Moldavian Journal for Education and Social Psychology
ISSN: 2559-7620
Covered in: CrossRef; RePEc; CEEOL; KVK; WorldCat; Google Scholar

2022, Volume 6, Issue 1, pages: 15-34 | https://doi.org/10.18662/mjesp/6.1/35

The Relationship between Future Perception Tendency and Sustainable Consumption Behaviors

Burak DEMİR[1],
Ali TATAR[2]

[1] Lecturer PhD, University of Mediterranean Karpasia Institute of Social Sciences, Cyprus, burak.demir@akun.edu.tr

[2] Assoc. Prof. PhD, University of Mediterranean Karpasia Institute of Social Sciences, Cyprus, ali.tatar@akun.edu.tr

Abstract: As a result of studies examining individual differences in temporal perception and the relationship of these differences with sustainable behavior, it has been observed that long-term perception predicts participation in pro-environmental attitudes and sustainable consumption behaviors. In this study, the relationship between the differences in future perceptions and sustainable consumption behaviors was examined in terms of individuals residing in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). In order to test this relationship, "Sustainable Consumption Behaviors" scale and CFC (Consideration of Future Consequences) scale were used. Since the normality assumption of the data could not be achieved, it was decided to use nonparametric tests. As a result of the analysis of the data, collected from 319 participants who were accessed online, it was found a statistically significant but a weak relationship between "Perception Tendency of the Future" and "Sustainable Consumption Behaviors". While no statistically significant relationship was found between the "Short-Term Thinking Tendency" subscale and "Sustainable Consumption Behaviors", it was found that the "Long-Term Thinking Tendency" subscale had a statistically significant relationship with "Sustainable Consumption Behaviors". In line with this finding, it was determined that those who tend to think long-term do their consumption behavior by taking sustainability into account compared to the group who thinks short-term. In addition, it has been determined that there is a noticeable difference between those who do sports and those who never do, and in this context, those who do sports differ significantly in terms of environmental awareness, unnecessary purchasing and sustainable consumption behaviors compared to those who do not do sports. It has been determined that the importance given to healthy eating is significantly related to long-term thinking, similarly, as the importance given to healthy nutrition increases, consumption becomes more environmentally friendly, and as the importance given to healthy nutrition decreases, consumption behavior that takes into account sustainability is abandoned.

Keywords: *Perceiving the Future; Sustainable Consumption; Environment; Short Term and Long Term Thinking.*

How to cite: Demir, B., & Tatar, A. (2022). The Relationship between Future Perception Tendency and Sustainable Consumption Behaviors. *Moldavian Journal for Education and Social Psychology, 6*(1), 15-34. https://doi.org/10.18662/mjesp/6.1/35

©2022 Published by LUMEN Publishing. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Introduction

Global warming is one of the most serious problems of the age we are in. Many scientists agree that people's consumption habits are one of the most prominent factors contributing to global warming. Considering that the world population is approximately 7.5 billion and is expected to reach 10 billion in 2050 and that the world's resources are limited, the importance of sustainable consumption for the future of the globe is once again revealed. Although there have been some trends towards minimal living and controlled consumption, it is not known whether these efforts will be sufficient to ensure that consumption is carried out in a sustainable manner. The fact that the momentum gained by global warming in recent years continues at the same pace causes concerns about the future of the globe to increase. In the light of all these data, it is clear that people have an important duty to control global warming and to protect the environment and biodiversity.

The decision to act sustainably requires focusing on future outcomes while abandoning recent positive outcomes. The fact that the long-term benefits of pro-environmental behavior mostly include near-term costs (such as time and money spent in the short term) has highlighted the need to increasingly investigate the role played by the time perspective in influencing individuals' decisions to engage in pro-environmental behavior. However, environmental problems today are not just about conflicts between individual and shared social interests (Arnocky et al., 2007; Arnocky & Stroink, 2011) also refers to temporal perception between short- and long-term interests (Joireman et al., 2004; Milfont & Gouveia, 2006).

As a result of the researches examining the individual differences in temporal perception and the relationship of these differences with sustainable behaviors, long-term time perception;

- Pro-environmental attitudes (such as strong attitudes towards protecting the environment and weak attitudes towards taking advantage of the environment) (Milfont & Gouveia, 2006) and,
- Participation in sustainable behaviours (such as green consumerism, the use of public transport, and motivation to take pro-environmental actions) (Joireman et al., 2001; Joireman et al., 2004; Lindsay & Strathman, 1997). In addition, another study in the literature using the meta-analysis method (6,301 participants from seven countries) found that long-term time perception had a strong effect on sustainable behaviors (Milfont et al., 2012).

