

CONSISTENCY OF SUSTAINABLE CONSUMPTION WITH VALUES AND LIFESTYLE IN POST-MODERN TOURISTS



SCAN ME

Kader KIZIL EROL 

Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University, Çorlu Vocational School, kkizilerol@nku.edu.tr

Article history:

Submission 07 August 2021

Revision 10 November 2021

Accepted 05 December 2021

Available online 31 December 2021

Keywords:

Postmodern Tourism,
Sustainable Tourism,
Sustainable Consumption,
Values and Lifestyle,
VALS Scale.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.32936/pssj.v5i3.275>

Abstract

The concepts of sustainable consumption and sustainable tourism are studied separately within the scope of sustainability. In this study, it has been examined whether individuals' understanding of values and lifestyle are consistent with sustainable consumption behaviors in post-modern tourism by considering both concepts together. Today, post-modern consumers have a more individual and liberal perception and reflect the consumption behaviors shaped in this direction more intensely and more clearly in the tourism sector. Especially in the Turkish tourism literature, it has been found that there are few studies to measure the consistency between post-modern tourism perception, individual's lifestyle and values and sustainable consumption behavior. The main question of this study is whether individuals' understanding of lifestyle and value are consistent with the tendency to display sustainable tourism behavior when manipulated with post-modern tourism perception. In this context; consumers' values, lifestyles and consumption trends were measured through the data obtained through the survey method using the VALS scale and the sustainable tourism scale. The findings of the study revealed that post-modern tourism preferences are related to individuals with principled motivation and individuals with spatial mobility, depending on their sustainable consumption trends. The data obtained from this study are also expected to give an idea about how post-modern tourism perception is related with lifestyle and values and whether there is consistency between the tendency to display sustainable tourism behavior and help further studies.

1. Introduction

Today, as a result of the rapidly increasing population, there is a versatile and very rapid resource consumption. Sustainable production and consumption, which emerged from the environmental effects of this intense resource consumption, has become a widely accepted social goal around the world. Bringing a vital understanding of sustainable consumption to us, the consumers, is extremely important in order to offer a more livable world to future generations. Considering the interaction between people's preferences, that is, their consumption patterns and ecological balance around the world, it is not difficult to imagine how frightening the result can be. Therefore, sustainable consumption, whose importance is increasing day by day due to the effects of intensive resource consumption, especially on the environment, focuses largely on conscious consumer behaviors. On the other hand, the concept of sustainable tourism and post-modern tourism are gaining more and more importance in the

tourism sector, which is affected by all social events due to the fact that it is human (Richards and Khovanova Rubicondo, 2011). The most important feature of post-modern tourism is that it brings the individual to the fore and the services are shaped according to customer needs and expectations. Because the need of post-modern people is no longer about the struggle for life, but about satisfaction (Nuryanti, 1996: 258).

In this study, primarily focusing on the concepts of post-modern tourism, sustainable consumption and sustainable tourism, it is investigated whether the lifestyle and values of individuals and their tendency to display sustainable tourism behavior are consistent when they are stimulated with the perception of post-modern tourism. Values and lifestyle (VALS) scale and sustainable tourism scale were used in the research. In addition, post-modern tourism perception was stimulated by means of photographs related to post-modern tourism added to the

questionnaire. In the selection of the photographs, importance was given to the selection of photographs reflecting the phenomena such as security, cleanliness, ostentatiousness and modernity in order to define the perception of post-modern tourism. The scales and photographs of post-modern tourism were presented to the participants in the experimental and control groups in different ways, before and after the questionnaire form. Thus, it was tried to determine whether the lifestyle and values of the participants and their tendency to show sustainable tourism behavior were consistent when they were stimulated with the perception of post-modern tourism. As a result, the participants, who first saw the photographs prepared to create a post-modern tourism perception, were really manipulated as the research aimed. In the VALS scale, the fact that the group who saw the scale first got higher scores once again revealed the tendency of people to give socially desirable answers. In addition, although the relationship between people who tend to consume sustainable due to environmental concerns and the perception of post-modern tourism is significant, the negative correlation between the two variables is remarkable.

2. Post-Modern Tourism Concept

Within the concepts of developing technology and globalizing world, businesses should have a flexible structure in order to adapt to rapid and continuous change. Every day, new concepts and rising trends appear in front of all sectors and businesses in this rapid movement (Tekin, 2014). Considering this situation; It can be said that changing social patterns have created new supplies in the field of tourism within the framework of expectations and needs and have changed in the direction of consumer orientation. In other words, the major changes in people's needs, preferences and expectations have brought the concept of "Post-Modern Tourism" to the field of tourism. The most important feature of post-modern tourism is that the individual comes to the fore instead of the mass.

As in modernism, it is difficult to make a general definition for post-modernism. There are many definitions of post-modernism with emphasis on a certain aspect (Armağan, 1995, 53). Post-modernism is a break with modernism for some, and a refined, advanced state of modernism for others. According to another definition, it is expressed as a period in which the mind goes bankrupt, ideologies are exhausted, and our understanding of space and time is shaken (Yıldız, 2015). According to Giddens (2018), what separates modernism from the concept of post-modernism is the effective use of transportation and communication tools, which are among the biggest changes of today. In addition, post-modernism differs from modernism in that it allows the social process to go beyond local spatial and

temporal limitations with these technological developments (Johnson, 2008).

One of the most important features of post-modernism is individualism. Postmodernity emphasizes differences rather than similarities; It is an approach based on the differences of values, cultures, traditions and lifestyles (Spicer, 1997). Therefore, in this period, consumers demand and buy products or services in a way that highlights their differences. The post-modern consumer wants to be a producer of experience and a part of consumption, and this is based on participation and interaction (Sönmez and Karataş, 2010). In the post-modern tourism understanding, it is seen that the motives of the consumers differ from the traditional tourist motives. As the needs and expectations that drive classical service consumers have changed, naturally, there has been a change in the preferences of tourists. Therefore, with the concept of post-modern tourism, it is observed that services are shaped according to customer needs and expectations, different trends and new destinations have emerged. Preferences such as observing different cultures, having nostalgic experiences, and taking part in the production of local products are some of the changing expectations of tourists and the demand for them is increasing day by day.

According to Natan Uriely (1997), post-modern tourism; The simulation is divided into two as tourism and other tourism. Simulation tourism, which offers the opportunity to experience a certain period, makes tourists experience a different concept as if it were real. Tourists who demand the other, on the other hand, want to experience the natural things with all their authenticity because of their desire to have nostalgic experiences. As a result, the reflections of this period on tourism; nature-sensitive structures, individualized tour organizations that appeal to special interests, and an increase in the diversity of touristic experiences.

