



Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

MATERIALISM VERSUS VOLUNTARY SIMPLICITY: DOES THE LIFESTYLE AFFECT WORKPLACE DEVIANCE BEHAVİORS?*

İbrahim TÜRKMEN^{1*}
Enver Samet ÖZKAL²
Belkis ÖZKARA³

Abstract

Workplace deviation literature has mainly focused on the effects of organizational practices on workplace deviation behaviors. It has been ignored that the individual characteristics of the employees can also cause workplace deviation. This research aims to determine the effect of employees' lifestyles on deviant behavior in the workplace. Materialism and voluntary simplicity were discussed as lifestyles in the research. The research was designed as cross-sectional quantitative research. Research data were collected through a questionnaire consisting of materialism, voluntary simplicity, and workplace deviant behavior scales. Research data were obtained from 387 professionals working in the service sector. Hypotheses are tested using regression analysis. According to the research findings, while materialism affects workplace deviance positively, voluntary simplicity affects negatively. These results show that managers should also take into account the lifestyle of employees while making decisions to prevent workplace deviant behavior.

Keywords: Lifestyle, Materialism, Voluntary Simplicity, Workplace Deviance

JEL Codes: D23, M12, M54, O15

MATERYALİZME KARŞI GÖNÜLLÜ SADELİK: HAYAT TARZI İŞYERİ SAPMA DAVRANIŞLARINI ETKİLER Mİ?

Öz

İşyeri sapma literatürü, esas olarak örgütsel uygulamaların işyeri sapma davranışları üzerindeki etkilerine odaklanmıştır. Çalışanların bireysel özelliklerinin de işyeri sapmasına neden olabileceği göz ardı edilmiştir. Bu araştırma, çalışanların yaşam tarzlarının iş yerindeki sapkın davranışlara etkisini belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmada yaşam biçimleri olarak materyalizm ve gönüllü sadelik ele alınmıştır. Araştırma, kesitsel nicel araştırma olarak tasarlanmıştır. Araştırma verileri materyalizm, gönüllü sadelik ve işyeri sapma davranışları ölçeklerinden oluşan bir anket aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Araştırma verileri hizmet sektöründe çalışan 387 profesyonelden elde edilmiştir. Hipotezler regresyon analizi kullanılarak test edilmiştir. Araştırma bulgularına göre materyalizm işyeri sapmasını olumlu yönde etkilerken, gönüllü sadelik olumsuz yönde etkilemektedir. Bu sonuçlar, yöneticilerin işyerinde sapkın davranışları önlemek için kararlar alırken çalışanların yaşam tarzlarını da dikkate almaları gerektiğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hayat Tarzı, Materyalizm, Gönüllü Sadelik, İşyerinde Sapma

JEL Kodları: D23, M12, M54, O15

* It was approved by Usak University Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee with the decision of 2019/60 dated 06.11.2019. This research was presented at the 5th LIOS held on September 10, 2021.

¹ Lecturer, Uşak University, Vocational School of Health Services, Department of Management and Organization, ORCID: 0000-0002-1558-0736.

* **Corresponding Author** (Sorumlu yazar): ibrahim.turkmen@usak.edu.tr

² Lecturer, Afyonkarahisar University of Health Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Health Management, ORCID: 0000-0002-7346-5402.

³ Prof. Dr., Afyon Kocatepe University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business Administration, ORCID: 0000-0002-4324-9741.

Received (Başvuru Tarihi) : 02.03.2022 **Accepted** (Kabul Tarihi): 24.10.2022

Introduction

Workplace deviance behaviors of employees for organizations have become a common and costly problem (Bennett and Robinson, 2000). It has been found out that the employees show deviance between 33% and 75% (Harper, 1990). It is estimated that the annual cost of workplace deviation can reach up to \$200 Billion (Murphy, 1993). Ignoring deviant behaviors or not taking precautions may cause financial damage as well as deterioration of the working environment. Managers must take the necessary measures to prevent and correct the deviant behavior of their employees.

Workplace deviance is defined as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both” (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). This definition divides workplace deviant behaviors into two as "organizational deviance" and "interpersonal deviance". While organizational deviance consists of behaviors such as disrupting business, failing to comply with the working hours, not following the orders and instructions of the managers, and making irregular expenditures, interpersonal deviance consists of behaviors such as hurting, humiliating, embarrassing the colleagues, and gossiping (Bennett and Robinson, 2000).

In the researches, the factors affecting workplace deviance behavior are mostly seen as the result of the practices of organizations. As organizational practices that affect workplace deviance, variables such as leadership (Bodla et al., 2019; Valle et al., 2019; Erkutlu and Chafra, 2018; Gils, Quaquebeke et al., 2015; Neves and Story, 2015), perceived organizational ethical climate (Hsieh and Wang, 2016), organizational policy (Crawford et al., 2019), organizational support (Chen et al., 2006; Ferris et al., 2009), psychological contract (İyigün and Çetin, 2012; Chiu and Peng, 2008), organizational justice (Ayazlar and Güzel, 2013; Yeşiltaş et al., 2012) were looked into. Some studies have tried to determine the effect of employee personality traits on workplace deviance behavior (Pletzer et al., 2019; O'Neill et al., 2011; O'Neill and Hastings, 2011; Hastings and O'Neill, 2009). From another point of view, there are studies on the effects of lifestyle on a person's social life. However, there is not enough research on the effects of lifestyle on working life (Unanue et al., 2017).

