Y KUŞAĞININ ALIŞVERİŞ YÖNELİMİ[1]

Celile Özçiçek DÖLEKOĞLU[2]   *Onur ÇELİK[3]*

Öz

Y kuşağı günümüzde hayatın içerisinde; tüketim ve üretim sürecinde aktif olarak yer alan en büyük kitleyi oluşturmaktadır. Bu nedenle de hem uygulamacılar hem de bilim dünyasının dikkatini çekmektedir. Bu çalışma da Y kuşağının alışveriş yönelimini, herhangi bir sektör veya ürün grubuna odaklanmadan, ortaya koymak amacıyla yapılmıştır. Ayrıca Y kuşağının alışveriş yönelimine etki eden faktörlerin kuşak içerisinde sosyo-demografik değişkenler açısından farklılıkları olup olmadığını da ortaya koyabilmeyi hedeflemiştir. Bu kapsamda Türkiye'nin Adana ilinde 300 kişiye ulaşılmıştır. Çalışmada tanımlayıcı istatistiklerin yanı sıra faktör analizi de gerçekleştirilmiştir. Faktör analizi sonucu varyansın %72,96'sını açıklayan 6 faktör elde edilmiştir (Rekreasyonel Alışveriş Yapma Eğilimi, Karar Karmaşası, Marka Sadakati, Alışverişte Özgüven ve Fiyat Bilinci, Alışveriş Antipatisi ve Popüler Kültür). Çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre kadınlar erkeklere kıyasla popüler tüketim, rekreasyonel ve özgüvenli alışveriş eğiliminde olduğu görülmüştür. Gelir seviyesine göre marka sadakatinde ve popüler tüketimde farklılıklar elde edilmiştir. Eğitim düzeyi dikkate alındığında ise lisans ve üzeri eğitime sahip olan Y kuşağı tüketicileri rekreasyonel ve popüler kültür eğilimi çerçevesinde alışveriş yaptıkları görülmüştür.

Jel Sınıflandırması: *M31, M39*
Anahtar Kelimeler: *Y kuşağı, Alışveriş Yönelimi, Tüketici Davranışları*

SHOPPING ORIENTATION OF Y GENERATION

Abstract

In life today, Y generation constitutes the largest population group which is actively involved in consumption and production process. Therefore, it draws the attention of both implementers and science world. This study was conducted in order to reveal shopping orientation of Y generation without focusing on any sector or product group. In addition, it was aimed to present if there are any differences of the factors affecting the shopping orientation of Y generation in terms of socio-demographic variables. In this context, 300 people were reached in Adana province of Turkey. In addition to descriptive statistics, factor analysis was also performed. As a result of the factor analysis, 6 factors explaining 72.96% of the variance were obtained (Recreational Shopping Tendency, Decision Complexity, Brand Loyalty, Self-Confidence in Shopping and Price Awareness, Shopping Antipathy and Popular Culture). According to the results of the study, it was seen that women have popular consumption, recreational and self-confident shopping tendency compared to men. According to income level, differences in brand loyalty and popular consumption were seen. When education level was taken into consideration, it is seen that Y generation consumers who got university and above education level are shopping within the framework of the recreational and popular culture trend.

Jel Classification: *M31, M39*
Keywords: *Y Generation, Shopping Orientation, Consumer Behavior*

1. Introduction

The world has been the scene of many important events since its existence. The periods of these events revealed similar characteristics and behaviors within themselves. The term of "new generation" is used for each period. This concept has been derived from social life, consumption, habits and world view of each generation. For the periods in which the generations remarkably differ, different generation description names given in several ways are used (such as Silent Generation, Baby Boomers, X, Y and Z). The period we live in is a period dominated by Y generation. In the last 50 years, the rapid increase in the population of the world has led to a significant increase in Y generation and this caused Y generation to have the largest share in the world. On the other hand, the world population consists of approximately 21% X generation and 18% Baby Boomers (http://www.generationy.com). In the total population, the share of people born between 1981-1997 is 27% (http://www.atkearney.co.uk). The high share of Y generation in the population leads it to have a distinct position in terms of marketing.

A generation is defined as people and communities who were born in the same time period and affected by the same social, economic, cultural, political events and prevailing values of the time period they lived in (Altuntuğ, 2012). Generation theorists argue that changes in the macro environment affect the profile of people born in a particular region. Suppression of a specific and joint purchase and consumption behavior (Howe and Strauss, 2007). There is a generally accepted classification on the generations as Silent Generation (1925-1945), Baby Boomers Generation (1946-1964), X Generation (1965-1979), Y Generation (1980-2000) and Z Generation (2001-2020) (Adıgüzel et al., 2014). The generation born from 2010 called Alpha Generation. Different generational cohorts have different values, preferences, and shopping behaviors.

