

VOLUNTARY SIMPLICITY, VALUES AND LIFESTYLES: A CASE OF ANKARA - TURKEY

*Gönüllü Sadelik, Değerler Ve Yaşam Tarzı:
Ankara-Türkiye*

Ayşegül Ermeç Sertoğlu*
Gazi Üniversitesi

Çağla Pınar Bozoklu**
Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi

Sezer Korkmaz***
Gazi Üniversitesi

Özet

Çevresel bozulma, aşırı tüketim, gelişmekte olan ülkelerin istismarı ve reklam karmaşası gibi çeşitli kaygılar gönüllü sade yaşama ortam hazırlamaktadır. Benzer kaygılar son zamanlarda Türkiye’de de ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu araştırmada, Ankara’daki üniversite ve üstü eğitim düzeyindeki tüketicilerin değer yapıları ve gönüllü sade yaşam tarzı (GSY) arasındaki ilişki incelenmiştir. Bu amaçla, Iwata’nın (2006) GSY ölçeği ve Rokeach Değerler Ölçeği birlikte kullanılmıştır. Kolayda ve kartopu örnekleme yöntemleri ile 195 web tabanlı ve kağıt-kalem anketi toplanmış olmakla birlikte kullanılabilir anket sayısı 101’dir. Veriler keşfedici faktör analizi ve kümeleme analizi ile analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar, örneklemin önemli bir kısmının gönüllü sade yaşam stilini benimsediğini göstermekte olup beklentilerle uyumludur. Ayrıca, gönüllü sade yaşamı benimseme dereceleri açısından üç farklı grubun elde edildiği örneklemin değer desenleri literatüre katkı sağlamaktadır.

* **Sorumlu Yazar:** Dr. Ayşegül Ermeç Sertoğlu, Gazi Üniversitesi İİBE Ankara, E-posta: segu0704@yahoo.com

** Yard. Doç. Dr. Çağla Pınar Bozoklu, Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, KKTC, E-posta: cutkutug@hotmail.com

*** Prof. Dr. Sezer Korkmaz, Gazi Üniversitesi İİBE Ankara, E-posta: sezerk@gazi.edu.tr

Anahtar kelimeler: Gönüllü sadelik, değerler, keşfedici faktör analizi, kümeleme analizi

Abstract

Several concerns such as environmental impairment, overconsumption, abuse of developing nations and advertising clutter paved the way for a voluntarily simple life. Similar concerns have arisen recently in Turkey. In this research, the relation between the value structure and voluntary simplicity lifestyle (VSL) of highly educated Turkish consumers in Ankara is examined. For this purpose, the scale depending on VSL scale of Iwata (2006) along with Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) is employed. By the convenience and snowball sampling methods, 195 web-based and paper-and-pencil questionnaires were collected, but only 101 of them could be used. Data were analyzed using explanatory factor analysis and the cluster analysis. Results revealed that a significant portion of the sample adopted a voluntarily simple lifestyle compatible with the expectations. Further, the value patterns of emergent clusters with different levels of voluntary simplicity contribute new insights to the literature.

Keywords: Voluntary simplicity, values, explanatory factor analysis, cluster analysis

INTRODUCTION

More environmentally friendly and self-sufficient ways of living based on lower levels of consumption have recently surfaced in many mass-consumption societies (Lonard-Barton, 1981). Differing from each other in terms of behavioral patterns and underlying motivations and concerns, one of these emerging lifestyles is voluntary simplicity.

As a divergent attitude, resistance to consumption is not easy to adopt and refusing to purchase certain items can often be emotionally and financially costly (Cherrier, 2009; Cherrier and Murray, 2007). On the other hand, a voluntarily simple life is crucial for sustainability of scarce sources as well as the survival of the nature and human life. Several concerns such as environmental impairment, overcon-

sumption, abuse of developing nations (Craig-Less and Hill, 2002) and advertising clutter paved the way for sustainable behaviors and anti-consumption activities.

Similar concerns have arisen recently in Turkey, which is a developing nation in an increasingly embattled region bordering failed states such as Syria, but also the ones struggling with economic problems such as Greece. Micro and macro environmental factors such as Gezi Park protests, damage of the green belts in cities (e.g. land of Atatürk Forest Farm), political disputes and turmoil, the economic recession may have triggered anti-consumption activities for a group of consumers who have ecologically and socially conscious preferences.

As stated by McDonald et al. (2006: 516), any decision of buying (or not buying) something (goods, services) may contribute to a “more or less sustainable pattern of consumption,” and each purchase relates to “ethical, resource, waste, and community” issues. Increasing number of people in prosperous nations are now looking for ways to slow down the abiding growth of consumption and reshaping their lives in a way that requires less earning (Schor, 1998; Hamilton, 2003). As a result, examination of frugal consumer behavior, which is defined as the limitation of expenditures on consumer goods and services (Lastovicka et al., 1999), gains importance regardless of whether such behavior is undertaken with pro-social or pro-environmental intent (Pepper et al., 2009). The emerging interest in more frugal lifestyles is confirmed by a growing body of academic literature especially on the voluntary simplicity (VS) lifestyles.

The main goal of this paper is to analyze the voluntary simplicity lifestyle of the highly-educated customers living in Turkish capital Ankara as per community’s shared values.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Voluntary Simplicity

The dream of eluding oneself from a fast-paced, complicated and consumerist world to have a simple, slow-paced life is referred to

by many different names, but the most well-known one is voluntary simplicity.

The term “Voluntary Simplicity” is believed to be first used by Richard Gregg, in his article in 1936. Voluntary simplicity is considered as a variant of the anti-consumption movements (Boujbel and d’Astous, 2012: 487) and includes the choice of limiting material consumption in order to free one’s resources, mainly money and time as people seek to be satisfied through nonmaterial aspects of life (Etzioni, 1998; Shaw & Newholm, 2002; Huneke, 2005). They also want to maximize their control over daily lives, and to lessen dependence on large and powerful institutions such as government, oil companies, etc. as much as possible (Leonard-Barton, 1981). It should be noted that a simple lifestyle embraced because of economic constraints should not be regarded as voluntary simplicity. It is instead a “value-driven consumer lifestyle” (Cengiz, Rook, 2015: 123). While there is no single correct way of simplification, Elgin (2000) identified 10 different approaches (e.g. Choiceful, Commercial, Compassionate, Frugal and Ecological simplicity) to voluntary simplicity. Although some of them converge on similar issues, each approach has a different impact on daily life.