However, since there are very few studies examining the relationships between sustainable behavior and past and present time

perception, this study, which was conducted using the meta-analysis method, can only be a reflection of the relationship between sustainable behavior and long-term time perception. The authors of the study in question have issued a similar warning. In this context, since most of the studies included in the meta-analysis focused solely on the future time perspective, the insignificant effect detected for short-term temporal perception is likely due to the small number of studies in the analyses. For this reason, it is important to further review the relationship between environmental considerations and both long-term and short-term time perceptions in future research and to decide on this issue (Milfont et al., 2012).

Recent advances in the literature support this concern. One of the most commonly used scales to assess individual differences in the future time perspective is the "Perception Tendency to Perceive the Future (CFC)" scale. This scale has traditionally been used in a one-dimensional manner ranging from low CFC instantaneous behavior at one end to high CFC at the other end (Strathman et al., 1994). However, as a result of a series of recent studies, it has been suggested that the CFC Scale consists of two different factors, theoretical and experimental (Adams, 2012; Charlton et al., 2011; Joireman et al., 2008; Joireman et al., 2010). One of these involves concerns about long-term consequences, while the other involves short-term concerns.

Review of the Literature

Temporal Differences in the Perception of the Future

Many of the behaviors related to environmental sensitivity result in a conflict between short-term and long-term benefits (Dawes, 1980). For example, as a result of long-term thinking, avoiding leaving electrical appliances (such as TVs, computers, etc.) in a standby position or reducing the settings of electrical appliances used to heat up in winter can help protect the environment along with lower energy costs, resulting in a loss of comfort for short-term thinking. This difference in temporal understanding is especially important for long-term investments. For example, investing in energy-efficient appliances is beneficial for society in the long run, as it will reduce resource consumption.

While it is generally accepted that environmental behaviour varies according to differences in the temporal perception of the future, more research on the subject is needed to clarify the findings (Hendrickx et al., 2001). In one of the approaches to the subject, it is suggested that the

behavior of individuals can be predicted by differences in the perception of the future. Proximity to long-term thinking in the perception of the future means how much of a person's thoughts are related to the future.

In this context, people who are prone to long-term thinking often plan their future actions, set goals that can be achieved in the long term, and often consider the long-term consequences of their behavior (Lasane & O'Donnell, 2005). A scale called "Tendency to Perceive the Future (CFC)" was developed by Strathman et al. (1994) to measure the temporal differences in the perception of the future. The CFC scale determines the extent to which individuals consider the potential long-term consequences of their current behavior and to what extent they are affected by these potential outcomes.

Sustainable Consumption

Sustainable consumer behavior is a subdiscipline of consumer behavior that examines why and how consumers take sustainability issues into account or why they do not engage in consumption behavior in a sustainable way. It also examines how consumers select, use and dispose of products in line with their individual sustainability goals (Belz & Peattie, 2009).

From a traditional marketing perspective, consumers' behavior is largely focused on the buying phase of the consumption process. This is mainly due to the fact that the purchase stage is the main point at which a contract is concluded between the buyer and the seller, money is paid, and the ownership of the products passes to the consumer. However, from a social and environmental point of view, it would be more appropriate to understand consumer behavior as a whole, since a product affects all stages of the consumption process.

There are several claims as to why factors that encourage sustainable consumer behavior are of interest to marketers. One of these is the fact that marketing experts know that the consumption concept triggered by traditional marketing is one of the most important reasons for the negative effects it has on the environment (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Another claim is that businesses that are able to adapt to the demands of our changing world due to the urgency of sustainability are more likely to be more successful in the long run and benefit from strategic benefits (Banerjee et al., 2003). A sustainable business approach has advantages such as developing new products and markets, using developing technologies, encouraging innovation, increasing organizational efficiency and motivating and retaining employees (Hopkins et al., 2009). In addition, research on the

subject shows that businesses that act in a socially and environmentally responsible manner have the potential to increase profits by positively influencing consumer perceptions (Brown & Dacin, 1997; Luo & Bhattacharya, 2006; Olsen, et al., 2014).

