Mindfulness
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-025-02681-x

ORIGINAL PAPER

Adaptation and Psychometric Testing of Mindful Consumption Scale for Turkish Speaking Populations

Nihan Selin Soylu-Konak[1]

Accepted: 31 August 2025

Abstract

Objectives This study aimed to adapt the Mindful Consumption Scale (MCS) to Turkish-speaking populations and assess its psychometric properties. Additionally, the relationships between mindful consumption and self-esteem, mindfulness, conspicuous consumption, and life satisfaction were examined to establish the construct validity.

Method A total of 541 Turkish-speaking adults participated in the study. The translation and adaptation process followed a standard back-translation procedure. The translation and linguistic adaptation process of MCS was completed. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, Mindful Attention Awareness Scale, Conspicuous Consumption Orientation Scale and Life Satisfaction Scale were utilized.

Results The three-factor structure of MCS was confirmed with acceptable fit indices after modifications ($\chi^2/df = 3.94$, CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.91, RMSEA = 0.08). The reliability of the scale was satisfactory (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.82$). As expected, MCS was positively correlated with self-esteem ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$), mindfulness ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$), and life satisfaction ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.001$), while it was negatively correlated with conspicuous consumption ($r = -0.29$, $p < 0.001$). These findings support the scale's validity.

Conclusions The Turkish version of MCS demonstrated sound psychometric properties, confirming its applicability in Turkish-speaking populations. This study introduces a useful measure that can support subsequent research on mindful consumption.

Keywords Mindful consumption · Mindful consumption scale · Reliability · Validity · Confirmatory factor analysis

Sustainability challenges are often attributed to rapid population growth and the notion that humanity is outgrowing the planet. However, this perspective may obscure a more fundamental driver: consumption patterns (Samways, 2022). In particular, excessive consumption in high-income countries fuels the reckless depletion of planetary resources. Thus, the root cause of the current environmental crisis lies not primarily in population size, but in unsustainable consumption behaviors (Hughes et al., 2023). Addressing this issue requires a substantial transformation in human consumption habits. One promising approach is the cultivation of mindfulness, which may play a pivotal role in enabling such change. Fostering individuals' capacity to act mindfully at each stage of consumption is crucial not only for personal and societal well-being but also for the future of the planet (Parvatiyar & Sheth, 2023).

The concept of mindfulness is built upon the constructs of consciousness, attention, and awareness, and can be briefly defined as the individual's regular consciousness directed both towards the environment and themselves. Foundationally, mindfulness has been conceptualized as "paying attention in a particular way: on purpose, in the present moment, and nonjudgmentally" (Kabat-Zinn, 1990, p.3-4), and as a state of actively noticing new things and being open to multiple perspectives (Langer, 1989). Mindfulness is correlated with elevated levels of pleasant affect, positive affectivity, vitality, life satisfaction, self-esteem, optimism, self-actualization, as well as enhanced autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Brown & Ryan, 2003). The influence of mindfulness on consumption behaviors can manifest in various forms. According to Garg et al. (2024), these manifestations can be examined across a broad spectrum, ranging

✉ Nihan Selin Soylu-Konak
nihanselinsoylu@gmail.com

[1] Department of Psychology, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Türkiye

Published online: 26 September 2025

from responsible consumption to consumer environmental consciousness.

The pioneering scholars who first linked mindfulness to consumption, Sheth et al. (2011), conceptualized it as the individual engaging in mindful consumption through conscious care for oneself, the community, and nature, thereby fostering temperate consumption behaviors. Fischer et al. (2017), in their integration of sustainable consumption literature with mindfulness, proposed that mindfulness would alter consumption behavior in four fundamental ways. First, mindfulness enables the disruption of unconscious habits, deactivating the automatic "drive" mode, leading individuals to reconsider routine consumption patterns. Second, by directing attention toward experiences, mindfulness reduces the likelihood of impulse consumption by diminishing cognitive dissonance related to self-efficacy. Third, the cultivation of virtues such as generosity and kindness through mindfulness leads to a reduction in unwanted impulses. This proposition is supported by empirical studies showing that mindfulness training enhances compassion, empathy, and altruistic behavior (Condon et al., 2013; Lim et al., 2015). Finally, the enhancement of these prosocial dispositions fosters a greater propensity for sustainable and ethical consumption choices (Barbaro & Pickett, 2016; Panno et al., 2018). Existing research suggests that mindful individuals are more likely to evaluate alternatives consciously (Brown & Ryan, 2003), show greater empathy toward both other people and the natural environment (Barbaro & Pickett, 2016), and recognize the broader implications of their consumption decisions (Fischer et al., 2017). Moreover, they tend to report higher satisfaction with their choices, as mindfulness reduces materialistic tendencies and enhances appreciation of existing possessions (Brown et al., 2009). These behavioral tendencies underscore the nuanced ways in which mindfulness informs consumption choices, contributing to a more conscious, intentional, and reflective approach to consumerism.