The classic psychological theory of Maslow (1943; 1968) has been referred (Etzioni, 1998; Zavestoski, 2002a; b) to explain voluntary simplicity. Maslow asserts that human needs are organized in a hierarchy, and physiological needs (drives) are at the bottom of human motivation pyramid. When physiological needs are satisfied, a new set of needs will emerge. These are grouped as: Safety-security needs, love needs, need for esteem and the need for self-actualization, respectively. Maslow also, states that the hierarchy is not rigidly fixed. For example, some people may care self-esteem more than love (Huneke, 2005). According to Etzioni (1998: 632) this theory explains the rise of voluntary simplicity for the citizens of affluent societies. VS appeals mostly to people whose primary needs are satisfied and can be adopted to fulfill the highest level needs. When making a pur-

chase, a voluntary simplifier consumer considers whether he/she is satisfying a need or not, as well as the environmental impact and production conditions of a product. (Elgin, 1993). As Huneke (2005) stated, a conscious person, also considers whether his/her job is satisfactory and socially beneficial. The VS lifestyle requires maintaining a balance between the inner and outer lives by expressing inner values through outward ways of living, including purchases, appearance, living and occupation (Elgin, 1993, 2000b). When practiced fully, adoption of this lifestyle would have effects on many aspects of social and domestic life like housekeeping, child rearing, social activities and occupation (Huneke, 2005).

Another point worth mentioning is that, voluntary simplicity is a process and “a matter of degree” (Bekin, Carrigan & Szmigin, 2005: 10) and therefore, researchers identified the levels of voluntary simplicity and categories of simplifiers. For example, Etzioni states that the degree of VS ranges from moderate to extreme levels, and identifies categories of simplifiers: a moderate form called as “Downshifters” includes people who are well off and choose to give up some luxuries; “Strong Simplifiers” encompasses who give up high-paying, high-stress jobs for either more time or occupations that are perceived as more meaningful; “Simplicity Movement” that refers to holistic simplifiers who change their lifestyles completely to fully embrace all aspects of voluntary simplicity. On the other hand, Elgin and Mitchell (1977), define the concept as a continuum varying from simplicity to non-simplicity. When considered from this point of view, non-voluntary simplifiers (NVS) can be defined as ones who do not engage in any sustainable activities, while voluntary simplifiers (VS) are vigorous advocates of this type of lifestyle. The broad gap between these two groups (NVS and VS) consists of consumers called beginner voluntary simplifiers (BVS) who may be “currently undertaking some features of the VS lifestyle, but have not fully committed or converted to it” (Oates et al., 2008: 353). In terms of promoting sustainable consumption, they are an intriguing group (McDonald et al., 2006: 518).

Values, Motivations and Voluntary Simplicity Lifestyle

Social adaptation theory (Kahle, 1983; Kahle, Kulka & Klingel, 1980; Piner, Kahle, 1984) postulates that an individual filters societal and cultural demand, refines and redefines values in order to be more adaptive (Kahle, 1983: 49). According to this theory, values facilitate the adaptation to one's environment, and they are similar to attitudes in a way that they are the most abstract one of social cognitions. (Homer, Kahle, 1988). Values can be defined as standards of desirability invoked in social interaction to evaluate the preferability of behavioral goals or modes of action (Williams, 1968). From this point of view, "values are assumed to be central to the cognitive organization of the individual and serve as a basis for the formation of attitudes, beliefs, and opinions" (Alwin and Krosnick, 1985: 535). When deciding how to behave in different situations, cognition and values lead individuals (Kahle, 1980). So the sequence is from values to attitudes and from attitudes to behavior. Williams, (1979) in his review of both laboratory and survey studies involved in the general social science literature, concludes that values influence behavior.

Marketers take interest in defining lifestyle segments and aligning common values embraced by these segments (Carman, 1978). The highest ranked (or rated) value is supposed to be the "dominant value" of the respondent, and it determines the segment into which he/she will be placed (Thompson, 2009). Also, it is believed that people are more certain of their extreme values and less certain of many other values (Beatty et. al. 1985: 184). People within the same value segment are thought to have similar beliefs, attitudes, activities, purchasing habits etc. (Kahle 1983). Carman (1978) proposes a consumer behavior model in which values directly influence the individual's lifestyle including the interests, time-use activities, and roles. According to this model, terminal values make the person more attached to certain instrumental values. In turn, these values may shape behavioral patterns (consumption, shopping, media exposure), interests and assumed roles, in other words, lifestyle of the person.

Previous researches (Elgin and Mitchell 1977; Leonard-Barton and Rogers, 1980; Shama and Wisenblit, 1984; Etzioni, 1998; 2003, Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002;, Moisander and Pesonen, 2002; Shaw and Newholm, 2002; Johnston and Burton, 2003; Huneke, 2005; McDonald et al., 2006; Cherrier and Murray, 2007; Roubanis, 2008) generate peculiar characteristics, inherent values of voluntary simplifiers. For example, Elgin and Mitchell (1977: 5) assert that VS is built upon certain values and define five basic values that lie at the heart of voluntary simplicity lifestyle namely: Material simplicity (non-consumption-oriented patterns of use), Self-determination (the desire to assume greater control over personal destiny), Ecological awareness (the recognition of the interdependency of people and resources), Human scale (the desire for smaller-scale institutions and technologies) and Personal growth (the desire to explore and develop the inner life). Self-sufficiency, social responsibility and spirituality are other stated core values (Shama, 1985; Shama and Wisenblit, 1984; Etzioni, 1998; Huneke, 2005).

Looking from the viewpoint of underlying motivations, people who adopt the voluntary simplicity movement have concerns about environmental issues (Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002; Ottman, 1995), health or religion (Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002), are suspicious of ethical implications of consumption preferences (Strong, 1997; Shaw and Newholm, 2002; Bekin et al., 2005) and “careerism,” and do not want to be fully involved in a mass consumer society. They believe that dominant culture is materialistic, competitive, detrimental to the planet and all living creatures, and it is the trigger of over-consumption (Grigsby, 2004:1). Defenders of simple lifestyle deny the view that “the good life is to be found in ever-higher levels of consumption” (Segal, 1996: 20), and they repudiate careerism and materialism. As stated by Southerton and others (2001), some consumers complain about not having enough time, always being busy and thus unable to accomplish their priorities. Thus, voluntary simplifiers intend to resign from their well-paid jobs to pursue a relaxing lifestyle (Budden, 2000; Birchfield, 2000; Schachter, 1997; Caudron, 1996), to

make more time for their families and their hobbies, and “reconnect with nature” (Bekin et al., 2005: 415).

Researchers underline that the voluntary simplifiers are predominantly over-educated, high-income people, working under stress and motivated by both spiritual and material values instead of only material ones. However, free choice condition distinguishes them from the poor or near poor who are forced to lead a simpler lifestyle (Mitchell, 1983; Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002). Socio-economically, voluntary simplifiers are highly educated, quite wealthy and professionally skilled people (Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002; Etzioni, 1998; Zavestoski, 2002a; b).

