

Dr. Agnes Hofmeister Toth  
Professor  
Corvinus University of Budapest  
Market Research and Consumer Behaviour Department  
1093 Budapest, Fővám tér 8.  
Phone: +36 1 482- 5410  
e-mail: agnes.hofmeister@uni-corvinus.hu

and

Dr. Agnes Neulinger  
Assistant Professor  
Corvinus University of Budapest  
Market Research and Consumer Behaviour Department  
1093 Budapest, Fővám tér 8.  
e-mail: agnes.neulinger@uni-corvinus.hu

## Measures of Materialism in Hungary

### SUMMARY

#### *Objectives*

In terms of consumer values, the socialist system (altruism, acting for the good of the community, interest in culture, etc.) reflects a post-materialist orientation (Keller and Vihalemm 2003). According to data from World Value Surveys, however, there was a strong shift toward materialist values in former socialist countries after the change of regime, which also holds true for Hungary (Hofmeister-Tóth, 2004). Most likely, this is partly due to the success of the market economy, competition and private enterprise and partly to the obligatory system of values of the socialist regime's disappearance. The present research study uses the materialism scale developed by Belk to measure possessiveness, non-generosity and envy in Hungary.

#### *Methods*

The research study used quantitative analysis with national representative sample (N=500) in 2002 and 2007.

#### *Results*

The results of the study indicate that possessiveness is the most significant dimension out of the three examined fields of materialism in both periods. However the nature of possessiveness changed in accordance to the change of consumer behaviour.

#### *Conclusions*

Based on our findings, we can assume that possessions have a central place in people's life. Our results suggest that materialist orientation characterize the Hungarian society.

*Key words: consumer behaviour, values, materialism*

## INTRODUCTION

In consumer societies, consumption is a leading principle of living. It rules cultural and individual values, lifestyle and motivation of people who are acting as consumers actually. The term 'consumerism' has strong connection with the Western world, but this is rather an international phenomena. In the Central-Eastern Europe region the role played by consumption in society is constantly growing in importance. In 1996, an interdisciplinary project of researchers from Romania, Yugoslavia, Croatia, Slovenia and Hungary titled "Culture with Boundaries: Shopping Tourism and Travelling Objects in Post-World War II Middle Europe" examined the effect the inflow of Western objects and ideas on the process of socialization in the consumer society and on the formation of local identities (Wessely 2000). Findings showed that in the countries mentioned, a unique (limited and somewhat distorted) consumer society was formed.

In Hungary, conclusions concerning the changes in the social role of consumption can be based on the lifestyle studies performed since the change of regime (Hofmeister-Tóth and Töröcsik 1998; Hofmeister-Tóth, 2004) and on the surveys of a number of market research firms. In terms of consumer values, the socialist system (altruism, acting for the good of the community, interest in culture, etc.) reflects a postmaterialist orientation (Keller and Vihalemm 2003). According to data from World Value Surveys, however, there was a strong shift toward materialist values in former socialist countries after the change of regime, which also holds true for Hungary (Hofmeister-Tóth, 2004). Most likely, this is partly due to the success of the market economy, competition and private enterprise and partly to the obligatory system of values of the socialist regime's disappearance. Consumer goods do play an important role in consumer society. Materialism can be considered as a factor through this phenomenon can be measured (see, e.g., Inglehart 1981; Belk 1984; 1985, 1991; Richins 1992, 2004). This article describes a scale to measure materialism among individuals in Hungary. The measurement based on materialism scale developed by Belk (1984; 1985). Similar to prior approaches (Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981; Belk 1985) our study focuses on three generations in order to compare levels of materialism and related attitudes.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Materialism has been defined as an orientation that reflects the importance a consumer attaches to worldly possessions (Shaw, Leung and Wattendorf 2004). Since the 1950's the concept has been widely studied in the marketing field. Douglas and Isherwood (1979) examined goods within the society communication. They argue that "goods are part of a live information system" (Douglas and Isherwood 1979). Others investigated the meaning of possession and ownership (Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981; Furby 1978). In the same time Moschis and Churchill (1978) presented a materialism scale that included attitudes toward money as well as attitudes toward possessions.

Based on the two main conceptualizations, materialism can be considered as a personality trait (Belk 1984, 1985) or a value (Richins and Dawson 1992).