The income of people from their working lives affects their lifestyle. When people prefer a more luxurious lifestyle, and if the income they earn from their work is not enough to meet this lifestyle, dissatisfied with their work, colleagues, managers, and the organization in general, thinking that they are not paid what they deserve or that the resources are not distributed fairly, they might have the tendency towards deviating behaviors that can increase their income. Therefore, this research aims to contribute to the literature by providing pieces of evidence that the lifestyles adopted by professionals directly working in the service sector can also affect workplace deviance behavior.

1. Theoretical Background

1.1. Two Extreme Dimensions as a Lifestyle: Materialism and Voluntary Simplicity Lifestyle

Lifestyle is a phenomenon that changes from individual to individual and is shaped in line with the wishes and needs of individuals. Lifestyle is naturally related to what a person has and the desire to have them. The characteristics of the area and place lived, the tools, items owned and used, and their quantity and qualities reflect the lifestyle of individuals. The higher these are in terms of quality and quantity, the more a person has a desire to obtain them, then the more income and the more effort that person will need to achieve it. In a positive sense, this effort can also lead the person to work harder to earn more. If organizational systems reward more effort with more income, then the behavior of deviance may not occur immediately. However, if the reward systems are insufficient or do not support the lifestyle, then the likelihood of turning to deviant behavior may increase (Kasser et al., 2006; Tang and Chiu, 2003; Richins and Dawson, 1992; Belk, 1985; Belk, 1984).

Materialism and voluntary simplicity are considered as two opposite variables for the lifestyles. Materialism, in general, is defined as “the importance a person attaches to beings in the world” (Belk, 1984). Materialism includes a range of values and purposes, focusing on wealth, property, image, and status (Kasser, 2016). Voluntary simplicity, on the other hand, is a lifestyle that usually contributes to enriching the self by directing the individual towards non-materialistic goals (Boujbel and D'astous, 2012).

Materialist goals such as being wealthy, acquiring goods, offering an attractive appearance, and being in high status are a basic element of human value systems (Kasser, 2016). As the materialistic tendencies of individuals increase, having material assets is accepted as an indicator of success and happiness (Belk, 1984). The basis of materialism is the transformation of properties into tools used in expressing the personal and social identity of the individual, as well as being a tool used in daily life (Dittmar and Pepper, 1994). Materialism is the making of material goods an end rather than an instrumental value. In other words, it is an effort to have things to show that people are successful and happy, not to meet their needs (Kilbourne and Pickett, 2008). For this reason, the material goods that materialist individuals have or want to have been at the center of their life goals. One of the reasons why ownership and acquisition of them are so central to materialists is that they think they are necessary to be satisfied and successful in life (Richins and Dawson, 1992).

Kraisornsutasinee and Swierczek (2018) stated that voluntary simplicity emerged as a reaction to today's consumer society and its materialist tendencies. Converting consumption-oriented values into voluntary simpler values has become a necessity for human survival (Iwata, 1997). Voluntary simplicity can be considered as one of the ways to reach happiness and achieve inner peace by voluntarily adopting values such as self-sufficiency, less and responsible consumption, sustainability, social responsibility, and environmental awareness (Kasser, 2016; Friedman and Friedman, 2010; Shama and Wisenblit, 1984).

Voluntary simplicity expresses the free will choice instead of being forced by poverty and government austerity programs (Etzioni, 1998). Simplicity is a relative matter depending on the individual's character, climate, traditions, and culture (Gregg, 1936). Voluntary simplicity is the transformation of a belief system into practice. Voluntary simplicity is based on the belief that success, happiness, and personal satisfaction stem from the intangible elements of life. This belief turns into behaviors such as self-confidence, self-sufficiency, focusing on mental and inner wealth rather than material wealth (Zavestoski, 2002). The essence of voluntary simplicity; "is plain life on the outside, a rich life on the inside." (Elgin and Mitchell, 1977).

1.2. Materialism and Workplace Deviance

Financial success, image, and popularity are common external goals associated with materialism (Grouzet et al., 2005). Some organizations recognize that materialist individuals will work more efficiently to attain external rewards, and therefore materialism is a direct or indirect measure of productivity (Kasser et al., 2006). However, recent research shows that high materialistic values can have negative effects on working life (Deckop et al., 2010).

An employee who gives importance to external values rather than internal values is more likely to encounter negative consequences such as emotional exhaustion, reluctance, stress, dissatisfaction, and intention to leave (Vansteenkiste et al., 2007). Giacalone et al. (2008) concluded that materialism is negatively related to compliance with work ethics and personal social responsibility. The results of the research conducted by Xie et al. (2016) show that materialism can have a negative effect on employee engagement. It is observed that individuals with high materialistic tendencies are less satisfied with their lives while looking for high income and financial security (Richins and Dawson, 1992). Individuals are more likely to show unethical behaviors when their materialistic tendencies increase, give excessive importance to material wealth, and see money as

a motivation tool (Tang and Chiu, 2003). In addition, it has been determined that individuals who care about materialistic values have distant social relations with others, move away from helping and cooperation behaviors, and tend to individualize (Vohs et al., 2006). The materialistic goals of individuals are relatively inconsistent with internal values such as developing good relations, making the world better, and being a good and useful person to society (Kasser, 2016). For this reason, it is foreseen that materialism would positively affect workplace deviance behavior and its sub-dimensions organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance behavior. In this context, the following hypothesis has been developed:

H1: Materialism has a positive and significant effect on workplace deviance behavior.

