Studies on Social Science Insights
Yıl: 2025, Cilt: 5, Sayı: 2, ss. 46-76
http://dx.doi.org/10.53035/SOSSCI.128

Demographic Influences on Sustainable Consumption: The Role of Personality, Lifestyle and Motivation*

Sürdürülebilir Tüketim Üzerine Demografik Etkiler: Kişilik, Yaşam Tarzı ve Motivasyonun Rolü

Çalışma Başvuru Tarihi: 24.05.2025
Çalışma Kabul Tarihi: 23.06.2025
Çalışma Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Caner ÖNİZ** **Sabiha KILIÇ***** **Şükran KARACA******

Keywords:

Green Consumption Behavior, Demographic Segmentation, Psychographic Profiling, Consumer Typology.

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the question of how individual characteristics affect sustainable consumption behaviors. Within this scope, the study aims to examine individuals' lifestyles, personality traits, motivations, and sustainable consumption behaviors within the framework of demographic variables. Data collected from 518 participants using convenience sampling methods were analyzed using statistical software packages. The study, which included an Independent Sample T-Test, One-Way ANOVA, and Cluster Analysis, yielded the following results: Individuals' perceptions of lifestyle differ according to marital status, age, and occupation. Personality differs according to gender, marital status, age, education, and occupational groups. Motivations differ according to marital status and age, while no differences were observed in other variables. When examining the variation in sustainable consumption behavior according to demographic variables, it was observed that it differs according to marital status, age, education, and occupational groups. In addition, personality, lifestyle, motivations, and the sub-dimensions that constitute sustainable consumption were subjected to cluster analysis. The study, which used the hierarchical clustering method, divided individuals into two clusters: those with high and medium levels of awareness. The results of the cluster analysis revealed that the variable with the highest importance level was the self-efficacy variable from the multidimensional personality sub-dimensions, with an importance level of 100%. The variable with the lowest importance level was found to be the motivations dimension. Based on the study results, it was concluded that demographic differences could yield different results or show variations depending on the variables. Various recommendations were made based on the obtained results.

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Yeşil Tüketim Davranışı, Demografik Segmentasyon, Psikografik Profilleme, Tüketici Tipolojisi.

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, bireysel özelliklerin sürdürülebilir tüketim davranışlarını ne ölçüde etkilediği sorusuna odaklanmaktadır. Bu kapsamda yapılan çalışma bireylerin yaşam tarzı, kişilik özellikleri, güdüleri ve sürdürülebilir tüketim davranışlarının demografik değişkenler çerçevesinde incelenmesini amaçlamaktadır. 518 katılımcıdan kolayda örnekleme yöntemiyle toplanan veriler istatistik paket programları yardımıyla analiz edilmiştir. Bağımsız Örneklem T Testi ve Tek Yönlü Anova ve Kümeleme analizi yapılan çalışmada sonucunda şu sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır. Bireylerin Yaşam tarzı algıları medeni durum, yaş ve mesleklere göre farklılık göstermektedir. Kişilik ise cinsiyet, medeni durum, yaş, eğitim ve meslek gruplarına göre farklılık göstermektedir. Güdüler medeni durum ve yaşa göre farklılık gösterip diğer degişkenlerde farklılığa rastlanılamamıştır. Sürdürülebilir tüketim davranışının demografik degişkenlere göre değişimine bakıldığında medeni durum, yaş, eğitim ve meslek gruplarına göre farklılaştığı görülmüştür. Çalışmada ayrıca kişilik, yaşam tarzı, güdüler ve sürdürülebilir tüketimi oluşturan alt boyutlar itibariyle kümeleme analizine tabi tutulmuştur. Hiyerarşik kümeleme yöntemi kullanılan çalışma yüksek ve orta algı seviyesine sahip kişiler olarak iki kümeye ayrılmıştır. Kümeleme analizi sonucunda en yüksek önem derecesine sahip olan değişkenin çok yönlü kişilik alt boyutlarından öz yeterlilik değişkeni olduğu ve önem derecesinin %100 olduğu görülmüştür. En düşük önem derecesine sahip değişken ise güdüler boyutu olduğu analiz sonucunda ortaya çıkmıştır. Çalışma sonuçları itibariyle demografik farklılıkların degişkenlere göre farklı sonuçlar verebildiği veya değişiklik gösterebildiği sonucuna varılmıştır. Elde edilen sonuçlar doğrultusunda çeşitli önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

* This study is derived from the doctoral thesis entitled 'The Role of Motives in the Effect of Personality and Lifestyle on Sustainable Consumption', prepared in the Department of Business Administration at the Institute of Graduate Studies, Hitit University.

** Asst. Prof., Sivas Cumhuriyet University, School of Zara Veysel Dursun, coniz@cumhuriyet.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-7061-1518
*** Prof. Dr., Hitit University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, sabihakilic@hitit.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-0906-4567
**** Prof. Dr., Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Tourism, skaraca@cumhuriyet.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-0268-1810

1. INTRODUCTION

In modern society, consumption has become a phenomenon that not only fulfills individual needs but also assumes roles such as self-expression, happiness and social status. Consumption functions as a mechanism that regulates and categorizes social relations and is considered by some as a measure of success (Quoquab and Mohammad, 2016). This situation increases the importance of concepts such as sustainable consumption, environmental awareness, frugal behavior and creating non-consumption alternatives while providing a better quality life cycle.

Excessive and insatiable consumption, one of the biggest problems of the modern age, forms the basis of environmental problems caused by humanity itself. The problems that arise as a result of the responses of businesses to the consumption demands of individuals with production reach unpreventable dimensions (Ha et al., 2019). The increase in the level of consciousness of human beings brings along environmental and social concerns as well as the satisfaction of personal needs. In order to increase this level of awareness, it is necessary to carry out studies to raise awareness of both businesses and consumers in the field of sustainable consumption, as in all areas of sustainability (Ziesemer & Balderjahn, 2021; Ersoy, 2023). The dissemination and adoption of sustainable consumption behavior throughout the society is important in terms of caring about future consequences, feeling responsibility and raising awareness of individuals on this issue (Pealtie & Collins, 2009). These environmental problems and future concerns make it necessary to examine consumption behaviors in more detail and with environmental concerns (Zeynalova & Namazova, 2022). Recent studies have begun to establish a direct relationship between personality, lifestyle, and sustainability (Başak et al., 2017). However, these relationships have not been systematically examined in terms of demographics. In order to fill this gap, our study attempted to examine the concepts of personality, lifestyle, motivation, and sustainable consumption from a demographic perspective.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Consumer behavior is the key to society's impact on the environment. People's consumption choices vary, whether to consume certain products and services or to live differently from other people. These different choices have many direct and indirect impacts on both the environment and societal future. This is why the issue of sustainable consumption behavior has become an important topic for national and international policy. Understanding the seriousness of the issue of sustainable consumption behavior and the importance of every step

to be taken for future generations, bodies (governments, organizations and researchers) are working on this issue (Jackson, 2005).

In addition to the correct understanding of sustainable consumption, which is considered so important for future generations, other concepts that directly or indirectly affect this concept should also be understood. For this purpose, as one of the most important actors of sustainable consumption, the lifestyle personality, structures and motives of individuals are emphasized and demographic differences that directly affect these concepts are detailed.

Personality, lifestyle, and motivations are among the most fundamental psychological and sociological factors that shape an individual's consumption behavior. These concepts provide deep insights into understanding trends toward sustainable consumption. Personality reflects an individual's enduring traits and tendencies, such as sensitivity to environmental issues, while lifestyle is directly related to an individual's daily habits, value priorities, and social positioning. Lifestyle plays a particularly significant role in determining long-term behaviors that require ethical and environmental sensitivity, such as sustainable consumption. Motivations are the internal dynamics that drive an individual's behavior and are a key concept in explaining why an individual chooses sustainable products and which needs or values guide this choice.

When reviewing domestic and foreign literature, studies that analyze the effects of personality, lifestyle, and motivations on sustainable consumption in the context of their impact on sustainable consumption (Cleveland et al., 2005; Özgül, 2010; Minton et al., 2012; Ribeiro et al., 2016; Mataracı, 2017; Sarı and Topçuoğlu, 2019; Čapienė et al., 2021; Özdemir and Sunaoğlu, 2023), no study has been found that examines them together. Considering these three variables together enables a comprehensive perspective that is lacking in the literature, as well as a multidimensional and in-depth analysis of sustainable consumption.