Lifestyles may be scrutinized to have a better understanding of the motives behind people’s actions and explain the meaning of their actions (Chaney, 1999: 14; Mowen, 1993: 236; Blackwell et al., 2001: 253). Lifestyle is individuals’, families’, and societies’ way of living, and it is expressed in terms of their behavior patterns (social relationships, consumption, working, entertainment etc.) and reflects their attitudes, values and opinions (Lin, Shih, 2012; Business Dictionary; Hung, 2009). Lifestyles emerge due to similar consumption models of consumers having common values and tastes (Solomon, 1999: 658; Chaney, 1999: 14), and alternative measurement approaches may be used to reveal these common values. One of the approaches used in lifestyle researches is Rokeach Value Survey (RVS). Rokeach (1973: 32-33) developed a system, which consists of 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values for value measurement. Terminal values define the preferences for lifelong values (Schermerhorn et al., 1994: 136), which leads to the dominance of certain instrumental values over others (Carman, 1978). Rokeach integrates them according to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (1970) and previous researches on value (Shao, 2002: 20). These are, namely; a comfortable life, an exciting life, sense of accomplishment, world at peace, a world of beauty, equality, family security, freedom, happiness, inner harmony, mature love, national security, pleasure, salvation, self-respect, social recog-

nition, true friendship and wisdom. Instrumental values refer to the instruments that are utilized for achieving goals and function as the representative of acceptable behaviors that individuals use to come to conclusions. They comprise personal characteristics and character traits. The instrumental values are; being ambitious, broad-minded, capable, cheerful, clean, courageous, forgiving, helpful, honest, imaginative, independent, intellectual, logical, loving, obedient, polite, responsible and self-controlled.

Voluntary simplicity is an emerging topic in Turkey over the past decade. According to our knowledge, the first study (Özkan, 2007) is also carried out in Ankara on married couples with children to determine their behaviors of voluntary simple lifestyle. Following this, Özgül (2010) analyzed the relationship between the value structure of consumers and the voluntary simple lifestyle, and between VSL and sustainable consumption. Soon after in his subsequent research Özgül (2011) examined the relationship between the reasons of hedonic consumption and VSL. As mentioned above, people adopt VSL due to various motives (environmental concern, religious etc.). In this context in their research, Kaynak and Ekşi (2011) explored the effects of ethnocentrism, religiosity, environmental and health consciousness on anti-consumptional attitudes of voluntary simplifiers. Babaoğlu and Buğday (2012) discussed voluntary simplicity and issues related to conspicuous consumption. More recently, Erdoğan and Karapınar (2015) tried to segment Turkish consumers with similar characteristics related to VS attitude and behaviors. Although this paper has some similarities with previous researches (Özgül, 2010; Erdoğan and Karapınar, 2015), it differs by measurement of values (RVS) and inclusion of values as characteristics of voluntary simplifiers. Accordingly, this study aims to segment the highly-educated consumers in Ankara as per common value patterns and to determine their voluntary simplicity adoption scores (levels) and characteristics. Any difference found between the value rankings of consumers that adopt VSL in different levels will help relate certain values to this type of lifestyle.

METHODOLOGY

Measures

The VSL scale used in this study consisted of 20 items from the scale developed by Iwata (2006), which was translated into Turkish and validated in the study of Özgül (2010). Moreover, the value survey of Rokeach (1973) was also added to analyze the relationship between VSL and driving values.

Values can be measured by ranking set of competing alternatives or rating a group of items. According to Rokeach (1973:6), values are often thought to be inherently comparative and competitive, and thus the 'choice' nature of the ranking task fits with this conceptualization. There are also other researchers (Allport et al., 1960; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Lenski, 1961; Bengston, 1975) who validated this point of view. On the other hand, this approach has some drawbacks (Alwin and Krosnick, 1985: 536). Ranking process may be difficult for respondents because it requires cognitive effort and concentration, especially when the list of concepts to be ranked is lengthy (Rokeach, 1973:28; Feather, 1973:228). This process is also time-consuming, and it is difficult to gather such information using telephone methods of data collection (Groves and Kahn, 1979: 122-33). And the statistical techniques that can be employed to the ranked preference data are limited. The aggregate or average preference orders measured by ratings and rankings have generally been found to be quite similar, (Feather, 1973; 1975; Moore, 1975) while individual level orders tend to be much less similar across ratings and rankings (Moore, 1975, Rankin and Grube, 1980). Alwin and Krosnick (1985) suggest that these techniques may be interchangeable for the purpose of measuring aggregate preference orderings.

In this research, as the researchers wanted to reveal the most important values for consumers who adopted different levels of voluntary simplicity, Rokeach's rating scale (1973) was preferred. Besides these two scales, the final questionnaire included a set of questions about socio-demographic characteristics of respondents.

Population and Sampling

The general target population of the study was composed of Turkish consumers living in Ankara, capital city of Turkey, having at least a graduate degree from a university. In the data collection process, the sampling started with convenience sampling method and proceeded with snowball sampling method. The sample size estimate of survey was computed by following formula:

$$SS = \frac{(p)*(1-p)Z^2}{c^2} \quad (1)$$

Z = Z value (e.g. 1.96 for 95% confidence level)

p = population proportion (.2 used for sample size needed)

c = confidence interval, expressed as decimal (e.g., .08 = ±8)

The data related to the sample size for the year of 2015 was taken from Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK, 2015). The population of Ankara was 4.671.340 for that year and number of people who had at least a university level of education was 911.266. The ratio of 'Undergraduates of Ankara' to 'Population of Ankara' was equal to 0.195 (approximately 0.20). Thus, the acceptable sample size seems to be obtained as 96 when p value and p-1 value are considered as, respectively, 0.20 and 0.80.

The data collection process was completed with 195 web-based and paper-and-pencil questionnaires. Nevertheless, the number of usable ones was 101, as 84 questionnaires had to be omitted due to the errors ascertained, stemming from the ranking (ordinal) data (values). This fact will be discussed in detail in the discussion and limitations section.

Table 1 shows demographics of the respondents, which consist of 58.4 %female and 41.6 %, male. Majority respondents were at 20-30 years of age, representing 39.6 % followed by the age of 31-40 (36.6 %). Considering the educational level, many respondents were

bachelor degree graduates 42.6 %, and 34.7 % had a master's degree. The highest percentage of respondents (45.6 %) were the ones occupied/ employed in the education sector (teachers and academicians), whereas approximately 11 percent of the respondents were employed in a white-collar job. Table 1 also revealed the income level of the respondents with majority (38.6 %) earning an annual income above 5001 TL and those whose income falls between 5000 and 3501 were 27.7 %. Over half of the respondents (53.5 %) were single.