Not only are businesses that can operate more sustainably, but also businesses that promote business models toward sustainable consumption potentially have the opportunity to make more profits in the long term (Kotler et al., 2010). The growth of the sharing economy (the effort to access products and services instead of owning products), which has entered our lives more intensively in recent years, leads to significant environmental and economic gains by shifting consumers to sustainable regions. Although marketing's relationship to sustainable consumption has historically manifested itself in the way it identifies the "green consumer" segment (Anderson & Cunningham, 1972; Kilbourne & Beckmann, 1998), scientists today call for work on sustainable consumption factors (Kotler & Armstrong, 2011). In this context, it is in the interests of marketing managers to expand their markets for the long-term benefit of their businesses and the globe, rather than targeting only the green consumer segment. So when businesses adopt more sustainable production and marketing methods, they can expect consumers to recognize and reward these actions that promote sustainable consumption.

There are various suggestions regarding what sustainable forms of consumption behavior are. Moving towards more sustainable consumption is not just about which products and services are purchased, but about adopting a lifestyle where sustainability is reflected in all aspects of consumer behavior. One of the most accepted forms of sustainable consumption behavior shapes lifestyle according to five core values (Belz & Peattie, 2009, 86-87):

• Product simplicity approach: Consuming fewer goods and services, using resources efficiently, looking for products that are durable and have reduced environmental damage.

• Human-scale approach: Following the principle of "small is beautiful" in moving towards smaller, simpler, and less centralized work and living environments.

• Self-determination approach: Reducing one's dependence on large commercial enterprises that meet one's needs and even determine what those needs might be.

• Ecological awareness development approach: To strive for the conservation of resources and the reduction of waste in order to protect the environment.

• Personal development approach: To provide personal pleasure and happiness through the development of personal abilities rather than exhaustion.

The world faces many environmental problems, and people are responsible for many of them. The number of natural disasters is increasing significantly, there are significant changes in weather events, global temperatures continue to rise, largely due to greenhouse gases produced by humans as glaciers melt. Greenhouse gases are largely composed of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide. Through deforestation, urbanization, automobile emissions, and the use of fossil fuels, humans have increased their carbon dioxide concentrations by more than 33%. The use of fertilizer in the production of agricultural products such as cotton increases the amount of nitrogen oxide in the atmosphere. Even the recycling of waste after consumption affects greenhouse gas emissions. The decomposition of waste in landfills increases the level of methane (methane is a much more active greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide). The net contribution of producing a new product to the concentration of greenhouse gases compared to recycled products exceeds this.

Therefore, since every decision about what to buy, how much to buy, how much to consume, and how to dispose of has a direct impact on the environment and future generations, consumption is directly related to sustainability and the cumulative impact of each consumer's consumption is devastating.

Most people want to live and make decisions to meet their current needs without sacrificing the environment. From this perspective, environmental or sustainable behavior can be defined by the impact it creates. In other words, every decision made by consumers has an impact on the environment. Most people knowingly or unknowingly engage in behaviors that have negative environmental impacts. While some of the people engage in sustainable consumption behaviors, the consumption behaviors of others are the subject of research on why they engage in behaviors that have negative effects on the environment despite environmental concerns. Understanding the psychology behind environmental or sustainable behaviors is crucial to a sustainable future and widespread behavior change. However, despite its undisputed importance, information on the cause of sustainable behaviour is not at a sufficient level and lags significantly behind other areas in consumer psychology.

Methods and Findings

Method of Research

In this research, where "quantitative research" management was preferred, "relational screening" type research category was used. In screening researches, individuals' attitudes, beliefs and opinions on certain subjects are determined with the help of scales (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2016).

When evaluated in terms of the objectives of this study, it is included in the "descriptive research" class. In descriptive research, the aim is to uncover and define the characteristics of facts, objects, people, groups or organizations. In this context, how individuals' future oriented thinking tendencies and their views on sustainable consumption are distributed will be defined and also whether there is a significant relationship between these two variables will be examined.

Model of Research and Hypotheses

The model of the study was created as shown in Figure 1. In this context, the relationships between short- and long-term thinking tendency, which are sub-factors of the temporal perception difference scale for the future, and environmental sensitivity, unnecessary purchasing, saving tendency and reuse behavior, which are the four sub-factors of sustainable consumption behavior, were examined.

The alternative (research) hypotheses based on the model of the research are as follows:

H_1: There is a relationship between the tendency to think short-term and to act sensitively to the environment.

