

HOMOMORALIS SEARCH IN PURCHASE BEHAVIORS OF VEBLEN'S LEISURE CLASS AND THE CONSPICUOUS WHO IMITATE THEM THROUGH VIGNETTES

¹Lect. Dr. Kader EROL, ²Dr. Nihan TOMRİS KÜÇÜN,

¹Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University / Türkiye

²Eskişehir Osmangazi University / Türkiye

ABSTRACT

Economics and marketing disciplines, which left behind the days when traditional theories were in competition with behavioral theories, where the basic view is to maximize self-benefit, have been busy with studies that question the limits of people's selfishness in recent years. In these studies, in which human behavior is considered as the dependent variable, the independent variables constantly differ. In the research, in which different working methods are used, many independent variables such as psychology, genetics, neurology, sociology, personality and environment can be mentioned. In this study, while the dependent variable remains the same as "human", the motives of non-producing and conspicuous consumers were tried to be determined by following the moral traces of Veblen's leisure class and conspicuous purchasing behaviors. Drawing attention with his findings opposing the law of demand of the economy, Veblen states that in some cases, the demand of some consumers for goods with higher prices may increase. He calls this group of consumers the leisure class. This class is a class that participates in the economy only through consumption. In addition, the class of conspicuous people trying to imitate the economic behavior of this class also emerged from Veblen's theory. The pretentious class, on the other hand, can be defined as consumers who participate in the economy through production, but who try to imitate the leisure class because of their spending behavior. Researching such consumer classes can be difficult, often due to social desirability. In other words, individuals may not want to admit it even if they are in the leisure class, or they may try to provide evidence that they are not, even though they are in the conspicuous class. For this reason, in this study, the vignette method, which has recently become widespread in the field of social sciences, was preferred in order to minimize the socially desirable response errors. The results of the study conducted through the vignette method reveal that people who are estimated to be from the leisure class are more likely to display ethical behaviors about spending. In other words, the group that is only involved in the economy through consumption shows not only homoeconomicus but also homomoralis behaviors that try to maximize their own interests. In the conspicuous class, homomoralis traces are more obscure. As Veblen clearly states in his theory, conspicuous ones display changing behavior in front of others for the sole purpose of showing off.

KEYWORDS: Veblen's leisure class, Vignette research, Purchasing behavior, Conspicuous Consumption, Homomoralis

1. INTRODUCTION

Homoeconomicus, which is the basic human definition of traditional economic theories, has started to make a name for itself with its evolution over time. There is no indication that this process, which started with the questioning of human rationality in the decision-making process and continued with the evolution of homoeconomicus, has ended. Because, as an open system, human is an organism that is open to change and development as it is in constant communication with the external environment. Therefore, it can be said that the evolution in question has not been completed yet. Sometimes the decision-making process, which is considered sociologically, is called homosociologus, while at other times it is considered together with morality and ethics and called homomoralis. Sometimes, the effect of the culture in which the individual lives in the decision process has been noticed and the term homoculture has been coined. However, recent studies show that the dimensions of decision making are greater than expected. When we look at the studies that show that psychology, genetics and neurology are closely related to decision making, we may soon hear terms such as homopsychology, homogeneticus or homoneurologicus. These terms, which emerged as a result of the

interdisciplinary treatment of decision-making behavior, show that this behavior is also related to many disciplines.

Considering the multidisciplinary structure of decision-making behavior, it would be correct to say that the field of social sciences comes to the fore. When we look at the routine decisions made every day, it is seen that there is an endless research area for economics and marketing sciences. What to buy, under what conditions? Many questions such as what should be the benefit to be obtained at the end of the purchase, should this benefit be only individual or is it possible to talk about a social benefit are some of the questions waiting to be answered by the consumers. In addition, questions such as what should be sold, under what conditions should be sold, what should be the benefit to be obtained at the end of the sale, and whether this benefit should be only at the company level or should a social benefit be considered are questions that must be answered by the producers. The answers to these questions will undoubtedly be given by economics and marketing sciences.

While the traditional theories of economics and marketing are closely concerned with the decision-making process of human beings, they have changed over time and innovative theories have been put forward. The change in the demand function of the economy in parallel with the change in the 4Ps of marketing is the best example of this. Despite the ethical concerns, studies such as neuromarketing, genoeconomics and neurofinance, which are growing rapidly, are important in terms of showing the direction that economy and marketing have reached, while at the same time showing the direction they are going. The starting point on this path of change is homoeconomicus.

The aim of this study is to theoretically examine the deviations of individuals' purchasing behavior from individual utilitarian homoeconomicus to moral utilitarian homomorality within the framework of Veblen's Leisure Class Theory, which reveals exceptions to the law of demand from traditional economic theories and criticizes the capitalist system by citing positive and negative instincts. In addition, in order to exemplify Veblen's conspicuous consumption, a vignette study was carried out on a group of samples with the scenarioed single-profile combined analysis method, and the results were discussed in the context of homomoralis.

2. VEBLEN'S LEISURE CLASS AND THE PHENOMENON OF CONSPICUOUS CONSUMPTION

One of the basic principles of traditional economics is undoubtedly the law of demand. According to the law, a decrease in the price of any product will cause an increase in the quantity demanded, and an increase in the price will cause a decrease in the quantity demanded. However, there are some exceptions to the law. The first exception to challenge standard economic and consumer demand theories are goods known as Giffen Goods (Mason, 1989). Robert Giffen, who defines the exception created by the law of demand for low-priced, non-luxury goods with few close substitutes, gives examples of these goods such as bread, rice, potatoes, and wheat (Jensen and Miller, 2007). Among the basic inferences of Giffen goods are statements that *"if the price of a Giffen good increases, its demand will increase, and the reverse of this situation is also possible"* and that *"the demand curve of Giffen goods starts from the origin and follows a right upward slope"* (Stigler, 1947).