2.1. Sustainable Consumption

According to the United Nations Environment Program (1995), sustainable consumption is defined as “not jeopardizing the needs of future generations by minimizing the use of natural resources and the emission of toxic substances and pollutants while using products that meet basic needs and improve the quality of life” (Jones, et al., 2011). The consumption-based economies of the modern age push businesses to produce and societies to consume. The increasing prosperity of both countries and individuals makes people more consuming individuals and this phenomenon continues at an increasing rate. As a result of this situation,

environmental problems erupt and this situation reaches unpreventable dimensions (Jeswiet, 2007). In this context, the examination of variables influencing the concept of sustainable consumption, which affects both present and future generations, constitutes one of the main objectives of the study. Sustainable consumption, which is directly influenced by consumer behaviors and arises as a response to their negative environmental impacts, encompasses various sustainable practices. For example, choosing a bicycle over a car, using a dishwasher instead of washing dishes with hot water, opting for a hybrid vehicle instead of a gasoline-powered sports car, or using public transportation during rush hours to reduce traffic congestion can all be considered sustainable behaviors (Hass et al., 2005). As it can be understood from here, sustainable consumption behavior is not not consuming but consuming wisely (Charter, et al., 2002; Ergen, 2016).

Sustainable consumption has become a concept that is increasingly influencing consumer preferences, purchasing behavior, and general consumption habits today. In this context, as emphasized by Čapienė et al. (2021), it is of great importance to identify the factors that can guide consumers toward sustainable consumption and to examine them according to demographic data. In this context, the concepts of lifestyle, personality and motive, which are thought to be related to sustainable consumption, have been mentioned. It is thought to be important in terms of understanding the effects of these concepts on sustainable consumption and giving an idea to those concerned about taking the necessary measures.

2.2. Lifestyle

The concept of lifestyle was first defined by the German sociologist, Max Weber, as “In general, lifestyle reflects the activities that show how people want to live” (Wilkie, 1994). Lifestyle is the reflection of the self-concept, which is expressed as an individual's self-knowledge, definition and self-perception, to the outside world. In the simplest terms, it is the answer to how we live. Our life experience, current conditions, economic, cultural and demographic structure, as well as our psychological state shape and reveal our lifestyle that we reflect to the external environment (Odabaşı & Barış, 2018). Lifestyle varies according to activities, ideas, interests and demographic variables (Plummer, 1974; Solomon et al., 2006). These differences shape individuals' consumption preferences and affect consumer behavior (Islamoğlu & Altunışık, 2003). Plummer (1974) explains this issue as “*individuals belonging to different social classes, having different cultures, different motives, different incomes have different interests, activities, attitudes and consumption behaviors*”.

Lifestyle is a fundamental concept that reflects an individual's values, way of life, and identity, while also shaping their consumption habits. Consumers' choices of which products to consume, which brands to prefer, and the meanings they attach to these preferences are largely dependent on their lifestyles (Holt, 1995).

Figueroa-García and colleagues (2018) concluded that educated individuals who feel the need to research products are more sensitive to the environmental and social impacts of the products they consume. It is stated that these consumers prefer ecological products and are even willing to pay higher prices for sustainable products. It is emphasized that all these behaviors reflect a transformation toward sustainability in individuals' lifestyles.

2.3. Personality Concept

When the literature is examined, although personality theorists have made personality definitions in line with their theoretical tendencies, it is difficult to make a consensual personality definition. Based on the definitions of personality, Cüceloğlu's (1990) definition of personality is as follows: “it is a consistent and structured form of relationship that an individual establishes with his/her inner and outer self, which makes him/her different from other individuals”. According to Doğan (2005), who refers to the social aspect of personality, all attitudes and behaviors of the individual in the environment in which he/she interacts are a reflection of his/her personality. When we look at the environmental factors that are effective in the formation of personality, we can list socio-cultural factors, familial factors, social structure and social class factors, and geographical and physical factors. While these factors affect personality, personality traits also significantly affect sustainable consumption behavior (Özdemir & Sunaoğlu, 2023). Öner (2020) tried to explain the relationship between sustainable consumption and personality with the concept of “ecological citizen”, which he defined as individuals who are aware of all citizenship duties and behaviors based on future generations and living things other than humans. In other words, it is said that personality is effective in environmental choice and being a sustainable consumer.

Personality is the set of enduring characteristics that shape an individual's ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving. The Five-Factor Personality Model (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness) developed by McCrae and Costa (1987) is frequently used in studies related to consumption behavior. In particular, it has been shown that personality traits such as “openness” make individuals more willing to try innovative products and engage in sustainable consumption practices. Additionally, research

has revealed that personality traits contribute to individuals making more responsible spending decisions by considering the future (Gleim et al., 2013).

2.4. Motives

The basic dimension of the modern marketing approach is to identify consumer needs and to create product and service mixes to meet these needs. The other dimension is to motivate consumers to meet these needs. The concept of motivation, whose word origin is motivation in French, is defined as something that activates. This situation appears in marketing as creating demand and directing the demand to purchase, mobilizing motives and directing consumption. From here, it is possible to express the main function of motivation as "directing consumer groups to purchasing activities by creating a balance of need and satisfaction" (Odabaşı & Barış, 2002).

Today, people tend to consume and buy irresponsibly, regardless of whether they need it or not, under the influence of their motives. In the modern age, people consume products that they do not need or need very little. In modern culture, where pleasure and passion have become more prominent, consumption has turned into an argument that represents the individual, introduces him/her and brings him/her to the forefront. While this irrepressible passion for consumption consumes today's environment and limited resources, it reaches an unsustainable point in terms of leaving a livable environment for future generations (Moreira et al., 2017).

In this context, it becomes more important to examine concepts such as motives, personality traits and lifestyle, which are thought to have a direct impact on sustainable consumption, with demographic differences. When the literature is examined, it is expected that the study will contribute to the literature in this respect since there is no study in which these concepts are analyzed together.

Motivations are internal or external sources of motivation that enable individuals to achieve specific goals. Consumption motivations can be based on various reasons such as meeting needs, gaining social status, or obtaining pleasure (Maslow, 1954). In this context, external motivations such as social norms and environmental influences play an important role in directing individuals toward sustainable products (Tybout et al., 2005).

Consumption behavior is shaped by the interaction of many individual factors such as personality traits, lifestyle, and motivations. Therefore, it is crucial to consider consumers' psychological and sociological structures for brands and marketing strategies to be more

effective. Analyzing personality traits, lifestyles, and individual motivations enables marketing activities to be structured in a more targeted, personalized, and effective manner. In this context, the examination of concepts such as motivations, personality traits, and lifestyle, which are thought to have a direct impact on sustainable consumption, in relation to demographic differences has become more important. Since no study has been found in the literature that analyzes these concepts together, this study is expected to contribute to the field from this perspective.

3. METHOD OF THE STUDY

The population of the study consists of individuals aged 18 and over living in Turkey. Within the scope of the study, 525 data were collected between 01.11.2021-01.05.2022 with the online survey technique to the people reached by convenience sampling method. After 7 erroneous data were eliminated from this data, 518 data were included in the study. SPSS program was used in the analysis of the data obtained.

The survey form employed in the study is composed of five distinct sections. In the first part, “Sustainable Consumption Behavior Scale” developed by Doğan, Bulut and Çımrın (2015), in the second part, “Multifaceted Action Personality Scale” developed by E. Côté (2002) and adapted by Atak, Kapçı and Çok (2013), in the third part, “Motivational Buying Tendency Scale” developed by Verplanken and Herabadi (2001), in the fourth part, scales developed by Walker and Hill-Polerecky (1996) and Sanchez et al. (1998) were used to measure lifestyle. In the fifth section of the questionnaire, questions regarding demographic characteristics are included. The statements in the scale were prepared on a 5-point Likert-type question and answer scale and the rating was made as “Strongly disagree” (1), ... Strongly agree” (5). The study was found ethically appropriate with the decision of “Hitit University Non-Interventional Research Ethics Committee” dated 09/12/2021 and numbered 2021-285.

4. FINDINGS

The demographic distribution table showing the number and percentages of 518 data collected by online method during the study period and accepted as error-free is presented.