H_2: There is a relationship between short-term thinking tendency and non-need buying behavior.

H_3: There is a relationship between the tendency to think short-term and the tendency to save.

H_4: There is a relationship between short-term thinking tendency and reuse behavior.

H_5: There is a relationship between the tendency to think long-term and to act sensitively to the environment.

H_6: There is a relationship between long-term thinking tendency and non-need buying behavior.

H_7: There is a relationship between the tendency to think long-term and the tendency to save.

H_8: There is a relationship between long-term thinking tendencies and reuse behavior.

Universe and Sample

The universe of the study consisted of individuals over the age of 18 living in the TRNC. The population of the TRNC is 265,100 according to the data of the State Planning Organization (DPÖ, 2021). The size of the sample group was calculated as 315 based on 0.05 margin of error and 0.95 confidence level. Since the sample number of 319 people was reached in this study, the findings have the adequacy to represent the universe. The unit of analysis in the research is individuals.

Collection of Data

In the study, data were collected by using survey technique. There are 2 scales in the survey. The scale used in the research conducted by Doğan et al. (2015) and in which sustainable consumption behaviors are measured has been adapted to this study by amending it. The CFC Scale (Consideration of Future Consequences) developed by Strathman et al. (1994) was used to determine the orientation of individuals to perceive the future.

Normality Assumption Analysis and Outlier Detection

In order to use parametric tests with more statistical power, it is important to determine whether the data distribution meets the normal distribution conditions (Bursal, 2017). At this stage of the study, skewness coefficient and normality tests were examined in order to test whether the data meet the normality assumption. When the skewness values for both scales were divided by their standard errors, it was seen that the normality assumption could not be achieved since the obtained values were greater than the reference value of 1.96. In addition, since n=319 (n>50) for both scales, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test result was taken into consideration. Since these values (p=0.000) were p<0.05, it was seen that the data could not meet the normal distribution requirement at the level of 0.05 significance in terms of these variables. As a result, as a result of the analyzes made by using two criteria, it was accepted that the data could not meet the normal distribution requirement. In this context, it was decided to use non-parametric tests in the analysis of the data.

Since there was no extreme value in the collected data, no subtraction was applied.

Reliability Analysis

In order to measure the reliability of the Future Perception Tendency and Sustainable Consumption Behavior Scales in the context of the collected data, Cronbach's Alpha values are calculated and shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Reliability Test

Scale Name	Cronbach's Alpha Value	Number of Items on the Scale
Future Perception Scale	**0,706**	**11**
Short Term Thinking Scale	0,758	7
Long Term Thinking Scale	0,711	4 (Article 5 has been removed)
Sustainable Consumption Behaviors Scale	**0,896**	**21**
Environmental Sensitivity Scale	0,857	7
Out of Need Purchasing Scale	0,793	5
Savings Scale Scale	0,804	5
Reuse Scale	0,704	4

Source: Authors' own conception

The long-term thinking scale consists of 5 items. However, when the reliability analysis was performed by taking the data into consideration, it was seen that Cronbach's Alpha value was calculated as 0.661. Since this value is less than the generally accepted value of 0.7, the items were taken into consideration one by one and it was decided to use the scale with 4 items since it was seen that Cronbach's Alpha value increased to 0.711 when item number 5 was removed. The Tendency to Perceive the Future Scale, which is formed by the combination of Short and Long Term scales, was formed from 11 items. The scales were accepted as reliable because the Cronbach's Alpha values calculated for the Sustainable Consumption Behavior Scale and all of the subscales were 0.7 and above.

Validity Analysis

In the first stage of the factor analysis, the results of "Determinant" and "KMO and Barlett Globality Test" were taken into consideration for the

"Future Perception Tendency Scale" and it was decided that the data were suitable for factor analysis. In the second stage of the factor analysis, in order to determine the number of factors of the measurement tool, "Explained Total Variance" and "Slope Accumulation Graph" were evaluated together and it was decided to use the scale with 2 factors. As a result of the rotation made in the final stage, it was decided to use the scale materials as they were, since there was no substance with a load below 0.3 and there was no overlapping substance.