Another criticism of the law of demand from traditional economic theories came from Veblen. According to Veblen, the economic problem of mainstream economic theories is defined as the most efficient use of resources within the existing institutional structure, but the problem is related to the creation of the most effective institutions to deal with scarcity (Anderson, 1933). From this point of view, capitalism is not concerned with dealing with scarcity or creating the most ideal institutions to cope with it, and rather is dominated by predatory, imitative and monetary instincts that support dysfunctional social behaviors. Such instincts, on the other hand, create behaviors and tendencies that benefit the individual rather than the society and have harmful consequences for the society (Baysal Kar, 2020). However, in Veblen, social life is more important than individual actions, and what is acceptable is social procurement behavior, not individual procurement (Waller, 2009).

Thorstein Veblen generally criticizes capitalism in all his works, but there is not a single work in which he clearly demonstrates these criticisms. In his different works, he expresses these criticisms with different aspects (Davis, 1945). However, in his general critique of capitalism, Veblen identifies individualism as the fundamental moral flaw and bad instinctive behaviors that serve individual interests. If these behaviors dominate the markets, the prevailing morality is the morality of capitalism and such bad instincts will lead to waste, exploitation, unemployment, stagnation and many other devastating consequences for society (Hunt and Lautzenheiser, 2011; Zingler, 1974; O'Hara, 1999; Davis, 1957; Harris, 1953). Accordingly, behaviors that increase community welfare should be good instincts. In other words, human behavior is based on instinctive

behaviors, not self-interest, and behavior is motivated by these instincts. These instincts are shaped by language, cultural symbolic systems, social institutions, and the social and cultural environment (Waller, 2007).

Veblen especially focuses on monetary imitation of these instincts in his Theory of the Leisure Class. According to him, consumption behavior is motivated by monetary emulation. According to traditional economic theories, while income level is the main determining condition of consumption, Veblen's Leisure Class sets standards at the top of the social hierarchy and engages in conspicuous consumption and pretentious idleness (Waller, 2009). Accordingly, the benefit obtained from the goods or services owned by the conspicuous consumption in question is not the benefit inherent in that good or service, but the benefit arising from the satisfaction of showing off to others and showing the high purchasing power of the individual. In other words, the thing that benefits is not the thing bought, but the fact that the thing bought shows the high purchasing power of the individual. The purpose of the monetary emulation in question stems from the individual's desire to be accepted in the society (Watkins, 2015). According to Veblen, these expenditures, which do not contribute to the productivity of life, hinder the industrial efficiency of the society and prevent the increase in production (Veblen 1899-Kirmizialtin & Bilir, 2016).

The concept of "leisure" in Veblen's Class of Leisure can correspond to words such as laziness, lethargy, laziness. However, in the theory, "leisure" is used in the sense of non-productive consumption of time. Accordingly, individuals in the leisure class see "*production and productivity*" as worthless. The life they live is an indication of their richness, and according to them, this is the main thing.

Veblen also has ideas about the distinction between commerce and industry and about it. At this point, according to Veblen, who defends ideas similar to the conflicting ideas of Karl Marx between capitalists and proletarians, it is a small minority that owns the means of production and the system is run by the propertyless, who sell their labor to the owners (Davis, 1957). The entrepreneur, on the other hand, has two different definitions according to Veblen. The first of these is the captain of the industry, who made important contributions to the increase of society's welfare from the Industrial Revolution to the mid-19th century, when corporate finance was on the rise. The second is the absentee proprietor, who is morally criticized and controls the country's commerce and industry with restricted output (Veblen, 1923).

The conspicuous consumption that emerged in the light of Veblen's accumulating theories seems to be a consumption model that has gained momentum today. This consumption behavior exhibited by the pretentious people who imitate the leisure life, cannot go beyond trying to imitate them, even though they do not have the wealth of the leisure class. Besides, show-off consumers who imitated the leisure class also developed a reluctance to work.

According to Davis (1957), conspicuous consumption is a consumption habit realized as a symbol of social class status. Veblen, who draws attention to the fact that the members of the real leisure class consciously waste their time as well as the unnecessary expenditures they make, defines the waste of time and effort as conspicuous idleness, and the wasting of wealth as conspicuous consumption. According to this view, the symbol of prestige is equated with being extravagant (Veblen 1899-Kirmizialtin & Bilir, 2016).

Conspicuous consumption does not mean extravagance in terms of neoclassical economics. Because the motto of neoclassical economic theory is *homo economicus* and accordingly, preferences are external and rational (Davanzati, 2006). For this reason, consumption is made as a result of rational choices without any emulation. In this context, the pretentious consumer actually maximizes his own utility. However, according to Veblen, every expenditure or effort made by an individual should serve the welfare of the society. However, according to the conspicuous consumption theory, the individual imitates the consumption structures of other individuals who are higher in the hierarchy. Veblen defines this imitation drive as "an unfair comparison drive that provokes us to be superior to others in the habit of placing ourselves in a certain class" (Trigg, 2001). He states that the elimination of this unfair comparison drive will increase the efficiency of the resources in the economy, they will be channeled to the right areas, and as a result, every individual in the society will be happy (Clark, 1998). On the other hand, it is seen that Veblen's conspicuous consumers are satisfied with their situation and this satisfaction is called Social Stability Theory by Heilbroner (2019). Accordingly, these consumers try to climb to the level of the leisure class they imitate and do not even think of clashing with them, rather than imitating the tension that Karl Marx predicted between capitalists and workers. In other words, those who show off support the interests of the leisure class or capitalists at some point, even if the results are against them (Hunt & Lautzenheiser, 2011).

It is clear that the most obvious similarity and difference between the ostentatious imitators of the leisure class and the leisure class is in terms of their purchasing behavior. Eastman, Goldsmith, and Flynn (1999) state that while consumers in the leisure class make expensive purchases due to their social position, ostentatious people do it because they emulate this position they do not belong to. Coleman (1983), on the other hand, considers the subject as an effort to influence others. According to Coleman, shopping, which is sociologically attributed to wealth in society in the leisure class, is made in an effort to impress the members of the leisure class and then other individuals by conspicuous class. Accordingly, the main motivation of conspicuous consumption is the effort to influence others.