Table 1. Socio-Demographic Distribution of Participants

Gender	f	%
Female	338	65,3
Male	180	34,7
Age	**f**	**%**
18- 24	207	40,0
25-34	159	30,7
35-44	104	20,1
45-54	38	7,3
55 and above	10	1,9
Education Level	**f**	**%**
Elementary School	16	3,1
Middle School	12	2,3
High School	155	29,9
Associate Degree	113	21,8
Bachelor's Degree	146	28,2
Master's Degree	61	11,8
Doctorate	15	2,9
TOTAL	**518**	**%100**

Marital Status	f	%
Married	228	44,0
Single	290	56,0
Occupation	**f**	**%**
Housewife	65	12,5
Student	185	35,7
Private Sector Employee	69	13,3
Retired	8	1,5
Public Sector Employee	138	26,6
Academic	21	4,1
Freelancer	11	2,1
Other	21	4,1
Monthly Income	**f**	**%**
Under 2400 TL	190	36,7
2400 TL-3499 TL	58	11,2
3500 TL-4999 TL	61	11,8
5000 TL-6499 TL	94	18,1
6500 TL-7999 TL	60	11,6
8000 TL and above	55	10,6
TOTAL	**518**	**%100**

As seen in Table 1, 65.3% of the participants were women and 34.7% were men. When the distribution of the participants among age groups is examined, the largest group consists of individuals aged 18–24 (40%), while the smallest group comprises 1.9% of individuals aged 55 and over. When we look at the distribution of the participants in terms of educational status, it is seen that 29.9% of the participants are high school graduates, 28.2% are bachelor's degree graduates, 2.9% are doctorate graduates and finally 2.3% are middle school graduates, which constitute the smallest group. 56% of the participants in the study were single. When we look at the occupational status of the study group; 35.7% are students and 26.6% are public employees.

Table 2. Data Related to Scale Items

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	AFA (Factor Load Range)	CFA	KMO	Total Explained Variance (%)	Explanation
Personality Scale	0,849	0,535-0,868	Acceptable Fit	0,815	63.286% (3 factors)	Strong internal consistency.
Lifestyle Scale	0,833	0,554-0,862	Acceptable Fit	0,859	55.423% (3 factors)	Very high reliability; no items were removed.
Motivations Scale	0,764	0,626-0,800	Acceptable Fit-Perfect Fit	0,820	50.100% (1 factor)	Reliability was ensured after item removal.
Sustainable Consumption Scale	0,879	0,535-0,868	Acceptable Fit	0,892	64.113% (3 factors)	Items with low correlation were removed, and analyses were repeated.

4.1. Difference Analyses of Lifestyle According to Demographic Variables

Table 3. Difference Analysis of Lifestyle Dimensions by Gender

	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	s.d	t	P
Communication and Spiritual Development	Female	338	4,21	,51	-,041	,967
	Male	180	4,21	,48		
Positivity	Female	338	3,97	,71	-,043	,966
	Male	180	3,97	,78		
Healthy Nutrition	Female	338	3,35	,82	-,892	,373
	Male	180	3,42	,85		
Lifestyle	Female	338	3,99	,46	-,381	,704
	Male	180	4,01	,47		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to determine the difference in the lifestyle dimensions of the participants according to gender, the difference in the dimensions of lifestyle sub-dimensions according to gender was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05). According to these results, it can be said that the sub-dimensions of the lifestyle scale do not differ according to the gender of the participants.

Table 4. Difference Analysis of Lifestyle Dimensions According to Marital Status

	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	s.d	t	p
Communication and Spiritual Development	Female	228	4,27	,47	2,406	,016*
	Male	290	4,16	,52		
Positivity	Female	228	4,04	,70	1,797	,074**
	Male	290	3,92	,76		
Healthy Nutrition	Female	228	3,46	,78	1,940	,053
	Male	290	3,32	,87		
Lifestyle	Female	228	4,06	,42	2,822	,005*
	Male	290	3,94	,49		

*p<0.05 **p<0.10

According to the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to determine the differences of the participants' lifestyle dimensions according to marital status, the difference in communication and spiritual development dimensions according to marital status was found statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=2,406; p<0.05). The communication and spiritual development perception dimensions of married people ($\bar{X}$=4,27) are higher than single people ($\bar{X}$=4,16). The difference in positivity dimensions according to marital status was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=1,797; p<0.05). The positivity perception dimensions of married people ($\bar{X}$=4,04) are higher than single people ($\bar{X}$=3,92). The difference in lifestyle dimensions according to marital status was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=2,822; p<0.05). Lifestyle perception dimensions of married people ($\bar{X}$=4,06) are higher than single people ($\bar{X}$=3,94). The difference in health nutrition sub-dimension dimensions according to marital status was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

Table 5. Difference Analysis of Lifestyle Dimensions According to Age Groups

	Age	n	$\bar{X}$	s.d	F	P	LSD
Communication and Spiritual Development	18- 24	207	4,13	,56	3,411	,009*	1-2 1-3
	25-34	159	4,23	,46			
	35-44	104	4,34	,46			
	45-54	38	4,19	,36			
	55-64	10	4,13	,47			
Positivity	18- 24	207	3,90	,76	2,123	,077	
	25-34	159	3,94	,75			
	35-44	104	4,14	,69			
	45-54	38	4,01	,66			
	55-64	10	4,10	,39			
Healthy Nutrition	18- 24	207	3,33	,87	,455	,769	
	25-34	159	3,41	,80			
	35-44	104	3,40	,89			
	45-54	38	3,50	,60			
	55-64	10	3,36	,59			
Lifestyle	18- 24	207	3,92	,51	2,992	,018*	1-3
	25-34	159	4,01	,43			
	35-44	104	4,11	,42			
	45-54	38	4,01	,35			
	55-64	10	3,96	,36			

*p<0,05
1: 18-24; 2: 25-34; 3: 35-44; 4: 45-54; 5: 55-64

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the difference between the age groups of the participants' lifestyle dimensions, the difference between the communication and spiritual development dimensions of the lifestyle sub-dimensions between the age groups was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=3,411; p<0.05). In order to determine the differentiation between the groups, the data were analyzed with the LSD test, one of the Post Hoc tests, since the data were homogeneously distributed. The difference in lifestyle dimensions between age groups was statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (F=2,992; p<0.05). According to the results of the Post Hoc test, the lifestyle dimensions of those in the age group 18-24 ($\bar{X}$=3.92) were lower than those in the 35-44 ($\bar{X}$=4.11) group. The difference in positivity and health nutrition sub-dimension dimensions between age groups was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

Table 6. Difference Analysis of Lifestyle Dimensions According to Educational Background

	Education Status	**n**	$\bar{X}$	**s.d**	**F**	**p**
Communication and Spiritual Development	Primary School	16	4,13	,66	1,390	,217
	Middle School	12	4,12	,23		
	High School	155	4,21	,47		
	Associate Degree	113	4,12	,56		
	License	146	4,23	,50		
	Master's Degree	61	4,33	,42		
	PhD	15	4,29	,50		
Positivity	Primary School	16	3,96	,84	1,064	,383
	Middle School	12	4,16	,38		
	High School	155	3,92	,73		
	Associate Degree	113	3,89	,85		
	License	146	4,04	,65		
	Master's Degree	61	4,09	,67		
	PhD	15	3,83	,97		
Healthy Nutrition	Primary School	16	3,35	,82	,632	,705
	Middle School	12	3,66	,94		
	High School	155	3,42	,85		
	Associate Degree	113	3,30	,90		
	License	146	3,39	,73		
	Master's Degree	61	3,39	,81		
	PhD	15	3,17	1,05		
Lifestyle	Primary School	16	3,94	,62	1,208	,301
	Middle School	12	4,02	,26		
	High School	155	4,00	,46		
	Associate Degree	113	3,91	,55		
	License	146	4,02	,41		
	Master's Degree	61	4,09	,39		
	PhD	15	3,99	,45		

According to the results of one-way ANOVA conducted to determine the difference in the participants' lifestyle dimensions according to their educational status, the difference in the dimensions of lifestyle sub-dimensions according to educational status was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level ($p>0.05$). According to these results, it can be said that the sub-dimensions of lifestyle do not differ according to educational status.