According to Belk, materialism can be defined as manifestation of psychological traits, the importance consumers attach to possessions. "At the highest levels of materialism, such possessions assume a central place in a person's life and are believed to provide the greatest sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction" (Belk 1985). Belk (1985) identified five major issues in this field. (1) One of the most important issues is whether materialism is a positive or a negative trait. Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1978, 1981) hypothesize that materialism is not necessarily either good or bad. (2) The second major issue is whether marketing creates materialism or exacerbates it. (3) The third issue handles materialism as an essentially egoistic trait that opposes altruism. It means that people identify themselves through consumption. (4) We can also examine materialism based on its impact on interpersonal relationships. In this case we use consumption items as rewards. (5) Last but not least materialism raises the issue whether it contributes to the enhancement and maintenance of a positive self-identity. However as Belk states "It is unclear whether buying things for oneself and others acts successfully in the service of self-esteem; it is also unclear whether mood effects on consumption would be similar for those who are more (versus less) materialistic."

Belk (1984) proposed, measured and tested three measures of materialistic traits: possessiveness, non-generosity and envy. Belk (1983, in 1985) defines (1) possessiveness as "the inclination and tendency to retain control or ownership of one's possessions". The conceptual frame of possessiveness and the statements within three sub-dimensions include a concern about loss of possessions, a desire for the greater control of ownership rather than the lesser control of rental, borrowing, or leasing and an inclination to save and retain

possessions. Also experiences can be considered as potential possessions embodied in collecting souvenirs, photographs, and other mementos. (2) Non-generosity is defined as “an unwillingness to give possessions to or share possessions with others” by Belk (1983, in 1985). This dimension of materialism also includes reluctance to lend or donate possessions to others, and negative attitudes toward charity. (3) In case of envy Belk uses Schoeck (1966, in Belk 1985) definition and considers envy as “displeasure and ill will at the superiority of (another person) in happiness, success, reputation, or the possession of anything desirable.” It is important to emphasize that envy is likely to focus on another's possessions not on one's own possessions. Later in their cross-cultural study Belk and Ger (1990) modified the original materialism scale and defined a fourth dimension, called tangibility or preservation. “Tangibility can be defined to be the conversion of experience into material form. Taking pictures during a vacation, keeping souvenirs, and taking slides of places visited and showing them to friends are examples” (Belk-Ger 1990).

In 1992, Richin and Dawson published their material value scale (MVS) in *Journal of Consumer Research*. The authors treat materialism “as a value that influences the way that people interpret their environment and structure their lives”. They conceptualize material values using three domains namely success, centrality, and happiness. Success reflects the use of possessions in order to judge the success of others and oneself. This sub-dimension relates to the role that possessions play as evidence of success. Centrality explains the levels of possession play in a person’s life. Those people, who score high on this subscale, make possessions the focus of their lives. Happiness refers to life satisfaction through acquisition. It means that possessions are vital for a materialistic consumer’s well-being and satisfaction in life.

Attitudes toward materialism might differ among consumer groups. Findings of Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1981) emphasize that generational differences exist in attitudes toward materialism. They studied three generations of a family's members and asked them to name their favourite possessions and explain their significance. The authors found systematically differences between generations in the possessions they named and the rationales they mentioned. The youngest generation was most likely to name products that allowed them to do things, e.g. stereo equipment. The middle generation mentioned objects related to past success and shared experiences. The oldest generation mainly recalled mementos. Belk (1985) also studied the inter-generational differences between three generations. He concluded that the middle generation tended to score highest in both the overall scale and the subscales of materialism. However, these scores were not significantly

higher than those for the youngest generation on two of the three subscales, and again, the magnitudes of difference were small. Moreover he found that materialism and specific materialistic traits were weakest among the oldest generation.

Several studies suggest that a connection between materialism and well-being exist. Based on Belk's research results envy and non-generosity, and to a lesser extent possessiveness are negatively related to reported happiness with life. Richins (1992) found the same result namely materialism was negatively related to satisfaction in all the aspects of life measured. Shaw, Leung and Wattendorf (2004) measured the relationship between materialism and life satisfaction, emotional well-being, material well-being. They also found negative relationship between materialism and global measures of quality of life. Ryan and Dziurawiec (2000) found similar results in Australia. They confirmed that those individuals who were high in materialism were less satisfied with their life as a whole and with sub areas of life domains compared to those who were low in materialism.