Similar operations were also carried out for the "Sustainable Consumption Behaviors Scale", and it was decided to remove the 7th item of the "Environmental Sensitization" scale, the 1st item of the "Unnecessary Purchase" scale and the 4th item of the "Reuse" scale from the scales since they were loaded with more than one factor. As a result, in the analysis of the data, the environmental sensitivity scale was used with 6 items, the non-need purchasing scale with 4 items, the savings scale with 5 items, and the reuse scale with 3 items.

Results

Descriptive Statistics of Participants

The majority of the participants (37.6%) are between the ages of 36-45. 2 participants did not report their age range. The majority are those with a bachelor's degree (45.5%). Primary/secondary school graduates constitute the least group of participants (1.9%). 55.2% of the individuals constituting the sample group are women and the rest are men. 67.4% are married and the others are single.

While the majority of the participating individuals (54.9%) had the habit of doing irregular sports, a group of 16% stated that they did not do sports at all. While the majority of individuals (60.8%) declare that they have a healthy eating habit, the rate of those who say they do not care is 5.6%.

Correlation Analysis Findings

Since the assumption of normality of the data could not be met, non-parametric tests were used to test the relationships between the variables. In the examination of the correlation between the scales, the Spearman Correlation coefficient was calculated and analyzes were performed. The values containing these correlation coefficients are in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlation Analysis Table

		1	2	3	4	5	6
Short-Term Thinking	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,275**	,166**	,015	,010	-,008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000	,003	,795	,860	,880
	N	319	319	319	319	319	319
Long Term Thinking	Correlation Coefficient	-,275**	1,000	,165**	,279**	,305**	,240**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.	,003	,000	,000	,000
	N	319	319	319	319	319	319
Environmental Awareness	Correlation Coefficient	,166**	,165**	1,000	,212**	,453**	,312**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,003	,003	.	,000	,000	,000
	N	319	319	319	319	319	319
Out of Need Purchase	Correlation Coefficient	,015	,279**	,212**	1,000	,574**	,467**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,795	,000	,000	.	,000	,000
	N	319	319	319	319	319	319
Saving	Correlation Coefficient	,010	,305**	,453**	,574**	1,000	,591**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,860	,000	,000	,000	.	,000
	N	319	319	319	319	319	319
Reuse	Correlation Coefficient	-,008	,240**	,312**	,467**	,591**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,880	,000	,000	,000	,000	.
	N	319	319	319	319	319	319

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Authors' own conception

As expected, a statistically significant inverse relationship was found between short-term and long-term thinking trends. This result means that an

individual moves away from the tendency to think short-term when he tends to think long-term and from the long-term thinking tendency when he tends to think short-term ($p=0.000$; $r=-0.275$). However, the strength of the relationship was found to be weak ($r<0.3$). This value can be interpreted as individuals not being clear and persistent in their tendency to think in the future and are close to exhibiting both tendencies at the same time.

When the perception of the future and the subscales of sustainable consumption behaviors were compared, a significant relationship was found between short-term thinking tendency and only environmental sensitivity ($p<0.05$). The relationship is meaningful but weak (0.166). It is an expected result that individuals who tend to think short-term will be distant from sustainable consumption. When the relationship between long-term thinking tendency and sustainable consumption behaviors is examined, the existence of a statistically significant relationship between all variables stands out. When the strength of the relationship is examined, it is seen that individuals who tend to think long-term are more willing to save. In this context, the strength of the relationship is at the intermediate level ($r=0.305$). Although there was a significant relationship between long-term thinking tendency and environmental sensitivity, non-need purchasing and reuse variables, the strength of the relationship was found to be weak.

When the individuals living in the TRNC are evaluated in general, although the long-term thinking tendency outweighs the short-term thinking tendency, there is no obvious difference. The assumption here is that those who tend to think long-term will be more sensitive about global sustainability. When this assumption is accepted as true, it will be seen that the level of awareness of TRNC individuals about the sustainability of global resources is not at a sufficient level.

Finally, in the context of the correlational relationship, the relationships between the subscales of sustainable consumption behaviors were evaluated. In this context, a statistically significant and strong relationship was found between non-need purchasing and saving tendency ($p<0.05$; $r=0.574$). The relationship between non-consumer purchasing and reuse variables is significant and moderate. While the relationship between environmental sensitivity and saving and reuse is meaningful and moderate, the relationship between environmental sensitivity and non-essential purchasing behavior is meaningful but weak. The strongest relationship was found between saving tendency and reuse behavior ($p<0.05$; $r=0.591$). That is, it has been observed that individuals who tend to save are closer to reusing what they have.