Table 7. Difference Analysis of Lifestyle Dimensions According to Occupational Groups

	Profession	**n**	$\bar{X}$	**s.d**	**F**	**p**	**Tamhae's T^2**
Communication and Spiritual Development	Housewife	65	4,24	,46	1,659	,117	
	Student	185	4,12	,56			
	Private Sector Employee	69	4,29	,42			
	Retired	8	4,26	,29			
	Public Employee	138	4,24	,46			
	Academician	21	4,29	,52			
	Self-employment	11	4,04	,38			
	Other	21	4,32	,53			
Positivity	Housewife	65	4,10	,73	1,477	,173	
	Student	185	3,85	,77			
	Private Sector Employee	69	4,00	,72			
	Retired	8	3,87	,58			
	Public Employee	138	4,04	,69			
	Academician	21	4,11	,66			
	Self-employment	11	3,81	,81			
	Other	21	4,09	,80			
Healthy Nutrition	Housewife	65	3,47	,71	1,144	,334	
	Student	185	3,30	,88			
	Private Sector Employee	69	3,34	,84			

	Retired	8	3,33	,66			
	Public Employee	138	3,45	,82			
	Academician	21	3,47	,89			
	Self-employment	11	2,96	,64			
	Other	21	3,58	,83			
Lifestyle	Housewife	65	4,06	,44	2,243	,030*	1-2 2-3 2-5 2-8
	Student	185	3,91	,51			
	Private Sector Employee	69	4,04	,41			
	Retired	8	4,00	,31			
	Public Employee	138	4,05	,41			
	Academician	21	4,09	,48			
	Self-employment	11	3,77	,27			
	Other	21	4,13	,50			

*p<0.05
1: Housewife; 2: Student; 3: Private Sector Employee; 4: Retired; 5: Public Employee; 6: Academic; 7: Self-Employed; 8: Other

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the difference between the occupational groups of the participants' lifestyle dimensions, the difference in lifestyle dimensions between occupational groups was found statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=2,243; p<0.05). In order to determine the differentiation between the groups, the data were analyzed with Tamhane's T2 test, one of the Post Hoc tests, since the data were not distributed homogeneously. The differences in communication and spiritual development, positivity and healthy eating sub-dimension dimensions between the occupational groups were not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

4.2. Analysis of Differences in Personality According to Demographic Variables

Table 8. Analysis of Differences in Personality Dimensions by Gender

	Gender	**n**	$\bar{X}$	**s.d**	**t**	**p**
Self-efficacy	Female	338	3,53	,81	-1,969	,049*
	Male	180	3,68	,79		
Life Purpose	Female	338	3,23	,82	-1,458	,145
	Male	180	3,35	,86		
Self Respect	Female	338	3,63	,64	-,663	,508
	Male	180	3,67	,79		
Personality	Female	338	3,47	,58	-1,897	,058
	Male	180	3,58	,64		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to determine the difference in the personality dimensions of the participants according to gender, the difference in the self-efficacy sub-dimension level according to gender was found statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=-1,969; p<0.05). Women ($\bar{X}$=3,53) had lower self-efficacy dimensions than men ($\bar{X}$=3,68). The difference in life purpose, self-esteem and personality dimensions according to gender was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

Table 9. Difference Analysis of Personality Dimensions According to Marital Status

	Marital Status	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d	t	p
Self-efficacy	Married	228	3,71	,67	3,356	,001*
	Single	290	3,48	,89		
Life Purpose	Married	228	3,36	,70	2,135	,033*
	Single	290	3,21	,92		
Self Respect	Married	228	3,67	,63	,620	,536
	Single	290	3,63	,74		
Personality	Married	228	3,59	,51	2,882	,004*
	Single	290	3,44	,66		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to determine the differences in the personality dimensions of the participants according to marital status, the difference in the self-efficacy dimensions of the personality sub-dimensions according to marital status was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=3,356; p<0.05). The difference in life purpose dimensions according to marital status was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=2,135; p<0.05). The difference in personality dimensions according to marital status was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=2,882; p<0.05). The difference in self-esteem sub-dimension level according to marital status was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

Table 10. Difference Analysis of Personality Dimensions According to Age Groups

	Age	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d	F	p	Difference
Self-efficacy	18- 24	207	3,46	,85	3,388	,009*	1-4
	25-34	159	3,61	,85			
	35-44	104	3,65	,71			
	45-54	38	3,91	,53			
	55-64	10	3,87	,46			
Life Purpose	18- 24	207	3,14	,96	2,796	,026*	1-4
	25-34	159	3,35	,72			
	35-44	104	3,32	,74			
	45-54	38	3,54	,73			
	55-64	10	3,40	,84			
Self Respect	18- 24	207	3,59	,76	1,032	,390	
	25-34	159	3,66	,64			
	35-44	104	3,66	,70			
	45-54	38	3,84	,57			
	55-64	10	3,66	,64			
Personality	18- 24	207	3,40	,67	3,985	,003*	1-2
	25-34	159	3,55	,56			1-3
	35-44	104	3,55	,55			1-4
	45-54	38	3,78	,48			2-4
	55-64	10	3,67	,54			3-4

*p<0.05
1: 18-24 years; 2: 25-34 years; 3: 35-44 years; 4: 45-54 years; 5: 55-64 years and above

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the difference between the age groups of the personality dimensions of the participants, the difference between the self-efficacy dimensions of the personality sub-dimensions between the age groups was found statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=3,388; p<0.05). In order to determine the differentiation between the groups, the data were analyzed with

Tamhane's T2 test, one of the Post Hoc tests, since the data were not distributed homogeneously. The difference in life purpose dimensions between age groups was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=2,796; p<0.05). The difference in personality dimensions between age groups was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=3,985; p<0.05). The difference in self-esteem dimensions of the participants according to age groups was not statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

Table 11. Difference Analysis of Personality Dimensions According to Educational Background

	Education Status	**n**	$\bar{X}$	**s.d**	**F**	**P**	**LSD**
Self-efficacy	Primary School	16	3,93	1,01	1,739	,110	
	Middle School	12	3,54	,68			
	High School	155	3,49	,84			
	Associate Degree	113	3,59	,81			
	License	146	3,54	,78			
	Master's Degree	61	3,75	,77			
	PhD	15	3,90	,49			
Life Purpose	Primary School	16	3,50	,77	,690	,658	
	Middle School	12	3,16	,98			
	High School	155	3,19	,90			
	Associate Degree	113	3,35	,88			
	License	146	3,26	,83			
	Master's Degree	61	3,33	,60			
	PhD	15	3,33	,62			
Self Respect	Primary School	16	3,56	,90	3,274	,004*	1-2
	Middle School	12	3,02	,92			3-2
	High School	155	3,56	,74			4-2
	Associate Degree	113	3,62	,67			5-2
	License	146	3,73	,65			6-2
	Master's Degree	61	3,78	,51			7-2
	PhD	15	3,93	,65			3-5
Personality	Primary School	16	3,69	,76	1,904	,078	
	Middle School	12	3,27	,74			
	High School	155	3,42	,65			
	Associate Degree	113	3,53	,62			
	License	146	3,52	,57			
	Master's Degree	61	3,63	,46			
	PhD	15	3,74	,48			

*p<0.05 1: Primary School; 2: Secondary School; 3: High School; 4: Associate's Degree; 5: Bachelor's Degree; 6: Master's Degree; 7: Doctorate

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the difference in the personality dimensions of the participants according to their educational status, the difference in self-esteem dimensions between the educational groups was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=3,274; p<0.05). In order to determine the differentiation between the groups, the data were analyzed with the LSD test, one of the Post Hoc tests, since the data were homogeneously distributed. According to the results of the Post Hoc test, the self-esteem dimensions of those whose educational status is secondary school ($\bar{X}$=3.02) and primary school and high school ($\bar{X}$=3.56) are lower than the participants in the associate degree ($\bar{X}$=3.62), undergraduate ($\bar{X}$ =3.73), master's ($\bar{X}$ =3.78), doctorate ($\bar{X}$=3.93) groups.