The generation of Silent was born in the first and second world wars. For this reason, people who submit to authority, depend on their leaders. They complied with rules instead of complaining (Etlican, 2012). Baby boomers were born to the end of world wars that is why they are also known as Cold War children (Keles, 2013). They had been described as individualistic, competitive free agents with strong interests in self-fulfillment through personal growth. They had lived through and actively participated in political and social transformations such as the Civil Rights Movement. This group had demonstrated a strong work ethic and high job involvement, which had led to economic security and career success.

Generation X is a period in which TV channels become widespread and consumption is rapidly increasing (Engizek ve Şekerkaya, 2016). Generation X is one of the most highly educated generations. Factors that drive Generation X behavior are their first disappointment with cultural icons and ongoing preoccupation with the Internet and their seemingly infinite ability to simplify, streamline and enrich the activities and relationships of their daily lives (Jackson & Stoel et al., 2011; cited by Ordun, 2015).

Y generation is known as "Millennials", "Net Generation", "Digital Natives" and "Generation C" (Chuah et al., 2017). They live were globalism (DeVaney, 2015). Generation Y has mixed pleasures and being a generation with mixed shopping behaviors and being focused on consumption. They have different consumption habits than previous generations because of having more money than they can spend (Mandhlazi et al., 2013). Generation Y is not only a generation with mixed pleasures and mixed shopping behaviors, but also with a focus on consumption (Holtshausen and Styrdom, 2006; Wolburg and Pokrywczynski, 2001). Consumption most types of products they are interested in; clothing, shoes, furniture, sports equipment, automobile, accessories and entertainment (Williams and Page, 2011).

Generation Z is the period between 2000-2020 is the generation. However, generation Z will likely show some strong consumer-oriented differences from Generation Y because of the age of these individuals during periods of economic recession. Generation Z as consumers has four trends are likely to characterize: 1) An interest in new technologies, 2) An insistence on ease of use, 3) A desire to feel

safe, and 4) A desire to temporarily escape the realities they face (Wood, 2013). They are called Internet generation, crystal generation, google generation, .com generation (Çetin ve Karalar, 2016). This generation born with technology and witnessing its progress very good in the use of tools (Berkup, 2014).

Although there are studies on consumption patterns of each generation, studies on Y generation that constitute a significant part of the current population are weighted. As well as the studies which have aimed identifying distinctive characteristics of these generations and valid year intervals for generations in their own circumstances in the countries (e.g. Howe and Strauss,1992; Washburn, 2000; Pekala, 2001; Alwin, 2002; Reeves and Oh, 2008; Giancola, 2006; Tufur, 2011; Eriş et al., 2013; Yüksekbilgili, 2013 and 2015; Sekam, 2014; Gürbüz, 2015; Ekşili and Antalyalı, 2017), there are also other studies conducted mainly about working life and career of the generations from the perspective of human resources (e.g. Smola and Sutton, 2002; Macky et al., 2008; Duvendack, 2010; Zemke et al., 2013; Yelkıkalan and Altın, 2010; Toruntay, 2011; Akdemir et al., 2012; Ayhun, 2013; Aydın and Başol, 2014; Adıgüzel et al., 2014; Demirkaya et al., 2015; Karabekir et al., 2016). In addition, there are some studies carried out to determine the purchasing behavior of the generations on the basis of product group or products. However, there are fewer studies compared to human resources studies. Martin and Turley (2004) discussed the attitudes of Y generation consumers in terms of shopping centers and consumption motivations. Jang et al. (2011) reviewed the perceptions and attitudes of university students aged between 17 -30 in the USA towards green restaurant preferences; Nusair (2011) reviewed Y generation's hotel preferences via the internet and their loyalty towards e-sales companies providing these services; Muller (2016) reviewed alcohol consumption of Y generation and the motives that affect it and Chuah et al. (2017) reviewed the attitudes and beliefs of Y generation towards mobile internet service providers. In Turkey, Altuntuğ (2012) examined the generations in terms of the periods and reviewed the characteristics of each period and important transition events separating them from each other in terms of purchasing behavior. Ordun (2015) analyzed whether the shopping structure of generation Y was different from the others. He also analyzed brand dependence in consumer behavior.

Yaşa and Bozyiğit (2012) examined the relationship between gender, income characteristics of Y generation students and their cell phones which they prefer as a communication tool and the mobile operators they prefer. Okan and Yalman (2013) examined views and assessments of X and Y generations on controversial advertisements. Kuyucu (2014), Onurlubaş and Öztürk (2018a) and Karahisar (2013) examined social media usage habits of generations. Akten (2016) and Bilgihan (2016) examined tourism perception of generations. Onurlubaş and Öztürk (2018b) examined the views of Y generation about the logos on shoes while they are buying sports shoes. Kaderli et al (2017) focused on the compulsive buying behaviors of the Y generations, who find out the attitudes of the individuals in the Y generation to the money, the attitude towards the credit card and the attitude of materialism. They have stayed in their work that the socio-demographic variables and the usage of credit cards and these attitudes are also affected by compulsive buying has been achieved.