Watson (1998) studied the relationship between materialism and attitude toward debt and found that people who are highly materialistic have more favorable attitudes toward spending as well as more favorable attitudes toward debt than people with low levels of materialism. Ponchio and Aranha (2008) studied relationship between materialism and indebtedness in the context of low income consumers. Their findings confirmed that the materialism level of consumers influences debt behavior. Another research question in this field whether materialism has negative societal effects. Study of Muncy and Eastman (1998) concluded that materialism is negatively correlated with people's higher ethical standards as consumers.

Most recent studies have adopted the value concept of materialism over trait-based concepts. However based on previous findings (Belk 1984, 1985; Richins and Dawson 1992) the measured relationship between life satisfaction and materialism is hardly sensitive on the scale it was measured. The results of the two different conceptualizations generally yielded similar findings.

Our recent study used the Belk (1984, 1985) materialism scale since the scale proved to be suitable for cross-cultural applications. The test of the scale has stretched over thirteen countries (Belk-Ger 1990) and resulted in satisfactory levels of alphas in the total sample, as well as within each of the examined three cultures. Our research also aimed to understand inter-generational differences. Evaluation of generational differences by Belk (1985) offers opportunity for benchmarking.

## STUDY

### *Sample*

Data collections were conducted in 2000 and 2007. In both years nationally representative sample of 500 people were used in Hungary. The samples were representative on gender, age, settlement type and region. Face to face interviews were conducted.

The two samples are similar in sample size, representativity and the way of data collection. The main difference is the age of respondents. The first project included elderly people above 65 years old (19%) while the second one covered only people between 18 – 65 years old. 65 years old people makes only 1,5% of the total sample in the latter case. During the analysis the first database was restricted to the age group of 18-65 years old people.

Nearly half of the overall sample (47% in 2000 and 48% in 2007) was male. People between 18 and 29 years old represent 28%, the middle generation makes 44% and the oldest group, people between 50 and 64 years old make 28% in average in both years. Table 1 provides further details of the sample characteristics.

{Insert Table 1. here}

### *Questionnaire*

In 2000, in our study the Belk scale was preferred to measure materialism because of the available international results, more extensive benchmark data. In 2007, we used the same list of questions for comparability reasons, namely Belk's original items. English version of the questionnaire was translated into Hungarian with back-translation procedure. The materialism scale was part of a more extended questionnaire and consisted of 24 five-point Likert scale items from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' scores according to Belk (1984, 1985) scale.

## RESULTS

### *Dimensionality*

Belk proposed three dimensions of materialism, namely possessiveness, non-generosity and envy and specified 9, 7 and 8 scale items that reflect each dimension, respectively. In our samples, we faced with very low correlations among several items. We had to remove some statements from the subscales on the basis of correlations and low communalities to get satisfactory result from the exploratory factor analysis. After this procedure we obtained results similar to those obtained by Belk (1985). The final three dimensions (see Table 2) consist of 10 items: 4 for possessiveness, 2 for non-generosity and 4 for envy in case of year 2000 sample. In the 2007 sample we have 3 items for possessiveness; the other two dimensions are the same as in the 2000 sample.

{Insert Table 2. here}

### *Reliability Issues*

Cronbach's alpha is used to assess reliability measuring consistency among individual items in a scale. In 2000, coefficient alpha was 0.63 for the 'envy' sub-dimension, 0.6 for the 'non-generosity' sub-dimension, and 0.5 for the 'possessiveness' sub-dimension. Coefficient alpha for the overall materialism scale was 0.55. On the first administration, Belk's measurement (1985) produced Cronbach coefficient alphas of 0.66 – 0.73 and considered as satisfactory. Referring the most widely accepted evaluation of alpha, the value should be above 0.7, but not much higher than 0.9 (Nunnally 1978). According to this principle, none of our subscales including the overall scale can be accepted as measuring the same concept due to the lack of internal consistency. However, others claim that a value as low as 0.6 might be acceptable for an exploratory study (Garson 2002).