Table 1. Socio-economic characteristics of the sample and the clusters

Characteristics		Sample		Cluster 1		Cluster 2		Cluster 3	
		N	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Gender	Female	59	58.4	12	48.0	41	66.1	6	42.9
	Male	42	41.6	13	52.0	21	33.9	8	57.1
Age	20-30	40	39.6	8	32.0	26	41.9	6	42.9
	31-40	37	36.6	11	44.0	23	37.1	3	21.4
	41-50	15	14.9	4	16.0	9	14.5	2	14.3
	51 and over	9	8.9	2	8.0	4	6.5	3	21.4
Education	Graduate	43	42.6	12	48.0	23	37.1	8	57.1
	Master's degree	35	34.7	11	44.0	22	35.5	2	14.3
	Doctoral degree	23	22.8	2	8.0	17	27.4	4	28.6
Income level	< 890 TL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	891-1600 TL	5	5.0	1	4.0	3	4.8	1	7.1
	1601-2500 TL	11	10.9	1	4.0	9	14.5	1	7.1
	2501-3500 TL	18	17.8	6	24.0	9	14.5	3	21.4
	3501-5000 TL	28	27.7	8	32.0	15	24.2	5	35.7
	> 5001 TL	39	38.6	9	36.0	26	41.9	4	28.6
Occupation	Student	7	6.9	0	0	7	11.3	0	0
	White collar	11	10.9	2	8.0	6	9.7	3	21.4
	Health personnel (MD, nurse, etc)	7	6.9	1	4.0	5	8.1	1	7.1
	Academician	33	32.7	6	24.0	23	37.1	4	28.6
	Banker	7	6.9	3	12.0	4	6.5	0	0
	Engineer	8	7.9	1	4.0	7	11.3	0	0
	Teacher	13	12.9	5	20.0	4	6.5	4	28.6
	Others	15	14.9	7	28.0	6	9.7	2	14.3
Marital status	Single	54	53.5	15	60.0	31	50.0	8	57.1
	Married	47	46.5	10	40.0	31	50.0	6	42.9

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Exploratory Factor Analysis

To refine and test the dimensionality of the VSL scale, a series of exploratory factor analysis were applied to data with the use of PCA and a varimax rotation and items didn't load on any factor ($< .50$) or loaded on more than one factor were removed iteratively. The appropriateness of the factor structure was ensured with KMO measure at .624. To decide how many factors to retain for rotation, the Kaiser's eigenvalue-greater-than 1 (Kaiser, 1960) method was considered. This process ended up with a six factor solution (eigenvalues > 1.0), retaining 16 items, accounting for 65.5% of the total variance. Before labeling the emergent factors, reliability of the whole scale and factors were considered. The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the first and second factors (factors with more than 2 items) were 0.71 and 0.70, respectively. As some researchers (Stainfort, Booske, 2000; Verhoef, 2003) assert, alpha coefficient is not applicable for scales less than three items and therefore, correlation coefficient should be used. We calculated Pearson correlation coefficient for rest of the factors and all but one of the coefficients were significant ($p < 0.01$). The correlation coefficient of the sixth factor was insignificant and this being the case, we omitted two items (hence the last factor) and performed factor analysis again. Emergent 5 factor solution (14 items) was taken into consideration in subsequent analysis. Following this revision, the Cronbach alpha estimate of the whole scale was 0.74. Since Nunnally (1978:245) suggests 0.70 to be an acceptable reliability coefficient, the scale and generated factors are reliable.

First factor, explaining the 17.6% of total variance, was composed of four items that does not impulse buying and shopping unless something is really needed. Thus, it was labeled as "Planned Buying Behavior". The second factor, explaining the 13.2% of total variance, contained four items associated with using products as long as possible and thus, named as "A desire for long term usage". Third factor, explaining the 13.1% of total variance, contained two items related to

being self-sufficient as much as possible. So we labeled this factor as “Acceptance of self-sufficiency” like Iwata (2006). The fourth factor, explaining the 11.5% of total variance, contained two items related to preferring simple products to more complicated ones and labeled as “Preferences for simple products”. The last factor, explaining the 10.5% of total variance, contained two items associated with having a simple life, so this factor was labeled as “A desire for a simple life”. (See Table 2).

Table 2. Exploratory factor analysis: Voluntary simplicity scale

Factors	Factor Loading
Factor 1: Planned buying behavior	
I 1: Even if I have money, it is not my principle to buy things suddenly.	.803
I 2: I want to buy something new shortly after it comes out, even if I have a similar thing already.	-.675
I 3: I do not do impulse buying	.672
I 4: When I shop, I decide to do so after serious consideration of whether an article is necessary to me or not.	.550
Factor 2: A desire for long-term usage	
I 5: If I am surrounded by what I have bought, I feel fortunate.	.765
I 6: When I shop, I take a serious view of being able to use an article for a long time without getting tired of it.	.628
I 7: I try to use articles which I bought as long as possible.	.585
I 8: Except for traveling, I enjoy my leisure time without spending too much money.	.520
Factor 3: Acceptance of self-sufficiency	
I 9: In the future, I want to lead a life that can be self-sufficient as far as possible.	.913
I 10: It is desirable to be self-sufficient as much as possible	.907
Factor 4: Preferences for simple products	
I 11: As far as possible, I do not buy products with sophisticated functions.	.838
I 12: I prefer products with simple functions to those with complex functions.	.808
Factor 5: A desire for a simple life	
I 13: I try to live a simple life and not to buy articles which are not necessary	.761
I 14: I want to live simply rather than extravagantly.	.713

KMO=,623 Bartlett's Test of Sphericity; Approx. Chi-Square=377,875 (sign=,000)

Afterwards, in order to reveal the connection between voluntary simplicity lifestyles and values, we computed factor scores for each subject. Herein, as the item 2 was reflecting a non-voluntary approach, this item was reverse coded before this computation.

Cluster Analysis

In order to define groups of people with similar value rankings and VS scores, cluster analysis was applied to the data. Cluster analysis is used to classify objects “with respect to a particular attribute” (Moye and Kincade, 2003: 62). The obtained clusters of participants are homogeneous within the clusters and heterogeneous between the clusters. Two-step clustering process (hierarchical and then non-hierarchical) using Ward’s method yielded 3 clusters. Characteristics of the clusters profiled in Table 1. As can be seen, majority of the largest cluster (Cluster 2) were female (66.1%), had income level over 5001 TL (41.9%) and were at 20-30 years age. Most of the respondents with doctoral degree (73.9%) and concordantly majority of the academicians were in this cluster.