3. Values and Lifestyle (VALS)

Consumers' product or service preferences allow us to have a general idea about them. Because consumers make choices in line with their own values and lifestyles. From a wide range of products and services, they often buy products and services that fit or reflect their lifestyle. Therefore, values and lifestyles can be defined as an internal preference system that shapes both consumption and all activities of individuals (Özgül, 2010: 120). According to Rokeach (1973), values are; a person's guiding standards or important life goals in life. Values that encompass much more than this are defined as decisive and permanent beliefs that guide human behavior and make some behaviors and goals more preferable than others (Odabaşı, 2002: 212). In other words; Values are our abstract ideas that tell us what is right and what is wrong in determining our goals and behavior. On the other

hand, the concept of lifestyle, first discussed by Weber, is defined as the differences and status between social groups (Kesic and Rajh, 2003: 162). Lifestyle is a concept that separates people from each other and embraces different behavior patterns (Uztuğ, 2003: 103). In other words, some behaviors and perceptual reactions of individuals such as eating, drinking and mental abilities are regulated according to their lifestyles (Gençtan, 1990: 136). One of the most used methods in lifestyle research is Rokeach Value Research. Rokeach discussed value in the context of the intended behavior or situation of individuals in life (Thompson and Troester, 2002: 552).

The concept of VALS, which is used to determine the lifestyle of individuals, was first developed by social scientist Arnold Mitchell in 1978. The VALS scale was later developed by the Stanford Research Institute (SRI). Values and Lifestyle VALS2 was also used in this study. VALS tried to understand and associate people's personalities with their attitudes by addressing the concept of changing values and lifestyles. In other words, VALS, people; It is a way of examining attitudes, needs, wishes, beliefs and demographic characteristics (Anandan et al. 2006: 98; Mohan Raj and Sait A. K. 2015: 96). Consisting of the initials of the English words Value Attitude and Lifestyle, the "VALS" scale is a scale used to identify different consumer typologies in the marketing world. Developed by Mitchell, VALS was first used to analyze the shopping habits of adults in American society. The VALS scale has 8 lifestyle typologies according to consumers' motivations, purchasing power and living standards. These lifestyle typologies are based on the way consumers spend their money and time. In other words, these typologies, which can be expressed as orientations, are generally classified under 3 headings, and these classifications actually reflect the motivation sources of individuals. Motivational resources of individuals are evaluated by dividing them into groups as they vary according to personality, values, opinions, attitudes and lifestyles. According to the scale, individuals with principled motivation are divided into "thinkers" and "believers". In the second place are the achievement or positional motivations, and these are called "achievers" and "striving". Finally, individuals who are motivated by movement or self-expression are classified as "builders" and "experimenters". The VALS scale is based on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory, and is a two-dimensional analysis in terms of its structure and content. According to VALS, the ability to access and control resources is associated with individuals' motivation values. The main features of dividing individuals into 8 different typologies according to their motivation and access to resources in the VALS scale can be explained as follows:

Innovators; They are successful and sophisticated, self-developed and self-confident people who take on other people's responsibilities. They have high self-respect. They are highly motivated in terms of success, personal development and self-confidence. They are change leaders and open to change. They are the most open to new ideas and technologies. They are individuals who like to develop and produce. They are consumers with high shopping volumes. They often prefer to purchase high-end and expensive services that reflect their tastes. For innovators, image is very important. For them, the image is the image of their taste and personality. They love to push themselves, and for this reason, they constantly look for areas of interest that will challenge them. They come to the fore with their leadership qualities in business and political life as well as in their own lives.

Thinkers: Thinkers are motivated by their ideals. For them, the greatest motivation is their ideal. They value knowledge and responsibility. They are mature, satisfied, relaxed individuals and give importance to order. They can express their opinions openly. They value education and are generally well-educated people. In any decision-making process, information search tendencies are high. They always want to be knowledgeable. General culture is very important to these individuals. They want to have all kinds of information about events in the world and in their country. They are respectful of authority and common social views adopted by the society. They take a moderate approach to social issues and controversial views. They are not critical. They are simple and practical consumers, although their income allows them to purchase many products. However, they give importance to durability and functionality in the products they buy.

Achievers: They are motivated by the desire for success. They have a goal-oriented lifestyle. They act in line with their goals and objectives. They have a deep commitment to their career and family. This is also reflected in their social life. They are individuals with a high concept of value. They lead a focused life around their family and work. They live a traditional life and are respectful to social values. They respect and attach great importance to authority and status. Shared values of successes; risk avoidance, stability, compromise, sincerity, close friendship and self-discovery. Since image is very important to them, they prefer to buy products and services that will reveal their image. For this reason, the achievers take place as active people in the consumer market with their many wants and needs. They prefer prestigious products and services to show their success to the people around them. Because they usually have a busy work life, they are interested in practical products that save them time.

Expiricist: Their biggest motivation is to be able to express themselves in public. They are young, enthusiastic, enthusiastic, dynamic and quick decision makers. When it comes to new possibilities, they can get excited and get started, but they can also quickly become cold and lose interest. They seek change and excitement. They want to try new, unusual and risky things. Apart from doing sports, they are energetic enough for recreational and social activities. Experiencers; Being enthusiastic and enthusiastic, they spend most of their earnings on fashion, entertainment or social events. Their desire to look good, energetic and dynamic is also reflected in their shopping. For this reason, experiencers are consumers who are eager to buy.

Believers: Like thinkers, believers are motivated by their ideals. They are conservative individuals with strong beliefs based on social and nation norms. They are people with traditions and high beliefs based on family, religion, society and nation. They lead a life in accordance with customs and norms. Their lives are shaped within the framework of family, society and nation. Spiritual and religious elements are a source of inspiration for believers. They have no tolerance for ambiguity and ambiguity. They want every concept to be precise and clear. They do not want society to change and are not open to change. They are motivated by their ideals, but unlike thinkers, they represent the low-income group. Because of all these features, as a consumer; are loyal customers who prefer well-known, local products and brands.

Strivers: Strivers follow fashion and love to have fun. Because they are successfully motivated, they are concerned and care about the opinions and approval of others. They are low-income individuals. Although they have the same character as the Achievers, they represent a group that has difficulties in accessing resources. For employees who often do not have enough income to meet their wants, money symbolizes success. They buy products that are fashionable and considered a sign of wealth. Individuals with high earnings prefer imitations of the products they buy. Many find it more important to have a job than to have a career. Their lack of focus on skills and careers hinders their advancement. They usually have low level and street culture. These are consumers who love to spend. They can spend all of their income on their looks. Shopping is both a social activity for them and an opportunity to show their purchasing abilities to those around them. Employees are active consumers as far as their financial means allow. As much as their financial strength allows, they make unplanned, impulsive and sudden purchases.

Makers: Like experimenters, makers are motivated by expressing themselves. They describe themselves as people who build houses, own a car, grow vegetables and fruit, canned food, and work on issues such as raising children. They are defined as

people who have sufficient skills and energy to realize this success. They are practical individuals who value self-sufficiency. They live in a traditional, circumscribed environment of family, work, and physical environments and have little interest in life outside of this environment. Makers display skeptical attitudes towards new ideas and big business. They are people sensitive to human rights. Tangible assets, other than those that do not have a practical or functional purpose, do not affect them. Because they prefer things with functional value to luxury. For this reason, they buy basic products.

Survivors: They lead their lives in a narrow space. They believe that the world is changing rapidly due to the lack of available resources. They aim to meet their basic needs. They watch too much TV and live a shallow-minded life. Their security-related requests come first because they need it more than any other request. This group of people does not show a very obvious source of motivation. As consumers, they are stable and cautious. They are modest consumers when it comes to purchasing many products and services. They have favorite brands, they show loyalty to those brands and products. If their favorite products or brands are on sale, their loyalty characteristics are more prominent.

