

Sharing as a form of anti-consumption? An examination of toy library users

Lucie K. Ozanne* and Paul W. Ballantine

Department of Management, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch 8140, New Zealand

- *While the literature on anti-consumption is rich and growing, there is still a lack of understanding among consumer researchers regarding why consumers choose to avoid consumption. This study seeks to extend the literature by exploring whether a group of consumers who reduce consumption through choosing to share rather than own are motivated by anti-consumption reasons. The authors use quantitative data from 397 toy library members to explore why members choose to participate in this form of sharing. The study reveals four groups - Socialites, Market Avoiders, Quiet Anti-Consumers and Passive Members. The Socialites enjoy the social benefits of active participation in their library. The Market Avoiders also perceived social and community benefits, are interested in sharing and are the least materialistic of the groups. The Quiet Anti-Consumers feel a sense of belonging to their toy library and hold strong anti-consumption, frugality and sharing values. The Passive Members are not socially involved, nor did they hold strong anti-consumption values. Thus, the authors find evidence that sharing may be one possible alternative market structure that may be adopted by anti-consumption consumers.*

Copyright © 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Introduction

The hardest thing is to take less when you can get more. - Kin Hubbard

Exchange has historically been accepted as the primary role of marketing (Kotler, 1972; Bagozzi, 1978). Thus, marketers have focused on facilitating beneficial exchanges with customers by exploring customers' needs, wants and preferences. However, since Kotler's

(1972) seminal declaration on the core concept of marketing, the foundations of marketing have been continually challenged. Most recently, consumer movements which seek to challenge the fundamental tenets of marketing and consumption have emerged (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004). As marketing scholars, we must acknowledge that those who choose to go against consumption, rejecting specific products, brands and organisations, are also stating a preference (Zavestoski, 2002) worthy of study.

Anti-consumption has been described as 'being against consumption', and that research in this area should focus on 'reasons against

*Correspondence to: Lucie K. Ozanne, Department of Management, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch 8140, New Zealand.
E-mail: lucie.ozanne@canterbury.ac.nz

consumption' (Lee *et al.*, 2009a: 145). Zavestoski (2002: 121) described anti-consumption as 'a resistance to, distaste of, or even resentment or rejection of consumption more generally'. Given these broad approaches to anti-consumption, it is not surprising that a variety of behaviours and manifestations have been captured by the research paradigm – from boycotting (Herrmann, 1993; Hoffmann and Muller, 2009), brand avoidance (Lee *et al.*, 2009b), ethical consuming (Shaw and Newholm, 2002), voluntary simplification (Craig-Lees and Hill, 2002; Huneke, 2005), ad busters (Rumbo, 2002), brand rejection (Sandikci and Ekici, 2009), consumer resistance (Fournier, 1998; Penaloza and Price, 2003), consumer rebellion (Dobscha, 1998) and retaliating (Funches *et al.*, 2009). Cherrier (2009: 189) argued that regardless of the manifestation of anti-consumption behaviour, it is important for researchers to consider 'how and why individuals resist particular consumption practices, who those individuals are, and the meanings they give to their participation'.

Iyer and Muncy (2009) argued that many different approaches to anti-consumption and alternative consumption exist and the motivations for anti-consumption vary among political, personal and environmental concerns. Craig-Lees (2006) suggested that although anti-consumption behaviour often focuses on the reduction of all consumption activities, it is also possible to focus on the reduction of the purchase of specific products and brands. Although a grand theory of anti-consumption (Lee *et al.*, 2009a) does not appear to yet exist, all forms seem to share an overall goal of consumption reduction related to specific brands, product categories or consumption activities.

One possible form of anti-consumption behaviour that has not been adequately explored in the literature is the sharing of communally owned goods. Belk (2007: 126) defined sharing 'as the act and process of distributing what is ours to others for their use and/or the act or process of receiving or taking something from others for our use'. Belk's (2010) seminal article on sharing outlined

three prototypes of marketplace behaviour: sharing, gift giving and commodity exchange. Accordingly, exchange and transfer of ownership are required for the latter two, while sharing involves the non-reciprocal pooling of resources resulting in joint ownership. Thus, as goods are jointly owned when shared, there is a likely reduction of the overall number of purchased goods by individual consumers.