Table 12. Difference Analysis of Personality Dimensions According to Occupational Groups

	Profession	**n**	$\bar{X}$	**s.d**	**F**	**p**	**Tamhane's T^2**
Self-efficacy	Housewife	65	3,70	,62	1,938	,062	
	Student	185	3,46	,85			
	Private Sector Employee	69	3,54	,93			
	Retired	8	3,90	,35			
	Public Employee	138	3,61	,76			
	Academician	21	3,69	,81			
	Self-Employed	11	4,13	,60			
	Other	21	3,76	,86			
Life Purpose	Housewife	65	3,35	,68	2,798	,007*	2-3 4-6
	Student	185	3,14	,93			
	Private Sector Employee	69	3,55	,87			
	Retired	8	3,75	,29			
	Public Employee	138	3,28	,74			
	Academician	21	3,14	,53			
	Self-Employed	11	3,63	,87			
	Other	21	3,06	,98			
Self Respect	Housewife	65	3,61	,60	1,141	,336	
	Student	185	3,59	,73			
	Private Sector Employee	69	3,80	,72			
	Retired	8	3,66	,43			
	Public Employee	138	3,64	,68			
	Academician	21	3,88	,57			
	Self-Employed	11	3,63	,80			
	Other	21	3,52	,81			
Personality	Housewife	65	3,57	,47	1,983	,056	
	Student	185	3,40	,66			
	Private Sector Employee	69	3,62	,65			
	Retired	8	3,78	,27			
	Public Employee	138	3,52	,57			
	Academician	21	3,58	,49			
	Self-Employed	11	3,83	,61			
	Other	21	3,48	,58			

*p<0.05
1: Housewife; 2: Student; 3: Private Sector Employee; 4: Retired; 5: Public Employee; 6: Academic; 7: Self-Employed; 8: Other

According to the results of the one-way anova analysis conducted to determine the difference in the personality dimensions of the participants according to their occupational groups, the difference in the life purpose dimensions between the occupational groups was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=2,798; p<0.05). In order to determine the differentiation between the groups, the data were analyzed with the LSD test, one of the Post Hoc tests, since the data were homogeneously distributed. The difference in the dimensions of environmental awareness, reusability, and sustainable consumption behavior according to occupational groups was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

4.3. Difference Analyses of Motives According to Demographic Variables

Table 13. Difference Analysis of Motives Level by Gender

	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	s.d	t	P
Motives	Female	338	3,05	,75	1,466	,143
	Male	180	2,95	,73		

*p<0.05 1: Female; 2: Male

According to the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to determine the difference of the participants' motives dimensions according to gender, the difference of motives dimensions according to gender was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05). In other words, it can be said that the motives of the participants do not differ according to gender.

Table 14. Difference Analysis of Motives Level According to Marital Status

	Marital Status	n	$\bar{X}$	s.d	t	p
Motives	Married	228	2,91	,67	-2,791	,005*
	Single	289	3,10	,79		

*p<0.05 1: Married; 2: Single

According to the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to determine the difference of the participants' motive dimensions according to marital status, the difference was found statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=-2791; p<0.05). According to these results, participants' motives vary depending on whether they are married or single. In other words, it can be said that the motives of single participants have a higher average than those of married participants.

Table 15. Difference Analysis of Motives Level According to Age Groups

	Age	n	$\bar{X}$	s.d	F	p	LSD
Motives	18- 24	207	3,13	,78	3,280	,011*	1-3 1-4 1-5
	25-34	159	3,01	,75			
	35-44	104	2,89	,67			
	45-54	38	2,86	,70			
	55-64	10	2,60	,49			

*p<0.05
1: 18-24 years; 2: 25-34 years; 3: 35-44 years; 4: 45-54 years; 5: 55-64 years and above

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the difference between the age groups of the participants at the level of motives, the difference between the age groups was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=3,280; p<0.05). At the level of motives, it can be said that the average of the participants aged 18-24 is higher than the average of the participants aged 35-44, 45-54 and 55-64. In other words, it can be said that the motivation level of participants aged 55-64 is low.

Table 16. Difference Analysis of Motives Level According to Education Level

	Education Status	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d	F	p
Motives	Primary School	16	3,03	,70	,545	,774
	Middle School	12	2,81	,78		
	High School	155	3,04	,76		
	Associate Degree	113	3,02	,82		
	License	146	3,00	,75		
	Master's Degree	61	3,07	,61		
	PhD	15	2,75	,59		

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the difference in the sustainable motive dimensions of the participants according to their educational status, the difference in the motive dimensions between the educational groups was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level ($p<0.05$). Accordingly, it can be said that the motivation level does not show any difference according to educational status.

4.4. Difference Analyses of Sustainable Consumption Behavior According to Demographic Variables

Table 17. Difference Analysis of Sustainable Consumption Behavior by Gender

	Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d	t	p
Environmental Awareness	Female	338	3,47	,77	1,427	,154
	Male	180	3,37	,78		
Savings	Female	338	3,94	,79	,907	,365
	Male	180	3,88	,88		
Reusability	Female	338	3,60	,77	1,271	,204
	Male	180	3,51	,75		
Sustainable Consumption Behavior	Female	338	3,66	,63	1,507	,133
	Male	180	3,57	,62		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to determine the difference in the sustainable consumption behavior dimensions of the participants according to gender, the difference in the dimensions of sustainable consumption behavior sub-dimensions according to gender was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level ($p>0.05$). It can be said that all sub-dimensions of sustainable consumption behavior do not differ according to the gender of the participants.

Table 18. Difference Analysis of Sustainable Consumption Behavior According to Marital Status

	Marital Status	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d	t	p
Environmental Awareness	Married	228	3,47	,73	1,060	,290
	Single	290	3,40	,80		
Savings	Married	228	4,19	,69	7,051	,000*
	Single	290	3,71	,86		
Reusability	Married	228	3,63	,69	1,552	,121
	Single	290	3,52	,81		
Sustainable Consumption Behavior	Married	228	3,75	,54	4,010	,000*
	Single	290	3,53	,68		

*p<0.05

According to the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to determine the difference in the lifestyle dimensions of the participants according to marital status, the difference in the savings sub-dimension dimensions according to marital status was found statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=7,051; p<0.05). The savings dimensions of those who are married ($\overline{X}$ =4.19) are higher than those who are single ($\overline{X}$ =3.71). The difference dimensions of sustainable consumption behavior sub-dimensions according to marital status were statistically significant at 95% confidence level (t=4,010; p<0.05). Those who are married ($\overline{X}$=3.75) have higher dimensions of sustainable consumption behavior than those who are single ($\overline{X}$ =3.52). The difference of environmental awareness and reusability sub-dimension dimensions according to marital status was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

Table 19. Analysis of Differences in Sustainable Consumption by Age Groups

	Age	n	$\overline{X}$	s.d	F	P	LSD
Environmental Awareness	18- 24	207	3,38	,80	3,980	,003*	1-4 1-5 2-4 2-5
	25-34	159	3,34	,77			
	35-44	104	3,51	,73			
	45-54	38	3,77	,68			
	55-64	10	3,94	,40			
Savings	18- 24	207	3,65	,83	12,845	,000*	1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5 2-3
	25-34	159	3,97	,79			
	35-44	104	4,24	,73			
	45-54	38	4,23	,75			
	55-64	10	4,37	,48			
Reusability	18- 24	207	3,54	,80	2,038	,088	
	25-34	159	3,48	,75			
	35-44	104	3,72	,66			
	45-54	38	3,72	,80			
	55-64	10	3,50	,59			
Sustainable Consumption Behavior	18- 24	207	3,51	,67	6,899	,000*	1-3 1-4 1-5 2-3 2-4 2-5
	25-34	159	3,58	,60			
	35-44	104	3,80	,56			
	45-54	38	3,91	,57			
	55-64	10	3,97	,37			

*p<0,05
1: 18-24; 2: 25-34; 3: 35-44; 4: 45-54; 5: 55-64

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the difference between the age groups of the sustainable consumption behavior dimensions of the participants, the difference between the age groups in environmental sensitivity dimensions was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=3,980; p<0.05). In order to determine the differentiation between the groups, the data were analyzed with the LSD test, one of the Post Hoc tests, since the data were homogeneously distributed. The difference in savings dimensions between age groups was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=12,845; p<0.05). The difference in sustainable consumption behavior dimensions between age groups was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=6,899; p<0.05). The

difference in reusability dimensions between age groups was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

Table 20. Difference Analysis of Sustainable Consumption Behavior According to Educational Background