4. Sustainable Consumption and Sustainable Tourism

Today, as a result of the rapidly increasing population all over the world, there is a rapid consumption of resources. Sustainable production and consumption, which emerged from the environmental effects of this intense resource consumption, has become a widely accepted social goal around the world. Bringing a vital understanding of sustainable consumption to us, the consumers, is extremely important in order to offer a more livable world to future generations. In this direction, sustainability; It is defined as an element that avoids being a consumer society without changing the life quality standards, protects the environment and reveals social responsibilities (Özoran, 2019). Therefore, sustainable consumption largely focuses on conscious consumer behavior. Considering the interaction between people's preferences, that is, their consumption patterns and ecological balance around the world, it is not difficult to imagine how frightening a wrong choice can lead to.

Since its existence, human beings have continued their lives by constantly consuming things and changing the environments in their favor. As a result of economic development, which started with industrialization in the 18th century and continued until today, people increased both production and consumption levels by using natural resources thoughtlessly. The rapid population growth, especially after the second half of the 20th century,

increased the use of foodstuffs and energy resources, and accordingly, total consumption increased rapidly. In this process, countries aimed to increase their welfare level and develop faster. In addition, in parallel with globalization, as a result of the increase in the purchasing power of consumers, as well as the business activities that have developed under the leadership of multinational enterprises and resulted in a continuous increase in consumption, negative environmental effects have started to emerge and the concept of sustainability of consumption has been brought to the agenda. Because, while the world population is increasing rapidly every year, the resources used by people have started to decrease in direct proportion to this increase and become insufficient. Meanwhile, it is not possible to ignore the interaction between the changing consumption pattern of human beings and the ecological balance of the world. In other words, the balances that have been disrupted by people's consumption can be protected, increased and sustainable depending on the way people consume. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development-OECD- (1997), sustainable consumption is defined as “products and services that meet basic needs and provide a better quality of life, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs and minimizing the use of natural resources, toxic substances and wastes. is to be used”. Accordingly, in order for consumption to be sustainable, natural resources must be protected and wastes must be re-evaluated and recovered. However, if we can turn our attention not to consumption but to the need for sustainable consumption, the lives of present and future generations will not be endangered. Therefore, it is meaningful in terms of examining the values and lifestyles (Grunert & Juhl, 1995; Kahle, 1996; Arnold & Reynol, 2003; Fraj & Martinez, 2006), which are stated to be an important determinant on consumers' purchasing habits, and understanding in which direction changes should occur in the future. will be. People's preferences affect their values and lifestyles, as well as their consumption patterns (Özgül, 2010). On the other hand, while people's lifestyles determine how they spend their time and money, consumption preferences express how people reflect their values and tastes.

Values and lifestyles are an internal choice system that shapes both consumption and all activities of individuals (Özgül, 2010:120). According to Rokeach (1973), who worked on this subject, values are important life goals or standards that guide one's life. According to this definition, we can think of values as criteria that determine the individual's purpose in life and how he will make his choices in this process. On the other hand, Kahle (1996) states that an individual's values are shaped by the meanings they derive from their experiences and learning processes. For example, it is a natural result that an individual who grows up in a sensitive and careful environment in

environmental and consumption issues and reinforces this through experience, establishes his relationship with society and the environment according to this value system. From this point of view, many studies have been conducted to determine what individuals' values and lifestyles affect, or whether they are consistent with their behaviors on any subject. For example, in a study on the environment, it was revealed that the intrinsic values of the individual are positively related to some desirable behaviors related to environmental consumption, while the external values are negatively related (Fraj and Martinez, 2006). Tourism, which continues to gain momentum every year and is the sector that uses environmental resources the most compared to other economic sectors (Tuna, 2007), both damages the environment and suffers from its share of negativities and troubles intensely. Tourism sector; In addition to being an important element of environmental, social and economic development, it creates negative effects that cannot be recycled if not controlled (Can, 2013). In a country, tourism must have a sustainable feature so that it can always exist and be transferred to future generations. The importance of sustainability for tourism started with the Brundland Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987. After the report, a widespread discussion started about the definition, feasibility and results of sustainability (Cater and Lowman, 1994; Hunter and Green, 1995; Erdoğan; 2003). Sustainable tourism, which is expressed as a balanced development model (Angelevska, Najdeska, & Rakicevik, 2012) that includes economic, social and cultural development without harming the environment, is defined by Scharpf (1998) as the long-term beautification, preservation and economic development of natural, social and cultural resources. defined as supporting development. At this point, sustainable tourism includes social responsibility, economic efficiency and ecological sensitivity at every stage.

In the context of what needs to be done and responsibilities in order to better understand the concept of sustainable tourism and to ensure a tourism development without disturbing the ecology;

- Recognizing the needs to take action,
- Supporting weak members, places, communities,
- To establish the goals of development in a regular way,
- To control the area and the asset, to follow an active policy towards the development of the area and the owner of the area,
- Creating the material policy,
- To protect nature,
- Strengthening the use of agriculture and forest areas,
- To expand the order of economic activities,

- Helping to preserve local architecture, traditions and cultural and folklore heritage.
- Ten principles have been determined, including tourism marketing and promotion (Buhalis and Flether, 1996).

The mass tourism movements, which became widespread after the Second World War, had many economic, social and environmental effects all over the world. One of the most important effects of mass tourism is that it causes environmental degradation. The fact that mass tourism, which consists of natural, historical and cultural assets, has begun to damage values over time has brought concepts such as the protection, conservation and sustainability of resources to the agenda (Gülbahar, 2009: 152). In our country, mass tourism, the effect of which was most intense in the 1980s, was not at the desired level and had negative effects on the environment, bringing the concept of sustainable tourism and the policies of diversification of tourism in this direction (Altıparmak, 2002). At the point reached today; The change in the tourism sector within the scope of being sensitive to the environment and ecology has brought along new searches.

In this research, it has been tried to reveal the tendency of VALS groups to show sustainable tourism behavior, which divides consumers into groups according to their value orientations.

5. Methodology

5.1. Scales and Sample

The main question addressed within the scope of the research is whether the lifestyle and values of individuals and their tendency to display sustainable tourism behavior are consistent when they are stimulated by the perception of post-modern tourism. For this purpose, two different groups of participants were studied. Sample selection was made by random sampling method. The participants, reached by mail, were divided into two as the experimental and control groups, and the same questions were asked to both groups in different order. Post-modern tourism perception stimulation was made through photographs related to post-modern tourism. While the participants in the experimental group were asked about the photographs first, the VALS scale and the sustainable tourism scale were added to the end of the questionnaire. In the control group, priority was given to the scales in the questionnaire, and the photographs used to stimulate the perception of post-modern tourism were added to the end of the form. In addition, both groups were first asked a "confirmation question" stating that they agreed to participate in the study voluntarily. All 352 individuals who participated in the study approved to participate in the study. Therefore, the analyzes were continued with 352 individuals. 163 people in the experimental group and 189 people in the control group answered the questionnaire. Finally, demographic questions on education, gender and age were asked to all of the participants. The descriptive statistics of the demographic characteristics of the participants by group distinction are as follows:

Table 1. Participant Profile Descriptive Statistics

		Experimental Group	Control Group
Age	18-25 years old	58	156
	26-40 years old	33	24
	41-50 years old	41	7
	51 years and older	31	2
Gender	Female	107	111
	Male	56	78
Education Status	Elementary School	1	1
	High School	18	3
	Bachelor (University Student)	93	176
	Postgraduate	51	9

According to the frequency analysis results for descriptive statistics, it can be seen that the participants in both groups are mostly between the ages of 18-25, the weight of the participation rate of women is felt in both groups, and the number of individuals who are university students or graduates is also high among the participants.