In 1990, Belk found in his cross-cultural study the same levels of reliability in case of Turkey sample as we found in our sample and mentioned the lower level of consumer society as one of the main reasons beside cultural differences. (See Table 3. in Appendix). In the last years, Hungarian society faced considerable value- and lifestyle changes. In terms of consumer values, the socialist system reflects a post-materialist orientation (Keller and Vihalemm 2003). According to data from World Value Surveys, however, there was a strong shift



toward materialist values in former socialist countries after the change of regime (Hofmeister-Tóth 2004). Most likely, this is partly due to the success of the market economy, competition and private enterprise and partly to the obligatory system of values of the socialist regime's disappearance.

In 2007, we repeated the first questionnaire with the original Belk's scale used in 2000 to discover whether the evolved consumer society in Hungary results in better reliability of the materialism scale. Unfortunately we have nearly the same reliability results in 2007 as we had in 2000. Coefficient alpha was 0.71 for the 'envy' sub-dimension, 0.61 for the 'non-generosity' sub-dimension, and 0.51 for the 'possessiveness' sub-dimension. Coefficient alpha for the overall materialism scale was 0.53. It means that only one sub-dimension fulfils the above mentioned requirement of internal consistency, namely 'envy'. However Belk (1984) himself considered alpha above 0.6 acceptably high for exploratory purposes. For 'possessiveness' subscale one item was removed to reach higher internal consistency. The other two sub-dimensions consist of the same items as in 2000.

See Cronbach's alpha values in Table 4.

{Insert Table 4. here}

### *Analysis*

Materialism was measured as the sum of the items from subscales, namely envy, possessiveness, and non-generosity scales, with reverse scoring as indicated in Table 2. Comparing maximum value and measured value of each subscale, the levels of envy, possessiveness, non-generosity and materialism were also presented.

The mean scores on overall scale indicate that there is no significant difference in materialism between 2000 and 2007 at an alpha 0.1. Out of the three sub-dimensions, 'possessiveness' reaches the highest score in both years suggesting that 'possessiveness' is a leading item of materialism in Hungary. The level of materialism did not change within 7 years with rate of 0.62 in 2000 and 0.61 in 2007. We can conclude that the Hungarians can be characterised with high level of possessiveness but generosity in the same time. However the level of non-generosity increased in the last years. There is statistically significant difference between 2000 and 2007 in possessiveness and non-generosity.

The materialism and subscale mean scores are shown in Table 5.

{Insert Table 5. here}

ANOVA procedure was run to assess the relationship between materialism scores and demography groups as gender, age and the level of education. We found that women, the oldest age group and people with elementary school have the highest materialism scores while men, the youngest age group and people with higher education have the lowest one, in both years. There is statistically significant difference between genders in possessiveness and generosity at an alpha of 0.05. Women are more generous but also more possessive. The results are valid in both years. It is interesting that Belk's test (1985) for gender differences in materialism scores was non-significant at an alpha of 0.10. Analysing the level of agreement on each statements (top2 boxes) the differences between genders became more obvious. In case of 8 items, the difference between the measures of men and women are more than 10 percentage point. Item related to insistence on possessions ('I tend to hang on to things I should probably throw out') showed the more remarkable difference with 15 percentage point difference. On the whole, women get more upset if something is stolen from them, but get less upset when they lose things. Women evaluate higher hospitality, sharing and donation. Moreover it seems that they are less envy. Comparing the results of 2000 and 2007, we can see more visible differences between men and women.

Analysing the results in age groups allow generational comparison. The elder participants lived the majority of their lives during the socialist era but younger people have only experienced the market economy. This difference can influence also their relationship to materialism. Interestingly, the oldest age group - people between 50-64 years old - proved to be the most materialistic in both years. In 2000, people under 30 years old was the least materialistic while in 2007 they moved to the second place and the middle generation became the least materialistic. In the overall materialism scale there is no statistically significant difference among the age groups at an alpha of 0.1 but there is such difference in the subscales. In 2000 we found the oldest people to be significantly higher possessive. The reason is that one of the measured items in this sub-dimension was much higher evaluated among them. The item 'I tend to hang on to things I should probably throw out' reached higher agreement in the oldest generation.