The Mindful Consumption Scale (MCS), developed by Sheth et al. (2011), assesses individuals' tendencies to engage in consumption behaviors that are conscious, ethical, and sustainable. The scale is grounded in three interrelated dimensions: awareness of consumption, temperance (non-materialism), and caring for self, community, and nature. Awareness refers to consumers' deliberate attention to the factors shaping their purchasing behavior, including marketing influences and the wider social and environmental impacts of their consumption. Care reflects the degree to which individuals consider how their consumption affects them, others, and the planet, while temperance involves exercising self-restraint and avoiding unnecessary purchases through conscious self-regulation. It captures the extent to which individuals consider the broader personal, social, and environmental implications of their consumption choices. This three-factor structure has demonstrated good validity and reliability in the original version (Gustafsson & Friberg, 2024), and has been confirmed in subsequent adaptations, such as in Indonesia (Argadian & Paramita, 2024). However, a two-factor structure was identified in the Chinese version based on exploratory factor analysis (Ji et al., 2025), suggesting some cultural variability in how the construct is perceived. Moreover, mindful consumption, as measured by the MCS, has been shown to positively influence ethical self-identity (Ji et al., 2025), as well as contribute to individuals' financial stability and psychological well-being (Gustafsson & Friberg, 2024).

Although the MCS is a relatively recent measurement tool, prior research has identified several key antecedents of mindful consumption behavior, including mindfulness, religious faith (Gupta et al., 2023), and consumer engagement in the form of emotional attachment and contextual involvement (Gabriella et al., 2021). Furthermore, mindful consumption has been found to be positively associated with both inner and outer awareness (Geiger et al., 2019), as well as with life satisfaction (Gupta & Verma, 2020). Despite its increasing use in English-speaking contexts, the scale had not yet been systematically adapted for Turkish populations, limiting its cross-cultural applicability. This gap is particularly significant given findings from a qualitative study in Turkey, which revealed that Generation Y conceptualizes mindful consumption as a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing self-awareness, social responsibility, and environmental concern. However, individuals often struggle to consistently act on these values due to systemic pressures and self-justification mechanisms (Aktan, 2017). Adapting the MCS into Turkish is therefore essential for advancing empirical research on mindful consumption in culturally specific contexts, and for promoting sustainable consumer behavior among Turkish-speaking populations.

Mindful consumption has been recognized to be associated with various psychological variables. In this study, the relationships between mindful consumption and self-esteem, mindfulness, conspicuous consumption, and life satisfaction were examined to assess the construct's validity. Self-esteem can be simply described as the worthiness of self that individuals feel as a result of their positive and negative evaluations of themselves (Rosenberg, 1965a). Low self-esteem is known to be positively related to impulse buying, and it is thought that this relationship functions as a form of self-regulatory strategy aimed at coping with negative affect (O'Guinn & Faber, 1989; Rook & Gardner, 1993; Verplanken et al., 2005). Additionally, high self-esteem is associated with high mindfulness (Randal et al., 2015). Therefore, it was expected that mindful consumption behavior would be positively associated with self-esteem.

As previously discussed, mindfulness serves as the foundational driver of mindful consumption behaviors. By

cultivating heightened awareness, mindfulness mitigates the influence of implicit societal pressures, habitual consumption patterns, and the unrelenting pursuit of instant gratification (Gupta & Sheth, 2023). Within this theoretical framework, a positive correlation is anticipated when assessing the scale's validity, as increased mindfulness should logically correspond with higher levels of mindful consumption. This relationship underscores the role of mindfulness in fostering more conscious, reflective, and ethically aligned consumer decisions.

Mindful consumption, by its very nature, appears antithetical to the concept of conspicuous consumption. Fundamentally, conspicuous consumption can be described as a performative display wherein individuals seek to imply their status and impress others (Veblen, 1899/2007). Conspicuous consumption, thus, serves as a medium through which social positioning and wealth are implicitly communicated, often through the acquisition of visible luxury goods. In contrast, mindful consumption emphasizes a deliberate and ethical approach to consumption, prioritizing sustainability, personal well-being, and broader societal impacts over the pursuit of status or external validation. This divergence reflects not only a shift in consumer values but also a broader cultural critique of materialism and its implications for both individuals and the environment. In this context, a negative relationship between mindful consumption and conspicuous consumption has been hypothesized for validity testing. This anticipated inverse correlation reflects the inherent tension between the two constructs, with mindful consumption grounded in intentional, ethical decision-making, while conspicuous consumption is driven by a desire for social status and external recognition. Thus, the hypothesized relationship aligns with theoretical expectations that as individuals engage more deeply in mindful consumption practices, their propensity for conspicuous consumption diminishes.

The question of whether happiness can be purchased through consumption is somewhat complex. However, from the perspective of sustainable consumption, the findings are more consistent: sustainable consumption behaviors (e.g., green purchasing) have been positively linked with individuals' life satisfaction (Brown & Kasser, 2005; Jacob et al., 2009; Xiao & Li, 2011). Moreover, mindfulness, through the intentional awareness it cultivates, enables individuals to utilize their experiences to enhance well-being and life satisfaction (Langer, 2005). Similarly, research by Gupta and Verma (2020) demonstrated that mindfulness sessions not only increased mindful consumption but also improved life satisfaction. In this context, it is expected that mindful consumption would also be positively associated with life satisfaction in this study.