The concept of communication, which has changed thanks to today's technological development, has also begun to change the motivation of pretentious consumers. Individuals who find new living spaces in the virtual world have discovered that their efforts to skip grades are easier in the virtual world compared to the real world. In particular, with the increasing use of social media, expenditures for conspicuous consumption have increased and changed (Jaikumar and Sharma, 2021; Wilcox and Stephen 2013; Beall et al., 2021; Taylor and Strutton, 2016). In addition to the products and services they buy, individuals have started to share their donations, environmental behavior, green product demands and opinions on social media channels.

While respecting the efforts to create a scale for the study of conspicuous consumption, it is also clear that the tendency of the participants to give socially desirable answers in such survey studies can be misleading in the research results. What makes this study unique from similar studies is its research method. Social desirability, which is one of the possible errors in the results of classical survey studies and in the interpretation of these results, has been tried to be reduced by using the vignette method in this study. Thanks to the vignette scenarios presented to the participants, they were asked to answer the answers in terms of the imaginary people in the scenario, not for themselves. Thanks to this method, the participants were encouraged to be more objective and the existence of homo-morality, which is one of the points where the evolution of the individual utilitarian homo-economicus, was tried to be revealed with the imaginary conspicuous consumers in the scenarios.

3. HOMO-ECONOMICUS VS. HOMO-MORALIS

Although he did not use the term homo-economicus conceptually, it was John Stuart Mill who put forward his first intellectual framework with his work "Essay on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy" published in 1848. At the end of the 19th century, marginalist economists such as Jevons, Walras and Menger expressed Mill's thoughts on a theoretical level through mathematical means (Levent, 2019; Madi, 2014).

The philosophical foundations of the concept were undoubtedly laid by Bentham. However, until Bentham, many philosopher explained the basic building blocks of homo-economicus in different ways. The most discussed concept on the subject is hedonism.

Hedonism in ancient philosophy begins with Democritus. According to Democritus (Yıldız Turan, 2015), who can be considered as the founder of eudaimonism (mutism), those who want to reach happiness must distinguish between what is beneficial and what is not. Aristippos, the founder of the Cyrene school, argues that tastes are individual and that everyone should act in line with this pleasure. In addition, according to the same trend, the pleasure one will get now is more valuable than the pleasure one will get in the future (Laertios; Şentuna, 2007). According to Aristippos, the reason for every behavior is the desire to be happy. Pleasure is the emotion that makes people human (Fettahlioğlu et al. 2014). The most well-known ancient philosopher on hedonism is undoubtedly Epicurus. The interpretation of Epicurus, which overlaps with today's hedonic marketing and pleasure economics, is hidden in the advice he gave to his followers. According to Epicurus, needs are divided into three: natural and necessary needs, natural but non-obligatory needs, and neither natural nor necessary needs. To be happy, it is enough to meet the requirements in the first category. There is no need for more (Gökberk, 2010). Antisthenes, the founder of the school of cynicism, defends a similar view and talks about the enslavement of pleasure. According to him, happiness can only be reached when he gets rid of empty delusions. This is virtue and the most important one is virtue (Kartal, 2015; Gökberk, 2010). According to Socrates, chasing pleasure without thinking about it will only lead to unhappiness in the future. Because he argues that some pleasurable actions will cause harm over time (Cevizci, 1999). Plato, on the other hand, defines happiness as the higher good. Saying that man is the ultimate goal and this goal is happiness, Plato says "happiness is a product of the correct and appropriate actions of the organism" (Sönmez, 2014).

Philosophically, the concept that started to be discussed after hedonism was utilitarianism. It was Bentham who philosophically dealt with the understanding of the highest utility, which is the main feature of homo-economicus. Bentham's utilitarian approach extends from the self-interested human model in traditional

economics to psychological hedonism. He considers psychological hedonistic needs as a phenomenon that gives pleasure and happiness if they are met, gives pain and suffering if they are not met, and that all actions can be taken to meet them (Ulaş, 2002). In fact, Bentham's approach to this issue has shaped traditional economic theory.

This individual, who centers his economic interests, is selfish and greedy, and for whom theories are built in modern economics, is a person who prioritizes his own interests and has made maximizing his benefit and profit the most important goal of his life. According to the selfish and greedy moral understanding, the individual puts his own interests at the center. Accordingly, what is good for the individual is acceptable, and what is not good for the individual is bad (Bulut, 2015).

Economic man, which is viewed from a philosophical point of view, should be considered together with different concepts from an economic point of view. When considered together with the budget, Nyborg's definition is remarkable. Nyborg (2000) describes the economic person as "the individual who aims to maximize his welfare within the budget possibilities, thus seeking pleasure and avoiding pain and sorrow". Although utility maximization is the basic feature of the economy, it is also a fact that human beings are not egoistic and hedonistic. Because the individual considers not only his own well-being, but also the welfare of his family and other close circles. In this respect, the individual who can be said to be an altruist will be utilitarian when he considers the benefit of the whole society from a wider framework. When all these are taken into consideration, it is easily seen that homo-economicus has lost its semantic power (White, 2004). Darwinist evolutionary process supports homo-economicus. According to the process, the economic life of the individual pursuing individual interests will continue, otherwise the individual will almost disappear on a eugenic basis. Gintis (2000) strongly opposes such approaches. According to him, individuals in economic life do not act rationally in accordance with theoretical axioms. On the contrary, they act pro-socially and collaboratively, and from this point of view, the individual exhibits a homo-reciprocans approach rather than a homo-economicus.

Most liberal economists regard the individual as rational and homo-economicus (White, 2004). Those who adhere to neoclassical theory and liberalists such as Hayek and Buchanan agree on the inadequacy of the concept of economic man (Ryan, 2003; Zafirovski, 2000; Buchanan, 1989a; Buchanan, 1989b). This inadequacy started the evolution process for homo-economicus. In this evolutionary process, which emerged with the realization that man was not purely rational, homo-economicus sometimes evolved into homo-culture, sometimes homo-sociologus, and sometimes homo-reciprocans.

Individuals who insist on doing the right thing under almost all circumstances are called homo-moralis. People who internalize feelings such as "patriotism, loyalty, obedience, courage and sympathy", use their preferences in favor of ethics, and are always ready to help each other and sacrifice themselves for the "common good" fit the definition of homo-moralis. At the other end of the line, there are homo-economicus, who primarily think of their own interests and constantly try to maximize their own earnings (Alger & Weibull, 2013).