This study was conducted to determine shopping trend of Y generation without focusing on a product group or a product. The data on the participants' lifestyles were also compiled. Although it is a constraint that the research area was limited to Adana, it will be contributing the researchers and related stakeholders working on Y generation by providing some new information from the field. The fact that the other studies conducted about Y generation are based on a product group or a product will make this study different than other similar studies as it defines shopping trends as well as providing a general perspective.

This research was carried out to determine the factors affecting the shopping orientation of Y generation and whether these factors differed in terms of socio-demographic variables in the

generation. The data of the study showed that women have popular consumption, recreation and self-confident shopping tendency compared to men. There were also differences in brand loyalty and popular consumption among income level groups and it was determined that people with an income higher than TL 3000 have popular culture shopping and brand loyalty tendency, also the people who work part-time basis shop with a recreational shopping tendency and the ones who got university education or above shop recreational and with popular culture tendency.

2. Method

The study is an applied research study. Main materials of the study include the scale questions formed from the basic common characteristics accepted for Y generation and the survey data consisting of the information form about their consumption which is developed by the researcher. In addition, among the scales of shopping orientation and shopping satisfaction scales, the shopping orientation scale used by Brosdahl and Carpenter (2011) and cited by Unurlu (2016) was used. The research population consists of people born between 1980-2000 years and live in Adana city center.

In the study, the convenience sampling method was used among the sampling methods which are non-probability-based sampling methods. Non-random sampling is preferred where the sampling framework is difficult or impossible to determine (Nakip, 2006). Achieving accurate results is possible by determining the appropriate sample volume. In marketing researches, sample volumes which are accepted and applied according to the research type are determined. It is stated that using between 300-500 responders is proper in this type of market test and also in consumer test studies (Malhotra and Birks, 2000; cited by: Gegez, 2010). In addition, when the main mass is more than 100 thousand and the main audience information is available, researchers can decide the sample volume by taking purpose and research process into consideration, and it can be found that with what percentage of error the selected sample volume represents the main audience. According to Adana provincial registry office and Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK) records, the population between the ages of 20 and 40 was 683 thousand in central districts of Adana in 2016 (TUIK 2018; https://www.endeksa.com/tr/analiz/adana/demografi#yas).The sample size will show a maximum deviation of 5.6% from the main population level at the significance level of 95%. In this study, a survey was conducted with 300 people of 17 to 37 age group in June 2018.

The shopping orientation scale answered in the five-point Likert scale was analyzed with factor analysis. Factor analysis is the unification of variables that are related to each other but are largely independent of their other subsets as homogeneous group. With this analysis, a large number of variables can be expressed as fewer variables. Thus, the relationship between the observed variables is defined concisely or a theory about basic processes can be tested (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2015). In this study, factor analysis was performed in order to test whether there is any difference between the shopping orientation attitudes of Y generation and socio-demographic variables or whether the shopping orientation behaviors of Y generation differed by socio-demographic variables. Proposition tests were performed based on averages of the statements constituting the obtained factors and by taking these averages as dependent variables. It was tested whether the data set (constituting food selectivity and healthy eating averages which is a dependent variable) provide the normality proposition. Chi-Square, Kolmogorow-Smirnov, Lilliefors and Shapiro - Wilkis analyzes were used to determine the appropriateness of the data to the normal distribution. Among these statistics Kolmogorow-Smirnov and Shapiro - Wilkis were the most commonly used ones (Hair et al., 1992).

3. Findings

50.7% of the participants were female and 49.3% were male; 57% of them were between the ages of 17-30 and 43% were between 31-37. In terms of education level, most of the participants were high-

school graduate and the rate of university graduate and postgraduate ones were %23. And in terms of income level, 85.3% of the participants had an income of TL 3000 or less. While 7.7% of the participants were working part-time; full-time working ones and unemployed ones were almost at similar rates (45.7% - 46.7%). In terms of occupational distribution, most of them were house-wives and self-employed (51%).

Table 1: **Descriptive Analysis Outputs**

Gender	%	Age	%
Female	50,7	17-25	39,3
		26-30	17,7
Male	49,3	31-35	22
		36-37	21
Education	%	**Income**	%
Illiterate	1,7	Less than1500 TL	44
Literate	7	1501-3000 TL	41,3
Primary School	12,7	3001-5000 TL	9,3
Secondary School	23,7	5001-7000 TL	2
High-School	38,3	7001-10000 TL	3,3
Graduate	22,7		
Post- Graduate	0,3		

TV watching rate was very high at 99.3%. The percentage of those who spend 5 hours or more in front of TV as a daily average was the biggest mass with 23.3%. In terms of the type of program being watched, domestic TV series took place on the top with 42%. TV comes to the forefront as a mass communication tool, which is an important output that marketing implementers must consider. Participants spend 41% of their free time to watch TV while only 14% of them doing regular exercises during their free time. Reading habits of Y generation is very low (63.3% does not read books and 86.7% does not read newspapers). In terms of smoking and alcohol consumption, smoking rate is 53.3% and alcohol consumption is 26.3%.