Toy lending libraries provide parents with the opportunity to share communally owned toys in their local neighbourhood and thus reduce their consumption of new toys. Toy sharing may be particularly beneficial as young children often have limited attention spans, growing tired of toys quickly, resulting in them consuming toys on a very short use cycle. There are a variety of possible motivations that may inspire parents to frequent toy libraries; from saving money, to enhancing play opportunities for their children, to helping children develop and master skills, to reducing the family's purchase of new toys (Ozanne and Ozanne, 2009). The purpose of this research is to explore the motivations for parental involvement in toy lending libraries to determine whether consumption reduction is an important value for all or some parent members. We achieve this objective through a quantitative examination of parent members of toy libraries in New Zealand, a country that has the second highest number of toy libraries per capita in the world.

Literature review

Fournier (1998) explained that consumer resistance activities manifest themselves in many different ways, and she depicted anti-consumption behaviour along a continuum with avoidance behaviours at one extreme and active rebellion, expressed through such practices as complaining, boycotting or dropping out, at the other extreme. Minimisation behaviours, such as coping and downsizing activities, would represent a mid-point along this continuum (Fournier, 1998). Dobscha (1998) examined a group of individuals who

were actively rebelling against the marketplace in order to forge relationships counter to perceived market domination. This extreme form of anti-consumption behaviour was manifested through such practices as doing without, creating products, buying second hand products or altering use to limit the amount consumed. Although likely a small portion of the population, these rebels illuminate the level of distrust and scepticism some consumers feel toward the market, and thus the motivations to resist the market and reduce their consumption.

Ritson and Dobscha (1999) categorised consumer resistance as 'futile' or 'not futile'. In the futile form of resistance, consumers choose to say 'enough is enough' and consume less. In the not futile form of resistance, consumers practice their 'heresy' through creating anti-brands, rejecting and re-appropriating specific signs and language of the market, and practicing anti-brand behaviour such as boycotting (Ritson and Dobscha, 1999). Cherrier (2009) added to the work of Fournier (1998) and Ritson and Dobscha (1999) by arguing that consumer resistance of the market should be examined using the concept of resistant identity. She noted two forms: hero identity and project identity, and suggested that the difference between each anti-consumption narrative is based on one's resistant identity rather than on the type of manifestation. The hero constructs their identity against exploitative consumption and is concerned with social and environmental threats (Cherrier, 2009). Project identity is not in opposition to market domination, but 'draws on discourses against positional consumption'; thus working within the rules of consumer culture by 'creating new codes, practices, and alternative market structures' (p. 189).

Iyer and Muncy (2009) depicted four distinct areas of anti-consumption research and developed scales to measure the various forms of anti-consumption. They described global impact consumers as being motivated to reduce consumption because of their concern for the welfare of society or the planet.

Simplifiers reduce consumption levels in order to construct a simpler, less consumption-based lifestyle. Market activists reduce consumption of specific brands or products to reflect societal concerns, such as a concern for a specific organisation's labour or environmental practices. Finally, anti-loyal consumers reject a product or brand because of perceived inferiority or a negative consumption experience.

As explained by Zavestoski (2002), rather than looking at a group of individuals holding anti-consumption attitudes, research by Shaw and Newholm (2002) explored a group of ethical consumers and asked whether they held anti-consumption attitudes; an approach that is adopted in this research. Shaw and Newholm (2002) also found that ethical consumers displayed voluntary forms of restraint and reduction as a part of their ethical consumption practices.

Sharing may be one possible alternative market structure that can be adopted by anti-consumption consumers. As sharing is a communal act, it may connect us to others and create feelings of solidarity and bonding (Belk, 2010). Belk (2007) proposed that sharing is an alternative form of distribution to commodity exchange or gift giving, and compared to those more traditional forms of distribution, may foster community and save resources. According to Belk (2010), sharing involves non-reciprocal pooling of resources resulting in joint ownership and caring and love without reciprocal expectations. Belk (2010) suggested two forms of sharing - 'sharing in' and 'sharing out'. Sharing in is similar to sharing within the family 'in that it involves regarding ownership as common' (p. 725). Sharing out involves giving to others outside the boundaries - separating self and other - but does not involve 'expanding the sphere of aggregate extended self beyond the family' (p. 726). The toy library example examined in this study may involve aspects of sharing in (i.e. an expression of community) and sharing out (i.e. a practice to save money).