Contrary to the Cluster 2, most of the respondents in the first cluster (Cluster 1) were male. Majority of this cluster were at the 31-40 years age (%44) and graduates with Bachelor Degree (42.6%).

The smallest cluster (Cluster 3) with 14 members was also dominated by males, and most of the respondents were graduates. About %43 of the respondents aged 20-30 and as in the second cluster, majority of the members engaged in education sector (academicians and teachers).

From a VS point of view, Cluster 2 had the highest scores on voluntary simplicity scale as a whole and on nearly all dimensions (See Table 3).

Table 3. Voluntary simplicity scale values of clusters

	Sample	Cluster1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	p value*
Factor 1: Planned buying behavior	3,57	3.39	3.65	3.54	,366
Factor 2: A desire for long-term usage	3,91	3.74	4.00	3.80	,434
Factor 3: Acceptance of self-sufficiency	4,65	4.64	4.68	4.57	,423
Factor 4: Preferences for simple products	3,49	3.40	3.52	3.46	,798
Factor 5: A desire for a simple life	3,96	3.62	4.06	4.11	,124
VS (whole scale)	3,91	3.76	3.98	3.89	,149

* *Kruskal Wallis Test*

Although not statistically significant, Cluster 2 had the highest mean value in terms of VS, and it was over the mean value of the whole sample. So, this group should be named as “Voluntary Simplifiers-VS” in accordance with the literature (Iwata, 2006). This group also had the highest scores on four dimensions, namely, planned buying behavior, a desire for long-term usage, acceptance of self-sufficiency and preferences for simple products. With the moderate value in terms of VS, Cluster 3 had the highest score on the fifth dimension, a desire for a simple life. While the VS score was under the sample value, members of this cluster had a desire for simplicity, thus this group should be named as “Beginner Voluntary Simplifiers-BVS”. With all but one mean scores being under the sample values, Cluster 1 had the lowest mean value in terms of VS. On the other hand, this value (3.77) was quite high in order to define this group as Non-Voluntary Simplifiers. Also, members of this group were ready to pay more for more comfort, and use a product for a long time. Therefore, we named this group as “Voluntary Simplifier Candidates-VSC”. However it is not certain that they will choose to live as BVS or VS in the future.

Value Patterns of Clusters

In the perspective of values, the clusters exhibited different ranking patterns (See Table 4 and 5). With regard to terminal value rankings, living an exciting and a comfortable life, as well as in a world of beauty with national security seem to be the strongest discriminators among the segments.

Voluntary simplifiers seem to give lesser importance to an exciting and a comfortable life, and as VS scores decrease, the importance given to these values seems to increase. On the other hand, voluntary simplifiers care more about national security relative to other segments, and as VS scores decrease, the importance given to that value seems to decrease.

Beginner voluntary simplifiers give more importance to the world of beauty than the other two segments. Freedom, mature love, pleasure, salvation, social recognition and true friendship said to be indiscriminating values. What is interesting, and somewhat of a surprise, is voluntary simplifiers, being the most highly educated group (majority of the doctoral graduates are in this segment), give less importance to sense of accomplishment, that represents the self-actualization aspect (Crosby et al., 1990), relative to other segments. On the other hand, two other values that also represent this aspect, namely self respect and inner harmony, were considered more important by Voluntary Simplifiers relative to other groups. Another interesting result is that Beginner Voluntary Simplifiers gave more importance to values (a world of beauty and equality), representing the idealism dimension (Crosby et al., 1990), than Voluntary Simplifiers.

VSC gave more importance to values (a comfortable and exciting life) that seem to represent a hedonistic world-view in comparison to both VS and BVS. This group also lagged behind in importance given to family security compared to others. These findings are not surprising considering that the majority of this segment is at 31-40 years of age and single (not married). In addition to these, considering the top 6 values, VSC should be defined as more individualistic.

In terms of instrumental values, as can be seen in Table 4 and 5, being polite, broad-minded, courageous and self-controlled seem to be the strongest discriminators among the segments, while being cheerful, forgiving, helpful, honest, imaginative, independent, logical and loving said to be indiscriminating values. Being honest was considered as the most important instrumental value in all groups.

Table 4. Terminal and instrumental values rankings

	Ranking	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3
TERMINAL VALUES	1	Happiness	Family security	Family security
	2	A comfortable life	Inner harmony	Equality
	3	Inner harmony	Happiness	Sense of accomplishment
	4	Freedom	Freedom	Freedom
	5	Family security	Self-respect	World at peace
	6	Sense of accomplishment	Wisdom	A comfortable life
	7	Pleasure	Equality	A world of beauty
	8	An exciting life	World at peace	Happiness
	9	Self-respect	National security	Inner harmony
	10	Equality	Sense of accomplishment	Self-respect
	11	Wisdom	A comfortable life	An exciting life
	12	A world of beauty	True friendship	Mature love
	13	Mature love	Pleasure	National security
	14	True friendship	Mature love	Pleasure
	15	World at peace	Social recognition	Social recognition
	16	Social recognition	Salvation	True friendship
	17	National security	A world of beauty	Salvation
	18	Salvation	An exciting life	Wisdom
		Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3
INSTRUMENTAL VALUES	1	Honest	Honest	Honest
	2	Broad-minded	Responsible	Independent
	3	Cheerful	Independent	Logical
	4	Courageous	Self-controlled	Helpful
	5	Clean	Helpful	Intellectual
	6	Capable	Logical	Self-controlled
	7	Helpful	Polite	Cheerful
	8	Independent	Cheerful	Forgiving
	9	Logical	Broad-minded	Loving
	10	Forgiving	Loving	Courageous
	11	Responsible	Clean	Imaginative
	12	Loving	Forgiving	Responsible
	13	Intellectual	Courageous	Clean
	14	Ambitious	Imaginative	Broad-minded
	15	Imaginative	Capable	Obedient
	16	Polite	Intellectual	Polite
	17	Self-controlled	Obedient	Capable
	18	Obedient	Ambitious	Ambitious

Voluntary Simplifiers give more importance to being self-controlled and as VS scores decrease, the importance given to this value also seems to decrease. Contrary to that, as VS scores decrease, the importance given to being courageous seems to increase and VSC find this value extremely important compared to VS and BVS. While VS care about being polite, BVS and VSC give relatively much less importance to this value. Being broad-minded and ambitious is considered most important by VSC, while being a responsible person is given more importance by Voluntary Simplifiers. Three of the values that compose the integrity factor (Vinson et al., 1977), namely being polite, self-controlled and responsible, seem to be more important for Voluntary Simplifiers compared to the other segments. As integrity related to avoiding from “unethical behaviors” (Turkyilmaz and Uslu, 2014: 264), it is not surprising to see the Voluntary Simplifiers being emphasized these values more significantly. VSC give more importance to being ambitious compared to others, and this is compatible with the more individualistic perspective of VSC.