In an economic society, homo-economicus represents business people who assume the role of entrepreneur, shareholder, employee or manager (Colombo, 2008), while homo-moralis represents individuals who think that the most important value is to do the right thing. From the point of view of homo-economicus, even the concerns of such people are selfish and therefore they consider their own interests before anything and everyone (Dixon & Wilson, 2013; Lee et al., 2009; Skitka, 2009).

According to Alger and Weibull (2013), the choices people make are caught somewhere between selfishness ("maximizing one's own gain") or ethical ("doing the right thing") and are shaped accordingly. Moral preferences are a part of human genes that are passed down from generation to generation, and in fact, it is in the nature of humans to consider both their own interests and ethics (Alger & Weibull, 2013; Dixon & Wilson, 2013).

Homo-economicus is cold and calculating, only worried about himself and ready to try any means that gives him the greatest financial advantage (Colombo, 2008, p. 739; Konow & Earley, 2008). From the point of view of homo-moralis, people are more inclined to internalize justice and evaluate right and wrong in terms of moral standards. In other words, these types of people see justice and righteousness as the most important values in life. They focus all their attention on their 'should' rather than their 'wants and desires'. People and companies with high homo-moralis prefer to make a profit with the right methods, without sacrificing honesty, by paying more attention to moral values.

Recent studies reveal that homo-moralis consumers generally have ethical preferences and behaviors and are more willing to buy products from ethical companies, even if they are more expensive than other products (GlobeScan, EAI and Korea Foundation for Advanced Studies, 2013). These types of consumers are helping to increase donations to charities by making social initiatives (Giving USA, 2016). In addition, they try to direct consumers with the campaigns they organize in order not to purchase products from unethical companies. In other words, ethical behavior preferences similar to these classify individuals as homo-moralis (Alger & Weibull, 2013; Begue, 2011; Skitka, 2009; Skitka & Bauman, 2008). In addition, homo-moralis appears in many studies on topics such as 'ethical consumerism', 'ethical purchasing behavior' or 'ethical consumption'.

In fact, perceptions, awareness and preferences lie at the basis of all human behavior. Moral decisions can only be made with moral behavior choices, and this is not always easy. In other words, a consumer may behave like homo-moralis (a moral person) in some situations, and prefer to behave like a homo-economicus (person who wants to make a profit) in another situation.

As ethical issues become more and more important in societies, it has been started to investigate the moral preferences of individuals in their purchasing decisions and how these preferences affect consumer behavior. Because modern societies have come to expect their individuals to be more sensitive and ethical in many areas. For example, a conflict between homo-moralis and homo-economicus is triggered even in the decision of consumers whether to choose a plastic straw or a paper straw (Lee, 2020). Deciding on the basis of their own 'wish and pleasure' or choosing the 'right thing' for society and the environment... In daily life, even in such a simple matter, consumers can easily be judged whether they have made a moral decision or not. From this point of view, the question of this research is to what extent the conspicuous consumers who imitate Veblen's leisure class exhibit homo-moral behavior.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The aim of the study is to reveal whether the leisure class and conspicuous people mentioned in Veblen's theory show homomoralis behavior in their purchasing behavior. The method used to find the answer to this research question is the vignette method, which is frequently preferred in new generation scientific research.

Vignette studies are studies that are used to examine human behavior, attitudes, ideas, beliefs, intentions, and decision-making processes in general on rare or ethically difficult issues (Atzmüller and Steiner, 2010; Alexander and Becker, 1978; Finch, 1987; Hughes et al. Huby, 2002, Ganong and Coleman, 2006; Rossi et al., 1974, 1985). Vignette studies generally start with the definition of the research question and follow a process such as determining the population and sample, choosing the hypothetical presentation type, deciding on the type of vignette, collecting and analyzing the data. While hypothetical vignette types include short prose text, cartoons, dialogue, still or moving pictures, or audio and video recordings, vignettes are contrasting vignettes, policy capture, paper-human studies, composite analysis, and multi-stage factorial vignettes (Auspurg). and Hinz, 2015; Murphy et al., 1986; Aguinis and Bradley, 2014; Sauer et al., 2011; Sleed et al., 2002; Hughes and Huby, 2002, 2004). In this study, it was preferred to conduct a vignette research with the in-subject single profile combined analysis method.

Two scenarios were presented to the participants in the study. The vignette, called Scenario 1, contains a narration representing the conspicuous people who imitate Veblen's leisure class, while the vignette, called Scenario 2, has a narration representing the leisure class of Veblen. Scenario 1 was answered by 98 participants while scenario 2 was answered by 96 participants. Four questions were prepared for the determination of homomoralis behaviors belonging to both classes and all participants were asked what behavior they thought the people in the scenarios would exhibit. Two questions about donation and two questions about green purchasing were prepared to represent homomoralis behavior. It is estimated that the participants in the group in which Scenario 1 was presented will predict that the scenario person will be more willing to donate and green purchases in the presence of other people, but more reluctant when they are alone.

On the other hand, it is estimated that the participants in the group in which scenario 2 is presented, assuming that the scenario person will show similar behaviors to the members of the leisure class, will make the prediction that they will exhibit the same behaviors both in the presence of other people and alone about donation and green purchasing. There are three options created in the light of these predictions. While option a in scenario 1 was created for the conspicuous behavior prediction, option b was created for the prediction of non-pretentious behavior and option c was created the prediction for both possible options. In scenario 2, option b was formed for the prediction of the behavior of the members of the leisure class, while option a was formed for the prediction of the behavior of those who are not from the leisure class, and option c was for both options that are

possible. The options of the vignettes were also used in the hypotheses established regarding the search for homomoralis in the purchasing behavior of the leisure class and the conspicuous class, which is the main research question of the study.