Herrmann (1993) proposed several strategies available to consumers who are dissatisfied with the market and choose to exit,

including consumer boycotts and the creation of alternative, consumer controlled providers of goods and services. He examined such alternative providers as food buying clubs and co-ops, credit unions and services providers such as the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) who provide specialised services to older consumers who are not being well served by other providers. As Herrmann (1993) explained, those exiting the conventional marketplace have organised themselves to provide a wide range of needs, including the pursuit of functional (e.g. better prices) and structural (e.g. enhancement of the welfare of the group served) goals. The toy lending libraries explored in this research would represent a form of alternative, consumer controlled service provider that provides both functional and structural goals to its members.

Toy lending libraries

The development of the toy library movement began in 1935 when the first toy library opened its doors in Los Angeles (Moore, 1995). This programme is still in existence with 42 toy loan centres throughout Los Angeles County. Brodin and Bjorck-Akesson (1992) found that there were 4500 toy libraries in 31 countries across all continents.

Although toy libraries can take several different forms, a definition that would describe most toy libraries is provided by Moore (1995: 6): 'a facility that allows children and their parents to borrow toys, games, puzzles, etc. as they would borrow books from a public library'. In addition, common to all toy libraries is the emphasis on play as a means for child development (Brodin and Bjorck-Akesson, 1992). 'Play is seen as moderator of the child's development, and to encourage children to play is a major concern for toy libraries' (Brodin and Bjorck-Akesson, 1992: 529), with toys seen as the tool that encourages and promotes play.

A variety of different forms of toy libraries can be identified throughout the world; for

instance, Brodin and Bjorck-Akesson (1992) identify three major types of toy libraries – community oriented toy libraries, Lekotek for children with special needs and toy libraries with social and cultural programmes. As explained by Brodin and Bjorck-Akesson (1992), each toy library system is influenced by the special conditions, culture, needs and development of its particular country.

Toy libraries may be initiated and sponsored by a variety of organisations. For example, in New Zealand, the dominant form would be the community oriented toy library that offers families the opportunity to borrow toys appropriate for children at different stages of development. In other areas, the toy library is connected to an existing program such as a school, library, hospital or childcare centre; it may have an open borrowing policy or may be restricted to the families associated with the sponsoring agency (Moore, 1995).

Depending upon the sponsoring organisation, toy libraries may be run entirely by parent or other volunteers from the community, employees of the government organisation or other sponsoring organisation, or in the case of Lekotek, professionals trained in diagnostic and remedial services for special needs of children. Although parents are the most common member of toy libraries, other caregivers may also have access to membership or even children themselves. Most toy libraries cater for children during the pre-school years; however some have begun to widen their scope of operation to include older children. In New Zealand, the site of this study, the dominant form of toy library is community based and run by parent volunteers, with specific borrowing rules and fees determined by each library. There are currently approximately 220 toy lending libraries in New Zealand serving over 23 000 children (Toy Library Federation, 2010).

A number of benefits provided by toy libraries have been recognised by researchers. For instance, in a UK study of good practice among toy libraries, it was found that toy libraries serve as a hub for the community, provide opportunities for volunteering and the

learning of new skills, create jobs and build community capacity (Capacity and Play Matters, 2007). In addition, toy libraries in the UK were found to be successful in engaging isolated families in areas of social deprivation, and redressing part of the imbalance between the supply of play equipment available to children from affluent areas and those growing up in poverty (Capacity and Play Matters, 2007). Finally, toy libraries serve an important social function, providing a valuable meeting place for families, a place to share advice and provide support to others (Brodin and Bjorck-Akesson, 1992).