Analyzes were continued with factor, validity and reliability analyzes of the scales used in the study.

5.1.1. Research question, Hypotheses and

Research Model

The questions addressed within the scope of the research are as follows:

- Are the values and lifestyles of individuals consistent with their sustainable consumption behaviors?
- What is the post-modern tourism preference of individuals?
- Are individuals' adoption of post-modern tourism preferences consistent with sustainable consumption behavior and values and lifestyles?

The hypotheses to be tested within the scope of these main research results are as follows:

H1= The scores obtained from the VALS dimensions between the experimental and control groups are statistically significantly different in terms of mean.

H2= The scores obtained from the Sustainable Consumption scale are statistically significantly different between the experimental and control groups in terms of mean.

H3= Post-modern tourism choices between the experimental and control groups are statistically significantly different in terms of mean.

H4= The scores obtained from the VALS dimensions are statistically significantly different between male and female participants in terms of mean.

H5= The scores obtained from the VALS dimensions in terms of educational status are statistically significantly different from the mean.

H6= Age scores obtained from the VALS dimensions are statistically significantly different from the mean.

H7= The scores obtained from the Sustainable Consumption Scale among female and male participants are statistically significantly different in terms of mean.

H8= The scores obtained from the Sustainable Consumption Scale in terms of educational status are statistically significantly different from the mean.

H9= Post-modern tourism choices in terms of age are statistically significantly different in terms of average scores.

H10= There is a statistically significant difference between male and female participants in terms of post-modern tourism choice.

H11= There is a statistically significant difference in terms of education level in terms of post-modern tourism choice.

H12= Post-modern tourism choice is statistically different in terms of age.

H13= There is a significant relationship between VALS dimensions between the experimental and control groups.

H14= There is a significant relationship between the Sustainable Consumption Tendency between the experimental and control groups.

H15= There is a significant relationship between the choice of post-modern tourism between the experimental and control groups.

H16= There is a significant relationship between participants who prefer post-modern tourism and those who do not, and VALS dimensions.

H17= There is a significant relationship between participants who prefer post-modern tourism and those who do not, and their Sustainable Consumption Tendency.

5.1.2. Results

Before starting the hypothesis tests, validity and reliability analyzes of the VALS and sustainable consumption scales used in the study were performed. Regarding sustainable consumption, based on the scales developed by Şener and Hazer (2007) and Fraj and Martinez (2006), a five-point Likert scale consisting of 14 items (1- Strongly disagree, 5-Strongly agree) was used after a detailed review of the relevant literature. The Cronbach Alpha value for these items was determined as 0.760. The second scale is the VALS 2 scale, which is a psychographic market segmentation scale developed by Arnold Mitchell at SRI (Stanford Research Institute) to identify lifestyle groups. The Cronbach Alpha value for these items was determined as 0.750. As a result of the confirmatory factor analyzes carried out in the sustainable consumption scale, 7 of the 14 items were included in the environment factor and 7 in the savings factor. A total of 8 factors were determined in the VALS scale. In addition, some items were excluded from the analysis due to factor loading problems. The questions in the questionnaire about the post-modern tourism perception were asked through photographs. In the selection of photographs, in order to define the post-modern tourism perception, importance was given to the selection of photographs reflecting the phenomena such as security, cleanliness, ostentatiousness and modernity. In these cases, participants who marked the option reflecting post-modern tourism were given 1 point, while those who chose the other option were given 0 points. As a result of the arrangements made, the descriptive statistical results of the factors are as follows:

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Factors

	Participatory Group	N	Mean	Standart Deviation
Expiricits	Experimental Group	163	21,9141	4,16392

	Control Group	189	24,0159	2,80667
Makers	Experimental Group	163	12,9448	2,91495
	Control Group	189	14,2751	2,58442
Thinkers	Experimental Group	163	10,0920	1,67704
	Control Group	189	10,4497	1,61570
Believers	Experimental Group	163	6,7362	2,36703
	Control Group	189	7,7672	2,35850
Strivers	Experimental Group	163	9,7239	3,11168
	Control Group	189	9,8201	3,01052
Survivors	Experimental Group	163	5,9448	1,64524
	Control Group	189	6,4233	1,55765
Achievers	Experimental Group	163	5,0429	1,38042
	Control Group	189	4,9630	1,32235
Innovators	Experimental Group	163	5,1595	1,12176
	Control Group	189	4,6138	1,15040
Saving	Experimental Group	163	16,9632	3,02844
	Control Group	189	16,5238	3,02573
Environment	Experimental Group	163	14,8834	3,56664
	Control Group	189	14,3968	3,35112

Before starting the hypothesis tests, the normality of the data was finally tested and it was determined that they did not have a normal distribution. Therefore, the analyzes were continued with non-parametric analyzes.

First of all, the level of differentiation of the scores obtained from the value and lifestyle in terms of gender and the sustainable consumption scale was examined. The results are as follows:

Table 3. The Level of Differentiation of the Scores Obtained from The Value and Lifestyle in Terms of Gender and The Sustainable Consumption Scale

	U	Z	p	r	Gender	N	Mean rank
Expiricits	11647,5	-3,213	0,00	0,1712	Female	218	162,93
					Male	134	198,58
Makers	9913,5	-5,093	0,00	0,2715	Female	218	154,97
					Male	134	211,52
Thinkers	14522	-0,093	0,93	0,0050	Female	218	176,11
					Male	134	177,13
Strivers	11178,0	-3,717	0,00	0,1981	Female	218	192,22
					Male	134	150,92
Survivors	12469,5	-2,36	0,02	0,1258	Female	218	186,30
					Male	134	160,56
Believers	12431,0	-2,366	0,02	0,1261	Female	218	166,52
					Male	134	192,73
Achievers	13687,5	-1,096	0,27	0,0584	Female	218	172,29
					Male	134	183,35
Innovators	13830	-0,877	0,38	0,0467	Female	218	172,94
					Male	134	182,29
Saving	13877,5	-1,618	0,11	0,0862	Female	218	185,86

					Male	134	168,43
Environment	14211,5	-1,257	0,21	0,0670	Female	218	183,81
					Male	134	170,19
Post-Modern Tourism Preference	13268,5	-2,333	0,02	0,1244	Female	218	189,6
					Male	134	165,2

According to the results, it is seen that men are mostly in the group that is characterized as experiential and their motivation is to express themselves ($U = 11647.5$, $p = .000$, $r = .17$). Considering that people with this motivation have a motivation level that requires more energy and more physical strength, it is not surprising that men score high on this factor. In addition, individuals in this group spend most of their income on social activities such as entertainment, music, cinema and food. Similarly, in the group of constructors who are motivated by self-expression, it is seen that males are concentrated ($U = 9913.5$, $p = .000$, $r = .27$). People in this group, on the other hand, make purchases by giving importance to value rather than purchasing luxury goods and services, and they often like jobs that require more energy and more physical strength.