1.3. Voluntary Simplicity and Workplace Deviance

Voluntary simplicity is often a way of life that contributes to enriching the self by directing the individual towards non-materialistic goals (Boujbel and D'astous, 2012). It can be said that individuals who adopt voluntary simplicity not only live sustainably but also work following ethical rules. In other words, individuals who adopt voluntary simplicity can be expected to behave ethically at work because they do not see money and material wealth as the focal point of their lives (O'Sullivan and Kraisornsuthasinee, 2020).

These individuals reject other aspects, such as seeking status and meaning through paid work (Grigsby, 2004). Voluntary simplicity is a conscious choice and is a process that requires learning new attitudes and behaviors, reducing the importance of material concerns, improving interpersonal relationships, and sticking to internal values such as participation in society (Boujbel and D'astous, 2012). The desire to achieve an intrinsic goal (i.e., personal development, mental development, health, sense of work, or contribution to society) contributes to individuals' better performance, participation, and focus compared to the desire to achieve an extrinsic goal (i.e., money or image). Managers' use of intrinsic goals seems to have a positive and significant impact on employee performance and job commitment (Vansteenkiste et al., 2004).

Participants of the voluntary simplicity movement stated that they were motivated by ethical factors, they made more effort to spend their money socially or ecologically conscientiously, they were happier than their former lives, and they adopted the values of frugal (minimizing the expenses) and minimalism (valuing fewer possessions) (Alexander and Ussher, 2012). Individuals who have adopted a voluntary simplicity attach importance to personal growth and the enrichment of their inner world instead of material growth (Elgin and Mitchell, 1977). Therefore, it can be foreseen that voluntary simplicity would negatively affect workplace deviance behavior and its sub-dimensions organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance behavior. In this context, the following hypothesis has been developed:

H2: Voluntary simplicity has a negative and significant effect on workplace deviance behavior.

2. Research Methodology

2.1. Participants and Procedure

The research is designed as quantitative research of a descriptive cross-sectional study type. In this research, it is aimed to determine the effect of lifestyles adopted by professionals directly working in the service sector on workplace deviance behavior. The universe of study consists of individuals working in different provinces of Turkey that are academicians and teachers who directly provide education services to students in the education sector and doctors and nurses who directly provide health services to patients in the health sector. Convenience sampling was used in sample selection. It was approved by Usak University Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee with the decision of 2019/60 dated 06.11.2019. The survey forms were prepared in Google Forms and sent to the corporate e-mail addresses of the participants.

Participants were asked to complete an anonymous questionnaire containing statements about lifestyle and organizational deviance behavior. Participants had to spend about 10 minutes to complete the survey form. A total of 406 participants were reached. However, as a result of the examination, it was found that 19 survey forms were not filled out properly and were excluded from the analysis. Therefore, the analysis of the study was carried out with data from 387 participants.

2.2. Measures

All the scales used in the study consist of 5-point Likert-type statements and the participants are asked to choose between 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.

Materialism Scale: The scale developed by Richins and Dawson (1992) to measure the level of materialist tendency consists of sub-dimensions of “centrality, success and happiness” and 18 items. Centrality is explained as the tendency of an individual to place assets and property at the center of his or her life. “Success”, one of the other sub-dimensions, refers to whether the quality and number of assets owned are perceived as a criterion for success. Happiness, on the other hand, is the tendency to see material assets as the main source of happiness. Success dimension is measured with 6 items, Centrality with 7 items, and Happiness with 5 items. Eight items on the scale are encoded in reverse. The reliability coefficients for the sub-dimensions of the scale are .82, .86, and .82 for the centrality, happiness, and success, respectively, and the overall reliability coefficient of the scale is .87 (Richins, 2004; Richins and Dawson, 1992). In this study, the reliability coefficient for the centrality, happiness, and success, sub-dimensions of the scale were .68, .71, .78 respectively, while the overall reliability coefficient of the scale was .80.

Voluntary Simplicity Scale: The scale, developed by Özgül (2010) using Iwata's studies (1997-2001-2006), consists of the sub-dimensions of “nonmaterial life, planned shopping, self-sufficiency, and simplicity in the product” and 8 items. Each dimension consists of two items. There are no reverse encoded items on the scale. Reliability coefficients for the nonmaterial life, planned shopping, self-sufficiency, and simplicity in the product, sub-dimensions of the scale were .73, .72, .74, .68 respectively (Özgül, 2010). In this study, the reliability coefficient for the nonmaterial life, planned shopping, self-sufficiency, and simplicity in the product, sub-dimensions of the scale were .81, .69, .76, .71 respectively, while the overall reliability coefficient of the scale was .72.