In 2007, the oldest age group proved to be the most non-generous. It means that they are the less likely enjoy sharing what they have and less likely enjoy having guests stay in their home. The scores on the subscale of envy indicate that people under 30 years old were the

most envy in 2007, while the middle generation had this first place in 2000. The magnitudes of difference are small in both years. Contrary to the current results, Belk (1985) found in his US study that the middle generation tends to score highest in both the overall scale and the subscales. However, the scores were not significantly higher compared to the youngest generation on two of the three subscales. Moreover he concluded in 1985 that materialism and specific materialistic traits are weakest among the oldest generation. But we know that life circumstances in the 80's were different, e.g. do not forget about the possible lasting effect of the Second World War. The interpretation can be supported by item level analysis. There are significant differences in case of three statements among generations. The eldest respondents tend to insist on possessions at a highest level. Decrease with age, people feel that they 'less likely than most people to lock things up'. The same holds true on taking photographs. Younger people prefer snapshotting more. These three statements are part of the 'possessiveness' subscale which suggests that age groups differ from each other the most from this aspect of materialism. Considering the level of agreement (top2 boxes) the differences became more obvious. 66% of people above 50 years old said they 'tend to hang on to things they should probably throw out'. This rate is only 42% in the youngest group. On the contrary, 72% of people between 18-30 years old take a lot of photographs when travel while only 43% of people above 50 do this in the same way.

In 2000, considering the level of education the scores on the subscales indicate that people with the lowest qualification were the most possessive and envious. In the same time the highest educated people proved to be the most non-generous. In 2007, the lowest qualified people maintained its first place on possessiveness and envy. Moreover they proved to be the most non-generous. The results on the overall scale were statistically significant at an alpha of 0.05 in both years. Moreover results on possessiveness in 2000 and envy in 2007 were also significantly different.

The overall materialism scale and subscale mean scores for the demography groups are shown in Table 6.

{Insert Table 6. here}

Analyzing the results item per item we can found other interesting result comparing data of 2000 and 2007. Out of the 24 items we found statistically significant difference at an alpha of 0.05 in case of 7 statements. (The list of statements is available in Table 7). The majority of these items belong to the 'possessiveness' subscale with 4 statements. Two items are part of 'non-generosity' subscale and one is within 'envy' dimension. It suggests that attachment to

possessions is somewhat lower but in the same time people became less generous, for instance we 'less enjoy sharing what we have'.

For the cross cultural comparison we can compare our results to Turkey, France, Germany and USA (Ger-Belk, 1990) on the overall materialism scale and subscales. We can compare indexes not absolute numbers because of the scale differences. In our analysis we used fewer items because of the deleted statements. The indexes were calculated dividing the maximum values by actual values. The Turkish sample is the most materialistic on the overall materialism scale followed by USA and then Hungary. France and Germany are behind our country. The scores on the subscales indicate that the Turkish and the Hungarian sample are the most possessive before Germany, France and USA. Based on 2000 result the Hungarian sample is as generous as the Turkish sample which was the most generous in Belk's study. In 2007, the level of generosity in Hungary decreased and the sample became as generous as the German sample. In case of envy, Hungary is just behind Turkey followed by USA and France, Germany. The indexes are shown in Table 8.

{Insert Table 8. here}

## **CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION**

Materialism was measured in Hungary to discover the importance of worldly possessions for Hungarian people. The study was carried out on nationally representative sample of 500 people in 2000 and 2007. The samples were representative on gender, age, settlement type and region. Face to face interviews were conducted. The two samples were similar in sample size, representativity and the way of data collection.

In our study the Belk materialism scale was tested at nearly 10 years distance of time. First, we used the Belk's scale in 2000 and found useful results on materialism however the scale showed low to middle reliability. Based on his cross cultural study in 1990, Belk concluded that his scale is more reliable in the United States and Europe than in Turkey. One possible reason is that "the present conception and measures of materialism derive more from highly developed countries in Europe and North America" (Ger-Belk 1990). However it seemed that the use of Belk's scale is advisable in other environment as well in case of developing consumer society.

In our 2007 study we aimed to examine whether a change in scale reliability increased as a consequence of a more developed consumer culture in Hungary. We can conclude that a more

advanced state of consumer society which means more similarity to the Western countries has no influence on the reliability of the scale.