Table 2: **Some Indicators of Participants Lifestyle**

TV Watching	%	Type of the Program Watched	%
Yes	99.3	Domestic TV series	42.0
No	0.7	Quiz Shows	7.0
Daily TV Watching Duration (Hours)	**%**	Other competitions (talent, music competitions such as survivor etc.)	20.3
1	9	News and discussion programs	8.7
2	23.3	Reality Shows (daytime programs; such as Esra Erol, Müge Anlı, etc.)	9.7
3	26	Foreign TV series	1.7
4	15.3	Sports programs	7.7
5 and above	26.4	Movies	3.0
Reading Books	**%**	**Reading Newspaper**	**%**
Yes	36.7	Yes	13.3
No	63.3	No	86.7
Smoking	**%**	**Alcohol Consumption**	**%**
Yes	53.3	Yes	26.3
No	46.7	No	73.7

Although the rate of those who say "I don't do research. I purchase if I like it" for food was quite high with 79%, this rate realized as 7.3% when it comes to computer and telephone. While "Making

comparisons with different brands" situation is 23,7% for computer and telephone, this rate was 8,7% for food.

<p style="text-align:center">Table 3: Research Tendency of Purchasing</p>

Research for Purchasing Items	Computer or Phone %	Food %
No, I don't do research. I purchase if I like it	7.3	79.0
I check forums on the internet	3.3	0.3
I consult my family and the people around me	24.0	1.3
I consult my friends	1.7	-
I follow products through bloggers	1.0	-
I decide with my previous experience with the brand	5.0	5.7
I compare it with different brands	23.7	8.7
Comparison with immediate environment and comparing different brands	12.3	7
Other	21.6	4.3

While the rate of those who say "It is important for me whether I need it" when buying a product or service was 52.7%, the rate of those who say "it is important to be affordable" realized as 35.3%.

<p style="text-align:center">Table 4: Important Variables When Buying a Product or Service</p>

The Aspects Taken into Consideration when Buying a Product or Service	%
Their promotions are important to me	2.7
It is important whether it is a new product	1.0
It is important whether I need it	52.7
Its brand is important	8.0
Being fashionable/popular is important	0.3
Being affordable is important	35.3

In the study conducted, rate of shopping through the internet for Y generation, which is known as a generation inclined to technology, surprisingly realized only as 30.7%. Yet, according to the research of Twentify (2018), the age group of 18 to 34 was determined as the one which has the highest rate with %40-65 for shopping from the internet for the product groups of clothing, electronic goods, food, books, travel and personal care/cosmetic products.

In addition, in order to determine the shopping tendencies of the consumers in Y generation, the shopping orientation trend scale was applied, and the results were evaluated with explanatory factor analysis. In the analysis in which 31 statements were used, Cronbach's alpha value was found as 0.889. According to Nakip (2006) alfa value should be above 0,81 which showed that the reliability and validity of the scale were high. Appropriateness of factor analysis was also tested as KMO (0.861) and Bartlett Sphericity (0,000). According to Hair et. al (1992) the Qualification Rate of Kaiser Mayer Olkin (KMO) Sampling Value should be above 0.70 and Bartlett Sphericity Test Rate should be under 0,05 due to that the values are in acceptance range. As a result of the analysis, 6 factors explaining 72,96% of the variance were obtained. This variance should be above 0,60 in social sciences (Hair et. al. 1979; Malhotra,1979). Recreational shopping tendency factor having the highest variance, 31.01%, which the consumers see the shopping as pleasure and enjoyment. Having a large number of brands and products is also an effective factor in purchasing decisions of consumers and this is called as confusion (Table 5).