Workplace Deviance Scale: To measure workplace deviance behaviors, a scale consisting of “interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance” dimensions developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000) and 19 items were used. Interpersonal deviance is measured by 7 items while 12 items are used to measure organizational deviance. There are no reverse encoded items on the scale. The reliability coefficient of the organizational deviance scale was .81 while 0.78 for the interpersonal deviance scale. Both scales showed acceptable internal consistency (Bennett and Robinson, 2000). In this study, the reliability coefficient for the interpersonal deviance scale was .79, and for the organizational deviance scale .83, while the overall reliability coefficient of the scale was .88.

3. Results

The statistics regarding the descriptive characteristics of the participants are given in Table 1. The research participants consisted of nurses (30 %), teachers (29.2 %), academics (26.9 %) and doctors (14.0%). Research participants; 59.7% are women, 72.9% are married, 47.8% are undergraduate graduates, 43.9% are between the ages of 30-39 and 47% have 10 years or less professional experience.

Table 1: Descriptive Characteristics of the Participants

Variable	N	%	Variable	N	%
Gender			Marital Status		
Female	231	59.7	Married	282	72.9
Male	156	40.3	Non-Married	105	27.1
Educational Status			Profession		
Associate degree	36	9.3	Academician	104	26.9
Bachelor's degree	185	47.8	Teacher	113	29.2
Master	87	22.5	Doctor	54	14.0
Doctorate	79	20.4	Nurse	116	30.0
Age			Working Year		
20-29	81	20.9	1-10	182	47.0
30-39	170	43.9	11-20	124	32.1
40 ≤	136	35.2	21 ≤	81	20.9
Total	387	100	Total	387	100

The mean, standard deviation, Skewness, Kurtosis, and Cronbach's Alpha values related to the variables of the study are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Scales

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach's Alpha
Success	2.21	.730	.325	-.188	.78
Centrality	2.48	.705	-.032	-.502	.71
Happiness	2.86	.802	-.111	-.349	.68
Materialism	2.56	.576	-.218	-.037	.80
Planned shopping	3.88	.830	-.501	-.340	.69
Self-sufficiency	4.37	.577	-.771	.850	.76
Nonmaterial life	4.08	.749	-.642	.087	.81
Simplicity in the product	3.69	.807	-.367	-.265	.71
Voluntary Simplicity	4.00	.495	-.162	.079	.72
Interpersonal Deviance	1.50	.505	1.085	.966	.79
Organizational Deviance	1.47	.485	1.002	.361	.83
Workplace Deviance	1.48	.444	1.017	.522	.88

The mean scores of the participants on the materialism scale were 2.56 ± 0.576 , the mean scores on the voluntary simplicity scale were 4.00 ± 0.495 , and the mean scores on the workplace deviation scale were 1.48 ± 0.444 . When the averages are evaluated, it is seen that the materialistic tendencies of the participants are "medium", their voluntary simplicity tendencies are "high" and their workplace deviation behaviors are "low". The normal distribution of the data was evaluated using the Skewness and Kurtosis values. Since the Skewness and Kurtosis values of all research variables were in the range of $\pm 1,500$, it was assumed that the data showed a normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The reliability of the research variables was evaluated using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient ($C\alpha$). As a result of the reliability analysis, it was accepted as reliable because the $C\alpha$ coefficients of the dimensions of Happiness ($C\alpha=0.68$) and Planned shopping ($C\alpha=0.69$) were very close to 0.70 (Kayış, 2016; Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). It was accepted as reliable because the $C\alpha$ coefficients of all the other variables of the study were higher than 0.70 (Table 2).

The results of the Pearson Correlation analysis for the determination of the relationships between the research variables are given in Table 3. There are positive and significant relationships between materialism and its sub-dimensions and workplace deviance behavior and its sub-dimensions. There are negative and significant relationships between voluntary simplicity and its sub-

dimensions and workplace deviance behavior and its sub-dimensions. Only voluntary simplicity does not have a significant relationship with the organizational deviance of the lower dimension of simplicity in the product (Table 3).

Table 3: Pearson Correlations Analysis Results

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Materialism	1											
2. Happiness	.82 **	1										
3. Centrality	.76 **	.34 **	1									
4. Success	.70 **	.42 **	.37 **	1								
5. Voluntary Simplicity	-.49 **	-.25 **	-.52 **	-.37 **	1							
6. Nonmaterial life	-.42 **	-.33 **	-.28 **	-.39 **	.66 **	1						
7. Planned shopping	-.47 **	-.24 **	-.60 **	-.22 **	.70 **	.24 **	1					
8. Self-sufficiency	-.12 **	.01	-.18 **	-.11 *	.58 **	.19 **	.28 **	1				
9. Simplicity in the product	-.24 **	-.07	-.27 **	-.24 **	.70 **	.30 **	.27 **	.25 **	1			
10. Workplace Deviance	.23 **	.14 **	.19 **	.22 **	-.32 **	-.24 **	-.24 **	-.27 **	-.12 *	1		
11. Organizational Deviance	.18 **	.10*	.17 **	.18 **	-.29 **	-.24 **	-.23 **	-.23 **	-.09	.92 **	1	
12. Interpersonal Deviance	.23 **	.15 **	.18 **	.23 **	-.29 **	-.19 **	-.20 **	-.26 **	-.13 **	.85 **	.61 **	1

** p<.01, *p<.05

Correlation analysis results provide initial support for hypotheses of the research. The hypotheses of the research were tested by simple linear regression and multiple regression analysis. In multiple regression analyses, it was found that the variance inflation factor value was below 1.5 and the tolerance value was higher than 0.7. It has been found that these values are acceptable and that there is no problem with multi-linearity in the current sample (Hair et al., 2014). The results of simple linear regression and multiple regression analyses were presented in Table 4.