However the use of Belk's scale supported us to understand the change of materialism through comparison of results 2000 and 2007. Considering the measured items we can conclude that Hungarians can be characterised with high level of possessiveness while there are generous in the same time. The level of non-generosity increased in the last years. There is statistically significant difference between 2000 and 2007 in possessiveness and non-generosity. Results of time comparison reflect the changes of consumer behaviour. Renting and leasing became more known and accepted constructions, popularity of snapshotting among young people follows the technical developments in this field.

Using Belk's scale we also had opportunity for generational comparison. Belk (1985) study examined the generational differences in materialism with a convenience sample of three-generation families. In our study we composed three subgroups by age. We hypothesised that people of different ages have different experiences of consumption e.g. the elder participants lived the majority of their lives during the socialist era but younger people have only experienced the market economy. Our results are contrary to Belk's results. In 1985 and in the U.S., Belk concluded that materialism and specific materialistic traits are weakest among the oldest generation. Nowadays and in Hungary we have opposite results. We concluded that the oldest age group - people between 50-64 years old – was the most materialistic in both years. The reason can be cultural and also explained by the period of time.

In 2007, in another part of the questionnaire we also measured the personal values and the materialist-postmaterialist orientation of the respondents using the modified Rokeach scale and the Inglehart scale. These results support our findings, that the majority of the Hungarian population has materialist values while only 7% shows post-materialist orientation. We also found that post-materialist values gain popularity first of all amongst the younger generation. We found that the post-materialist orientation is more typical amongst people under 50 years old. Above the age of 50 people have stronger materialist values. This result supports our findings that eldest people have higher score on Belk's materialism scale.

## **LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH**

Among the limitations of this work, we have to mention the selection of the tested materialism scale. The repeated use of the Belk scale gave us opportunity for time comparison and evaluation of the change of scale reliability by time. However the measurement of the

phenomena only partly succeeded. Because of the low internal reliability of the scale in both years, we had to remove several items from the original list. It produced better measures, but it also resulted in the loss of information. Beside it is possible that other aspects of materialism were not covered at all. The reliability problems with the Belk scale was also mention by Mickens (1995).

In our study, we did not use scale to control socially desirable responses (SDR). For materialism, the analysis of potential response bias is particularly important according to Mick's (1996) conclusions on the relationship between materialism and socially desirable responding.

In case of future research we should consider Belk (1990) suggestion that instead of a cross-culturally reliable materialism scale, different items may be more powerful or relevant in different cultures. However in this case comparability across cultures is sacrificed for local reliability and validity. Our future intention is to undertake a complex exploratory research in Hungary using learnings from previous experiences. We plan to test other scales and develop new measurement reliable in Hungary and Central-East European region. Besides, several other questions still wait to be answered, e.g. the level of materialism in post-communist countries, the influence of materialism on consumption in general and in different product categories or the manifestations of materialism in different segments of society.

## **REFERENCES**

Belk, R (1984): Three Scales to Measure Constructs Related to Materialism: Reliability, Validity and Relationships to Measure of Happiness, in *Advances in Consumer Research* 11, Thomas Kinnear, ed Prov. ÚT, Association for Consumer Research, 291-297.

Belk, R (1985): Materialism: Trait Aspects of Living in the Material World, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12 December, 265-280

Csikszentmihalyi, M. - Rochberg-Halton, E. (1981): *The Meaning of Things: Domestic Symbols and the Self*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Douglas, M. – Isherwood, B. (1996): *The Word of Good: Toward an Antropology of consumption*, London: Routledge

Fournier, S.- Richins, M (1991): Some Theoretical and Popular Notion on Concerning Materialism, Journal of social Behavior and Personality, 6., Special Issue, 403-414.