	Education Status	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d	F	p	LSD
Environmental Awareness	Primary School	16	4,03	,79	1,919	,076	
	Middle School	12	3,53	,84			
	High School	155	3,39	,74			
	Associate Degree	113	3,48	,81			
	License	146	3,39	,76			
	Master's Degree	61	3,37	,73			
	PhD	15	3,50	,84			
Savings	Primary School	16	4,21	,98	4,137	000*	1-3
	Middle School	12	3,77	1,02			5-3
	High School	155	3,73	,80			6-3
	Associate Degree	113	3,82	,91			7-3
	License	146	4,05	,76			4-1
	Master's Degree	61	4,14	,68			4-5
	PhD	15	4,31	,57			4-6 4-7
Reusability	Primary School	16	4,02	,77	2,289	,034*	1-2
	Middle School	12	3,61	,99			1-3
	High School	155	3,49	,69			1-4
	Associate Degree	113	3,60	,92			1-5
	License	146	3,61	,71			1-6
	Master's Degree	61	3,41	,61			3-7
	PhD	15	3,93	,74			6-7
Sustainable Consumption Behavior	Primary School	16	4,09	,78	2,562	,019*	1-3 1-4 1-5 1-6 3-7
	Middle School	12	3,63	,79			
	High School	155	3,53	,58			
	Associate Degree	113	3,62	,75			
	License	146	3,67	,57			
	Master's Degree	61	3,64	,52			
	PhD	15	3,88	,64			

*p<0,05
1: Primary School; 2: Secondary School; 3: High School; 4: Associate Degree; 5: Bachelor's Degree; 6: Master's Degree; 7: Doctorate

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the difference between the sustainable consumption behavior dimensions of the participants according to their educational status, the difference between the education groups in terms of savings dimensions was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=4,137; p<0.05). The difference in reusability dimensions between education groups was statistically significant at 95% confidence level (F=2,289; p<0.05). The difference between the dimensions of sustainable consumption behavior between the education groups was statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (F=2,562; p<0.05). The difference in the dimensions of environmental sensitivity sub-dimension between the education groups was not statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (p>0.05).

Table 21. Difference Analysis of Sustainable Consumption Behavior According to Occupational Groups

	Profession	**n**	$\bar{X}$	**s.d**	**F**	**p**	**LSD**
Environmental Awareness	Housewife	65	3,53	,72	1,134	,340	
	Student	185	3,40	,81			
	Private Sector Employee	69	3,53	,93			
	Retired	8	3,90	,26			
	Public Employee	138	3,36	,68			
	Academician	21	3,50	,89			
	Self-Employed	11	3,63	,53			
	Other	21	3,31	,70			
Savings	Housewife	65	4,16	,62	5,681	,000*	2-1 2-3 2-4 2-5 2-6
	Student	185	3,65	,83			
	Private Sector Employee	69	4,02	,85			
	Retired	8	4,34	,44			
	Public Employee	138	4,05	,78			
	Academician	21	4,33	,72			
	Self-Employed	11	3,95	,67			
	Other	21	3,88	1,10			
Reusability	Housewife	65	3,61	,67	,420	,890	
	Student	185	3,56	,79			
	Private Sector Employee	69	3,65	,76			
	Retired	8	3,45	,43			
	Public Employee	138	3,51	,72			
	Academician	21	3,69	,78			
	Self-Employed	11	3,69	,80			
	Other	21	3,55	1,08			
Sustainable Consumption Behavior	Housewife	65	3,76	,52	2,027	,050	
	Student	185	3,52	,68			
	Private Sector Employee	69	3,72	,68			
	Retired	8	3,93	,16			
	Public Employee	138	3,62	,56			
	Academician	21	3,82	,68			
	Self-Employed	11	3,75	,38			
	Other	21	3,56	,74			

*p<0.05
1: Housewife; 2: Student; 3: Private Sector Employee; 4: Retired; 5: Public Employee; 6: Academic; 7: Self-Employed; 8: Other

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA conducted to examine differences in the sustainable consumption behavior dimensions of participants across occupational groups, a statistically significant difference was found in the saving dimension among occupational groups at the 95% confidence level ($F = 5.681$; $p < 0.05$). The difference in the dimensions of environmental awareness, reusability, and sustainable consumption behavior according to occupational groups was not statistically significant at 95% confidence level ($p>0.05$).

5. CLUSTER ANALYSIS

Cluster analysis is used to classify individuals or phenomena into different clusters according to their basic characteristics. In this analysis method, which divides complex and very large data into clusters using multivariate analysis method, objects that are very similar to each other are grouped into the same cluster. Thus, homogeneity of variables within each cluster

and heterogeneity between clusters are maximized (Karagöz, 2019, p. 961). In clustering analysis, there is no superiority or relative difference between variables (Akın, 2008, p. 6).

Cluster analysis was conducted with the sub-dimensions of personality, lifestyle, motives and sustainable consumption. Hierarchical clustering method was used in the clustering analysis and the number of clusters was determined as 2. As a result of the clustering analysis, it was determined that the variable with the highest degree of importance was the self-efficacy variable from the multidimensional personality sub-dimensions and its degree of importance was 100%. The variable with the lowest degree of importance is the motives dimension. When the clusters are examined in detail, it is seen that cluster 1 consists of 268 people (54.4%) and cluster 2 consists of 225 people (45.6%).

All variables and sub-dimensions within the scope of the study were analyzed by clustering analysis together with demographic variables. In the clustering analysis, 8 variables were added in the variables and demographic dimension. At the end of the analysis, the success and validity of the clustering was evaluated with the Silhouette Index.

5.1. Clustering Analysis of Personality and Demographic Variables

The personality sub-dimensions of self-efficacy, life purpose, self-esteem and demographic variables such as gender, age, educational status, marital status and occupation were subjected to cluster analysis. As a result of the clustering analysis, it was determined that the variable with the highest degree of importance was age and its degree of importance was 100%. The variable with the lowest degree of importance is self-esteem in the personality sub-dimension (1%).

When the clusters are analyzed in detail, it is seen that cluster 1 is 316 people (61%) and cluster 2 is 202 people (39%). It was observed that the variable frequencies were high in cluster 1 and medium in cluster 2. Therefore, cluster 1 was named as “those with high personality perception” and cluster 2 as “those with moderate personality perception”.

Cluster with high personality perception: It consists of those who have high participation in the dimensions of self-efficacy (3.69), self-esteem (3.68), life purpose (3.37), female (60.4%), 25-34 years old, (49.1%), bachelor's degree (36.4%), married (72.2%) and public employee (42.4%).

Those with medium cluster personality perception: Self-efficacy (3.44), self-esteem (3.61), and life purpose (3.13) as personality sub-dimensions, with high participation in the

dimensions, are female (72.8%), between the ages of 18-24, (49.1%), high school graduates (45.5%), single (100%) and students (84.2%).

5.2. Cluster Analysis of Lifestyle and Demographic Variables

Lifestyle communication and spiritual development, positivity and healthy eating sub-dimensions and demographic variables such as gender, age, educational status, marital status and occupation were subjected to cluster analysis. As a result of the clustering analysis, it was determined that the variable with the highest degree of importance was age and the degree of importance was 100%. The variable with the lowest degree of importance was healthy eating in the lifestyle sub-dimension (1%).

When the clusters are analyzed in detail, it is seen that cluster 1 is 310 people (59.8%) and cluster 2 is 208 people (40.2%). It was observed that variable frequencies were high in cluster 1 and medium in cluster 2. For this reason, cluster 1 was named as “those with a high level of lifestyle perception” and cluster 2 as “those with a moderate level of lifestyle perception”.

The cluster has a high level of lifestyle perception: It consists of women (59.7%), 25-34 years old, (47.4%), bachelor's degree graduates (36.1%), married (73.2%) and public employees (44.2%) who have high participation in the dimensions of communication and spiritual development (4.27), positivity (4.05), healthy eating (3.42) as lifestyle sub-dimensions.

Cluster lifestyle perception is at a medium level: As lifestyle sub-dimensions, communication and spiritual development (4.13), positivity (3.87), healthy eating (3.33), high participation in the dimensions, female (73.6%), 18-24 age range, (94.2%), high school graduate (44.7%), single (99.5%) and student (83.7%).