The acceptance/rejection status of the hypotheses formed in the model section of the research is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Hypothesis Conclusion Table

Hypotheses	Admission/Rejection Status	The Power of Relationship
H_1: There is a relationship between the tendency to think short-term and to act sensitively to the environment.	**Acceptance**	**Slim**
H_2: There is a relationship between short-term thinking tendency and non-need buying behavior.	Alex	-
H_3: There is a relationship between the tendency to think short-term and the tendency to save.	Alex	-
H_4: There is a relationship between short-term thinking tendency and reuse behavior.	Alex	-
H_5: There is a relationship between the tendency to think long-term and to act sensitively to the environment.	**Acceptance**	**Slim**
H_6: There is a relationship between long-term thinking tendency and non-need buying behavior.	**Acceptance**	**Slim**
H_7: There is a relationship between the tendency to think long-term and the tendency to save.	**Acceptance**	**Middle**
H_8: There is a relationship between long-term thinking tendencies and reuse behavior.	**Acceptance**	**Slim**

Source: Authors' own conception

Testing of Differences Between Groups

The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to evaluate whether the tendency to perceive the future and sustainable consumption behaviors

showed a statistically significant difference according to gender and marital status groups. The results obtained are in Table 4.

Table 4. Differences Between Groups

Scales	**mann-whinney u**	**Z**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)**
Group Criteria: **Gender**			
Out of Need Purchase	10808,500	-2,176	,030
Group Criteria: **Marital Status**			
Short-Term Thinking Tendency	9497,000	-2,185	,029
Environmental Awareness	9589,000	-2,066	,039
Saving Trend	9524,500	-2,158	,031

Source: Authors' own conception

While the tendency to buy out of need showed a statistically significant difference according to gender groups ($p=0.03<0.05$), there was no significant difference in terms of other variables ($p>0.05$).

While short-term thinking tendency, environmental sensitivity and saving tendency showed a statistically significant difference according to marital status groups ($p<0.05$), no significant difference was found in terms of other variables ($p>0.05$).

Kruskal-Wallis Test test was applied to evaluate whether the tendency to perceive the future and sustainable consumption behaviors showed a statistically significant difference according to graduation, age groups, sports habits and healthy eating groups. The results obtained are in Table 5.

Table 5. Differences Between Groups

Scales	Chi-Square	Df	Asymp. Sig.
Grouping Criteria: **Graduation**			
Short-Term Thinking Tendency	15,321	3	,002
Environmental Awareness	16,967	3	,001
Grouping Criteria: **Age Groups**			
Environmental Awareness	27,393	3	,000
Out of Need Purchase	22,201	3	,000
Saving Trend	34,161	3	,000
Grouping Criteria: **Healthy Nutrition**			
The Tendency to Think Long-Term	6,324	2	,042
Environmental Awareness	25,698	2	,000
Out of Need Purchase	12,935	2	,002
Saving Trend	14,077	2	,001
Reuse	7,972	2	,019
Grouping Criteria: **Sports Habit**			
Environmental Awareness	17,298	2	,000
Out of Need Purchase	7,605	2	,022

Source: Authors' own conception

When Table 5 is examined, it will be seen that while short-term thinking tendency and environmental sensitivity show a statistically significant difference ($p<0.05$), there is no significant difference in terms of other variables ($p>0.05$). In this context, it was seen that high school graduates had short-term thinking tendencies and graduate graduates had long-term thinking, and the most sensitive group about environmental sensitivity was those who received education in high school and below, and the group with the least sensitivity was undergraduate graduates.

While environmental sensitivity, non-need purchasing and saving tendency showed a statistically significant difference between age groups ($p<0.05$), there was no significant difference in terms of other variables ($p>0.05$). It has been observed that the tendency to save and environmental sensitivity increase or decrease depending on age, in this context, the tendency to save and environmental sensitivity increase as the age increases, and the most sensitive group for non-need purchasing is the 46-55 age range.

While environmental sensitivity and non-need purchasing behaviors showed a statistically significant difference according to sports habit ($p<0.05$), there was no significant difference in terms of other variables ($p>0.05$). It is noteworthy that those who do sports and those who never do it are visibly separated from each other. In terms of environmental sensitivity and non-need purchasing, it was seen that those who did sports were significantly differentiated compared to those who did not do sports.