In summary, mindful consumption behavior and its relationships with various psychological variables are increasingly gaining importance from individual, societal, and environmental perspectives. The present study aimed to adapt the MCS for Turkish-speaking populations, thereby establishing a foundation for enhancing empirical data in this field. Through this adaptation, the research sought to provide a tool for future research that may enable deeper investigation of mindful consumption behaviors and their implications across different contexts.

Method

Participants

For the 11-item scale, a sample size exceeding 300 participants was aimed for, as this is generally considered desirable for achieving stable and reliable factor solutions and aligns with the commonly suggested criterion of at least 20 participants per item (Kline, 2023; Kyriazos, 2018). Following the online announcements, 541 people participated in the study. However, 79 participants who answered attention check questions incorrectly were excluded from the analysis. The final sample consisted of 462 participants in total: 319 women, 141 men, and 2 participants who did not specify their gender. The age range was between 18 and 64 years ($M_{age} = 24.87$, $SD = 8.18$).

Measures

Mindful Consumption Scale (MCS)

The scale developed by Gupta and Sheth (2023) to assess individuals' mindfulness levels in consumption behavior comprises three distinct dimensions. The awareness dimension includes 3 items, the caring dimension encompasses 5 items, and the temperance dimension consists of 3 items, totaling 11 items measured on a 7-point Likert scale. Prior to data collection for this study, permission was obtained via email from Sharad Gupta, one of the original developers of the scale. Initially, the original scale was translated into Turkish by two psychology experts, including the researcher. Subsequently, the first Turkish version was back-translated into English by two different psychology experts. To finalize the Turkish form (Appendix A), two professional translators reviewed the forms for translation accuracy and clarity. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was 0.77 in the original study.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES)

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, developed by Rosenberg (1965b) to measure individuals' levels of self-esteem, was adapted into Turkish by Çuhadaroğlu (1986). The original scale comprised a total of 12 dimensions; however, for the purposes of this study, only the Self-Esteem subscale was

utilized. The Self-Esteem subscale consisted of 10 items, with 5 positive and 5 negative statements, measured on a 5-point Likert scale. In the Turkish adaptation study, the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as 0.71, in the current study it is 0.86.

Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS)

The scale developed by Brown and Ryan (2003) to measure individuals' levels of mindfulness was adapted into Turkish by Özyeşil et al. (2011). The scale consisted of a single dimension with 15 items, measured on a 6-point Likert scale. In the Turkish adaptation study, the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as 0.80 and in the current study it is 0.84.

Conspicuous Consumption Orientation Scale (CCOS)

The scale developed by Chaudhuri et al. (2011) to measure individuals' levels of consumption behavior motivated by conspicuousness was adapted into Turkish by Aslan (2021). The scale consists of a single dimension with 11 items, measured on a 6-point Likert scale. In the Turkish adaptation study, the calculated Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was 0.88; in this study, it was 0.83.

Life Satisfaction Scale (LSS)

The scale developed by Diener et al. (1985) to measure individuals' life satisfaction was adapted into Turkish by Dağlı and Baysal (2016). The scale consisted of a single dimension with 5 items, measured on a 7-point Likert scale. In the Turkish adaptation study, the calculated Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient is 0.88 and in the current study it is 0.81.

Procedure

Following ethics approval, the data collection process was conducted entirely online during May and June 2024. Participants were recruited through announcements distributed via university mailing lists and social media platforms, and participation was entirely voluntary. A convenience sampling method was applied, as participants self-selected into the study by responding to the online announcements. The only inclusion criterion was being aged 18 years or older; no exclusion criteria were applied.

Upon accessing the research link, participants first reviewed an informed consent form describing the purpose of the study, the procedure, expected duration, potential risks and benefits, data confidentiality, and the voluntary nature of participation. Only those who provided consent were able to continue. After giving consent, they provided socio-demographic information and subsequently completed the Mindful Consumption Scale (MCS), Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS), Consumer Consciousness Scale (CCOS), and Life Satisfaction Scale (LSS) in the specified sequence. At the end of the session, a standardised on-screen debriefing was presented, explaining the study's aims in greater detail and providing the researcher's contact information so that participants could ask questions or request further information if desired. The entire participation process took approximately 30 min.

Data Analyses

All statistical analyses were conducted using the R statistical environment (R Core Team, 2024). Prior to confirmatory factor analyses (CFA), the suitability of the data was assessed using pre-hoc diagnostics. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.82, indicating meritorious sampling adequacy. Item-level MSA values ranged from 0.73 to 0.91. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(55) = 1800.18$, $p < 0.001$, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012).

Normality was examined using skewness and kurtosis values, all of which fell within acceptable ranges (skewness ± 3; kurtosis ± 10), as suggested by Kline (2023). Descriptive statistics were computed using the psych package (Revelle, 2024). CFA was conducted using the lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012), and model fit was evaluated based on multiple indices and their conventional cut-offs: $\chi^2/df \leq 5$ (acceptable), ideally ≤ 2–3; RMSEA ≤ 0.06 (close fit), ≤ 0.08 (reasonable fit); CFI and TLI ≥ 0.95 (excellent), ≥ 0.90 (acceptable) (Hu & Bentler, 1999). To compare nested models, chi-square difference testing was used.