While all of the participants are 194, there are 53 women and 45 men in the conspicuous group, and totally 96 people, 48 women and 48 men in the leisure class group. The average age of the participants in both groups is around 21 and the average family income is around 14.000 Turkish Liras. Therefore, it is thought that there is no difference between the groups in terms of participant distribution and the participants are homogeneously distributed among the groups (Table 1).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the participants

		Gender		Age			Income		
		Frequency	Percent	Min.	Max.	Average	Min.	Max.	Average
Conspicuous Class	Female	53	54,1	18	51	21,72	5.000	35.000	14.250
	Male	45	45,9						
Leisure Class	Female	48	50,0	18	52	21,15	5.000	37.000	13.980
	Male	48	50,0						

HYPOTHESIS AND FINDINGS

The hypotheses established in the context of the research question of the study are as follows:

- H1= Participants in the conspicuous scenario group will mostly choose option a for the Donation-1 question.
- H2= Participants in the conspicuous scenario group will mostly choose option a for the Green Purchase-1 question.
- H3= Participants in the conspicuous scenario group will mostly choose option a for the Donation-2 question.
- H4= Participants in the conspicuous scenario group will mostly choose option a for the Green Purchase-2 question.
- H5= Participants in the leisure class scenario group will mostly choose option c for the Donation-1 question.
- H6= Participants in the leisure class scenario group will mostly choose option c for the Green Purchase-1 question.
- H7= Participants in the leisure class scenario group will mostly choose option c for the Donation-2 question.
- H8= Participants in the leisure class scenario group will mostly choose option c for the Green Purchasing-2 question.

These hypotheses, which were formed based on the main research question of the study, were examined through frequency analysis. According to the results, the frequency distribution among the answers given for **the question Donation 1** by the participants who answered the questions in **Scenario 1**, where **the conspicuous group** is represented, does not seem far from each other. In fact, the number of participants choosing option a has the lowest frequency. In this case, hypothesis H1 could not be confirmed. However, in other questions it is also clear that option a has a higher frequency. Accordingly, hypotheses H2, H3, and H4 are confirmed. Moreover, it can be said that the participants in this group can easily predict the behaviors of conspicuous people in the green purchasing questions while their predictions are correct only for the second one of the donation questions. In other words, people who were described as the conspicuous could easily be identified by the participants. In terms of homomoralis behavior, it is clear that the participants do not believe that conspicuous people have high moral values in their purchasing decisions. The participants also predicted that these people would act in accordance with Veblen's definition of the conspicuous who emulate the leisure class. H5, H6, H7 and H8 hypotheses are confirmed according to the results of the frequency analysis for the participants of **the leisure class in Scenario 2**. As in the hypotheses for the two questions in the donation scheme and the two questions in the green purchase scheme, the frequency of choosing **options c** is quite high. Accordingly, the participants in this group can easily recognize the leisure class and can predict their behavior mostly correctly (Table 2).

Table 2. Frequency analysis of the answers given to the questions on the basis of groups

		Donation - 1		Green Purchase-1		Donation - 2		Green Purchase-2	
		Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
Scenario-1 Cospicuous Class	a	28	28,6	57	58,2	59	60,2	51	52,0
	b	34	34,7	11	11,2	17	17,3	12	12,2
	c	36	36,7	30	30,6	22	22,4	35	35,7
Scenario-2 Leisure Class	a	26	27,1	24	25,0	24	25,0	23	24,0
	b	14	14,6	14	14,6	18	18,8	16	16,7
	c	56	58,3	58	60,4	54	56,3	57	59,4

According to the expression in Veblen's theory, individuals in the leisure class participate in the economy only as consumers. However, they also have the financial power to exhibit their consumption under all conditions. However, the conspicuous people, who emulate the leisure class, participate in the economy as both producers and consumers, and they make their conspicuous consumption in a way and time that only others can see. Considering the results of the study from this perspective, the expectations in the behavior of these two classes can still be easily predicted as of today. However, the results cannot answer what triggers these behaviors. In other words, it is still unclear why the participants recognized the conspicuous and leisure class so easily and answered all the questions in the prescribed manner. The likely answer would be the relationships between the questions asked to the participants. The hypotheses on this subject are as follows:

H9= There is a relationship between the questions asked to the participants in the conspicuous group.

H10= There is a relationship between the questions asked to the participants in the leisure class group.

Chi-square analysis was used to examine whether there was a statistically significant relationship between the questions asked to the participants in the scenarios prepared to describe the leisure class and the conspicuous people who emulate this class. Considering the results, a significant relationship was found between **the Donation 2 question and the Green Purchase 1 question** among the four questions in the conspicuous group ($\chi^2(4, N=98) = 12.474, p=.014$). It can be thought that the reason why the participants established a relationship between these two questions and gave answers in this direction is likely because the questions were sequenced one after the other, but the fact that such a relationship was not found between the other sequential questions eliminates this possibility. On the other hand, in the group in which the person describing the leisure class was scripted, statistically significant relationships were found between all questions. Between **Donation 1 and Green Purchase questions** ($\chi^2(4, N=98) = 21.779, p=.000$), between **Donation 1 and Green Purchase 2 questions** ($\chi^2(4, N=98) = 15.558, p=,004$), between **Donation 2 and Green Purchase 1 questions** ($\chi^2(4, N=98) = 24.367, p=,000$) and between **Donation 2 and Green Purchase 2 questions** ($\chi^2(4, N=98) = 17,981, p=,001$) significant relationships were observed. It may be assumed that the reason for these meaningful relationships established by the participants between all questions is due to the participants, but this possibility will disappear when the homogeneous distribution of demographic factors among the participant groups is considered. On the other hand, the fact that the questions were presented sequentially can also be considered as a reason, but similar questions were asked to the participants in the conspicuous group in the same order, but only a correlation was observed between the two questions. Therefore, the sequential order of the questions will not be the reason for this meaningful relationship. The main reason for the high reliability of this relationship analysis among the leisure class participants is thought to be the easy recognition of the leisure class members, as well as the easy predictability of their behavior (Table 3).