In a qualitative study of parental involvement in toy lending libraries, Ozanne and Ozanne (2009) found that parents report a number of benefits from participation. For instance, parents reported that toy libraries, because of the ability to regularly borrow from a huge range of toys, enabled children to learn and develop a number of skills and abilities. The toy library experience 'stretched' children in ways parents had not anticipated, with boys trying toys that are typically associated with girls, and less active children becoming more physical in their play, for instance. The toy library enabled parents to mediate the children's relationship to the marketplace because branded toys and undesirable toys (e.g. guns) had been edited out by librarians and toy library committees. Finally, Ozanne and Ozanne (2009) reported that the toy library experience enabled parents to affirm core values, such as frugality, community, anti-materialism, generosity and environmentalism.

As can be seen from this discussion, the vast majority of research on toy lending libraries has focused on delineating the types of toy libraries and their operational form, with a much smaller number of studies exploring the benefits to the community and individual members of toy libraries. The present study drew on the relevant literature to determine whether reducing consumption, a goal of anti-consumption behaviour, was a motivating force in parental participation in toy lending libraries, as suggested by the research of Ozanne and Ozanne (2009).

However, as previous literature suggests there are a number of potential benefits gained through sharing toys at the toy library, this study also explored other potential motivations to participation. For instance, as the research of Brodin and Bjorck-Akesson (1992) suggested the toy library can serve an important social function, we drew on the research of Nielsen *et al.* (2000) to understand the prevalence of friendship within the toy library context. Previous research also suggested that toy libraries serve an important function in the community by creating community capacity (Capacity and Play Matters, 2007). Thus, we draw on the research of Peterson *et al.* (2008) to understand whether toy libraries help to facilitate a sense of community and help to develop community efficacy. Most toy libraries promote the ability to save money through borrowing rather than purchasing toys. Thus, the ability to save money may be an obvious attraction to members, and as explained by Lastovicka *et al.* (1999) frugality may be a useful method for understanding consumer product use behaviours. Finally, as the research by Ozanne and Ozanne (2009) suggested parents have appropriated the meaning of toy library participation, beyond just economic savings, as a means of expressing important values, we explored whether anti-materialism and voluntary simplification were important motivations to members.

Methodology

Sample

This study took a quantitative approach, where an online survey was administered to toy library members in New Zealand. The survey population included parents who are members of and frequent their local toy library. Unfortunately, as there was not a sample frame to draw a sample of parents, we utilised a number of techniques to reach members. First, the Toy Library Federation of New Zealand, who supported this research, posted a link to the online survey on their website. Next, all toy

libraries were contacted by the Federation, who included a letter of appeal from the researchers to direct parent members to the online survey, with the toy library's annual subscription fees. All toy library buyers were contacted via a database of buyers and notified of the survey. Finally, the research and survey were highlighted in the monthly toy library magazine, *The Link*, which asked members to visit the website and take the survey. When visiting the website, parents found an introductory explanation, which included a statement of support from the Toy Library Federation, an explanation of the anonymous and confidential nature of the survey, and a description of the incentives being offered for participation.

Survey instrument

A draft survey instrument was developed and pretested in the following manner. First, three chairpersons of local toy libraries were asked to review the survey and comment on its completeness and their ability to understand the questions. Next, four parent members were asked to take the survey and to comment on their ability to understand the questions and to identify any vague or misleading questions. From their feedback, a number of additional questions were added, answer options were adjusted and instructions clarified.

The data collection included an incentive to encourage individual members to complete the survey and toy library committee members to direct their members to the survey. The toy library that had the most members complete the survey was awarded a voucher of \$200 to be used to purchase toys for the library. In addition, three toy libraries, whose members had completed the survey, were drawn at random and awarded a voucher of \$100 to be used to purchase toys for the library.