Factor loadings were interpreted using the following heuristic thresholds: ≥ 0.40 as meaningful, ≥ 0.55 as good, and ≥ 0.63 as very good; loadings below 0.30 were considered for potential removal (Comrey & Lee, 1992). Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega coefficients. Nomological validity was evaluated via Pearson correlations with RSES, MAAS, CCOS, and LSS.

Results

Descriptive statistics of MCS and its subscales are presented in Table 1. The mean value for the entire scale was 5.50 ($SD = 0.87$), for awareness 5.05 ($SD = 1.21$), for caring 6.03 ($SD = 0.95$) and for temperance 5.08 ($SD = 1.34$).

In the first CFA model, which proposed a 3-factor structure as in the original scale, it was observed that the fit indices could be improved ($\chi^2(41, n = 462) = 262.09$, $\chi^2/df = 6.39$, CFI = 0.88, TLI = 0.83, RMSEA = 0.11). All factor

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of the items of MCS

Item	*M*	*SD*	Item	*M*	*SD*
mc1	4.87	1.46	mc7	6.41	1.11
mc2	5.33	1.53	mc8	6.25	1.14
mc3	4.96	1.70	mc9	5.59	1.44
mc4	6.21	1.26	mc10	5.01	1.60
mc5	5.94	1.25	mc11	4.63	1.84
mc6	5.32	1.43			

loadings were found to be significant, ranging between 0.52 and 0.83. In the second model, which was modified based on the recommendations from the modification indices, the error variances of the items on the same factor were correlated (Items 7–8, 4–5, 5–6). To determine whether the modifications made in the second model significantly improved model fit, a Chi-square difference test was conducted, and the difference was found to be significant (Table 2).

Model selection followed both theoretical considerations and empirical fit indices. The initial three-factor model, in line with the original scale structure, showed suboptimal fit. Modification indices suggested correlating residuals among items loading on the same factor (items 7–8, 4–5, and 5–6). A chi-square difference test revealed that these modifications significantly improved model fit. The final model was retained based on improvements in CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and χ^2/df values, aligning with established guidelines (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2023).

The final model's fit indices were within acceptable ranges ($\chi^2(38, n=462)=149.81$, $\chi^2/df=3.94$, CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.91, RMSEA = 0.08). According to commonly accepted thresholds (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2023), a good model fit is typically indicated by CFI and TLI values ≥ 0.90, RMSEA ≤ 0.08, and $\chi^2/df \leq 5$. The final model met these criteria, suggesting a reasonably good fit to the data. The factor loadings and standard errors of the final model are presented in Table 3.

In order to test the reliability of MCS, Cronbach's alpha values were calculated. The values obtained were 0.82 for the entire scale, 0.66 for awareness, 0.82 for caring, and 0.76 for temperance. Additionally, McDonald's omega values were calculated and found to be 0.84 for the overall scale, 0.67 for awareness, 0.83 for caring, and 0.77 for temperance. The Guttman split-half coefficient was 0.86, with λ_2 and λ_6 values of 0.83 and 0.84, respectively. Based on these values, results indicate that the scale is acceptably reliable.

The nomological validity of the MCS was evaluated through the inclusion of four distinct scales. Grounded in prior research, positive correlations were hypothesized with self-esteem (RSES), mindful attention awareness (MAAS), and life satisfaction (LSS), while a negative association was anticipated with conspicuous consumption orientation (CCOS). These relationships were examined for each subscale—awareness, caring, and temperance—individually.

Table 2 Comparison of fit indices for the models for the Turkish form of MSC tested in CFA

Models	df	AIC	BIC	χ^2	$\Delta\chi^2$	*p*
Model2	38	16,336	16,452	149.81	112.28	< .001
Model1	41	16,442	16,546	262.09		

Table 3 Factor loadings and standard errors of MSC

Factor	Item	Factor loading	*SE*
Awareness	I am concerned about the impact of my consumption on my society/community	0.64	
	I am aware that my consumption impacts society	0.75	0.12
	Sharing my products with others means caring for society	0.51	0.11
Caring	I try to live without damaging the environment	0.72	
	I satisfy my consumption needs without harming the environment	0.63	0.06
	I buy products that are not harmful to others	0.6	0.09
	Everyone should conserve water at home	0.74	0.07
	Using public services (e.g., parks, schools, transportation) is good for society	0.65	0.07
Temperance	I refrain from buying the latest product if the current product is working	0.62	
	I try to minimize my consumption even in the case of abundance	0.83	0.13
	I have a habit of minimizing the wastage of clothes	0.73	0.13

Table 4 Correlations between MCS subscales and SE, MAAS, CCOS and LS

	RSES	MAAS	CCOS	LS
Awareness	0.19**	0.08	0.03	0.12*
Caring	0.25**	0.1*	-0.07	0.17**
Temperance	0.11*	0.1*	-0.18**	0.14*

*$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.001$, MCS: Mindful Consumption Scale, RSES: Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale, MAAS: Mindful Attention and Awareness Scale, CCOS: Conspicuous Consumption Orientation Scale, LSS: Life Satisfaction Scale

The correlations and their statistical significance are summarized in Table 4. The findings from the Pearson correlation analysis confirmed all predicted relationships. All correlation values are presented in Table 4.