5.3. Cluster Analysis of Sustainable Consumption and Demographic Variables

As a result of the cluster analysis, it was determined that the variable with the highest degree of importance was age and the degree of importance was 100%. The variables with the lowest degree of importance were reusability and environmental sensitivity in the sustainable consumption sub-dimension (0%).

When the clusters are analyzed in detail, it is seen that cluster 1 is 207 people (40%) and cluster 2 is 311 people (60%). It was observed that the variable frequencies were at a medium level in cluster 1 and at a high level in cluster 2. For this reason, cluster 1 was named as

"those with moderate sustainable consumption perception" and cluster 2 as "those with high sustainable consumption perception".

Cluster with moderate sustainable consumption perception: Consists of women (73.4%), between the ages of 18-24, (95.2%), high school graduates (44.9%), single (99%), students (84.1%), (95.2%), with high participation in the dimensions of saving (3.67), reusability (3.55), environmental awareness (3.42) as sustainable consumption sub-dimensions.

The cluster has a high perception of sustainable consumption: The respondents with high participation in the sustainable consumption sub-dimensions of saving (4.09), reusability (3.59), environmental awareness (3.45), are female (59.8%), between the ages of 25-34, (47.9%), bachelor's degree (33.6%), married (72.7%), and public employees (44.1%).

5.4. Cluster Analysis of Motives and Demographic Variables

Along with motives, demographic variables such as gender, age, education level, marital status and occupation were subjected to cluster analysis.

As a result of the clustering analysis, it was determined that the variable with the highest degree of importance was age, and its degree of importance was 100%. The variables with the lowest degree of importance were Motives (1%).

When the clusters are analyzed in detail, it is seen that cluster 1 is 326 people (62.9%) and cluster 2 is 192 people (37.1%). It was observed that the variable frequencies were at a medium level in cluster 1 and at a high level in cluster 2. For this reason, cluster 1 was named as "those with medium level of motive perception" and cluster 2 as "those with high level of motive perception".

Cluster with moderate motive perception*:* Motives (2.97), female (60.1%), 25-34 years old, (47.5%), undergraduate (37.1%), married (69.9%), public employee (42.0%).

Those with high cluster motive perception: Motives (3.10), female (74%), 18-2 years old, (97.9%), high school (47.4%), single (100%), and students (88.5%).

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study population consists of individuals aged 18 and over living in Turkey, with the aim of examining whether lifestyle, personality, sustainable consumption behavior, and motivations differ according to demographic characteristics. The sample consists of a total of 518 individuals selected using convenience sampling. Within the scope of the study, scales that have been tested for validity and reliability in previous local and foreign literature were

used. To test whether participants' demographic variables differ according to lifestyle, personality, motivations, and sustainable consumption behavior, an Independent Samples T-Test and One-Way ANOVA analysis were performed.

According to the results of the analysis conducted to test whether participants' lifestyles differed according to demographic characteristics, no difference was found in terms of gender and education level, while differences were found in terms of marital status, age, income level, and occupation. When reviewing the relevant literature and examining similar results, the study conducted by Barutçu Türkmen et al. (2017) concluded that individuals who adopt a voluntary simple lifestyle, a type of lifestyle, have a significant effect on consumption-oriented attitudes and behavioral intentions. Similarly, in studies conducted by Figueroa-García et al. (2018), it was emphasized that the lifestyles chosen by individuals directly affect sustainable consumption. Sustainable consumption requires not only adopting a lifestyle in harmony with nature and society but also developing an accountable attitude toward the environment and society (Tripathi & Singh, 2016). In this regard, many consumers who are aware of the impact of environmental issues on lifestyles and consumption behaviors are demonstrating an increasing sense of responsibility (Sung & Woo, 2019; Laroche et al., 2001; Balázsné Lendvai et al., 2022). Indeed, consumers are behaving more consciously in terms of environmental sustainability, green consumption, and production (Ali et al., 2023; Yemez & Delice Akca, 2024).

Participants' personality levels differ according to gender, marital status, age, education, and occupational groups, but do not show a significant difference according to income level. These results are supported by the relevant literature. Kavak and Naldöken (2024) found significant differences between sociodemographic variables such as gender, age, and occupational group and personality traits in a study on health professionals, but did not find any significant differences based on income levels. However, studies by Çoban and Bükeç (2021) and Gürbüz and Bozkurt (2022) have shown opposite results. In these studies, it was concluded that there were no significant differences between personality traits and demographic variables in terms of gender, marital status, and educational status. When the literature is evaluated in general, it is seen that there are differences according to sociodemographic variables such as gender, marital status, age, education, and occupation.

While a significant difference was found in the motivations of the participants according to marital status and age, no significant difference was found according to gender, education, income level, and occupational groups. Whether motivations differ according to gender,

marital status, age, education, and occupation, but not according to income level, has become a topic of debate in the literature. Karademir (2023) noted that the study did not find a significant difference in motivation according to income distribution, but that motivation was not mentioned in relation to educational status and gender. There are studies that have reached different conclusions from the current study. These studies have concluded that income level affects motivation (Pulana & Perez, 2022; Wang et al., 2022). In conclusion, while there are studies in the literature indicating that motivation varies according to gender, marital status, age, education, and occupational change, it appears that income level does not have a significant effect and that there are various views related to individual experiences.

Finally, it has been determined that sustainable consumption behavior varies according to marital status, age, education, income level, and occupational groups, but does not vary according to gender. Studies in the literature show that sustainable consumption behavior varies according to age, education, income level, and occupational status, but no difference is seen according to gender. This situation reveals that various demographic variables are related to sustainable consumption. Looking at related studies, a development by Karaca (2018) shows that demographic variables such as age, education, income, and occupation show significant differences in sustainable consumption. However, it has been stated that marital status only affects lifestyle. This finding suggests that demographic variables other than gender may strengthen sustainable consumption behavior. In contrast, Altın (2023) emphasizes that gender has a significant effect on sustainability-related behaviors. Additionally, they argue that women have a higher level of sustainability awareness than men. While this shows that there are different views in the literature regarding the effect of gender on sustainable consumption, no significant differences were found in terms of other variables such as marital status, age, education, income level, and occupation. These results indicate that the effect of gender on sustainable consumption needs to be examined in greater depth.

Additionally, a cluster analysis was conducted on personality, lifestyle, motivations, and the sub-dimensions that constitute sustainable consumption.

When we look at the results of the cluster analysis related to personality; in the cluster named those with high personality perception, the cluster consists of those who have high participation in the dimensions of self-efficacy (3.69), self-esteem (3.68), life purpose (3.37), who are female (60.4%), in the 25-34 age range, (49.1%), bachelor's degree (36.4%), married (72.2%), and public employee (42.4%).

When the clustering analysis results related to lifestyle are examined; in the cluster named those with a high level of lifestyle perception; communication and spiritual development (4.27), positivity (4.05), healthy eating (3.42), high participation in the dimensions, female (59.7%), 25-34 age range, (47.4%), bachelor's degree (36.1%), married (73.2%) and public employee (44.2%).

In the cluster named those with a high perception of sustainable consumption; the cluster consists of women (59.8%), 25-34 age range, (47.9%), bachelor's degree (33.6%), married (72.7%) and public employees (44.1%) who have high participation in the dimensions of saving (4.09), reusability (3.59) and environmental awareness (3.45).

In the cluster named those with high motive perception; motives (3,10), female (74%), 18-24 years old, (97,9%), high school (47,4%), single (100%) and student (88,5%).

In line with the results obtained within the scope of the study, the following suggestions can be made:

Businesses can carry out promotion activities for groups with high perceptions of sustainable consumption and which can be determined as the target audience; public personnel, 25-34 years old, married, undergraduate graduates, and women. Businesses can carry out promotion activities for groups that are understood as a result of the study to have high motivational perceptions through the motives that mobilize people; students, 18-24 years old, single, high school graduates. Businesses should identify the motives that drive people in order to continue marketing their goods and services in the future and to make more sales.

Considering the limitations of the study, the fact that it was conducted within a short period of time and that the data was collected online constitutes a limitation of the study. In addition, the fact that the study sample was based on a single culture and language can also be considered another limitation of the study.

REFERENCES

Akın, Y. K. (2008). *Clustering algorithms and cluster analysis in data mining* (Doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey.