In the group of those who strive, women have higher scores ($U = 11178.5$, $p = .000$, $r = .20$). Individuals in this group, who have an achievement-oriented motivation source, attach great importance to the approval of others and their thoughts about themselves. That's why they shop for fashion. From this perspective, it is not surprising that women score higher in this group. Another important issue in this regard is this: for those who strive to be seen as active customers, shopping is a social activity and it is very important for them to show the things they buy to the people around them. Therefore, according to this result,

when the party making the purchasing decision is a woman, the thing to be purchased may change significantly. In terms of the VALS scale, another group that differs in terms of gender is the survivors group ($U = 12469.5$, $p = .02$, $r = .13$). Individuals in the survivor group have a relatively low income and focus primarily on their basic physiological needs such as safety and security. The market they represent is modest and they represent the cautious consumer. From this point of view, it can be said that women make more cautious and safe purchasing decisions. Finally, a significant gender difference was found between the scores obtained from the believer's dimension ($U = 12431.0$, $p = .02$, $r = .13$). It was determined that male participants got more points in this group. Accordingly, it should be taken into account that the individuals in this group, who are motivated by their ideals, have more established and stable brand preferences, are more likely to be loyal customers, and prefer less to more in meeting their needs, and it can be said that it would be more appropriate to offer products and services to male individuals in this direction. Regarding the sustainable consumption trend, no significant difference was found in terms of gender ($p > .05$).

The Kruskal Wallis Test results in terms of age groups are as follows:

Table 4. The Kruskal Wallis Test results in terms of age groups

Age		N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	p
Expiricts	18-25 years old	214	190,70	27,810	3	0,000
	26-40 years old	57	147,87			
	41-50 years old	48	121,17			
	51 years and older	33	214,38			
Makers	18-25 years old	214	176,70	3,216	3	0,359
	26-40 years old	57	184,75			
	41-50 years old	48	155,38			
	51 years and older	33	191,67			
Thinkers	18-25 years old	214	171,32	25,502	3	0,000
	26-40 years old	57	228,05			
	41-50 years old	48	174,90			
	51 years and older	33	123,36			
Strivers	18-25 years old	214	187,09	13,446	3	0,004
	26-40 years old	57	187,57			

	41-50 years old	48	135,53			
	51 years and older	33	148,29			
Survivors	18-25 years old	214	194,70	20,643	3	0,000
	26-40 years old	57	133,42			
	41-50 years old	48	162,39			
	51 years and older	33	153,41			
Believers	18-25 years old	214	167,31	10,099	3	0,018
	26-40 years old	57	174,83			
	41-50 years old	48	218,47			
	51 years and older	33	177,91			
Achievers	18-25 years old	214	173,50	5,078	3	0,166
	26-40 years old	57	190,54			
	41-50 years old	48	190,38			
	51 years and older	33	151,55			
Innovators	18-25 years old	214	151,46	40,682	3	0,000
	26-40 years old	57	230,20			
	41-50 years old	48	217,98			
	51 years and older	33	185,79			
Saving	18-25 years old	214	161,59	42,945	3	0,000
	26-40 years old	57	143,43			
	41-50 years old	48	230,65			
	51 years and older	33	251,55			
Environment	18-25 years old	214	158,23	34,691	3	0,000
	26-40 years old	57	162,52			
	41-50 years old	48	232,74			
	51 years and older	33	237,30			
Post-Modern Tourism Preferences	18-25 years old	214	183,74	13,187	3	0,004
	26-40 years old	57	196,95			
	41-50 years old	48	142,09			
	51 years and older	33	144,26			

According to the results, the participant group who got the highest score from the experiencer dimension was the individuals aged 51 and over ($H(3) = 27.81, p = .000$). This result, which contradicts the information in the literature that people in this dimension are relatively younger, active, rebellious and quick to make decisions, shows that experiencers can be individuals who contradict the literature in the perception of post-modern tourism. Another significant difference was observed in the thinker's dimension, and the highest scorers in this dimension were participants in the 26-40 age range ($H(3) = 25.50, p = .000$). People in this group, who are motivated by their ideals, are individuals who attach importance to order, knowledge and responsibility and have many economic opportunities. From this point of view, we can talk about the 26-40 age group of participants who motivate themselves with their ideals. It is observed that people in the same age group got the highest score in the struggling dimension ($H(3) = 13.45, p = .004$). Their motivation is success. For those in the

struggling group, a status-oriented group that needs the approval of others, shopping is like a social activity. Considering that people in this age group are kneaded with popular culture, it can be said that he obtained a result that can be used to explain the buying behaviors made in order to gain social status. It is observed that people in the 18-24 age group got the highest score from the survivor's dimension ($H(3) = 20.64, p = .000$). People in this group, who are not economically lucky, can also be called cautious consumers. In the believers group, it is observed that the participants with the highest scores are between the ages of 41-50 ($H(3) = 10.00, p = .018$). People in this group, who are greedy for their needs and prefer a routine life, have fixed brand preferences and difficult decisions to change. Finally, in the innovators group, individuals aged 26-40 got the highest score ($H(3) = 40.68, p = .000$). Innovators are known as individuals who are versatile, sophisticated, self-confident and have sufficient economic

resources. They have developed tastes and are constantly looking for new interests. They are also open to new experiences.

In the sustainable consumption scale, it has been determined that individuals with a focus on savings are mostly 51 years old and over ($H(3) = 42.95, p = .000$), while environmentally focused individuals are mostly between the ages of 26-40.

On the subject of post-modern tourism preference, which is the main subject of the study, it was found that people between the ages of 26-40 preferred post-modern tourism more ($H(3) = 13.18, p = .004$). The results of the Kruskal Wallis Test regarding education are as follows:

Table 5. The results of the Kruskal Wallis Test Regarding Education

Education Status		N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	p
Expriçits	Elementary School	2	39,75	19,908	3	0,000
	High School	21	124,02			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	189,01			
	Postgraduate	60	143,32			
Makers	Elementary School	2	102,50	9,798	3	0,020
	High School	21	163,60			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	185,38			
	Postgraduate	60	143,69			
Thinkers	Elementary School	2	170,50	2,346	3	0,504
	High School	21	144,64			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	178,15			
	Postgraduate	60	180,43			
Strivers	Elementary School	2	154,50	2,182	3	0,536
	High School	21	166,69			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	180,87			
	Postgraduate	60	161,09			
Survivors	Elementary School	2	311,25	17,483	3	0,001
	High School	21	198,02			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	183,51			
	Postgraduate	60	133,03			
Believers	Elementary School	2	190,25	8,803	3	0,032
	High School	21	224,67			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	178,37			
	Postgraduate	60	150,81			
Achievers	Elementary School	2	88,50	3,557	3	0,313
	High School	21	194,71			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	178,13			
	Postgraduate	60	165,76			
Innovators	Elementary School	2	147,25	6,140	3	0,105
	High School	21	141,33			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	174,54			
	Postgraduate	60	198,58			
Saving	Elementary School	2	265,00	7,303	3	0,063
	High School	21	222,93			