Discussion

As an applied manifestation of mindfulness in consumer behavior, mindful consumption—conceptualized through the dimensions of awareness, caring, and temperance—is increasingly being recognized for its significance at individual, societal, and environmental levels. Reliable measurement of mindful consumption not only supports theory-driven research but also provides a valuable tool for policymakers aiming to promote sustainable consumer practices. Its cultural adaptation for Turkish populations is particularly relevant in light of rapid urbanization, increasing environmental strain, and shifting consumer norms within the region. The factor structure, reliability, and validity of the Mindful Consumption Scale were examined in a sample of Turkish-speaking adults, with particular focus on the dimensions of caring, awareness, and temperance in consumption behavior. The factor structure revealed a consistent pattern with the original model, aligning with the proposed modifications. This consistency underscores the robustness of the original conceptualization of mindful consumption. However, minor adaptations required for the Turkish context underscore the relevance of cultural sensitivity in scale adaptation studies, as subtle linguistic and cultural nuances can influence how items are interpreted. Additionally, it was observed that the model fit indices of the second model, along with the AIC and BIC values, were better, leading to the selection of this model. It was also observed that the factor loadings of the items fell within acceptable limits, indicating that the factor structure of the scale is applicable to the Turkish-speaking sample.

Confirmatory factor analysis supported the original three-factor structure—awareness, caring, and temperance—with acceptable model fit after minor modifications. This is in line with Gustafsson and Friberg's (2024) study conducted in the original language, where the three-factor model also showed good validity and reliability. Similarly, Argadian and Paramita (2024) confirmed the same structure in their Indonesian adaptation. In contrast, Ji et al. (2025) reported a two-factor structure in their Chinese sample, based on exploratory factor analysis. The retention of the original structure in the present and other cross-cultural validations suggests overall consistency, with the divergence in the Chinese context possibly reflecting cultural differences. Moreover, the scale's positive correlations with life satisfaction and self-esteem, and its negative association with conspicuous consumption, align with previous research highlighting the nomological network of mindful consumption (e.g., Gupta & Verma, 2020; Ji et al., 2025). These consistencies reinforce the scale's cross-cultural applicability and support its validity in non-Western, developing contexts.

When examined in terms of nomological validity, an expected pattern was observed. MCS showed a positive relationship with self-esteem and mindful attention awareness, a negative relationship with conspicuous consumption orientation, and a positive relationship with life satisfaction. Thus, it was observed that the nomological validity was also confirmed within the context of the Turkish-speaking sample.

It was observed that self-esteem and life satisfaction were positively correlated with the dimensions of awareness, caring, and temperance. However, mindful attention awareness was found to be associated only with caring and temperance, while no significant relationship with awareness was observed. Considering that awareness in consumption behavior and mindful attention awareness are theoretically aligned constructs, this finding is somewhat surprising. This unexpected result may reflect differences in how individuals conceptualize and practice mindfulness in specific domains of their lives, such as general mindfulness versus consumption-specific mindfulness, warranting further exploration in future studies. Regarding the relationship between mindful consumption behavior and conspicuous consumption, temperance appeared to emerge as the key dimension. This pattern suggested that temperance might function as a psychological barrier against conspicuous consumption, aligning with previous research that identifies self-regulation and restraint as critical mechanisms in reducing excessive consumption behaviors (Helm & Subramaniam, 2019; Richins, 2017).

Although consistent with prior research (e.g., Dhandra, 2019; Gupta et al., 2023), the expected positive correlation between the MCS and the MAAS was confirmed in the present study, it is important to acknowledge ongoing concerns about the conceptual validity of the MAAS. Specifically, the scale was criticized for measuring only a narrow aspect of mindfulness—namely attention and awareness—while neglecting essential components such as acceptance and

non-judgment (Baer et al., 2006; Sauer et al., 2012; Van Dam et al., 2010). Moreover, because all items are negatively worded and focus on the absence of attention, some scholars argue that the MAAS may reflect perceived inattention or mindlessness rather than mindfulness per se (Grossman, 2011). Therefore, while MAAS is widely used, future research may benefit from employing more comprehensive, multidimensional mindfulness measures (e.g., the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire) to further validate the nomological network of mindful consumption.

Despite the extensive body of literature addressing mindless consumption (see Iyer et al., 2020; Richins, 2017), empirical research on mindful consumption remains relatively limited compared to the broader body of work on mindless or impulsive consumption (Haider, 2022). This gap is particularly significant given the increasing emphasis on sustainability, ethical consumerism, and psychological well-being—areas in which mindful consumption plays a central role.