Table 5: **Consumption Tendency Scale Group Variables and Reliability Values**

	Factors					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
The Tendency to Make Recreational Shopping						
I like shopping.	.857					
Shopping makes me exhilarated.	.850					
I like my friends accompanying me when shopping.	.844					
I like to spend time for shopping.	.840					
I accompany my friends while they are shopping.	.767					
I like to take time to look around in the store.	.734					
Decision Complexity						
Sometimes I get confused about where to shop		.910				
The more information about the product I get, the more selecting becomes hard		.907				
The information I get from different products confuses me		.902				
I get confused as there are so many brands.		.890				
Brand Loyalty						
I always prefer the same brand when shopping.			.817			
I always visit the same store when shopping.			.786			
I try to be loyal to some stores when shopping.			.748			
I pay too much attention to the brand name.			.745			
When I like the store once, I get stuck with it.			.697			
A well-known branded product is a quality product.			.623			
I try to be loyal to some brands.			.549			
I like popular brands.			.521			
Self Confidence in Shopping and Price Awareness						
I can choose the right product.				.887		
I think I'm a good consumer.				.869		
I pay attention to the prices when shopping.				.836		
I'm disciplined about where to spend most of my money.				.832		
I trust my ability when shopping.				.796		
Shopping Antipathy						
Most of the time allocated for shopping is boring for me.					.879	
Shopping is troublesome for me.					.864	
I find it boring to shop at any store.					.823	
I find it annoying to shop.					.791	
Popular Culture						
When a new product hit the marketplace, I try to buy it in order to be one of the first users.						.791
Fashion is essential to me						.695
Ads affect me when shopping						.573
People's appearance is important						.564
Eigenvalues	9.61	4.13	2.95	2.30	2.16	1.47
Variance	31.01	13.33	9.53	7.41	6.96	4.73
Cronbach's Alpha	.926	.986	.852	.914	.917	.586

Hypothesis tests were performed by taking averages which constitute obtained factors as dependent variables. It was tested to see whether dependent variables provide the normality assumption. The most commonly used Kolmogorow-Smirnov and Shapiro - Wilkis (Hair et al., 1992) methods were used to determine the appropriateness of data to normal distribution. Because the

normality test was <0,05, the normality hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, non-parametric (Kruskal-Wallis and Mann Withney U) tests were performed.

The differences of consumers with these 6 factors were tested based on gender (Mann Withney U), training, age, income and working status (Kruskal Wallis). According to the test results, there was a significant difference (in a confidence interval of 99%) between recreational shopping trend and working status, education, gender. The difference between popular culture and gender, popular culture and income, popular culture and education, brand loyalty and income, self-confidence in shopping/price awareness and gender were found to be significant as in the confidence interval of 99%. Women had more tendency than men in terms of recreational shopping, self-confidence/price awareness and popular culture behavior. While those with an income in the range of TL 5000-7000 came forefront with brand loyalty, brand loyalty of the ones with an income less than TL 3000 was significantly low. In the factor called as popular culture, those with income higher than TL 3000 showed a significant difference. While university graduates and postgraduates showed a significant difference in recreational shopping and popular culture trend, in terms of working condition, those work on part-time basis came forefront with recreational shopping trend. The difference between social media usage and shopping tendency was founded significant in terms of recreational shopping trend, decision complexity and shopping antipathy for the ones who use it more than 3 hours and for the ones who use it for 2-3 hours, a significant difference in terms of self confidence in shopping/price awareness was revealed.

Table 6: **Hypothesis Test Results**

Factors	Gender	Income TL	Education	Working Status	Time Allocated to Social Media
Recreational Shopping Tendency	Woman		University education and above	Part time	> 3 hours
Decision Complexity					> 3 hours
Brand Loyalty		5000-7000			
Self Confidence in Shopping/Price Awareness	Woman				2-3 hours
Shopping Antipathy					> 3 hours
Popular Culture	Woman	> 3000	University education and above		

4. Discussion and Conclusion

According to the results, recreational shopping tendency of Y generation consumers was quite high. This result is consistent with other studies in the literature. In fact, Bakewell and Mitchell (2006) emphasize in their study that having fun in a store is more important than shopping for Y generation. Also, Gilboa and Vilnai-Yavetz (2010) emphasize the importance of entertainment during the shopping process by mentioning that Y generation has a greater tendency to spend their time in shopping malls more than all other generations. According to these results, companies' special attention to the elements of pleasure and entertainment while selling their products or services will be useful to pull Y generation consumers to their stores. As a matter of fact, Aydın (2011) mentions in his study that increasing the number of activities including mini-theaters, performances and entertainment elements would be effective in terms of recreational shopping orientation.

According to another result obtained by factor analysis, it was seen that brand loyalty is very low in shopping trends of Y generation. Similarly, Jain and Pant (2012) state that convincing Y generation consumers to be loyal to brands is quite difficult and regular transitions between brands are typical characteristics of Y generation. Companies required to be alerted and be active to make themselves chosen by Y generation consumers who tend to make brand transitions at any given time.

The result of the study not compatible with the literature was about the rate of online shopping. In the study, the rate of online shopping was only 30.7%. However, studies in the literature show that Y generation is quite high in terms of technology and shopping on the internet. As a matter of fact, online shopping tendency of Y generation in Dhanapal, et al. (2015) study conducted in Malaysia was revealed as 81%; in the study of Aziz and Wahid (2018) conducted in Malaysia again revealed it as 60,4%; and Fox and Madden (2006) reported it as 68% in their study conducted in the US.