	Bachelor (University Student)	269	170,49			
	Postgraduate	60	184,23			
Environment	Elementary School	2	105,50	12,037	3	0,007
	High School	21	221,81			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	167,23			
	Postgraduate	60	204,58			
Post-Modern Tourism Preference	Elementary School	2	164,00	0,159	3	0,984
	High School	21	174,26			
	Bachelor (University Student)	269	175,86			
	Postgraduate	60	180,58			

According to the results of the analysis, it was determined that university graduates or university students got the highest scores in the experimentalists and constructors groups (Respectively; $H(3)=19.91$, $p=.000$; $H(3)=9.80$, $p=.020$). The motivation for both groups is self-expression. The most important conclusion to be drawn from this will be that university graduates or students are motivated by self-expression and will make decisions in which they can express themselves in their purchasing decisions. In the survivors group, it was observed that primary school graduates got the highest scores ($H(3)=17.48$, $p=.001$). The purchasing behavior of people in this economically impossible group will be more directed towards their physiological and safety needs. In the believers group, high scores of high school graduates draw attention ($H(3)=8.80$, $p=.032$). It should be taken into account that the individuals in this group, whose ideals are motivational elements, are individuals who adhere to traditions, like to settle for less, and have a fixed brand preference. Finally, it is noteworthy that the high school graduates got the highest score from the environmental dimension of the sustainable

consumption scale ($H(3)=12.04$, $p=.007$). In terms of post-modern tourism perception, education levels did not differ in any way ($p>.05$).

Mann Whitney U test was used to test the other hypotheses established within the scope of the study. The main purpose of establishing these hypotheses is to compare the scores of the experimental group, who was manipulated by seeing the photographs used to measure the perception of post-modern tourism in the questionnaire form, and the control group, who saw the photographs in question at the end of the questionnaire, from the values and lifestyles and sustainable consumption scale. Accordingly, there is a statistically significant difference between the groups in terms of the scores obtained from the Experiencers, Makers, Thinkers, Survivors, Believers and Innovators in the VALS scale [Respectively; ($U=10.97$, $p=.00$, $r=.25$), ($U=11.39$, $p=.00$, $r=.23$), ($U=13.20$, $p=.02$, $r=.13$), ($U=12.86$, $p=.01$, $r=.15$), ($U=11.57$, $p=.00$, $r=.22$), ($U=10.88$, $p=.00$, $r=.27$)].

Table 6. Mann Whitney U Test Results between Experimental Group and Control Group in VALS Scale

	U	Z	p	r	Participatory Group	N	Mean rank
Expiricits	10969	-4,689	0,000	-0,2500	Experimental Group	163	149,29
					Control Group	189	199,96
Makers	11387	-4,245	0,000	-0,2265	Experimental Group	163	151,86
					Control Group	189	197,75
Thinkers	13203	-2,374	0,018	-0,1263	Experimental Group	163	163,00
					Control Group	189	188,15
Strivers	15091	-,330	0,741	-0,0176	Experimental Group	163	174,58
					Control Group	189	178,15
Survivors	12856	-2,741	0,006	-0,1460	Experimental Group	163	160,87
					Control Group	189	189,98
Believers	11570	-4,061	0,000	-0,2164	Experimental Group	163	152,98

					Control Group	189	196,79
Achievers	14525	-1,021	0,307	-0,0544	Experimental Group	163	181,89
					Control Group	189	171,85
Innovators	10880	-4,977	0,000	-0,2654	Experimental Group	163	204,25
					Control Group	189	152,56
Saving	13878	-1,618	0,106	-0,0864	Experimental Group	163	185,86
					Control Group	189	168,43
Enviroment	14212	-1,257	0,209	-0,0672	Experimental Group	163	183,81
					Control Group	189	170,19
Post-Modern Preference	13269	-2,333	0,020	-0,1242	Deney Grubu	163	189,60
					Kontrol Grubu	189	165,20

When the results are examined in detail, it is observed that the participants in the control group got higher scores in the scores obtained from the experienter scale. According to this result, the participants in the control group, in other words, the participants in the group that were not manipulated about the perception of post-modern tourism, were more experienced. Likewise, it can be said that this group is more constructive, more thinker, more surviving, more believing and more innovative. The important point here is that the experimental group got a higher score in post-modern tourism preference. The participants, called the

experimental group, who first saw the photographs prepared to create a post-modern tourism perception, were really manipulated as the research aimed. The fact that the control group, rather than the experimental group, had higher scores in the VALS scale dimensions, once again revealed the tendency of people to give socially desirable answers. The results of the VALS dimensions, sustainable consumption trend and post-modern tourism preference and the participant groups' relationship and correlation analysis to test this fact are as follows:

Table 7. Chi-Square Analysis between Experimental Group and Control Group in VALS Scale

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Chi-Square Relation Analysis			Correlation Analysis	
			Value	df	p	Spearman Correlation	p
Expiricits							
Those with lower than average	78	44	23,334	1	0,000	0,257	0,000
Those with higher than average	85	145					
Makers							
Those with lower than average	69	43	15,466	1	,000	0,210	0,000
Those with higher than average	94	146					
Thinkers							
Those with lower than average	45	41	1,658	1	,198	0,069	0,199
Those with higher than average	118	148					
Strivers							
Those with lower than average	64	65	0,895	1	,344	0,050	0,346
Those with higher than average	99	124					
Survivers							
Those with lower than average	78	74	2,7	1	,100	0,088	0,101
Those with higher than average	85	115					
Believers							
Those with lower than average	92	61	20,801	1	,000	0,243	0,000
Those with higher than average	71	128					
Achievers							
			0,459	1	,498	-0,036	0,500

Those with lower than average	48	62					
Those with higher than average	115	127					
Innovators							
Those with lower than average	11	34	9,919	1	,002	-0,168	0,002
Those with higher than average	152	155					
Saving							
Those with lower than average	40	57	1,384	1	,239	-0,063	0,241
Those with higher than average	123	132					
Environment							
Those with lower than average	56	71	0,391	1	,532	-0,033	0,533
Those with higher than average	107	118					
Post-Modern Tourism Preference							
Those with lower than average	19	31	1,617	1	,203	-0,068	0,205
Those with higher than average	144	158					

Considering the results, the status of individuals in the VALS-Experiencers dimension is associated with post-modern tourism choices ($\chi^2(1, N=352)=23.33, p=.000$ and $N(352)=.26, p=.000$). This result supports the Mann Whitney U Test result between the participant groups and the experiencer dimension. In addition, in the constructors dimension, the correlation and correlation results with the participant group classification were significant ($\chi^2(1, N=352)=15.47, p=.000$ and $N(352)=.21, p=.000$). This result also supports the previous analysis result. Although no relationship was found to support the results of previous analyzes in the dimensions of thinkers and survivors ($p>.05$), the analysis of the believers and innovators with the participant groups gave significant results (Respectively $\chi^2(1, N=352)=20.80, p=.000$ and $N(352)=.24, p=.000$; $\chi^2(1, N=352)=9.92, p=.002$ and $N(352)=-.17, p=.002$).