Limitations and Future Research

One limitation of this study is the use of a convenience sample, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings. Since participants were not randomly selected, the sample may not fully represent the broader population, potentially limiting the external validity of the results. Future research could address this issue by employing more diverse and representative sampling methods.

Another limitation of this study is that, while the internal consistency coefficients of the overall scale, as well as the caring and temperance dimensions, were generally strong, the awareness dimension showed only moderate but acceptable reliability. Although the original MCS development study did not report subscale-level reliability coefficients, findings from subsequent adaptations indicate variability in the consistency of the awareness dimension. For instance, Cronbach's alpha values for awareness were reported as 0.77 in the Indonesian adaptation (Argadian & Paramita, 2024), 0.65 in the Swedish sample (Gustafsson & Friberg, 2024), and 0.85 in the Chinese version (Ji et al., 2025). Taken together, these findings indicate that the internal consistency of the awareness dimension may be particularly influenced by cultural and linguistic context, warranting further refinement or contextual calibration of the awareness items in future research.

The ongoing depletion of planetary resources, coupled with the escalating demand driven by population growth, renders sustainable consumption increasingly imperative. In this context, fostering mindful consumption behaviors becomes a societal priority, as these behaviors not only mitigate environmental harm but also promote a more conscious and balanced approach to resource utilization. Policymakers and educators should consider integrating mindfulness principles into sustainability initiatives to encourage broader adoption. Mindful consumption behavior has been identified as a potentially pivotal mechanism for fostering sustainable consumption (Fischer et al., 2017; Helm & Subramaniam, 2019).

On an individual level, while the relationship between consumption and happiness is recognized as complex (Aknin et al., 2009; Kahneman & Deaton, 2010), findings across studies consistently demonstrated a positive correlation between mindful or sustainable consumption behaviors and both well-being and life satisfaction (e.g., Gupta & Verma, 2020; Resnik, 2022). This consistency underscores the significance of examining both the antecedents and outcomes of mindful consumption.

Moreover, the majority of studies in the field of sustainable consumption have predominantly drawn on data from developed countries, such as the UK and Denmark, leaving data from developing nations significantly underrepresented and ripe for investigation (Quoquab & Mohammad, 2020). By addressing this gap, the present study contributed a culturally specific measurement tool that can support future research on how mindful consumption behaviors manifest in developing economies.

Future research should aim to compare findings across diverse economic contexts to identify universal versus context-specific drivers of mindful consumption and could delve into the causal pathways linking mindful consumption to well-being, exploring potential mediators such as reduced financial stress, enhanced self-efficacy, or greater alignment with personal values. Such studies could provide valuable insights for designing interventions aimed at improving both individual and societal well-being.

Appendix A

Turkish Form of MCS

The items were presented in a randomized order, and participants were instructed to mark the option that best suited them. A 7-point Likert scale was used (1: Strongly disagree, 7: Strongly agree).

Farkındalık (Awareness)

Tüketim davranışlarımın içinde yaşadığım toplum üzerindeki etkileriyle ilgilenirim.

Tüketimimin içinde yaşadığım toplumu etkilediğinin farkındayım.

Eşyalarımı paylaşmak içinde yaşadığım toplumu önemsemek anlamına gelir.

Duyarlılık (Caring)

Çevreye zarar vermeden yaşamaya çalışırım.

Tüketim ihtiyaçlarımı giderirken çevreye zarar vermem.

Diğerlerine zarar vermeyen ürünleri satın alırım.

Herkes evinde su tasarrufu yapmalı.

Kamu hizmetlerinin (örneğin parklar, okullar, ulaşım) kullanılması toplum için iyidir.

Ölçülülük (Temperance)

Mevcut ürünüm çalışıyorsa en son çıkan ürünü satın almaktan kaçınırım.

Bolluk durumunda bile tüketimimi en aza indirmeye çalışırım.

Kıyafet israfını en aza indirme alışkanlığım var.

Author Contributions The author prepared the conceptualization and design, then conducted data collection and analysis, and finally prepared the manuscript.

Funding The current study did not receive any funding.

Data availability The data for the study can be accessed at this link: https://osf.io/hge6c/?view_only=4cb0a242350b404eb9be38f8c9f86cf6.

Declarations

Ethics Approval The current study was approved by the Karadeniz Technical University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee (E-82554930–050.01.04–521573).

Informed Consent Informed consent was obtained online from all individual participants included in the study at the beginning of their participation.

Conflict of interest Author declares no competing interests.

Use of Artifical Intelligence During the preparation of this work the author used artificial intelligence in order to improve readability and language. After using this tool/service, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

References

Aknin, L. B., Norton, M. I., & Dunn, E. W. (2009). From wealth to well-being? Money matters, but less than people think. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 4*(6), 523–527. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760903271421

Aktan, D. (2017). Mindful consumption and Generation Y: Comprehension, conceptualization, and communication [Unpublished master's thesis]. Izmir University of Economics.