Long-term thinking, environmental sensitivity, non-need purchasing, saving tendency and reuse behaviors showed a statistically significant difference compared to healthy nutrition ($p<0.05$). In this context, it is possible to say that as the importance given to healthy nutrition increases, the tendency to think long-term increases. The same trend is reflected in sustainable consumption behaviors. In other words, as the importance given to healthy nutrition increases, it will be seen that consumption approaches being nature-friendly, and as the importance given to healthy nutrition decreases, it will be seen that consumption behavior that takes sustainability into consideration is removed.

Conclusion and Discussion

As a result of the researches examining individual differences in temporal perception and the relationship of these differences to sustainable behaviors, it has been shown that long-term time perception predicts pro-environmental attitudes (such as strong attitudes to protect the environment and weak attitudes towards benefiting from the environment) and participation in sustainable behaviors (such as environmentalist consumerism, public transportation use and motivation to take pro-environmental actions). In the light of the evidence obtained as a result of these researches, the relationship between differences in perceptions for the future and sustainable consumption behaviors was examined in the context of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

When the relationship between the tendency to perceive the future and the subscales of sustainable consumption behaviors was examined, a significant relationship was found between the short-term thinking tendency and only the environmental sensitivity factor from the subscales of sustainable consumption behaviors ($p<0.05$). This relationship is significant but weak (0.166). It is an expected result that individuals who tend to think short-term will be distant from sustainable consumption. When the relationship between long-term thinking tendency and sustainable consumption behaviors is examined, the existence of a statistically significant relationship between all variables stands out. When the strength of the

relationship is examined, it is seen that individuals who tend to think long-term are more willing to save. In this context, the strength of the relationship is at the intermediate level (r=0.305). Although there was a significant relationship between long-term thinking tendency and environmental sensitivity, non-need purchasing and reuse variables, the strength of the relationship was found to be weak.

When the individuals living in the TRNC are evaluated in general, although the long-term thinking tendency outweighs the short-term thinking tendency, there is no obvious difference. The assumption here is that those who tend to think long-term will be more sensitive about global sustainability. When this assumption is accepted as true, it will be seen that the level of awareness of TRNC individuals about the sustainability of global resources is not at a sufficient level.

Prior to the research, it was assumed that there was an inverse and strong relationship between short- and long-term thinking trends. Because it is more appropriate for an individual's temporal perception tendency about the future to be either short or long-term. However, as a result of the analysis of the data, although a statistically significant relationship was determined between the two variables, it was seen that the strength of this relationship was weak. In other words, as a result of the data collected from individuals living in the TRNC, there was no clear distribution to the two categories specified. Although there are many social and cultural reasons for this, it is beyond the scope of this study.

Research conducted by Enzler (2015) has suggested that those with longer-term future time perception have higher concerns about environmental issues than those with short-term ones. Although the results of this research are not very strong, they have shown that individuals who think long-term are more sensitive to sustainable consumption and environmental sensitivity than those who think short-term.

References

Adams, J. (2012). Consideration of Immediate and Future Consequences, Smoking Status, and Body Mass Index. *Health Psychology*, *31*(2), 260–263. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025790

Anderson, W. T., & Cunningham, W. H. (1972). The Socially Conscious Consumer. *Journal of Marketing*, *36*(3), 23–31. https://doi.org/10.2307/1251036

Arnocky, S., & Stroink, M. L. (2011). Variation in environmentalism among university students: Majoring in outdoor recreation, parks, and tourism predicts environmental concerns and behaviors. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, *42*(3), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2010.516776

Arnocky, S., Stroink, M., & De Cicco, T. (2007). Self-construal predicts environmental concern, cooperation, and conservation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *27*(4), 255–264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2007.06.005

Banerjee, S. B., Iyer, E. S., & Kashyap, R. K. (2003). Corporate environmentalism: Antecedents and Influence of Industry Type. *Journal Of Marketing*, *67*(2), 106-122. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.2.106.18604

Belz, F. M., & Peattie, K. (2009). *Sustainability Marketing: A Global Perspective*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Brown, T. J., & Dacin, P. A. (1997). The company and the product: Corporate associations and consumer product responses. *Journal of Marketing*, *61*(1), 68–84, https://doi.org/10.2307/1252190

Bursal, M. (2017). *SPSS ile Temel Veri Analizi* [Basic Data Analysis with SPSS]. Anı Yayıncılık.

