with others, resulting in upward or downward comparisons that carry distinct emotional and motivational consequences.

Self-esteem, defined as an individual’s overall evaluation of self-worth (Rosenberg, 1965), has been consistently linked to social comparison processes. A substantial body of research indicates that upward comparisons may undermine self-esteem by highlighting personal shortcomings, whereas downward comparisons may enhance self-esteem by reinforcing relative advantage (Buunk & Gibbons, 2007; Wood, 1989). However, the psychological meaning and impact of these comparisons are not universal. Instead, they are shaped by cultural norms, values, and self-construals (Heine et al., 1999).

India provides a uniquely important context for re-examining SCT. Characterized by deep cultural diversity, collectivist traditions, hierarchical social structures, and rapid urbanization, Indian society reflects both continuity and change. Traditional interdependent self-construals coexist with emerging individualistic values, particularly in urban and digitally connected spaces (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Sinha & Tripathi, 1994). This cultural duality raises important theoretical questions regarding how social comparison processes influence self-esteem across different Indian contexts.

Rather than presenting new empirical findings, the present paper offers an extended conceptual and integrative review. It synthesizes existing theoretical and empirical literature to examine how cultural orientation, urban–rural context, and digital exposure moderate the relationship between social comparison and self-esteem in India.

2. Social Comparison Theory: Evolution and Core Concepts

Festinger's (1954) original formulation of Social Comparison Theory emphasized individuals' tendency to evaluate themselves in relation to others when objective criteria are unavailable. Subsequent refinements expanded the theory to include motivational, emotional, and contextual determinants of comparison outcomes (Suls, Martin, & Wheeler, 2002).

2.1 Direction of Social Comparison

Upward social comparison involves evaluating oneself against superior others and is often associated with feelings of inadequacy, envy, or decreased self-esteem, particularly when the comparison target is perceived as similar and the domain is self-relevant (Lockwood & Kunda, 1997). Downward comparison, in contrast, may enhance self-esteem by emphasizing one's relative advantage, though it may also elicit guilt or fear (Wills, 1981).

2.2 Individual Differences and Context

Later models of SCT emphasize that the impact of comparison depends on individual differences such as self-esteem level, comparison orientation, and cultural background (Gibbons & Buunk, 1999). These extensions highlight the importance of contextualizing social comparison within broader psychological and sociocultural frameworks.

3. Culture, Self-Construal, and Self-Esteem

Cultural psychology distinguishes between independent and interdependent self-construals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In individualistic cultures, individuals define themselves primarily through personal attributes and achievements, rendering self-esteem highly sensitive to interpersonal comparison. In collectivistic cultures, individuals define themselves through social roles and relationships, often deriving self-worth from group harmony and relational success (Triandis, 1995).

Empirical evidence suggests that the desire for positive self-regard, central to Western models of self-esteem, may be less dominant or differently expressed in collectivist cultures (Heine et al., 1999). In such contexts, social comparison may serve self-improvement or relational functions rather than purely self-enhancement (Sedikides, Gaertner, & Toguchi, 2003).

4. The Indian Sociocultural Landscape

Indian society has traditionally been characterized as collectivist, with strong emphasis on family interdependence, social hierarchy, and duty-based identities (Chadda & Deb, 2013). Self-worth is often embedded within relational networks, social roles, and community belonging rather than individual achievement alone (Roland, 1988).

However, post-liberalization economic growth, urbanization, and globalization have accelerated cultural shifts. Urban centers increasingly emphasize competition, personal success, and material achievement, fostering individualistic orientations alongside traditional values (Sinha, 2008). These transformations have altered standards of comparison and self-evaluation, particularly among younger generations.

5. Urban–Rural Context as a Cultural Moderator

The urban–rural divide in India represents a convergence of cultural, economic, and technological differences. Urban environments are characterized by increased anonymity, competitive labor markets, and exposure to global media, all of which heighten the salience of upward comparison (Srivastava, 2015). In such settings, self-esteem may become more contingent on achievement and visibility.

Rural contexts, while not devoid of comparison, often emphasize long-term relationships, shared identities, and collective responsibility. These features may reduce the personal threat associated with upward comparison by situating individual outcomes within a broader social framework (Mishra, 2014). This review conceptualizes the urban–rural divide not as a binary distinction but as a continuum of cultural orientations influencing comparison processes.