Argadian, A. F., & Paramita, W. (2024). I'm full when I feel awe: The role of awe in predicting the mindful consumption of tourists in the hotel buffet restaurant context. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 119*, 104019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2024.104019

Aslan, M. (2021). Gösterişçi tüketim eğilimi ölçeği'nin (GTE) Türkçe uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması [Conspicuous consumption orientation (CCO) scale to Turkish: A validity and reliability study]. İktisadi İdari ve Siyasal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 6(15), 271–281. https://doi.org/10.25204/iktisad.848114

Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self-report assessment methods to explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment, 13*(1), 27–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191105283504

Barbaro, N., & Pickett, S. M. (2016). Mindfully green: Examining the effect of connectedness to nature on the relationship between mindfulness and engagement in pro-environmental behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences, 93*, 137–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.026

Brown, K. W., & Kasser, T. (2005). Are psychological and ecological well-being compatible? The role of values, mindfulness, and lifestyle. *Social Indicators Research, 74*(2), 349–368. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-8207-8

Brown, K. W., Kasser, T., Ryan, R. M., Linley, P. A., & Orzech, K. (2009). When what one has is enough: Mindfulness, financial desire discrepancy, and subjective well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(5), 727–736. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.07.002

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 822–848. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822

Chaudhuri, H. R., Mazumdar, S., & Ghoshal, A. (2011). Conspicuous consumption orientation: Conceptualisation, scale development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 10*(4), 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.364

Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Condon, P., Desbordes, G., Miller, W. B., & DeSteno, D. (2013). Meditation increases compassionate responses to suffering. *Psychological Science, 24*(10), 2125–2127. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613485603

Çuhadaroğlu, F. (1986). *Adolesanlarda benlik saygısı [Self-esteem in adolescents] (Unpublished master's thesis)*. Hacettepe University.

Dağlı, A., & Baysal, N. (2016). Yaşam doyumu ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması [Adaptation of the Satisfaction with Life Scale into Turkish: The study of validity and reliability]. Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 15(59), 1250–1262. https://doi.org/10.17755/esosder.75955

Dhandra, T. K. (2019). Achieving triple dividend through mindfulness: More sustainable consumption, less unsustainable consumption and more life satisfaction. *Ecological Economics, 161*, 83–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.03.021

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*(1), 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Fabrigar, L. R., & Wegener, D. T. (2012). *Exploratory factor analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Fischer, D., Stanszus, L., Geiger, S. M., Grossman, P., & Schrader, U. (2017). Mindfulness and sustainable consumption: A systematic literature review of research approaches and findings. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 162*, 544–558. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.007

Gabriella, D. R., Hardjanto, R. W., Mawaridi, M. F., Harits, M. N., & Purnami, L. D. (2021). Mindful consumption behavior on second-hand fashion products: Intervariable influence analysis of stimulus-organism-response (SOR) model. *Asean Marketing Journal, 13*(1), 6. https://doi.org/10.21002/amj.v13i1.13229

Garg, R., Bansal, S., Rathi, R., & Bhowmick, S. (2024). Mindful consumption–A systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 459*, Article 142373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.142373

Geiger, S. M., Fischer, D., Schrader, U., & Grossman, P. (2019). Meditating for the planet: Effects of a mindfulness-based intervention on sustainable consumption behaviors. *Environment and Behavior, 52*(9), 1012–1042. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916519880897

Grossman, P. (2011). Defining mindfulness by how poorly i think i pay attention during everyday awareness and other intractable problems for psychology's (re) invention of mindfulness: Comment on Brown et al. (2011). *Psychological Assessment, 23*(4), 1034–1040. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022713

Gupta, S., Lim, W. M., Verma, H. V., & Polonsky, M. (2023). How can we encourage mindful consumption? Insights from mindfulness and religious faith. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 40*(3), 344–358. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-11-2021-5011

Gupta, S., & Sheth, J. (2023). Mindful consumption: Its conception, measurement, and implications. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 52*, 1531–1549. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-023-00970-2

Gupta, S., & Verma, H. V. (2020). Mindfulness, mindful consumption, and life satisfaction: An experiment with higher education students. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 12*(3), 456–474. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-11-2018-0235

Gustafsson, J., & Friberg, E. (2024). *Mindful consumption and its role in sustainable behaviour: A quantitative study on young adults in Sweden* (Unpublished master's thesis). Luleå University of Technology.

Haider, M., Shannon, R., & Moschis, G. P. (2022). Sustainable consumption research and the role of marketing: A review of the literature (1976–2021). *Sustainability, 14*(7), 3999. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14073999

Helm, S., & Subramaniam, B. (2019). Exploring socio-cognitive mindfulness in the context of sustainable consumption. *Sustainability, 11*(13), 3692. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133692

Hu, L.-T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Hughes, A. C., Tougeron, K., Martin, D. A., Menga, F., Rosado, B. H. P., Villasante, S., Madgulkar, S., Gonçalves, F., Geneletti, D., Diele-Viegas, L. M., Berger, S., Colla, S. R., Kamimura, V. de A., Caggiano, H., Melo, F., Dias, M. G. de O., Kellner, E., & do Couto, E. V. (2023). Smaller human populations are neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for biodiversity conservation. *Biological Conservation*, *277*, 109841. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2022.109841