As it is known, the motivation way of individuals in the dimensions of VALS experimenters and constructors is realized

in self-expression. As a result of the high scores of the participants in the control group in the dimensions of experiential and constructive and the significant relationship analysis, it can be said that the individuals in the control group were motivated by self-expression and they achieved their self-expression through relatively socially desirable answers. After all, the participants in this group are individuals with a relatively low perception of post-modern tourism.

In terms of sustainable consumption, no significant relationship was found between the experimental and control groups ($p>.05$). The final analyzes made within the scope of the study, on the other hand, are directed to the main research question of the study, whether there is a relationship between post-modern tourism preference and VALS and sustainable consumption tendency. The results of chi-square and correlation analysis for this purpose are as follows:

Table 8. The results of chi-square and correlation analysis

	Those who don't prefer post-modern tourism	Those who prefer post-modern tourism	Chi-Square Relation Analysis			Correlation Analysis	
			Value	df	p	Spearman Correlation	p
Exprierts							
Those with lower than average	23	99	3,31	1	,069	0,097	0,069
Those with higher than average	27	203					

Makers							
Those with lower than average	11	101	2,59	1	,108	-,0860	0,108
Those with higher than average	39	201					
Thinkers							
Those with lower than average	10	76	0,62	1	,431	-,0420	0,432
Those with higher than average	40	226					
Strivers							
Those with lower than average	23	106	2,195	1	,138	,0790	0,139
Those with higher than average	27	196					
Survivors							
Those with lower than average	17	135	2,003	1	,157	-,0750	0,158
Those with higher than average	33	167					
Believers							
Those with lower than average	17	136	2,125	1	,145	-,0780	0,146
Those with higher than average	33	166					
Achievers							
Those with lower than average	22	88	4,410	1	,036	,112	0,036
Those with higher than average	28	214					
Innovators							
Those with lower than average	14	31	12,101	1	,001	,185	0,000
Those with higher than average	36	271					
Saving							
Those with lower than average	10	87	1,667	1	,197	-,069	0,198
Those with higher than average	40	215					
Environment							
Those with lower than average	9	118	8,26	1	,004	-,153	0,004
Those with higher than average	41	184					

According to the results, there is a significant relationship between post-modern tourism preferences and innovators who have sufficient economic resources, are active and intellectual, and have developed tastes ($\chi^2(1, N=352)=12.10, p=.000$ and $N(352)=.19, p=.000$). There is also a significant relationship between the post-modern preferences of the successful consumers in the active consumer group, who are motivated by the desire to achieve, have a purposeful lifestyle, have many needs and desires and prefer prestigious products ($\chi^2(1, N=352)=4.41, p=.036$ and $N(352)=.11, p=.000$). According to this result, potential customers of post-modern tourism investments are likely to consist of people with these two lifestyles and values. In addition, although the relationship between people who tend to consume sustainable due to environmental concerns and the perception of post-modern tourism is significant, the negative correlation between the two variables is striking in the correlation analysis. Accordingly, people who will prefer sustainable consumption due to environmental concerns will have weak post-modern tourism preferences ($\chi^2(1, N=352)=8.26, p=.004$ and $N(352)=-.15,$

$p=.004$). This result is not surprising, but it is clear that in post-modern tourism, tourism enterprises need to launch their marketing activities in the direction of producing an environmentally friendly service.

6. Conclusions

Considering the results of the study, results consistent with the literature are found. The significant relationships between the VALS scale and gender are consistent with the study by Urbonavičius and Kasnauskienė (2005). Accordingly, women and men differ significantly in the sub-dimensions of the VALS scale, which aims to measure value and lifestyle. Similarly, the scores obtained from the VALS scale differ between age groups and educational levels. It is thought that these results are compatible with the literature, adding value to the study.

The differentiation of the experimental groups participating in the study and the control groups in terms of VALS dimensions is one of the primary research questions. According to this result, the

participants in the control group are more experienced. Likewise, it can be said that this group is more constructive, more thinker, more surviving, more believing and more innovative. The important point here is that the experimental group got a higher score in post-modern tourism preference. The participants, called the experimental group, who first saw the photographs prepared to create a post-modern tourism perception, were really manipulated as the research aimed. The fact that the control group, rather than the experimental group, had higher scores in the VALS scale dimensions, once again revealed the tendency of people to give socially desirable answers. On the other hand, being in the dimensions of experiencers, makers, believers and innovators is associated with post-modern tourism choices.

When the answer to the question of whether there is a relationship between post-modern tourism preference and VALS and sustainable consumption tendency, which is the main research question of the study, is investigated, innovators who have sufficient economic resources, who are active and intellectual, with advanced tastes, and a purposeful life motivated by the desire to succeed. A significant relationship was also found between the post-modern preferences of the successful consumers in the active consumer group, who have many needs and desires and prefer prestigious products. In addition, although the relationship between people who tend to consume sustainable due to environmental concerns and the perception of post-modern tourism is significant, the negative correlation between the two variables is striking in the correlation analysis. Accordingly, people who will prefer sustainable consumption due to environmental concerns will have weak post-modern tourism preferences. The compatibility of these results with the literature could not be determined due to the originality of the study. It is hoped that this study, which is thought to contribute to the literature, will shed light on future studies.

References

1. Altıparmak, M., (2002). Turizm Çeşitlendirilmesi Sürdürülebilir Turizm Ve Planlama. T.C. Turizm Bakanlığı 2. Turizm Şurası Bildirileri.
2. Anandan, C., Mohanraj, M. P. Ve Madhu, S. (2006). A Study of the Impact of Values and Lifestyles (VALS) On Brand Loyalty with Special Reference to English Newspapers. Vilakshan, XIMB Journal of Management, 3(2), 97-112. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2430709
3. Angelevska-Najdeska, K., & Rakicevik, G. (2012). Planning of Sustainable Tourism Development. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 44, 210-220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.022>
4. Armağan, M. (1995). Gelenek Ve Modernlik Arasında. İnsan Yayınları.
5. Arnold, M. J., & Reynolds, K. E. (2003). Hedonic Shopping Motivations. Journal of Retailing, 79(2), 77-95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-4359\(03\)00007-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-4359(03)00007-1)
6. Beatty, S. E., Homer, P. M., & Kahle, L. R. (1988). Problems with VALS İn International Marketing Research: An Example from an Application of the Empirical Mirror Technique. ACR North American Advances.
7. Bozok, D., Açıksozlü, Ö., & Şahin, N. N. (2018). Are You a Modern or Post-Modern Tourist? Predicting Touristic Preferences from Personality and Values. African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, Volume7(2) -(2018). ISSN:2223-814X. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324831946_Are_you_a_Modern_or_Post-Modern_Tourist_Predicting_Touristic_Preferences_from_Personality_and_Values
8. Buhalis, D. (1996). Enhancing The Competitiveness of Small and Medium Sized Tourism Enterprises. Electronic Markets, 6(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10196789600000002>
9. Buhalis, D., & Fletcher, J. (1995). Environmental İmpacts On Tourist Destinations: An Economic Analysis. Sustainable Tourism Development., 3-24. Available at: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Environmental-İmpacts-on-tourist-destinations%3A-an-Buhalis-Fletcher/0183f32f8ef4ad65113308bf83ec8a5709226d5e>
10. Cater, E. (1994). Ecotourism İn The Third World: Problems and Prospects for Sustainability. Ecotourism: A Sustainable Option? 69-86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177\(93\)90040-r](https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(93)90040-r)
11. Cater, E. (1994). Ecotourism, A Sustainable Option? Edited by Erlet Cater, Gwen Lowma.
12. Duygun, A. (2020). COVID-19 Pandemisi Sırasında Tüketicilerin Yaşam Tarzlarının Değerlendirilmesi. Econdor Uluslararası Akademik Dergi, 4(1), 232-247. <https://doi.org/10.35342>
13. Emel, C. A. N. (2013). Turizm Destinasyonlarında Sürdürülebilir Turizmin Sürdürülebilir Rekabet Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. İstanbul Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, (4), 23-40. <https://doi.org/10.26677/tr1010.2019.90>
14. Erdoğan, M. (2003). Anayasal Demokrasi (Vol. 7). Siyasal Kitabevi.