Regression models in which the effect of materialism on organizational deviance and lower dimensions was evaluated were found to be statistically significant (p<.05). According to the regression models in question, materialism significantly and positively affects workplace deviance behavior (p<.05, $\beta = .23$). Materialism explains 5% of the change in workplace deviance behaviors ($R^2 = .05$). According to the results obtained with this model, the H1 hypothesis has been accepted. Materialism affects both organizational deviance (p <.05, $\beta = .18$) and interpersonal deviance (p <.05, $\beta = .23$) behaviors significantly and positively. The positive effect of materialism on workplace deviance and organizational deviance behavior is due to the sub-dimensions of success and centrality. The positive effect of materialism on interpersonal deviance behavior is due to the sub-dimension of success. While individuals who perceive ownership of material property as an indicator of success demonstrate both organizational and interpersonal deviance behavior, while this perception has a greater impact on interpersonal deviance behavior. The success dimension seems to be more effective in the organizational deviance behavior compared to the centrality dimension. Individuals who devote their lives to acquiring material properties show organizational deviance behavior, but do not show interpersonal deviance behavior. The sub-dimension of happiness does not have a significant effect on the deviance and sub-dimensions of the workplace.

Table 4: Regression Analysis Results

Independent variables	Dependent variables					
	Workplace Deviance		Organizational Deviance		Interpersonal Deviance	
	b	β	b	β	b	β
Constant	1.03**		1.07**		.98	
Materialism	.18	.23*	.16	.18*	.20	.23*
Model F	21.01**		13.43**		21.57**	
R ²	.05**		.03**		.05**	
Constant	1.03**		1.07**		.99***	
Success	.10	.17*	.09	.13*	.12	.17*
Centrality	.08	.12*	.08	.11*	.07	.10
Happiness	.02	.03	.01	.01	.03	.04
Model F	8.58**		5.67**		8.61**	
R ²	.06***		.04**		.06**	
Constant	2.63**		2.60**		2.68**	
Voluntary Simplicity Lifestyle	-.29	-.32**	-.28	-.29**	-.29	-.29**
Model F	43.96**		34.73**		34.83**	
R ²	.10**		.08**		.08**	
Constant	2.85**		2.79**		2.92**	
Nonmaterial life	-.10	-.17**	-.12	-.18**	-.08	-.12*
Planned shopping	-.08	-.14**	-.09	-.15**	-.07	-.10*
Self-sufficiency	-.16	-.21**	-.14	-.17**	-.18	-.21**
Simplicity in the product	-.01	-.02	-.03	-.04	-.01	-.02
Model F	14.19**		11.77**		10.85**	
R ²	.13**		.11**		.10**	

b = unstandardized coefficient; β = standardized coefficient * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$;

Regression models in which the effect of voluntary simplicity on workplace deviance and sub-dimensions were evaluated were found to be statistically significant ($p < .05$). According to the regression models in question, voluntary simplicity significantly and negatively affects workplace deviance behavior ($p < .001$, $\beta = -.32$). Voluntary simplicity explains 10% of the change in workplace deviance behavior ($R^2 = .10$). According to the results obtained with this model, the H2 hypothesis has been accepted. Voluntary simplicity affects both organizational deviance ($p < .001$, $\beta = -.29$) as well as interpersonal deviance ($p < .001$, $\beta = -.29$) behaviors significantly and negatively. The negative effect of voluntary simplicity on workplace deviance and organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance behavior, which are sub-dimensions, is due to self-sufficiency, nonmaterial life, and planned shopping sub-dimensions. As the self-sufficiency perceptions of the employees develop, they avoid interpersonal deviance behavior, and by adopting the nonmaterial life, and make planned shopping, which allows them to avoid deviating behavior towards more organizations. The sub-dimension of simplicity in the product does not have a significant effect on workplace deviation and sub-dimensions.

4. Discussion

When the literature on the lifestyle adopted by individuals is examined, it is seen that people's social lives and consumption habits are examined by excluding their working lives. In this study, the effect of the lifestyle adopted by working individuals on their behaviors in work-life was discussed. Lifestyle, materialism as two opposing poles, and voluntary simple lifestyle are discussed in the research. In this study, in particular, the effect of employees' lifestyle on deviant behaviors towards their colleagues and organization was evaluated. The main outcome obtained

in this study is the determination that the lifestyle adopted by the employees affects deviant behaviors in the workplace.