Table 5. Comparison of value rankings for clusters

	Terminal values	Chi-Square	p value*	Instrumental values	Chi-Square	p value*
1	A comfortable life	18.420	.000	1 Ambitious	13.805	.001
2	An exciting life	33.659	.000	2 Broad-minded	15.731	.000
3	Sense of accomplishment	14.923	.001	3 Capable	12.554	.002
4	World at peace	10.358	.006	4 Cheerful	4.788	.091
5	A world of beauty	33.630	.000	5 Clean	8.208	.017
6	Equality	7.306	.026	6 Courageous	17.510	.000
7	Family security	6.627	.036	7 Forgiving	1.943	.378
8	Freedom	.583	.747	8 Helpful	.757	.685
9	Happiness	8.257	.016	9 Honest	.846	.655
10	Inner harmony	9.705	.008	10 Imaginative	2.944	.229
11	Mature love	1.610	.447	11 Independent	2.985	.225
12	National security	17.123	.000	12 Intellectual	10.480	.005
13	Pleasure	5.416	.067	13 Logical	4.038	.133
14	Salvation	2.784	.249	14 Loving	2.834	.242
15	Self-respect	10.870	.004	15 Obedient	8.088	.018
16	Social recognition	.795	.672	16 Polite	26.421	.000
17	True friendship	5.795	.055	17 Responsible	13.666	.001
18	Wisdom	14.007	.001	18 Self-control	17.970	.000

**Kruskal Wallis test*

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comparison of consumers' values revealed patterns according to degree of voluntary simplicity. Although the clusters are not so fixed and the sample size is not too satisfactory to come to a more generalizable conclusion, we have been able to identify differences in terms of importance given to values by consumers performing different levels of voluntary simplicity behaviors.

The factor analysis produced five factors, namely, planned buying behavior, a desire for long-term usage, acceptance of self-sufficiency, preferences for simple products and a desire for a simple life. Second, the voluntary simplicity factor scores and values were used in cluster analysis to create consumer segments with similar VS lifestyles and value patterns and the process ended up with 3 clusters. The demographic characteristics such as education (Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002; Etzioni, 1998; Zavestoski, 2002a; b) and income level (Mitchell, 1983; Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002) indicators were similar with previous VS researches.

The clusters exhibited different patterns in terms of both terminal and instrumental values. While living an exciting life and comfortable life, a world of beauty and national security seem to be the strongest discriminators among the segments, freedom, mature love, pleasure, salvation, social recognition and true friendship seem to be indiscriminating values. Voluntary simplifiers, being the most highly educated group seem to give less importance to the sense of accomplishment. On the other hand, self-respect and inner harmony were considered as more important for Voluntary Simplifiers relative to other groups. According to value rankings, BVS are thought to be more idealistic while VSC are thought to be more individualistic.

In terms of instrumental values, being polite, broad-minded, courageous and self-controlled seem to be the strongest discriminators among the segments, while being cheerful, forgiving, helpful, honest, imaginative, independent, logical and loving said to be indiscriminative. Voluntary Simplifiers give more importance to being self-controlled and VSC find being courageous extremely important. Being broad-minded and ambitious is considered most important by VSC, while being a responsible person is given more importance by Voluntary Simplifiers. VSC give more importance to being ambitious compared to others and this is compatible with the more individualistic perspective of VSC.

Accordingly, Voluntary Simplifiers who prioritize family security and are in the pursuit of inner harmony, life-long happiness and self-

respect, adopt certain instrumental values, namely being responsible, self-controlled and polite, for achieving these goals. When considered from the aspect of underlying motivations, adoption of the voluntarily simple lifestyle of Turkish consumers may be related to self-sufficiency, responsibility, personal growth, self-determination and ethical issues (Elgin and Mitchell, 1977; Shama, 1985; Shama and Wisenblit 1984; Etzioni, 1998; Huneke, 2005) but not religion (Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002). Voluntary Simplifiers also give less importance to having a comfortable and exciting life, that is to say hedonism, in comparison to other groups and not surprisingly they are highly-educated.

As a conclusion, a significant portion of the sample seems to adopt the voluntarily simple lifestyle compatible with the expectations. Further, the value patterns of the sample that present three different degrees of voluntarily simple life contribute new insights to the literature.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE STUDIES

Although the present study has yielded some preliminary findings, a number of caveats should be noted regarding the study. The main limitations are expressed below.

First, this study was primarily limited by its That is to say, because small sample sizes make the statistics of a study less dependable and generalizable, further larger studies are required to confirm these results. Also, larger sample sizes will provide higher Cronbach alpha estimates and thus more reliable results. The sample size can be expanded by adding more cities to the population of the study. On the other hand, although the data collection process ended with 195 web-based and paper-and-pencil questionnaires, 84 questionnaires had to be omitted due to the errors stemming from the ranking nature of the value data. More contact between the researchers and the target population, by increasing the number of face to face survey questionnaires, may have eliminated the errors and increased the sample size.

Second, because of the budget and time limitations a convenience sampling method was adopted in this research. Due to the non-random nature of data, the respondents may not have been totally representative of the population in Turkey, and the interpretation of results should instead be limited to the group examined at the time of this research. Since convenience sampling was used, the one third of the sample is composed of academicians who are colleagues of the researchers. However, it is not astonishing as highly educated respondents are appropriate for studying VSL (e. g. Boujbel and D'astous, 2012; Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002; Etzioni, 1998; Elgin and Mitchell, 1977), and the target population of this study is also highly-educated consumers. Future studies can include less educated consumers to make comparisons between these groups.

Third, RVS asks subjects to rank the values in order of importance. However, ranking 18 values have turned out to be confusing and led to a small sample size. An abbreviated ranking type scale or alternative rating value measurement scales can be employed in future studies for more impressive results.

Finally, comparison of web-based and P&P questionnaires was not performed in this study because of the inequalities of the sample sizes. Future studies can test the presence of response bias by comparing the data gathered in different ways.