15. Fraj, E., & Martinez, E. (2006). Environmental Values and Lifestyles as Determining Factors of Ecological Consumer Behaviour: An Empirical Analysis. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760610663295>
16. Geçtan, E. (1990). Varoluş Ve Psikiyatri. Remzi Kitabevi.
17. Gençöz, T. (2000). Positive and Negative Affect Schedule: Validity and Reliability Study. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 15(46), 19-26. <https://doi.org/10.1348/0144665031752934>
18. Giddens, J. (2018). Transformational Leadership: What Every Nursing Dean Should Know. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 34(2), 117-121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2017.10.004>
19. Grunert, S. C., & Juhl, H. J. (1995). Values, Environmental Attitudes, and Buying of Organic Foods. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 16(1), 39-62. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4870\(94\)00034-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-4870(94)00034-8)
20. Gülbahar, O. (2009). 1990'lardan Günümüze Türkiye'de Kitle Turizminin Gelişimi Ve Alternatif Yönelimler. *Suleyman Demirel University Journal of Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences*, 14(1). Available at: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/194691>
21. Hunter, C., & Green, H. (1995). *Tourism and the Environment: A Sustainable Relationship?* Routledge. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0160-7383\(96\)90138-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0160-7383(96)90138-3)
22. Johnson, D. P. (2008). Postmodern Social and Cultural Fragmentation. *Contemporary Sociological Theory: An Integrated Multi-Level Approach*, 543-566. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-76522-8_20
23. Kahle, L. R. (1996). Social Values and Consumer Behavior: Research from The List of Values. In *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium (Vol. 8, Pp. 135-151)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
24. Kesic', T., & Piri-Rajh, S. (2003). Market segmentation on the basis of food-related lifestyles of Croatian families. *British Food Journal*, 105(3), 162-174. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00070700310477112>
25. Kesić, T., Piri Rajh, S., & Kraljević, S. (2003). Country Image and Product Brand Image as Competitive Marketing Strategy Factors. In *Proceedings of The 5th International Conference On "Enterprise in Transition"*, (1501-1513). <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bm.2540102>
26. Maslow, A. (1943). Maslow's Hierarchy Of Needs. *Index of DOCS/Teacing {Sp} Collection/Honolulu*.
27. Mitchell, A. (1984). Nine American Lifestyles: Values and Societal Change. *Futurist*, 18(4), 4-14.
28. Mohan Raj, P., & AK, M. (2015). Psychographic Profiling of Indian Young Adult Consumers of Smartphone-VALS Approach. *Management Studies and Economic Systems (MSES)*, 2(2), 95-102. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0019395>
29. Nuryanti, W. (1996). Heritage and Postmodern Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(2), 249-260. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(95\)00062-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(95)00062-3)
30. Odabaşı, Y., & Barış, G. (2002). *Tüketici Davranışları*. İstanbul: Mediacat Yayınları.
31. Özgül, E. (2010). Tüketicilerin Değer Yapıları, Gönüllü Sade Yaşam Tarzı Ve Sürdürülebilir Tüketim Üzerindeki Etkileri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(2), 117-150. Available at: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/301001>
32. Özorun, A. B. (2019). Yeni Bir Yaşama Ve Düşünce Biçimi: Post- Modern Kültür. *Journal of International Social Research*, 12(62), 73-743. <https://doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2019.3090>
33. Richards, G. W. (2011). Cultural Tourism Trends In Europe: A Context for The Development of Cultural Routes. In *Impact of European Cultural Routes On Smes' Innovation and Competitiveness (Pp. 21-39)*. Council of Europe Publishing.
34. Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. Free Press.
35. Scharpf, F. (1998). Negative and Positive İntegration In The Political Economy of European Welfare States. In *The Future of European Welfare (Pp. 157-177)*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
36. Seker, S. E. (2015). Motivasyon Teorisi (Motivation Theory). *YBS Ansiklopedi*, 2(1), 22-26. Available at: https://ybsansiklopedi.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/motivasyonteorisi_yenifor mat.pdf
37. Sönmez, A. T., & Karataş, C. (2010). *Postmodern Pazarlama*. Ulusal Meslek Yüksekokulları Öğrenci Sempozyumu, Düzce: Düzce Üniversitesi.
38. Spicer, M. W. (1997). *Public Administration, The State, And The Postmodern Condition: A Constitutionalist Perspective*. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(1), 90-102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764297041001007>
39. Şeker, Ş. E. (2015). Değer Tutum Ve Yaşam Şekilleri (Value Attitude and Lifestyles). *YBS Ansiklopedi*, 2(4), 1-5. Available at:

- <https://ybsansiklopedi.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/vals.pdf>
40. Şener, A., & Hazer, O. (2008). Values and Sustainable Consumption Behavior of Women: A Turkish Sample. *Sustainable Development*, 16(5), 291-300. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.329>
 41. Tekin, M., Şahin, E., & Göbenez, Y. (2014). Postmodern Pazarlama Yaklaşımıyla Modern Pazarlama Yöntemleri: Güncel Şirket Uygulamaları. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (31.1), 225-232. Available at: <http://dergisosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/susbed/article/view/153>
 42. Thompson, C. J., & Troester, M. (2002). Consumer Value Systems In the Age of Postmodern Fragmentation: The Case of the Natural Health Microculture. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(4), 550-571. <https://doi.org/10.1086/338213>
 43. Tuna, M. (2007). *Turizm, Çevre Ve Toplum (Marmaris Örneği) Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara*
 44. Urbonavicius S., And Kasnauskiene G. 2005. New Applications of a Traditional Psychographic Segmentation Concept. *Journal Engineering Economics*. 2005. Vol. 5, No. 45, Pp. 80-102. <https://doi.org/10.5755/J01.EE.45.5.11353>
 45. Uriely, N. (1997). Theories of Modern and Postmodern Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(4), 982-985. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0160-7383\(97\)00029-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0160-7383(97)00029-7)
 46. Uztuğ, F. (2003). Siyasal Marka Konumlandırma Ve Siyasal Mesaj Stratejileri İlişkisi: 1991-1995-1999 Seçimleri Türkiye Siyasal Reklam Mesaj Türleri Analizi. *Selçuk İletişim*, 3(1), 4-19. Available at: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/josc/issue/19007/201022>
 47. Zengin, B., & Güngördü, A. (2015). Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 17(2), 282-298. Available at: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/gaziuiibfd/issue/28307/300809>