Another result coming forefront in the study is the high rate of TV watching behavior of Y generation consumers (99.3%). According to this result, it is inevitable for companies to be in the TV environment in order to reach Y generation. This situation will bring enterprises to an important decision-making position in terms of selecting the media for their promotional efforts. Moreover, the fact that popular culture factor showing significant difference with income, gender and education variables found to be supportive for showing the importance of TV as a mass advertisement tool.

Generation Y was born in the postmodern consumption age and shows the almost all consumption habits of this period. They are impatient, low brand loyalty, independence, result-oriented and fast consumers who use technology in all fields of their life. In this study, only shopping orientation tendency of generation Y was determined. However, rapidly changing technology, fashion and trends must assist dynamically to the characteristics of the Y generation. Therefore, the difference in the behavior of these consumers in the sector can be observed. Although many studies have been conducted on product group basis, it is necessary to question the rapidly changing habits at the same rate. Thus, repeating the cross-sectional studies for Y and subsequent generations will guide the marketing managers. The digital life, which can be controlled by the technology dependence of the Y generation and artificial intelligence, also provides rich data for the decision makers. Correctly controlling and processing of this big data is required. Considering the fact that Y generation is born through email communication and grows with social media, it provides flexibility and convenience in reaching consumers, and the delivery of digital advertising channels with varying messages will have a significant impact on consumer decision-making.

References

Adıgüzel, O., Batur, H. Z., & Ekşili, N. (2014). Kuşakların Değişen Yüzü ve Y Kuşağı İle Ortaya Çıkan Yeni Çalışma Tarzı: Mobil Yakalılar. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 1(19), 165-182.

Akdemir, A., & Konakay, G. (2014). Y Kuşağının Kariyer Algısı, Kariyer Değişimi Ve Liderlik Tarzı Beklentilerinin Araştırılması. *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Ekonomi Ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2*(2).

Akten, M. (2016). Y Ve Z Kuşaklarının Turizm Algıları ve Konaklama İşletmelerinden Beklentileri, Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Turizm İşletmeciliği Ve Otelcilik Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Altundağ N., (2012), "Kuşaktan Kuşağa Tüketim Olgusu ve Geleceğin Tüketici Profili", Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, S. 1, ss. 203-212

Altuntuğ, N. (2012). Kuşaktan Kuşağa Tüketim Olgusu Ve Geleceğin Tüketici Profili. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *4*(1), 203-212.

Alwin, D.F., (2002) "Generations X, Y And Z: Are They Changing America", American Sociological Association, Contexts, 42(1), ss. 42-51.

Aydın, Gülşen, Çetin ve Başol, Oğuz, (2014). X ve Y Kuşağı: Çalışmanın Anlamında Bir Değişme var mı? *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges-December.*1-15.

Aydın, Kenan (2010), Perakede Yönetiminin Temelleri, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara

Ayhün, S. E. (2013). Kuşaklar Arasındaki Farklılıklar ve Örgütsel Yansımaları. *Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2(1)*, 93-112.

Aziz, N. N. A., & Wahid, N. A. (2018). Factors Influencing Online Purchase İntention Among University Students. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 8(7), 702-717

Bakewell, C., & Mitchell, V-W. (2006). Male Versus Female Consumer Decision Making Styles. Journal of Business Research. 59 (12), 1297-1900. http://dx.doi:10.1016/ j.jbusres.2006.09.008

Berkup, S. B. (2014). Working With Generations X And Y İn Generation Z Period: Management Of Different Generations İn Business Life. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5(19), 218.

Bilgihan, A. (2016). Gen Y Customer Loyalty In Online Shopping: An integrated Model Of Trust, User Experience and Branding. Computers in Human Behavior, 61, 103-113.

Brosdahl, D. J. C., & Carpenter, J. M. (2011). Shopping Orientations of US Males: A Generational Cohort Comparison. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 18 (6), 548-554. http://dx.doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2011.07.005

Chuah, S. H. W., Marimuthu, M., Kandampully, J., & Bilgihan, A. (2017). What Drives Gen Y Loyalty? Understanding the Mediated Moderating Roles of Switching Costs and Alternative Attractiveness in The Value-Satisfaction-Loyalty Chain. journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 36, 124-136.

Çetin, C., & Karalar, S. (2016). X, Y Ve Z Kuşağı Öğrencilerin Çok Yönlü Ve Sınırsız Kariyer Algıları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 14(28), 157-197.

Demirkaya, H., Akdemir, A., Karaman, E., & Atan, Ö. (2015). Kuşakların Yönetim Politikası Beklentilerinin Araştırılması, İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi, 7/1 186-204

DeVaney, S. A. (2015). Understanding The Millennial Generation. Journal of Financial Service Professionals, 69(6), 11-14.