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon W., Philip E. Vernon and Gardner Lindzey (1960), *A Study of Values*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Alwin, Duane F. and Jon A. Krosnick (1985), "The measurement of values in surveys: A comparison of ratings and rankings", *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 49(4) (Winter): 535-552
- Babaoğul, Müberra and Esna Betül Buğday (2012), "Gösteriş tüketimine karşı gönüllü sadelik", *Tüketici Yazıları* (III), 76-87.
- Beatty, Sharon E., Lynn R. Kahle, Pamela Homer, and Shekhar Misra (1985), "Alternative measurement approaches to consumer values: The list of values and the Rokeach value survey," *Psychology and Marketing*, 2 (3), 181-200.
- Bekin, Caroline, Marylyn Carrigan and Isabelle Szmigin (2005), "Defying marketing sovereignty: Voluntary simplicity at new consumption communities", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* 8(4): 413 – 429.
- Bengtson, Vern L. (1975), "Generation and family effects in value socialization", *American Sociological Review* 40: 358-71.
- Birchfield, Damon (2000), "Downshifting by design", *NZ Business* 14(4): 40-2.
- Blackwell, Roger D., Paul W. Miniard and James F. Engel (2001), *Consumer Behavior*, Harcourt College Publishers, Ft. Worth, Texas.
- Boujbel, Lilia, and Alain d'Astous (2012), "Voluntary simplicity and life satisfaction: Exploring the mediating role of consumption desires", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 11(6) , 487-494.
- Budden, Robert (2000), "Take charge of your own destiny: downshifting", *Financial Times*, 12 (January): 17.
- Business Dictionary, <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/lifestyle.html>
- Carman, James M. (1978), "Values and consumption patterns: A closed loop", in *NA - Advances in Consumer Research* Volume 05, Eds. Kent Hunt, Ann Abor, MI : Association for Consumer Research, 403-407.

- Caudron, Shari (1996), "Downshifting yourself", *Industry Week*, 245(10): 126-30.
- Cengiz, Hakan and Dennis W. Rook (2015), "Voluntary simplicity in the final rite of passage", (Ed. Dobscha, Susan) In *Death in a Consumer Culture*, Routledge, 123-134.
- Chaney, H el ene (1999), *Yaşam Tarzları*. (Çev. İrem Kutluk), Dost Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara.
- Cherrier, Helene (2009), "Anti- consumption discourses and consumer-resistant identities", *Journal of Business Research*, 62(2): 181-190.
- Cherrier, H el ene and Jeff B. Murray (2007), "Reflexive dispossession and the self: constructing a processual theory of identity", *Consumption Markets & Culture* 10(1):1-29.
- Craig-Lees, Margaret and Constance Hill (2002), "Understanding voluntary simplifiers", *Psychology & Marketing* 19(2): 187-210.
- Crosby, Lawrence A., Mary Jo Bitner and James D. Gill (1990), "Organizational structure of values", *Journal of Business Research* 20: 123-34
- Elgin, D. and Mitchell, A. (1977), "Voluntary simplicity," *The Co-Evolution Quarterly*, Summer: 4-18.
- Elgin, Duane (2000), The garden of simplicity, Retrieved from <http://duaneelgin.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/A-Garden-of-Simplicity.pdf>
- Elgin, Duane and Arnold Mitchell (1977a), "Voluntary simplicity: Lifestyle of the future?", *The Futurist* 11: 200-261.
- Elgin, Duane and Arnold Mitchell (1977b), "Voluntary simplicity", *The Co-Evolution Quarterly*, Summer 3: 4-19.
- Erdogmus, İrem and Ekin Karapınar (2015), "Understanding levels of voluntary simplicity in Turkey", *Boğaziçi Journal*, 29(2), 1-19.
- Etzioni, Amitai (1998), "Voluntary simplicity: characterization, select psychological implications, and societal consequences", *Journal of Economic Psychology* 19(5): 619-43.
- Etzioni, Amitai (2003), "Introduction: voluntary simplicity – psychological implications, societal consequences", in Doherty, D. and Etzioni, A. (Eds), *Voluntary Simplicity: Responding to Consumer Culture*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., Lanham, MD: 1-25.

- Feather, Norman T. (1973), "The measurement of values: effects of different assessment procedures", *Australian Journal of Psychology* 25:221-231.
- Feather, Norman T. (1975), *Values in Education and Society*. New York: The Free Press.
- Grigsby, Mary (2004), *Buying time and getting by: The voluntary simplicity movement*, State University of New York Press, New York.
- Groves, Robert M. and Robert L. Kahn (1979), *Surveys by Telephone: A National Comparison with Personal Interviews*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hamilton, Clive (2003). "Downshifting in Britain: A sea-change in the pursuit of happiness", *Discussion Paper*, No. 58. Canberra: The Australia Institute
- Homer, Pamela M., and Lynn R. Kahle (1988), "A structural equation test of the value-attitude-behavior hierarchy", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(4), 638-646
- Huneke, Mary E. (2005), "The face of the un-consumer: an empirical examination of the practice of voluntary simplicity in the United States", *Psychology and Marketing* 22: 527-50.
- Hung, Yu-Sui (2009), "A study on consumer behavior to lifestyles and product attributes: A case on wine products in Erlin township at Changhua county", *Master's thesis*, Master's Program of Landscape & Recreation, Feng Chia University.
- Iwata, Osamu (2006), "An evaluation of consumerism and lifestyle as correlates of a voluntary simplicity lifestyle", *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal* 34(5): 557-568.
- Johnston, Timothy C. and Jay B. Burton (2003), "Voluntary simplicity: definitions and dimensions", *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal* 7(1): 19-36.
- Kahle, Lynn R. (1980), "Stimulus condition self-selection by males in the interaction of locus of control and skill-chance situations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(1), 50-56.
- Kahle, Lynn R. ed. (1983), *Social values and social change: Adaptation to life in America*, New York: Praeger

- Kahle, Lynn R., Richard A. Kulka, and David M. Klingel (1980), "Low adolescent self-esteem leads to multiple interpersonal problems: A test of social-adaptation theory." *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 39 (3): 496-502
- Kaiser, Henry F. (1960), "The application of electronic computers to factor analysis", *Educational and psychological measurement*.
- Kaynak, Ramazan and Sevgi Ekşi (2011), "Ethnocentrism, religiosity, environmental and health consciousness: Motivators for anti-consumers," *Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics*, 4(8): 31-50.
- Kluckhohn, Florence R. and Fred L. Strodtbeck (1961), *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston IL: Row, Peterson and Co.
- Lastovicka, John L., Lance A. Bettencourt, Renee S. Hughner and Ronald J. Kuntze (1999), "Lifestyle of the tight and frugal: Theory and measurement", *Journal of Consumer Research* 26: 85–98.
- Lenski, Gerhard (1961). *The Religious Factor*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Leonard-Barton, Dorothy (1981), "Voluntary simplicity lifestyles and energy conservation", *Journal of Consumer Research* 8: 243-252.
- Leonard-Barton, Dorothy and Everett M. Rogers (1980), "Voluntary simplicity", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 07, eds. Jerry C. Olson, Ann Abor, MI : Association for Consumer Research, 28-34
- Lin, Yi, and Yu Shih (2012), "The relationship of university student's lifestyle, money attitude, personal value and their purchase decision", *International Journal of Research in Management*, 1(2), 19-37.
- Maslow, Abraham Harold (1970), *Motivation and personality*. 2nd Ed. Harper & Row, New York.
- Maslow, Abraham Harold (1943), "A theory of human motivation." *Psychological review* 50(4), 370-396
- Maslow, Abraham Harold (1968), "Some educational implications of the humanistic psychologies." *Harvard Educational Review* 38(4), 685-696.
- McDonald, Swonaidh, Caroline J. Oates, C. William Young and Kumju Hwang (2006), "Toward sustainable consumption: Researching voluntary simplifiers", *Psychology & Marketing* 23: 515–534.