Charlton, S. R., Gossett, B. D., & Charlton, V. A. (2012). Effect of delay and social distance on the perceived value of social interaction. *Behavioural Processes*, *89*(1), 23–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2011.10.003

Dawes, R. M. (1980). Social dilemmas. *Annual Review of Psychology, 31*, 169–193. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.31.020180.001125

Doğan, O., Bulut, Z. A. & Çımrın, F. K. (2015). Bireylerin Sürdürülebilir Tüketim Davranışlarının Ölçülmesine Yönelik Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması [A Scale Development Study to Measure Sustainable Consumption Behaviors of Individuals]. *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 29*(4), 659-678. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/atauniiibd/issue/2719/36129

Enzler, H. B. (2015). Consideration of Future Consequences as a Predictor of Environmentally Responsible Behavior: Evidence from a General Population Study. *Environment and Behavior*, *47*(6), 618–643. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916513512204

Gürbüz, S., & Şahin, F. (2017). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri* [Research Methods in Social Sciences]. Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Hendrickx, L., Poortinga, W., & Kooij, R. (2001). Temporal factors in resource dilemmas. *Acta Psychologica*, *108*(2), 137-154. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-6918(01)00032-4

Hopkins, W. G., Marshall, S. W., Batterham, A. M., & Hanin, J. (2009). Progressive statistics for studies in sports medicine and exercise science. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise, 41*(1), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e31818cb278

Joireman, J. A., Lasane, T. P., Bennett, J., Richards, D., & Solaimani, S. (2001). Integrating social value orientation and the consideration of future consequences within the extended norm activation model of

proenvironmental behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*(1), 133–155. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164731

Joireman, J. A., Van Lange, P. A. M., & Van Vugt, M. (2004). Who Cares About the Environmental Impact of Cars? Those With an Eye Toward the Future. *Environment and Behavior*, *36*(2), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916503251476

Joireman, J., Balliet, D., Sprott, D., Spangenberg E., & Schultz J. (2008). Consideration of future consequences, ego-depletion, and self-control: Support for distinguishing between CFC-Immediate and CFC-Future sub-scales. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *45*(1), 15–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.02.011

Joireman, J., Kees, J., & Sprott, D. (2010). Concern with immediate consequences magnifies the impact of compulsive buying tendencies on college students' credit card debt. *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 44*(1), 155–178. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2010.01161.x

Kilbourne, W., & Beckmann, S. C. (1998). Review and critical assessment of research on marketing and the environment. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *14,* 513-532. https://doi.org/10.1362/026725798784867716

KKTC Devlet Planlama Örgütü. (2021). *KKTC De-Facto ve De-Jure Nüfusunun İlçe, Bucak ve Cinsiyete Göre Dağılımı* [Distribution of TRNC De-Facto and De-Jure Population by District, District and Gender]. http://nufussayimi.devplan.org/Nufus%20Kesin%20Sonuc.pdf

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2011). *Principles of Marketing.* (14th ed.) Prentice Hall.

Kotler, P., Hermawan, K., & Iwan, S. (2010). *Marketing 3.0: From products to customers to the human spirit*. Wiley.

Lasane, T. P., & O'Donnell, D. A. (2005). Time Orientation Measurement: A Conceptual Approach. In A. Strathman & J. Joireman (Eds.*), Understanding behavior in the context of time: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 11–30). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Lindsay, J. J., & Strathman, A. (1997). Predictors of recycling behavior: An application of a modified health belief model. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27*(20), 1799–1823. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1997.tb01626.x

Luo, X., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility, Customer Satisfaction, and Market Value. *Journal of Marketing*, *70*(4), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.70.4.1

Milfont, T. L., & Gouveia, V. V. (2006). Time perspective and values: An exploratory study of their relations to environmental attitudes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *26*(1), 72–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2006.03.001

Milfont, T. L., Wilson, J., & Diniz, P. (2012). Time perspective and environmental engagement: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Psychology, 47*(5), 325–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2011.647029

Olsen, M. C., Slotegraaf, R. J. & Chandukala, S. R. (2014). Green Claims and Message Frames: How Green New Products Change Brand Attitude, *Journal of Marketing, 78*(5), 119-137. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.13.0387

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55(*1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5

Strathman, A., Gleicher, F., Boninger, D. S., & Edwards, C. S. (1994). The consideration of future consequences: Weighing immediate and distant outcomes of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*(4), 742–752. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.4.742