According to the research findings, the fact that employees have a materialistic lifestyle affects workplace deviation at a low level and positively. Employees' tendency towards materialistic values positively affects both organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance among employees. In the literature, there are research results supporting this finding. In the research conducted by Deckop et al. (2015), while there was not a significant relationship between materialism and organizational deviance, it was found that materialism had a positive effect on interpersonal deviance. Materialist individuals are reluctant and jealous to share elements such as success, image, and status due to their strong motives for ownership (Belk, 1985). Therefore it has been found that individuals who care about materialistic values move away from engaging in social and collaborative behavior and have tendency towards increased level of social distance with others (Kasser 2016; Vohs et al., 2006). The fact that an employee paying more attention to extrinsic values than intrinsic values would lead to results such as a decreased level of job satisfaction, low commitment, and motivation, as well as emotional exhaustion, and quitting the job (Vansteenkiste et al., 2007). In the study of Giacalone et al. (2008), they found that materialism is negatively related to ethical standards at work and personal social responsibility. It has been determined in the researches that materialism negatively affects organizational commitment (Xie et al., 2016) and organizational citizenship behavior (Deckop et al., 2015; Torlak and Koç, 2007). The reason that materialism leading to negative job attitudes might be attributed to individuals not being able to meet their needs and feeling frustrated (Unanue et al., 2017).

In the study conducted by Cui et al. (2021), they concluded that hedonic motives encourage individuals to unethical behaviors through materialism. In addition, the research found that self-control plays a moderator role in the relationship between materialism and unethical behavior. In other words, when individuals' self-control is low, material motives cause them to show unethical behaviors. In a study conducted in Nigeria by Adekanmbi and Ukpere (2021), they concluded that materialism positively affects employees' attitudes towards fraudulent behavior in the workplace. Managers should develop reward mechanisms to encourage positive behavior to prevent employees from engaging in fraudulent behavior. It was also stated that it is important to guide employees to self-control in terms of money and property (Adekanmbi and Ukpere, 2021). Employees are likely to display deviant behavior due to their financial motives. However, a lack of discipline and control in organizations can also provide an environment for individuals to display deviant behaviors. For this reason, managers should provide the necessary discipline, order, and control in the organization to prevent deviant behaviors (Gottschalk, 2022). Because the most important causes of workplace deviations are organizational practices. Therefore, it is not possible to prevent deviant behaviors without correcting organizational practices. In order to prevent deviant behaviors, first organizational measures and then individual and interpersonal measures should be taken (Malik and Lenka, 2018).

It has been determined that workplace deviation behaviors are affected by both individual and organizational factors. However, employee characteristics explain only 7% of organizational workplace deviance (Braje, Aleksić ve Jelavić, 2020). Deckop et al. (2015) found that materialism has a low and positive effect on interpersonal deviation. It has been determined that materialism explains 14% of the change in interpersonal deviant behavior. In this context, the low effect of the materialistic lifestyle of the individuals obtained in the study on deviant behavior and the low rate of explanation is compatible with the literature.

Another finding of the research is that voluntary simplicity has a negative impact on workplace deviance behavior. Voluntary simplicity negatively affects deviance towards both the organization and other employees. Studies have shown that individuals who adopt a voluntary simplicity behave

following the ethical rules more at work (Alexander and Ussher, 2012; O'sullivan and Kraisornsuthasinee, 2020). Voluntary simplicity is often a process that requires adhering to intrinsic values, such as interpersonal relationships and participation in society (Boujbel and D'astous, 2012). Individuals who adopt a voluntary simplicity desire to achieve intrinsic goals (personal development, health, contribution to society beneficially) (Grigsby, 2004). Therefore, adopting voluntary simplicity contributes to individuals' better performance, participation, and focus. (Vansteenkiste et al., 2004).

5. Conclusion

In recent years, there has been an increase in researches conducted on workplace deviance behavior. These researches mainly focused on the effects of practices within the organization and personality traits of employees on workplace deviance behavior. The fact that also the lifestyles adopted by employees can lead to workplace deviances has been disregarded. In the research, it was found that the lifestyle adopted by employees affects workplace deviance behavior.

The results of the research have theoretical and practical contributions. These results contribute by expanding the existing literature on the impact of employees' lifestyles on organizational practices and results. The practical contribution of the study is that organizations and managers should also consider the lifestyles of their employees while evaluating them. The adoption of a materialist lifestyle of individuals positively affects the behavior of organizational deviance, while a voluntary simplicity negatively affects the behavior of organizational deviance. In this context, it may be useful for managers to take into account the lifestyle of employees when they make decisions to prevent organizational deviance behavior. Besides, lifestyle is an important variable that should be considered in the preference of employees, organizational culture, and reward system.

The research has some limitations. Firstly, as lifestyles, materialism, and voluntary simplicity were discussed as two opposite poles. In future researches, lifestyle can be discussed in different dimensions. Secondly, there are statements in which the participants evaluate themselves (self-reporting) in the scale forms. The current results of the study are based on the participants' self-reporting statements. For future researches, scales that would evaluate a person's behavior by their manager or colleagues can be used. The third limitation of the study is related to the sample. Our sample includes only professionals in the education and health sector. Therefore, a heterogeneous sampling of employees consisted of other service sectors can be used in future research on the subject. Finally, in future researches, variables that might have a mediating role in the effect of lifestyle on organizational deviation behavior can also be examined.