Iyer, G. R., Blut, M., Xiao, S. H., & Grewal, D. (2020). Impulse buying: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48*, 384–404. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00670-w

Jacob, J., Jovic, E., & Brinkerhoff, M. (2009). Personal and planetary well-being: Mindfulness meditation, pro-environmental behavior and personal quality of life in a survey from the social justice and ecological sustainability movement. *Social Indicators Research, 93*(2), 275–294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-008-9308-6

Ji, D., Pongsakornrungsilp, S., Pongsakornrungsilp, P., & Kumar, V. (2025). When mindful consumption meets green purchase intention: Empirical evidence on how a mindful mindset influences tourists. *Sustainability, 17*(3), 1266. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17031266

Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). Full Catastrophe Living: Using the Wisdom of Your Body and Mind to Face Stress, Pain, and Illness. Delacorte Press.

Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107*(38), 16489–16493. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011492107

Kline, R. B. (2023). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (5th ed.). Guilford Press.

Kyriazos, T. A. (2018). Applied psychometrics: Sample size and sample power considerations in factor analysis (EFA, CFA) and SEM in general. *Psychology, 9*(8), 2207–2230. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2018.98126

Langer, E. J. (1989). *Mindfulness*. Da Capo Press.

Langer, E. J. (2005). Well-being: Mindfulness versus positive evaluation. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 214–230). Oxford University Press.

Lim, D., Condon, P., & DeSteno, D. (2015). Mindfulness and compassion: An examination of mechanism and scalability. *PLoS ONE, 10*(2), e0118221. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118221

O'Guinn, T. C., & Faber, R. J. (1989). Compulsive buying: A phenomenological exploration. *Journal of Consumer Research, 16*(2), 147–157. https://doi.org/10.1086/209204

Özyeşil, Z., Arslan, C., Kesici, Ş, & Deniz, M. E. (2011). Bilinçli farkındalık ölçeği'ni Türkçeye uyarlama çalışması [Adaptation of the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale into Turkish]. *Eğitim Ve Bilim, 36*(160), 224–235.

Panno, A., Donati, M. A., Milioni, M., Chiesi, F., & Primi, C. (2018). Mindfulness, pro-environmental behavior, and belief in climate change: The mediating role of social value orientation. *Environment and Behavior, 50*(8), 864–888. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916517718887

Parvatiyar, A., & Sheth, J. N. (2023). Confronting the deep problem of consumption: Why individual responsibility for mindful consumption matters. *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 57*(2), 785–820. https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12534

Quoquab, F., & Mohammad, J. (2020). A review of sustainable consumption (2000 to 2020): What we know and what we need to know. *Journal of Global Marketing, 33*(5), 305–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2020.1811441

R Core Team. (2024). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing [Computer software], Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/

Randal, C., Pratt, D., & Bucci, S. (2015). Mindfulness and self-esteem: A systematic review. *Mindfulness, 6*(6), 1366–1378. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-015-0407-6

Resnik, S. (2022). A qualitative study of mindfulness, sustainable consumption and consumer well-being and their interrelationships. *Economic and Business Review, 24*(4), 260–277. https://doi.org/10.15458/2335-4216.1313

Revelle, W. (2024). psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research (Version 2.4.6) [R package]. Northwestern University. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych

Richins, M. L. (2017). Materialism pathways: The processes that create and perpetuate materialism. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 27*(4), 480–499. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2017.07.006

Rook, D. W., & Gardner, M. P. (1993). In the mood: Impulse buying's affective antecedents. In J. Arnold-Costa, & R. W. Belk (Eds.), *Research in consumer behavior* (Vol. 6, pp. 1–28). JAI Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1965a). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1965b). *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* [Measurement instrument]. American Psychological Association. https://www.apa.org/obesity-guideline/rosenberg-self-esteem.pdf

Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software, 48*(2), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02

Samways, D. (2022). Population and sustainability: Reviewing the relationship between population growth and environmental change. *The Journal of Population and Sustainability*, *6*(1), 15–41. https://doi.org/10.3197/JPS.63772239426891

Sauer, S., Walach, H., Schmidt, S., Hinterberger, T., Lynch, S., Büssing, A., & Kohls, N. (2012). Assessment of mindfulness: Review on state of the art. *Mindfulness, 4*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-012-0122-5

Sheth, J. N., Sethia, N. K., & Srinivas, S. (2011). Mindful consumption: A customer-centric approach to sustainability. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 39*(1), 21–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0216-3

Van Dam, N. T., Earleywine, M., & Borders, A. (2010). Measuring mindfulness? An item response theory analysis of the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 49*(7), 805–810. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.07.020

Veblen, T. (2007). *The theory of the leisure class*. Dover Publications. (Original work published 1899)

Verplanken, B., Herabadi, A., Perry, J. A., & Silvera, D. H. (2005). Consumer style and impulse buying. *Journal of Consumer Policy, 28*(2), 137–158. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.423

Xiao, J. J., & Li, H. (2011). Sustainable consumption and life satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research, 104*, 323–329. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-010-9746-9