Furby, L (1978): Possession in Humans: An Exploratory Study of Its Meaning and Motivation, Social Behavior and Personality, 6. 49-65

Garson, G. D. (2002): Guide to write empirical papers, theses and dissertations, New York: Marcell Dekker

Ger, G. - Belk, R (1996): Cross-Cultural Differences in Materialism, Journal of Economic Psychology, 17. 55-77

Grubb, E. Grathwohl, H. (1967): Consumer Self-concept, Symbolism and Market Behavior, A Theoretical Approach, Journal of Marketing, 31 October 22-27

Hirschman, E. (1991): Secular Morality and the Dark Side of Consumer Behavior, in Advances in Consumer Research 18. Michael Solomon and Rebecca Holman, ed. Provo. ÚT. Association for Consumer Research, 1-4

Hofmeister Tóth, Á – Neulinger, Á (2001): Mennyire anyagiasak a magyar fogyasztók? A Magyar Marketing Oktatók VII. Országos Konferenciájának előadása, Gödöllő, 2001. augusztus 30-31. pp 137-144 CD.

Hofmeister, A. (2004). Fogyasztói magatartás, Budapest: AULA

Hofmeister Tóth, Á – Neulinger, Á (2008): A magyar lakosság anyagiassága, A Magyar Marketing Oktatók XIV. Országos Konferenciájának előadása, Budapest, 2008. augusztus 25-26, CD.

Hofmeister-Tóth, Á., and Törőcsik, M. (1998) Fejezetek a fogyasztói magatartás témaköréből, Budapest: AULA.

Inglehart R. (1981): Post-materialism in an environment of insecurity, American Political Science Review, 75 (December) 991 – 1017 pp.

Keller, M. and Vihalemm, T. (2003) 'Return to the "consuming West"', *Young- Nordic Journal of Youth Research*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp.195-215.

Mick D. G. (1996): Are studies of dark side variables confounded by socially desirable responding? The case of materialism, *Journal of Consumer Research* 23: 106-119.

Micken K. S. (1995): A New Appraisal of the Belk Materialism Scale, *Advances in Consumer Research*, Volume 22, pp. 398-405

Muncy J. A. – J. K. Eastman (1998): Materialism and Consumer Ethics: An Exploratory Study, *Journal of Business Ethics* 17: 137–145, 1998.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978): *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ponchio, M. C. - Aranha F. (2008): Materialism as a predictor variable of low income consumer behaviour when entering into instalment plan agreements, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 7: 21-34 (2008)

Ryan L – Dziurawiec S. (2000): Materialism and Its Relationship to Life Satisfaction, *Social Indicators Research* 55: 185–197, 2001.

Richins, M (1987): Media, Materialism, and Human Happiness, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 14., 352-356.

Richins, M. - Dawson S. (1992): A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19. December 303-316.

Richins, M. (2004): The Material Values Scale: Measurement Properties and Development of a Short Form, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 31, June 2004



Shaw, J. W - Leung, A - Wattendorf, M (2004): The Effect of Materialism on Emotional Well-Being and Life Satisfaction: An Application of Multiple Discrepancies Theory, *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 31

Watson, J. (1998): Materialism and Debt: A Study of Current Attitudes and Behaviours, *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 25, 203–7.

Wessely, A. (2000). 'Utazó emberek, utazó tárgyak', *Replika*, Vol. 39, pp.95-106.

## APPENDIX

**Table 1**

Age and Gender of the Samples

		<b>2007</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>18-29</b>	<i>N</i>	132	118	250
	<i>%</i>	27	29	28
<b>30-49</b>	<i>N</i>	214	180	394
	<i>%</i>	43	45	44
<b>50-64</b>	<i>N</i>	146	106	252
	<i>%</i>	30	26	28
<b>Total</b>	<i>N</i>	492	404	896
	<i>%</i>	100	100	100
		<b>2007</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Men</b>	<i>N</i>	234	201	435
	<i>%</i>	48	47	49
<b>Women</b>	<i>N</i>	258	203	461
	<i>%</i>	52	53	51
<b>Total</b>	<i>N</i>	492	404	896
	<i>%</i>	100	100	100

**Table 2**

Sub-dimensions of Materialism Scale in Hungary, 2000 and 2007

**Possessiveness**

I don't get particularly upset when I lose things.\*

I get very upset if something is stolen from me, even it has little monetary value

I tend to hang on to things I should probably throw out. (Excluded from the sample of 2007)

I am less likely than most people to lock things up.\*

**Nongenerosity**

I enjoy sharing what I have.\*

I enjoy having guests stay in my home.\*

**Envy**

When friends have things I cannot afford it bothers me.  
 I am bothered when I see people who buy anything they want.  
 There are certain people I would like to trade places with.  
 I don't seem to get what is coming to me.