Authorship Contributions (Yazarlık Katkıları): İbrahim Türkmen, Enver Samet Özkal, Belkıs Özkara

References

- Adekanmbi, F. P., & Ukpere, W. I. (2021). Employees' attitude towards fraudulent behaviors: Investigating the effect of frugality and materialism. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 25(3), 381-394.
- Alexander, S., & Ussher, S. (2012). The voluntary simplicity movement: A multi-national survey analysis in theoretical context. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 12(1), 66-86.
- Ayazlar, G., & Güzel, B. (2013). The effect of organizational justice towards workplace deviant behaviour and job quit intention of hotel employees. *Journal of Travel and Hospitality Management*, 10(3), 6-23.
- Belk, R.W. (1985). Materialism: trait aspects of living in the material World. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12, 265-280.

- Belk, W.R. (1984). Three scales to measure constructs related to materialism: Reliability, validity, and relationships to measures of happiness. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *11*, 291-297.
- Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(3), 349-360.
- Bodla, A.A., Tang, N., Dick, R.V., & Mir, U.R. (2019). Authoritarian leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational deviance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *40*(5), 583-599.
- Boujbel, L., & D'Astous, A. (2012). Voluntary simplicity and life satisfaction: Exploring the mediating role of consumption desires. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *11*, 487-494.
- Braje, I. N., Aleksić, A., & Jelavić, S. R. (2020). Blame it on individual or organization environment: what predicts workplace deviance more? *Social Sciences*, *9*(6), 99.
- Chen, L.L., Fah, B.C., & Jin, T.C. (2006). Perceived organizational support and workplace deviance in the voluntary sector. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, *35*(1), 468-475.
- Chiu, S.F., & Peng, J.C. (2008). The relationship between psychological contract breach and employee deviance: The moderating role of hostile attributional style. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*(3), 426-433.
- Crawford, W., Jean, E.L., Kamar, K.M., & Harris, K.J. (2019). Organizational politics and deviance: Exploring the role of political skill. *Human Performance*, *32*(2), 1-15.
- Cui, P., Shen, Y., Hommey, C., & Ma, J. (2021). The dark side of the pursuit of happiness comes from the pursuit of hedonia: The mediation of materialism and the moderation of self-control. *Current Psychology*, 1-11.
- Deckop, J.R., Giacalone, R.A., & Jurkiewicz, C.L. (2015). Materialism and workplace behaviors: Does wanting more result in less? *Social Indicators Research*, *121*(3), 787-803.
- Deckop, J.R., Jurkiewicz, C.L., & Giacalone, R.A. (2010). Effects of materialism on work-related personal well-being. *Human Relations*, *63*(7), 1007-1030.
- Dittmar, H., & Pepper, L. (1994). To have is to be: Materialism and person perception in working-class and middle-class British adolescents. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *15*, 233-254.
- Elgin, D., & Mitchell, A. (1977). Voluntary simplicity, *The Co-Evolution Quarterly*, Summer, 1-30.
- Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2018). Despotic leadership and organizational deviance. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, *11*(2), 150-165.
- Etzioni, A. (1998). Voluntary simplicity: characterization, select psychological implications, and societal consequences. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *19*, 619-643.
- Ferris, L., Brown, D.J., & Heller, D. (2009). Organizational supports and organizational deviance: The mediating role of organization-based self-esteem. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *108*(2), 279-286.
- Friedman, H.H. & Friedman, L.W. (2010). Dying of consumption? Voluntary simplicity as an antidote to hypermaterialism. In W. Sun, J. Stewart, & D. Pollard, (Eds.), *Reframing corporate social responsibility: Lessons from the global financial crisis (critical studies on corporate responsibility, governance and sustainability)* (pp. 253-269). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Giacalone, R.A., Jurkiewicz, C.L., & Deckop, J.R. (2008). On ethics and social responsibility: The impact of materialism, postmaterialism, and hope. *Human Relations*, *61*(4), 483-514.