Table 3. Relationship analysis between the questions in both groups

Conspicuous Class		Green Purchase 1		Green Purchase 2	
		Pearson ki-kare	p	Pearson ki-kare	p
	Donation 1	3,286	,511	8,041	,090
	Donation 2	12,474	,014	3,255	,516
Leisure Class		Green Purchase 1		Green Purchase 2	
		Pearson chi-square	p	Pearson chi-square	p
	Donation 1	21,779	,000	15,558	,004
	Donation 2	24,367	,000	17,981	,001

5. CONCLUSION

Homomoralis is a concept that represents the individual who has limited knowledge and aims to maximize his own welfare, but also contributes to public welfare (Clavien & Chapuisat, 2016). This concept, which represents the moral way of life of people in society, defines the person who questions the choices and actions he/she makes with his/her mind from a social perspective (Özlem, 2010). The basic economic laws, on the other hand, are based on the person whose definition does not include the concepts of morality or society, and who only defends his own interests in the most selfish way and acts accordingly: homo-economicus. In fact, with the influence of behavioral theories, new homosubjects that have begun to replace purely economic human beings continue to emerge. On the other hand, the class of leisure and conspicuous, put forward by Veblen and about which there is a lot of scientific research, are on their way to becoming a new homosubject. Before there were other concepts unique to them, one of the concepts that befits these classes is homomoralis. It is thought that this study, which seeks moral traces in the economic behavior of the leisure class, in which they participate in the economy only by consumption, and in the economic behaviors of the conspicuous, who try to survive by emulating the leisure class, is thought to contribute to the literature because it uses a relatively new research method.

When the results obtained in the study are examined, the most basic result is the high level of recognition of the members of the leisure class by the society. It is seen that the participants not only know this class, but also predict their behavior as predicted by the study. On contrary, the situation is different in the group of participants who read the scenario in which one of the conspicuous class is depicted and try to predict the behavior of this person. The participants in this group could not easily recognize the conspicuous class. Therefore, they could not predict their behavior as predicted by the study. However, considering the number of participants, which is the main limitation of the study, it should not be forgotten that different results may be obtained if repeated in future studies. In the search for homomoralis, clues were found especially in the leisure class. There are answers that show that the members of this class, which is included in the economy only through consumption, will exhibit ethical behavior in their spending decisions.

When the research is evaluated in terms of its method, the use of the vignette method will shed light on similar studies that will follow. It is hoped that the study will contribute to the literature in terms of its results as well as having time and cost constraints.

REFERENCES

1. Aguinis, H. ve Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best Practice Recommendations for Designing and Implementing Experimental Vignette Methodology Studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(4), 351-371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114547952>
2. Alexander, C. S. ve Becker, H. J. (1978). The Use of Vignettes in Survey Research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 42(1), 93-104. <https://doi.org/10.1086/268432>
3. Alger, I., & Weibull, J. W. (2013). Homo moralis—preference evolution under incomplete information and assortative matching. *Econometrica*, 81(6), 2269-2302.
4. Anderson, K. L. (1933). The unity of Veblen's theoretical system. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 47(4), 598-626
5. Atzmüller, C. ve Steiner, P. M. (2010). Experimental Vignette Studies in Survey Research. *Methodology: European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*, 6(3), 128-138. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-2241/a000014>
6. Auspurg, K. ve Hinz, T. (2015). Multifactorial experiments in surveys: conjoint analysis, choice experiments, and factorial surveys. T. Wolbring ve M. Keuschnigg (Ed.), *Experimente in den Sozialwissenschaften. Sonderband 22 der Sozialen Welt içinde* (s. 291-315). Baden-Baden: Nomos.
7. Baysal Kar, B. (2020). Thorstein Veblen Düşüncesinde Kapitalizmin Ahlaki Sorunları. *Turkish Journal of Business Ethics*, 13(1), 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.12711/tjbe.2020.13.1.0150>
8. Beall, J. M., Boley, B. B., Landon, A. C., & Woosnam, K. M. (2021). What drives ecotourism: environmental values or symbolic conspicuous consumption?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(8), 1215-1234
9. Bègue, L. (2015). *The psychology of good and evil*. Oxford University Press.
10. Buchanan, James M. (1989a). The Achievement and Limits of Public Choice in Diagnosing Government Failure and in Offering Bases for Constructive Reform, *Exploration into Constitutional Economics*, Robert D. Tollison and Victor J. Vanberg, (Ed.), pp. 24-35, Texas A&M University Pres, Texas.
11. Buchanan, James M. (1989b). *Constitutional Economics, Exploration into Constitutional Economics*, Robert D. Tollison and Victor J. Vanberg (Ed.), pp. 57-67, Texas A&M University Pres, Texas.
12. Bulut, M. (2015). Ahlak ve İktisat. *Adam Akademi*, Cikt:5/2, 105-123.