- Mitchell, Olivia S. (1983), "Fringe benefits and the cost of changing jobs", *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 37(1): 70-78.
- Moisander, Johanna and Sinikka Pesonen (2002), "Narratives of sustainable ways of living: Constructing the self and the other as a green consumer", *Management Decision*, 40(4): 329-342.
- Moore, Michael (1975), "Rating versus ranking in the Rokeach Value Survey: An Israeli comparison", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 5:405-08.
- Mowen, John C. (1993), *Consumer Behavior*, Macmillan Publishing Company, Third Edition, New York.
- Moye, Letecia N. and Doris H. Kincade (2003), "Shopping orientation segments: exploring differences in store patronage and attitudes toward retail store environments among female apparel consumers", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 27(1): 58-71.
- Nunnally, Jum C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill
- Oates, Caroline, Seonaidh McDonald, Panayiota Alevizou, Kumju Hwang, William Young and Leigh-Ann McMorland (2008), "Marketing sustainability: Use of information sources and degrees of voluntary simplicity", *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 14(5): 351-365.
- Ottman, Jacquelyn (1995), "Today's consumers turning lean and green", *Marketing News* 29(23): 12-14.
- Özgül, Engin (2010), "Tüketicilerin değer yapıları, gönüllü sade yaşam tarzı ve sürdürülebilir tüketim üzerindeki etkileri", *HÜ İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 28(2): 117-150.
- Özgül, Engin (2011), "Tüketicilerin Sosyo-Demografik Özelliklerinin Hedonik Tüketim ve Gönüllü Sade Yaşam Tarzları Açısından Değerlendirilmesi", *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 11(1): 25-38.
- Özkan, Yasemin (2007), "Families' 'voluntary simple lifestyle' behaviours", *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy Social Sciences*, 2(3): 239-253
- Pepper, Miriam, Tim Jackson and David Uzzell (2009), "An examination of the values that motivate socially conscious and frugal consumer behaviors", *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 33: 126- 136.

- Piner, Kelly E., and Lynn R. Kahle (1984), "Adapting to the stigmatizing label of mental illness: Foregone but not forgotten." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47(4), 805-811.
- Rankin, William L. and Joel W. Grube (1980), "A comparison of ranking and rating procedures for value system measurement", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 10:233-46.
- Rokeach, Milton (1973), *The Nature of Human Values* (Vol. 438). New York: Free press.
- Roubanis, Jody L. (2008), "Comparison of environmentally responsible consumerism and voluntary simplicity lifestyle between US and Japanese female college students", *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* 37(2): 210-218.
- Schachter, Harvey (1997), "Forget the suit, get me an anvil: a growing number of executive renegades are finding satisfaction, and profits, in unconventional careers", *Canadian Business* 70(4): 68.
- Schermerhorn, J.R., J.G. Hunt and R.N. Osborn (1994), *Managing organizational behavior* (5th edition), Wiley, New York
- Schermerhorn, John R., James G. Hunt and Richard N. Osborn (1994), *Managing organizational behavior*. New York Wiley.
- Schor, Juliet B. (1998). *The overspent American: Why we want what we don't need*. Harper Collins, New York.
- Segal, Jerome M. (1996), "The politics of simplicity", *Tikkun*, 11(4), 20-7
- Shama, Avraham (1985), "The voluntary simplicity consumer", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 2(4), 57-63.
- Shama, Avraham and Joseph Wisenblit (1984), "Values of voluntary simplicity: Lifestyle and motivation", *Psychological Reports* 55: 231-240.
- Shaw, Deirdre and Terry Newholm (2002), "Voluntary simplicity and the ethics of consumption", *Psychology & Marketing* 19(2): 167-85.
- Solomon, Michael R. (1999), "The value of status and the status of value", in Holbrook, M.B. (Ed.), *Consumer Value: A Framework for Analysis and Research*, Routledge, London, pp. 63-84.

- Southerton, Dale, Elizabeth Shove and Alan Warde (2001), "Harried and hurried: Time shortage and co-ordination of everyday life". *CRIC Discussion Paper No. 47*, The University of Manchester and UMIST, Manchester.
- Stainfort, François, and Bridget C. Booske (2000), "Measuring post-decision satisfaction", *Medical Decision Making*, 20 (1), 51–61.
- Strong, Carolyn (1997), "The problems of translating fair trade principles into consumer purchase behavior", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* 15(1): 32-7.
- Thompson, Alex (2009), "Interpreting Kahle's list of values: Being respected, security, and self-fulfillment in context", *Journal of Undergraduate Research XII*
- TUIK (2015), *Ulusal eğitim istatistikleri veri tabanı*. available at <http://tuikaapp.tuik.gov.tr/adnksdagitapp/adnks.zul?kod=2>, accessed June 06, 2015.
- Turkyilmaz, Ceyda Aysuna and Aypar Uslu (2014), "The role of individual characteristics on consumers' counterfeit purchasing intentions: Research in fashion industry", *Journal of Management, Marketing and Logistics* 1(3): 259-275.
- Verhoef Peter C. (2003), "Understanding the effect of customer relationship management efforts on customer retention and customer share development", *Journal of marketing*, 67(4), 30-45.
- Vinson, Donald E., J. Michael Munson and Masao Nakanishi (1977), "An investigation of the Rokeach value survey for consumer research application", In Perreault, W.E. (Ed.), *Advances In Consumer Research* 4(1):247-252, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Williams, Robin M., Jr. (1968). Values. In E. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (pp. 283-287). New York: Macmillan
- Williams, Robin M., Jr. (1979), "Change and stability in values and value perspectives: A sociological perspective". In M. Rokeach (Ed), *Understanding human values: Individual and societal*. N.Y.: Free Press.
- Zavestoski, Stephen (2002a), "Guest editorial: Anti-consumption attitudes", *Psychology & Marketing* 19(2):121–6.
- Zavestoski, Stephen (2002b), "The socio-psychological bases of anticonsumption attitudes", *Psychology & Marketing* 19(2):149–58.