\* *Reversed item*

**Table 3**

Cronbach' Alpha of Belk 1990 study

<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>Turkey</b>	<b>Europe</b>	<b>USA</b>	<b>Combined</b>
Possessiveness	.51	.52	.76	.67
Nongenerosity	.63	.53	.67	.69
Envy	.46	.42	.50	.52
Tangibilization	.58	.63	.49	.56
Materialism	.56	.67	.49	.58

**Table 4**

Cronbach's Alpha of Subscales and Overall Scale

<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>Year: 2000</b>	<b>Year: 2007</b>
Possessiveness	0,63	0,71
Nongenerosity	0,60	0,61
Envy	0,51	0,51
Materialism	0,55	0,53

**Table 5**

The materialism and subscale mean scores

<b>2000</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std Dev.</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Possessiveness	15,64	3,18	0,78	20
Nongenerosity	4,02	1,77	0,40	10
Envy	11,45	3,77	0,57	20
Materialism	31,13	5,60	0,62	50
<b>2007</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std Dev.</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Possessiveness	11,42	2,52	0,76	15
Nongenerosity	4,45	1,63	0,45	10

Envy	11,73	3,67	0,59	20
Materialism	27,58	4,84	0,61	45

**Table 6**

The materialism and subscale mean scores by demography groups

2000		Gender		Age			Education		
		Men	Women	18-29	30-49	50-64	Elementary	Secondary	High
Possessiveness	Mean	15,24	15,97	15,03	15,29	16,33	16,08	15,37	14,43
	<i>Std Dev</i>	3,32	3,01	3,25	3,21	2,88	3,18	3,14	3,01
Nongenerosity	Mean	4,34	3,72	3,97	4,17	4,02	4,06	3,86	4,22
	<i>Std Dev</i>	1,81	1,68	1,65	1,81	1,89	1,85	1,64	1,77
Envy	Mean	11,24	11,65	11,27	11,73	11,64	11,77	11,30	10,52
	<i>Std Dev</i>	3,54	3,97	3,71	3,92	16,33	3,80	3,71	3,74
Materialism	Mean	30,78	31,42	30,36	31,11	31,86	31,96	30,49	29,29
	<i>Std Dev</i>	5,63	5,56	5,76	5,53	5,94	5,44	5,60	5,81

2007		Gender		Age			Education		
		Men	Women	18-29	30-49	50-64	Elementary	Secondary	High
Possessiveness	Mean	11,11	11,70	11,39	11,20	11,72	11,67	11,35	11,30
	<i>Std Dev</i>	2,52	2,49	2,47	2,49	2,61	2,52	2,52	2,53
Nongenerosity	Mean	4,71	4,22	4,39	4,32	4,72	4,50	4,48	4,29
	<i>Std Dev</i>	1,70	1,52	1,51	1,61	1,71	1,73	1,61	1,52
Envy	Mean	11,62	11,84	11,90	11,65	11,65	12,69	11,50	11,23
	<i>Std Dev</i>	3,72	3,63	3,69	3,69	3,67	3,65	3,69	3,45
Materialism	Mean	27,42	27,72	27,69	27,16	28,04	28,91	27,28	26,77
	<i>Std Dev</i>	5,10	4,60	4,51	4,91	5,09	4,83	4,85	4,46

**Table 7**

Items with significant differences between 2000 and 2007, total samples

I get very upset if something is stolen from me, even it has little monetary value.

I don't get particularly upset when I lose things.\*

I would rather buy something I need than borrow it from someone else.

I never discard old pictures or snapshots.

I enjoy sharing what I have.\*

I don't mind giving rides to those who don't have a car.\*

When friends have things I cannot afford it bothers me.

**Table 8**

Scores of materialism and subscales

	<b>Turkey</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>USA</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Hungary 2000</b>	<b>Hungary 2007</b>
Possessiveness	0,78	0,64	0,68	0,69	0,78	0,76
Nongenerosity	0,38	0,51	0,55	0,46	0,40	0,45
Envy	0,61	0,48	0,56	0,48	0,57	0,59
Materialism	0,65	0,60	0,64	0,59	0,62	0,61