13. Cevizci, A. (1999). İlkçağ Felsefesi. Gündoğan Yayınları.
14. Clark, B. (1998). Political economy: A comparative approach (2. Baskı). Westport: Praeger Publishers.
15. Clavien, C., & Chapuisat, M. (2016). The evolution of utility functions and psychological altruism. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, 56, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsc.2015.10.008>
16. Coleman, R. P. (1983). The continuing significance of social class to marketing. *Journal of consumer research*, 10(3), 265-280.
17. Colombo, R. J. (2008). Exposing the Myth of Homo Economicus (Book Review of Moral Markets: The Critical Role of Values in the Economy'). Hofstra Univ. Legal Studies Research Paper, (08-05).
18. Davanzati, G. F. (2006). Ethical codes and income distribution: A study of John Bates Clark and Thorstein Veblen. London: Routledge
19. Davis, A. K. (1945). Sociological elements in Veblen's economic theory. *Journal of Political Economy*, 53(2), 132-149
20. Davis, A. K. (1957). Thorstein Veblen reconsidered. *Science & Society*, 21(1), 52-85.
21. Dixon, W., & Wilson, D. (2013). A history of homo economicus: The nature of the moral in economic theory. Routledge.
22. Eastman, J. K., Goldsmith, R. E. & Flynn, L. R. (1999). Status consumption in consumer behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 7(3), 41-52.
23. Fettahlioğlu, S. (2014). Hedonik Tüketim Davranışları: Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Ve Adıyaman Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Hedonik Alışveriş Davranışlarında Demografik Faktörlerin Etkisinin Karşılaştırmalı Olarak Analizi. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, Number: 27, p. 307-331
24. Finch, J. (1987). The vignette technique in survey research. *Sociology*, 21(1), 105-114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038587021001008>
25. Ganong, L. H. ve Coleman, M. (2006). Multiple Segment Factorial Vignette Designs. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(2), 455-468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00264.x>
26. Gintis, H. (2000). Beyond Homo economicus: evidence from experimental economics. *Ecological economics*, 35(3), 311-322.
27. Giving USA (2016), The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2015, Giving USA, Kansa City, MO, available at: <http://cfnwmo.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Giving-USA-2016.pdf>.
28. GlobeScan, EAI and Korea Foundation for Advanced Studies (2013), "Radar 2013.Seoul: EAI", Retrieved from Research on Poverty Alleviation website available at: http://www.eai.or.kr/main/publication_01_view.asp?intSeq56650&board5kor_report.
29. Gökberk, M. (2000). Felsefe Tarihi. İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi
30. Harris, A. L. (1953). Veblen as social philosopher: A reappraisal. *Ethics*, 63(3), 1-32.
31. Heilbroner, R. L. (2019). İktisat düşünürleri: Büyük iktisat düşünürlerinin yaşamları ve fikirleri (4. Baskı). A. Tartanoğlu (Çev.). Ankara: Dost Kitabevi.
32. Hughes, R. ve Huby, M. (2002). The application of vignettes in social and nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 37(4), 382-386. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2002.02100.x>
33. Hughes, R. ve Huby, M. (2004). The construction and interpretation of vignettes in social research. *Social Work & Social Sciences Review*, 11, 36-51. <https://doi.org/10.1921/17466105.11.1.36>
34. Hunt, E. K. & Lautzenheiser, M. (2011). History of economic thought (3. Baskı). New York: Routledge.
35. Jaikumar, S. & Sharma, Y. (2021). Consuming beyond means: debt trap of conspicuous consumption in an emerging economy. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 29(2), 233-249.
36. Jensen R. & Miller N. (2007). Giffen Behavior: Theory and Evidence, Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government, Faculty Research Working Papers Series.
37. Kartal, A. (2015). Hazcı (Hedonik) Tüketim Davranışları Üzerinde Etkili Olan Faktörlerin Değerlendirilmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Halkla İlişkiler Ve Tanıtım Ana Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
38. Konow, J., & Earley, J. (2008). The hedonistic paradox: is homo economicus happier?. *Journal of public Economics*, 92(1-2), 1-33.
39. Laertios, D. *Recognovit Brevique Adnotatione Critica Instruxit*. Çeviren: Şentuna, C. (2007). Ünlü Filozofların Yaşamları ve Öğretileri. İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
40. Lee, J. (2020). Homo moralis and Homo economicus: scale development and validation of consumers' moral preferences. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 33(2), 607-621.
41. Lee, L., Amir, O., & Ariely, D. (2006). In search of homo economicus: Preference consistency, emotions, and cognition. *Emotions, and Cognition* (August 2006).
42. Mason, R. (1989). Robert Giffen and the Giffen Paradox. *The Economic Journal*, 99(398), 1224. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2234119>

43. Murphy, K. R., Herr, B. M., Lockhart, M. C. ve Maguire, E. (1986). Evaluating the Performance of Paper People. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 654-661. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.4.654>
44. Nyborg, K. (2000). Homo Economicus and Homo Politicus: interpretation and aggregation of environmental values. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 42(3), 305-322. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-2681\(00\)00091-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-2681(00)00091-3)
45. O'Hara, P. A. (1999). Thorstein Veblen's theory of collective social wealth, instincts and property relations. *History of Economic Ideas*, 7(3), 153-179.
46. Özlem, D. (2010). *Ahlak felsefesi*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
47. Rossi, P. H., Sampson, W. A., Bose, C. E., Jasso, G. ve Passel, J. (1974). Measuring Household Social Standing. *Social Science Research*, 3(3), 169-190. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X\(74\)90011-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X(74)90011-8)
48. Rossi, P. H., Simpson, J. E. ve Miller, J. L. (1985). Beyond Crime Seriousness: Fitting the Punishment to the Crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 1(1), 59-90. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01065249>
49. Ryan, F. X. (2003). Values as consequences of transaction: commentary on'Reconciling homo economicus and John Dewey's ethics'. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 10(2), 245-257.
50. Sauer, C., Auspurg, K., Hinz, T. ve Liebig, S. (2011). The Application of Factorial Surveys in General Population Samples: The Effects of Respondent Age and Education on Response Times and Response Consistency. *Survey Research Methods*, 5(3), 89-102. <https://doi.org/10.18148/srm/2011.v5i3.4625>
51. Skitka, L. J. (2009). Exploring the "lost and found" of justice theory and research. *Social justice research*, 22(1), 98-116.
52. Skitka, L. J., & Bauman, C. W. (2008). Is morality always an organizational good? A review of current conceptions of morality in organizational and social justice theory and research. *Emerging Perspectives on Managing Organizational Justice*, 6, 1-28.
53. Sleed, M., Durrheim, K., Kriel, A., Solomon, V. ve Baxter, V. (2002). The effectiveness of the vignette methodology: A comparison of written and video vignettes in eliciting response about date rape. *South African Journal of Psychology* 32(3), 21-28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630203200304>
54. Sönmez, A. (2014). Platon'un Protagoras'ında Haz Anlayışı Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 54, 1, 1-20.
55. Stigler, G. J. (1947). Notes on the History of the Giffen Paradox. *Journal of Political Economy*, 55(2), 152-156. <https://doi.org/10.1086/256487>.
56. Taylor, D.G. & Strutton, D. (2016). Does Facebook usage lead to conspicuous consumption?: The role of envy, narcissism and self-promotion. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 10(3), 231-248
57. Trigg, A. B. (2001). Veblen, Bourdieu, and conspicuous consumption. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 35(1), 99-115.
58. Ulaş, S. E. (2002). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. Ankara, Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
59. Veblen, T. B. (1899[2016]). *Aylak sınıfın teorisi*. E. Kırmızıaltın & H. Bilir (Çev.). Ankara: Heretik Yayınları.
60. Veblen, T. B. (1923). *Absentee ownership: Business enterprise in recent times: The case of America*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
61. Waller, W. T. (2007). Veblen's missing theory of markets and exchange, or can you have an economic theory without a theory of market exchange? J. T. Knoedler, R. E. Prasch & D. P. Champlin (Ed.). *Thorstein Veblen and the revival of free market capitalism içinde* (ss. 87-126). Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
62. Waller, W. T. (2009). Thorstein Veblen. J. Peil & I. Staveren (Ed.). *Handbook of economics and ethics içinde* (ss. 564-569). Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
63. Watkins, J. P. (2015). Economic waste and social provisioning: Veblen and Keynes on the wealth effect. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 49(2), 441-448.
64. White, M. D. (2004). Can homo economicus follow Kant's categorical imperative? *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 33(1), 89-106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2003.12.002>
65. Wilcox, K. & Stephen, A. T. (2013). Are close friends the enemy? Online Social Networks, Self-esteem, and Self-control. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(1), 90-103
66. Yıldız Turan, E. (2015). İlkçağ Felsefesinde Faydacılığın Temelleri. *Atatürk İletişim Dergisi*, Sayı:8, 249-258.
67. Zafirovski, M. Z. (2000). Spencer is dead, long live Spencer: individualism, holism, and the problem of norms. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(3), 553-579. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071310050131657>
68. Zingler, E. K. (1974). Veblen vs. Commons: A comparative evaluation. *Kyklos*, 27(2), 322-344.