Ali, A., Xiaoling, G., Ali, A., Sherwani, M., & Muneeb, F.M. (2019). Customer motivations for sustainable consumption: Investigating the drivers of purchase behavior for a green-luxury car. *Busines Strategy and the Environment*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2284

Altın, S. (2023). Sürdürülebilir tüketimi sağlamak için çevresel duyarlılık etkili bir faktör müdür? *Erciyes Akademi Dergisi,* 37(3), 1062-1083. https://doi.org/10.48070/erciyesakademi.1343768

Atak, H., Kapci, E. G., & Çok, F. (2013). Evaluation of the Turkish version of the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire. *Dusunen Adam: The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*, 26(1), 36–45.

Balázsné Lendvai, M., Kovács, I., Ferenc Balázs, B., & Beke, J. (2022). Health and environment conscious consumer attitudes: Generation Z segment personas according to the LOHAS model. *Social Sciences*, 11(269). https://doi.org/10.3390/ socsci11070269

Barutçu, Türkmen, M., Bora, Semiz, B., & Başak, B. (2017). Dijital Kabullenmenin Teknolojiye Hazır Olma ile İlişkisi üzerine ampirik bir çalışma. *8. Uluslararası Balkan Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi,*6-11 Eylül Romanya, 297-304.

Čapienė, A., Rūtelionė, A., & Tvaronavičienė, M. (2021). Pro-environmental and pro-social engagement in sustainable consumption: Exploratory study. *Sustainability, 13(4), 1601.,* https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041601

Charter, M., Peattie, K., Ottman, J., & Polonsky, M. J. (2002). *Marketing and sustainability*. Centre for Business Relationships, Accountability, Sustainability and Society (BRASS) in association with The Centre for Sustainable Design.

Côté, J. E. (2002). The role of identity capital in the transition to adulthood: The individualization thesis examined. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 5(2), 117–134.

Cüceloğlu, D. (1990). *Human and behavior* (40th ed.). Istanbul, Turkey: Remzi Publishing.

Doğan, O., Bulut, Z. A., & Çımrın, F. K. (2015). Developing a scale to measure individuals' sustainable consumption behaviors. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 29(4), 659–678.

Ergen, A. (2016). *Sustainable consumption: Voluntary simplicity and material values*. Istanbul, Turkey: Beta Publishing.

Ersoy, N. (2023). A cross-section from the consumer perspective on sustainable nutrition: Consumer awareness and motivation status. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 30(31), 76712–76717. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-27854-w

Figueroa-García, E.C., García-Machado, J.J., & Yábar, D.C. P-B. (2018). Modeling the social factors that determine sustainable consumption behavior in the community of Madrid, *Sustainability,* 10, 2811, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10082811

Gleim, M. R., Smith, J. S., & Sweeney, T. A**.** (2013). The ımpact of personality on the adoption of sustainable consumption practices. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 30(2), 111-119.

Gürbüz, C., & Bozkurt, Ö. (2022). Tüketicilerin deneyimsel ve sembolik tüketim davranışlarının bazı demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Bucak İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi,* 5(1), 23-46. https://doi.org/10.38057/bifd.1028172

Ha, S., Tran, M., Nguyen, D., & Hoang, T. (2019). Embedding sustainable consumption into higher education in Vietnam. *European Journal of Business and Management*. https://doi.org/10.7176/ejbm/11-18-12

Hass, W., Hertwich, E., Hubacek, K., Korytarova, K., Ometzeder, M., & Weisz, H. (2005). *The environmental impacts of consumption: Research methods and driving forces*. International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis.

Holt, D. B. (1995). How consumers consume: A typology of consumption practices. *Journal of Consumer Research, 22*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1086/209431

İslamoğlu, A. H., & Altunışık, R. (2003). *Consumer behavior*. Istanbul, Turkey: Beta Publishing.

Jackson, T. (2005). Live better by consuming less? Is there a “double dividend” in sustainable consumption? *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 9(1-2), 19–36.

Jeswiet, J. (2007). Design for the environment. In M. Kutz (Ed.), *Environmentally conscious manufacturing* (pp. 29–44). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Jones, P., Hillier, D., & Comfort, D. (2011). Shopping for tomorrow: Promoting sustainable consumption within food stores. *British Food Journal*, 113(7), 935–948.

Karaca, Ş. (2018). Yaşam tarzının sürdürülebilir tüketim davranışı üzerindeki etkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir çalışma. *Journal of Business Research-Tur*k, 10(3), 403-425. https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2018.480

Karademir, M. (2023). Investigation of work motivation and anxiety levels of trainers working in Antalya. *Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi.* https://doi.org/10.38021/asbid.1347479

Karagöz, Y. (2016). *Statistical analyses*. Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Publishing.

Kavak, B. & Naldöken, Ü. (2024). Sağlık çalışanlarında aydınlık üçlü kişilik özellikleri: bir devlet hastanesi örneği. *Avrasya Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi,* 7(2), 113-122. https://doi.org/10.53493/avrasyasbd.1455384

Laroche, M., Bergeron, J., & Barbaro-Forleo, G. (2001). Targeting consumers who are willing to pay more for environmentally friendly products. *Journal of Consumer Marketing,* 18(6), 503-520. https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000006155

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Mccrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T**.** (1987*).* Validation of the five-factor model of personality across ınstruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81-90.

Moreira, A., Fortes, N., & Santiago, R. (2017). Influence of sensory stimuli on brand experience, brand equity and purchase intention. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 18(1), 68–83.

Odabaşı, Y., & Barış, G. (2018). *Consumer behavior* (18th ed.). Istanbul, Turkey: MediaCat.

Öner, H. (2020). Examination of teacher candidates' sustainable consumption behavior dimensions in terms of various variables. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 13(81), 65–86. https://doi.org/10.29228/jasss.42972

Özdemir, N., & Sunaoğlu, Ş. (2023). The effect of dark triad personality traits on sustainable consumption behavior. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*. https://doi.org/10.30794/pausbed.1171780

Peattie, K., & Collins, A. (2009). Guest editorial: Perspectives on sustainable consumption. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33, 107–112.

Plummer, J. T. (1974). The concept and application of lifestyle segmentation: Combining two useful concepts provides a unique and important view of the market. *Journal of Marketing*, 38(1), 33–37.

Pulana, A., & Perez, R. (2022). Motivational strategies of teachers in relation to learners' academic performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v5-i1-28

Quoquab, F., & Mohammad, J. (2016). Sustainable consumption: Sacrificing for the future. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 224, 599–604. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.449

Solomon, M., Bamossy, G., Askegaard, S., & Hogg, M. K. (2006). *Consumer behaviour: A European perspective* (3rd ed.). England: Prentice Hall.

Sung, J., & Woo, H. (2019). Investigating Male consumers' lifestyle of health and sustainability (LOHAS) and perception toward slow fashion. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services,* 49, 120-128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.03.018 .

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Tripathi, A., & Singh, M.P. (2016). Determinants of sustainable/green consumption: A review, *International Journal Environmental Technologyand Management,* 1(3/4), 316-358. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJETM.2016.10003118

Tybout, A. M., & Cotte, J. (2005). The role of the consumer in the marketing process: A macro perspective. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42(4), 555-566.

Verplanken, B., & Herabadi, A. (2001). Individual differences in impulse buying tendency: Feeling and no thinking. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 71–83.

Walker, S. N., & Hill-Polerecky, D. M. (1996). *Psychometric evaluation of the Health-Promoting Lifestyle Profile II*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Nebraska Medical Center.

Wang, C., Zhu, S., & Zhang, H. (2022). Understanding the importance of motivational intensity in english as a foreign language context: A structural equation modeling analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1020558

Wilkie, W. L. (1994). *Consumer behavior* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Zeynalova, Z., & Namazova, N. (2022). Revealing consumer behavior toward green consumption. *Sustainability*, 14(5806), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14105806

Ziesemer, F., & Balderjahn, I. (2021). Young people as drivers or inhibitors of the sustainability movement: The case of anti-consumption. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 44(3), 427–453. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-021-09489-x

Başak, B., Barutçu, M. T., & Semiz, B. B. (2017). Tüketicilerin kişilik özelliklerine göre gıda temelli yaşam tarzı profillerinin belirlenmesi. *Türk Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2*(2), 52-63.