- Gils, S.V., Quaakebeke, N.V., Knippenberg, D.V., Dijke, M.V., & Cremer, D.D. (2015). Ethical leadership and follower organizational deviance: The moderating role of follower moral attentiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26, 190-203.
- Gottschalk, P. (2022). Trusted chief executives in convenient white-collar crime. *Crime & Delinquency*, 1-29.
- Gregg, R.B. (1936). *The value of voluntary simplicity*. Pennsylvania: Pendle Hill.
- Grigsby, M. (2004). *Buying time and getting by the voluntary simplicity movement*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Grouzet, F.M., Kasser, T., Ahuvia, A., Dols, J.M., Kim, Y., Lau, S., et al. (2005). The structure of goal contents across 15 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(5), 800-816.
- Hair, J.J., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R.E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis seventh edition*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Harper, D. (1990). Spotlight abuse-save profits. *Industrial Distribution*, 79, 47-51.
- Hastings, S.E., & O'Neill, T.A. (2009). Predicting workplace deviance using broad versus narrow personality variables. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(4), 289-293.
- Hsieh, H.H., & Wang, Y.D. (2016). Linking perceived ethical climate to organizational deviance: The cognitive, affective, and attitudinal mechanisms. *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 3600–3608.
- Iwata, O. (1997). Attitudinal and behavioral correlates of voluntary simplicity lifestyle. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 25(3), 233-240.
- Iwata, O. (2001). Attitudinal determinants of environmentally responsible behavior, *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 29(2), 183-190.
- Iwata, O. (2006). An evaluation of consumerism and lifestyle as correlates of a voluntary simplicity lifestyle. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 34(5), 557-568.
- İyigün, N.Ö., & Çetin, C. (2012). The impact of psychological contract on organizational deviance and a research in pharmaceutical sector. *Öneri Dergisi*, 10(37), 15-29.
- Kasser, T. (2016). Materialistic values and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67(1), 9.1-9.26.
- Kasser, T., Vansteenkiste, M., & Deckop, J.R. (2006). The ethical problems of a materialistic value orientation for businesses (and some suggestions for alternatives). In J. R., Deckop, (Eds), *Human resource management ethics (ethics in practice)* (pp. 283-306). Greenwich: Information Age Publishers.
- Kayış, A. (2016). Güvenilirlik Analizi. Ş. Kalaycı (Ed.), *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri 7. Baskı* içinde (ss. 403-419). Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kilbourne, W., & Pickett, G. (2008). How materialism affects environmental beliefs, concern, and environmentally responsible behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 61, 885–893.
- Kraisornsuthasinee, S., & Swierczek, F.W. (2018). Beyond consumption: The promising contribution of voluntary simplicity. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 14(1), 80-95.
- Malik, P., & Lenka, U. (2018). Integrating antecedents of workplace deviance: Utilizing AHP approach. *Journal of Indian Business Research*, 10(1), 101-122.
- Murphy, K.R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont: Thomson Brooks / Cole.

- Neves, P., & Story, J. (2015). Ethical leadership and reputation: Combined indirect effects on organizational deviance. *Journal of Business Ethics, 127*(1), 165-176.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory (Third edition)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Neill, T.A., & Hastings, S.E. (2011). Explaining workplace deviance behavior with more than just the big five. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(2), 268-273.
- O'Neill, T.A., Lewis, R.J., & Craswell, J.J. (2011). Employee personality, justice perceptions, and the prediction of workplace deviance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*(5), 595-600.
- O'Sullivan, P., & Kraisornsuthasinee, S. (2020). You earn as you live as you value: Consumption-work dialectic and its implications for sustainability. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal, 11*(2), 429-450.
- Özgül, E. (2011). Evaluations of consumers' socio-demographic characteristics in terms of hedonic consumption and voluntary simplicity life styles. *Ege Academic Review, 11*(1) 25-38.
- Pletzer, J.L., Bentvelzen, M., Oostrom, J.K., & Vries, R.E. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relations between personality and workplace deviance: Big five versus HEXACO. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 112*(1), 369-383.
- Richins, M. L. (2004). The material values scale: Measurement properties and development of a short form. *Journal of Consumer Research, 31*, 209-219.
- Richins, M.L., & Dawson, S. (1992). A consumer values orientation for materialism and its measurement: Development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Research, 19*(3), 303-316.
- Robinson, S.L., & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *The Academy of Management Journal, 38*(2), 555-572.
- Shama, A., & Wisenblit, J. (1984). Values of voluntary simplicity: Lifestyle and motivation. *Psychological Reports, 55*, 231-240.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics (Six edition)*. Boston: Pearson.
- Tang, T.L.P., & Chiu, R.K. (2003). Income, money ethic, pay satisfaction, commitment, and unethical behavior: Is the love of money the root of evil for hong kong employees? *Journal of Business Ethics, 46*, 13-30.
- Torlak, O., & Koç, U. (2007). Materialistic attitude as an antecedent of organizational citizenship behavior. *Management Research News, 30*(8), 581-596.
- Unanue, W., Rempel, K., Gómez, M.E., & Broeck, A.V. (2017). When and why does materialism relate to employees' attitudes and well-being: The mediational role of need satisfaction and need frustration. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1-15.
- Valle, M., Kacmar, K.M., Ziynuska, S., & Harting, T. (2019). Abusive supervision, leader-member exchange, and moral disengagement: A moderated-mediation model of organizational deviance. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 159*(3), 299-312.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Neyrinck, B., Niemiec, P.C., Soenens, B., Witte, H.D., & Broeck, A.V. (2007). On the relations among work value orientations, psychological need satisfaction and job outcomes: A self-determination theory approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*, 251-277.

- Vansteenkiste, M., Simons, J., Lens, W., Sheldon, K.M., & Deci, E.L. (2004), Motivating learning, performance, and persistence: the synergistic effects of intrinsic goal contents and autonomy-supportive contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 246-260.
- Vohs, K.D., Mead, N.L., & Goode, M.R. (2006). The psychological consequences of money. *Science*, 314(5802), 1154-1156.
- Xie, T., Shi, Y., & Zhou, J. (2016). The adverse effect of materialism on employee engagement in China. *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, 7(2), 100-114.
- Yeşiltaş, M., Çeken, H., & Sormaz, Ü. (2012). Ethical leadership and organizational justice on the effect of organizational workplace deviation. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 28, 18-39.
- Zavestoski, S. (2002). The social–psychological bases of anticonsumption attitudes. *Psychology & Marketing*, 19(2), 149-165.