APPENDIX

Scenario 1

Seyhan is a 30-year-old single woman with three siblings. She got a job as a human resources specialist in a large company right after graduating from a state university. Since she loves shopping and spends money very much, her monthly payments for her credit cards started to exceed 19.000 TL, which is her monthly income. Moreover, just one month after starting the job, she bought a BMW 1.16 Luxury Line model car on a 5-year loan. For this, she pays the loan debt every month. However, when she thinks that all her friends have Mercedes and BMW cars, she justifies herself for buying this car even though she can easily get to her work with a single bus. She is aware of the fact that she has financial difficulties due to the expenses she spends for the weekend-holidays she goes with her friends and the dinners she often has at popular places. However, Seyhan is currently looking for a way to buy an iPhone 12 mobile phone. Because everyone in her group has the same model cell phone, moreover, when the photos taken with this phone were shared on social media, she got a sense that the model of the cell phone would appear in the upper right corner of the photo. Seyhan thinks that she needs this phone more because she likes taking photos wherever she travels and shares them with location on social media. Which do you think Seyhan would prefer in the following situations?

- | | |
|----|---|
| a. | Instead of sending flowers for the wedding of one of her close friends, she donates 2,500 Turkish Liras to the TEMA foundation. (the turkish foundation for combating erosion reforestation and the protection of natural habitats) |
| b. | While wandering alone on Istiklal Street, she buys magazines from TEMA foundation members and donates 2,500 TL to the foundation. |
| c. | She can do both. |

- | | |
|----|---|
| a. | While having lunch at a restaurant with his friends, the waiter who asks whether she prefers a glass straw or a plastic straw, and she prefers a glass straw, even if she has to pay an extra 150 Turkish Liras for it. |
| b. | In a restaurant where she goes alone, she asks the waiter for a glass straw, even if she has to pay 150 Turkish Liras. |
| c. | She can do both. |

- | | |
|----|--|
| a. | She spends a total of 1,200 Turkish Liras to buy 100 pine saplings as a gift for her friend's newborn child and have them planted in his name. |
| b. | She immediately accepts the donation request of 1,200 TL from the Greenpeace foundation, who calls her during the day. |
| c. | She can do both. |

- | | |
|----|--|
| a. | She pays 235 Turkish Liras for the eco-friendly branded 8-pack toilet paper at the market she goes to with her friend. |
| b. | She pays 235 Turkish Liras for the eco-friendly branded 8-pack toilet paper in her weekly grocery shopping. |
| c. | She can do both. |

Gender:

Age:

Family's Monthly Income:

Scenario 2

Nazlı is a 29-year-old single woman with a brother. She studied fashion design at a private university after graduating from a popular private college, which she attended since kindergarten, but never worked. The average monthly pocket money she receives from her family is around 55,000 Turkish Liras, and her favorite activities are playing golf and horseback riding. She prefers travelling to Europe with her friends on holidays for the weekends. Defined as a popular person by her surroundings, Nazlı pays for every meal she goes to with her friends, and shares her social media account by reporting the location. She started driving her mother's Porsche Cayenne Coupe 4.0 GTS after her Bentley Continental GT Supersports car was seized at traffic control last month for lack of inspection. Now she has to buy a new one, as she dropped her iPhone 14 128 GB mobile phone, which was a gift from a close friend, into the pool. However, membership information for shopping sites in France, which was saved on her old phone, was also lost. Now she has to meet all of them again and renew their membership. Which do you think Nazlı would prefer in the following situations?

- | | |
|----|--|
| a. | She donates 25.000 Turkish Liras to TEMA Foundation on behalf of her close friend's newborn child and presents it to her friend. |
| b. | She donates 25,000 Turkish Liras to the volunteers of the TEMA Foundation at the shopping mall she goes alone. |
| c. | She can do both. |

- | | |
|----|--|
| a. | While having dinner with her friends at a restaurant, the waiter asked whether she preferred a glass straw or a plastic straw, to buy a glass straw, even if it cost 150 TL. |
| b. | In a restaurant where she goes alone, she asks the waiter for a glass straw, even if she has to pay 150 Turkish Liras. |
| c. | She can do both. |

- | | |
|----|---|
| a. | She buys 100 pine saplings as a gift for her friend's newborn child and spends a total of 8,200 Turkish Liras to have them planted in her name. |
| b. | She immediately accepts to donate 8,200 Turkish Liras for the Greenpeace foundation, who calls her during the day. |
| c. | She can do both. |

- | | |
|----|--|
| a. | She pays 235 Turkish Liras for the eco-friendly branded 8-pack toilet paper at the market she goes to with her friend. |
| b. | She pays 235 Turkish Liras for the eco-friendly branded 8-pack toilet paper in her weekly grocery shopping. |
| c. | She can do both. |