6. Social Media and the Intensification of Social Comparison

Digital platforms have fundamentally transformed social comparison dynamics by increasing both the frequency and intensity of exposure to others' achievements and lifestyles (Vogel et al., 2014). Social media environments tend to amplify upward comparisons through curated and idealized self-presentations, which have been linked to decreased self-esteem and increased psychological distress (Verduyn et al., 2017).

In India, rapid smartphone penetration has extended these dynamics across both urban and rural populations, though patterns of use and interpretation vary. Urban users may experience greater vulnerability due to individualistic value orientations and achievement pressures, whereas collectivist orientations may buffer negative effects in some contexts (Balakrishnan, 2013; Farheen, 2019).

7. Integrative Conceptual Framework

Based on the reviewed literature, this paper proposes an integrative framework in which:

1. Social comparison is a universal psychological process.
2. Cultural orientation shapes the meaning and emotional impact of comparison.
3. Individualistic contexts amplify self-esteem vulnerability to upward comparison.
4. Collectivist frameworks distribute self-worth across relational domains, buffering negative effects.
5. Digital environments intensify comparison processes, interacting with cultural context.

This framework underscores the need to move beyond culturally neutral applications of SCT and adopt context-sensitive models.

8. Implications for Mental Health and Well-Being

Understanding culturally moderated social comparison has important implications for psychological well-being in India. Rising rates of anxiety, depression, and self-esteem-related distress in urban populations may be partially understood through intensified comparison pressures (Patel et al., 2018). Interventions focusing on relational self-construals, media literacy, and community engagement may help mitigate these effects.

9. Future Directions

Future research should employ longitudinal, mixed-method, and cross-regional designs to empirically test culturally grounded models of social comparison. Greater attention to gender, socioeconomic status, caste,

and generational differences is also essential. Conceptual clarity regarding self-esteem fluctuation and cultural meanings of self-worth will strengthen theory development.

10. Conclusion

This comprehensive conceptual review demonstrates that the relationship between social comparison and self-esteem in India is deeply embedded in cultural context. The coexistence of collectivist traditions and individualistic transformations creates heterogeneous self-evaluative processes across urban and rural settings. Integrating Social Comparison Theory with cultural psychology offers a more nuanced understanding of self-esteem in contemporary India and provides a foundation for culturally sensitive research and intervention.

References

1. Balakrishnan, S. (2013). Effect of social media on self-esteem among various age groups in India. *International Journal of Scientific and Advanced Technology*, 3(2), 1–6.
2. Buunk, B. P., & Gibbons, F. X. (2007). Social comparison: The end of a theory and the emergence of a field. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 102(1), 3–21.
3. Chadda, R. K., & Deb, K. S. (2013). Indian family systems, collectivistic society and psychiatry. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 55(Suppl 2), S299–S309.
4. Farheen, A. (2019). Social media use, social comparison, and self-esteem among Indian adolescents. *Journal of Psychiatry*, 22(4), 1–7.
5. Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2), 117–140.
6. Gibbons, F. X., & Buunk, B. P. (1999). Individual differences in social comparison. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(1), 129–142.
7. Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive self-regard? *Psychological Review*, 106(4), 766–794.
8. Lockwood, P., & Kunda, Z. (1997). Superstars and me. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 91–103.
9. Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253.
10. Mishra, R. C. (2014). *Psychology in India: Theoretical and methodological developments*. Springer.
11. Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., et al. (2018). The Lancet Commission on global mental health. *The Lancet*, 392(10157), 1553–1598.
12. Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton University Press.
13. Sedikides, C., Gaertner, L., & Toguchi, Y. (2003). Pancultural self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(1), 60–79.
14. Sinha, D. (2008). *Culture and organizational behaviour*. Sage Publications.
15. Sinha, D., & Tripathi, R. C. (1994). Individualism in a collectivist culture. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7(3), 293–308.
16. Srivastava, A. (2015). Rural–urban differences in maximizing behavior in India. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 14(2), 101–112.
17. Suls, J., Martin, R., & Wheeler, L. (2002). Social comparison. *Handbook of social psychology*.
18. Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Westview Press.
19. Verduyn, P., Ybarra, O., Résibois, M., Jonides, J., & Kross, E. (2017). Do social network sites enhance or undermine well-being? *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 11(1), 274–302.

20. Vogel, E. A., Rose, J. P., Roberts, L. R., & Eckles, K. (2014). Social comparison on Facebook. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 3(4), 206–222.
21. Wills, T. A. (1981). Downward comparison principles. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90(2), 245–271.
22. Wood, J. V. (1989). Theory and research concerning social comparisons. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(2), 231–248.