Dhanapal, S., Vashu. D., & Subramaniam, T. (2015). "Perceptions on the Challenges of Online Purchasing: a Study from "Baby Boomers", Generation "X" and Generation "Y" Point of Views". Contaduría y Administracion, 60(1), 107-132.

Dursun, M. T., ve Eriş, E. D. (2013) Konaklama İşletmelerinde Kuşaklar Bağlamında İşveren Marka Algısı İle Çalışma Yaşam Kalitesi İlişkisi. Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi, 8(1), 160-179

Duvendack, C. M. (2010). Correlation of Work-Life Balance Decisions of Different Generations of Physicians. (Unpublished PhD. Thesis). USA: Capella University.

Engizek, N., & Şekerkaya, A. (2016). X ve Y Kuşağı Kadınlarının Karar Verme Tarzları Bakımından İncelenmesi/Analyzing Generation X and Y Females Based on Their Decision Making Styles. Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 13(36).

Etlican, G. (2012). X ve Y Kuşaklarının Online Eğitim Teknolojilerine Karşı Tutumlarının Karşılaştırılması. Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü (Doctoral dissertation, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul).

Yaşa, E, & Bozyiğit, S. (2012). Y Kuşağı Tüketicilerinin Cep Telefonu Ve GSM Operatörleri Tercihi: Mersin İlindeki Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Tercihlerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Pilot Bir Araştırma. Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 9(1), 29-46.

Ekşili, N., & Antalyalı, Ö. L. Türkiye'de Y Kuşağı Özelliklerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Çalışma: Okul Yöneticileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Humanities Sciences*, *12*(3), 90-111.

Fox, S., & Madden, M. (2006). Generations Online (Demographic Report). Pew Internet\& American Life Project.

Giancola, F. (2006). The Generation Gap: More Myth Than Reality?. *Human Resource Planning,* 29(4), 32-37.

Gürbüz, S. (2015). "Kuşak Farklılıkları: Mit mi, Gerçek mi?". İş ve İnsan Dergisi, 2(1), 39-57.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Grablowsky, B. J. (1979). Multivariate Data Analysis, PPC Books, Tulsa aktaran: Nakip, M. (2006). Pazarlama Araştırmaları, Teknikler ve (SPSS destekli) Uygulamalar. Seçkin Yayıncılık, s432.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1992). Multivariate Data Analysis Macmillan. New York, 47-82.

Holtzhausen, T., & Strydom, J. (2006). Generation Y Consumers: Behavioural Patterns Of Selected South African students. The Business Review Cambridge, 5(1), 314-318.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (1992). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. Harper Collins.

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2007), "The next 20 years: how customer and workforce attitudes will evolve", Harvard Business Review, Vol. 85 Nos 7/8, pp. 41-52.

Iris Vilnai-Yavetz, Shaked Gilboa (2010) The Effect of Servicescape Cleanliness on Customer Reactions. Services Marketing Quarterly 31:2, 213-234.

Jackson, V., Stoel, L., & Brantley, A. (2011). Mall Attributes and Shopping Value: Differences By Gender and Generational Cohort. Journal of Retailing And Consumer Services, 18(1), 1-9.

Jang, Y. J., Kim, W. G., & Bonn, M. A. (2011). Generation Y Consumers' Selection Attributes and Behavioral Intentions Concerning Green Restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *30*(4), 803-811.

Kaderli, Y., Armağan E.A., Küçükkambak, S.E. (2017). Y Kuşağının Kompulsif Satın Alma Davranışına Etki Eden Faktörler Üzerine Bir Araştırma, Istanbul University Journal of the School of Business Vol/Cilt: 46, No/Sayı:2, November/Kasım 2017, 188-210

Karabekir M., Nur M., Şencan M.,, Tozlu E,(2016), Y Kuşağının Girişimcilik Algısının Ölçümüne Yönelik Bir Araştırma, International Journal Of Academic Values Studies, (4), 59-67.

Karahisar, T. (2013). Dijital Nesil, Dijital İletişim ve Dijitalleşen (!) Türkçe, *AJIT-e: Online Academic Journal of Information Technology, (4)*12,

Keleş, H. N., (2013). Girişimcilik Eğiliminin Kuşak Farkına Göre İncelenmesi, Selçuk Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Sosyal Ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi, Sayı 26.

Kuyucu, M.(2014), Y Kuşağı ve Teknoloji: Y Kuşağının İletişim Teknolojilerini Kullanım Alışkanlıkları. Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi, 5(2), 845-872

Macky, K., Gardner, D. & Forsyth, S. (2008). Generational Differences At Work: Introduction and Overview, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 857–861.

Malhotra, N. K. (1996). Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation, 2. Basım, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, aktaran; Nakip, M. (2006). Pazarlama Araştırmaları, Teknikler ve (SPSS destekli) Uygulamalar. Seçkin Yayıncılık, s432

Malhotra, N. K., & Birks, D. F. (2000). Marketing Research: An Applied Approach, Prentice Hall, European Edition, p.351; aktaran: Gecegz A.E 2010. Pazarlama Araştırmaları, Beta Basım A.Ş., p223

Mandhlazi, L., Dhurup, M., & Mafini, C. (2013). Generation Y Consumer Shopping Styles: Evidence From South Africa. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 4(14), 153.

Martin, C.A., & Turley L.W. (2004). Malls and Consumption Motivation: An Exploratory Examination Of Older Generation Y Consumers. International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, 32 (10), 464–75.

Muller, C. (2017). *Perceptions of Alcohol-Consumption Motives Amongst Generation Y Students* (Doctoral Dissertation, North-West University (South Africa), Vaal Triangle Campus).

Nakip, M. (2006). Pazarlama Araştırmaları, Teknikler ve (SPSS destekli) Uygulamalar. Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Parsa, H. G., & Cobanoglu, C. (2011). Building a Model Of Commitment For Generation Y: An Empirical Study On E-Travel Retailers. Tourism Management, 32(4), 833-843.Okan, E., & Yalman, N. (2013). Türkiye'de Tartışmalı Reklamlar: Kuşaklar Arası Karşılaştırma. Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 31(2), 135-152.

Onurlubaş, E., & Öztürk, D. (2018) Sosyal Medya Uygulamalarının Y Kuşağı Satın Alma Davranışı Üzerine Etkisi: Instagram Örneği1. OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 9(16), 12-12.

Onurlubaş, Ö. Ü. E., & Öztürk, Ö. Ü. D. (2018). Y Kuşağındaki Kişilerin Marka Logo'larıyla İlgili Görüşlerinin Belirlenmesi: Spor Ayakkabı Örneği, Kesit Akademi Dergisi, Yıl: 4, Sayı:17, Aralık 2018, s. 85-108.

Ordun, G. (2015). Millennial (Gen Y) Consumer Behavior, Their Shopping Preferences and Perceptual Maps Associated With Brand Loyalty, Canadian Social Science Vol. 11, No. 4, 2015, pp. 40-55.

Pekala, N. (2001). Conquering the generational divide. Journal of Property *Management*, *66*(6), 30-37.

Reeves T.C., & Oh E., (2008). Generational differences, in handbook of research on educational communications and technology, p. 296, Third Edition Selected South African Students", The Business Review Cambridge, 5, 314–318

Sekam., (2014). Türkiye Gençlik Raporu: Gençliğin Özellikleri, Sorunları, Kimlikleri ve Beklentileri. İstanbul.

Smola, K. W. & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational Differences: Revisiting Generational Work Values For The New Millennium, *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 23, 363–382.

Suzanne M Crampton-John W Hodge, "Generations in the Workplace: Understanding Age Diversity", *The Business Review Cambridge*, Vol: 9, Issue: 1, 2007, pp. 16-23.

Toruntay, H.(2011), Takım Rolleri Calısması: X ve Y Kusağı Uzerinde Karsılastırmalı Bir Arastırma İstanbul Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu İsletme Anabilim Dalı İnsan Kaynakları Yonetimi Bilim Dalı Yuksek Lisans Tezi

Tufur, M., (2011). Türkiye"nin Y Kuşağı. İstanbul: Contento. http://www.conento.com.tr/uploads/Conentodan_Trkiyenin_Y_Kua_Aratrma_Raporu.pdf.

Unurlu, Ç. (2016). Alışveriş Yöneliminin Alışveriş Memnuniyeti Üzerine Etkisi. Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 14(2).

Washburn, E. T. R. (2000). The Five Generations. Physician Executive, 26(1), s.54.

Williams, K. C., & Page, R. A. (2011). Marketing To The Generations. Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business, 3(1), 37-53.

Wolburg, J. M., & Pokrywczynski, J. (2001). A Psychographic Analysis of Generation Y College Students, Journal of Advertising Research, 41(5), 33-52.

Wood, S. (2013). Generation Z As Consumers: Trends And Innovation. Institute for Emerging Issues: NC State University, 1-3.

Yelkıkalan, N., Altın E. (2010) Farklı kuşakların Yönetimi, Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 8(2), ss. 13-17.

Yüksekbilgili Z. (2015), Türkiye'de Y Kuşağının Yaş Aralığı, Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt:14 Sayı:53 (259-267)

Yüksekbilgili, Z. (2013). "Türk Tipi Y Kuşağı". Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 12(45), 342-353.

Zemke, R., Raines C., Filipczak B., (2000) Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, Nexters in Your Workplace, Publisher: AMACOM Books

http://www.atkearney.co.uk

http://www.generationy.com

https://www.endeksa.com/tr/analiz/adana/demografi#yas