Measures

The following constructs were measured by appropriate scales for each variable as

this section describes. Saving money was operationalised in terms of an 8-item measure based on the frugality research of Lastovicka *et al.* (1999) and adapted to the toy library context. The items were measured on a five-point Likert scale anchored strongly agree - strongly disagree. Community building was operationalised in terms of a 10-item measure based on the scale developed by Peterson *et al.* (2008) with additional questions added to reflect the toy library context. The items were measured on a five-point Likert scale anchored strongly agree - strongly disagree. Friendship prevalence was operationalised in terms of a 5-item measure, adapted to reflect the toy library context, from Nielsen *et al.* (2000). The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale anchored strongly agree - strongly disagree. The anti-consumption construct was operationalised in terms of a 7-item scale developed by Iyer and Muncy (2009). The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale anchored strongly agree - strongly disagree. The materialism construct was measured using the 6-item scale developed by Ward and Wackman (1971), again measured on a five-point Likert scale anchored strongly agree - strongly disagree. The voluntary simplicity construct was measured with 3-items from the scale developed by Huneke (2005). The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale anchored strongly agree - strongly disagree.

Several scales were developed specifically for this research as the constructs were not developed in the existing literature. First, an 8-item measure was developed to capture the sharing construct. This scale was developed by first generating a set of items based on the academic literature on sharing (Belk, 2007; Belk, 2010). Next, we asked several academics familiar with the sharing literature to review the scale items for face validity. We then used exploratory factor analysis to refine the scales. Items included the following type questions: 'I believe sharing is an important skill to learn in life', 'I would rather share toys at the toy library than buy them at the toy store', and 'I do not like the idea of sharing toys'. These items were also measured using a 5-point Likert scale

anchored strongly agree - strongly disagree. Market mediation was measured with a 6-item scale developed for this research. These six items were generated by examining the exploratory research of Ozanne and Ozanne (2009) who found that parents use toy libraries to mediate the influence of the market in several ways - to avoid taking children into stores, to avoid branded toys, to avoid certain types of toys (e.g. guns), etc. We then used exploratory factor analysis to refine the scales. Items included the following type questions: 'Avoiding toy stores was one of the reasons I joined a toy library', 'Avoiding branded toys was one of the reasons I joined a toy library' and 'Since joining this toy library I have reduced the number of times I visit toy stores'. These items were also measured using a 5-point Likert scale anchored strongly agree - strongly disagree. Finally, a number of demographic questions were also included in the survey to help categorise respondents.

Data analysis

The online survey website was left open for a period of 1 month, from the mid-April to mid-May 2010, and at the end of this time, 467 surveys were submitted. Of these, 397 surveys were suitable for inclusion in the final sample, with 70 surveys being removed due to systematic responses patterns or a failure to fully complete the questionnaire. Although we were unable to determine an overall response rate, as there was no appropriate sample frame, responses originated from 83 different toy libraries, representing 37.7 per cent of toy libraries in New Zealand. In terms of sociodemographic characteristics, 96 per cent of respondents were female, 90 per cent were between the ages of 25-39 (suggesting that parents were the main users of toy libraries), with 95 per cent also indicating their household could best be described as being a family with young children. A two child household was most common (51%), followed by one child (32%) and three child (11%) households. Household income was spread, with households in the \$40 000 - \$79 999 range being

the most common (35%), followed by \$80 000 - \$119 999 (29%), more than \$120 000 (28%) and less than \$40 000 (8%).

Principal components analysis (with Varimax rotation) was used to assess the underlying structure of the measures used. Based on this analysis, a nine-factor solution emerged. These factors explained 81 per cent of the variance, with all eigenvalues being over one, all items loading heavily onto one of the factors, and with all factors also being easily interpretable. **Table 1** provides the factor loadings for each of the scale items. The dimension of friendship was found to contain four items, sense of belonging contained three items, while each of the other factors (sense of duty, anti-consumption, parental mediation, frugality, materialism, toy library efficacy and sharing) all contained two items each. Measures were then assessed for their internal consistency using the Cronbach alpha reliability procedure (Cronbach, 1951). **Table 2** reports the means, standard deviations and reliabilities of all the measures used in this study.

To determine if respondents may hold common attitudes and perceptions about toy libraries and toy library usage, cluster analysis was used to uncover any similarities that might be used to help identify distinct groups within the sample. These groups were identified following a two-step procedure (e.g. Milligan, 1980; Hair *et al.*, 2006). First, hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward's method was applied to the mean item scores of the nine factors. Adopting the 'stopping rule' (e.g. Hair *et al.*, 2006), the changes in the within-cluster sum of squares suggested four clusters as an initial solution. Second, K-means cluster analysis was then used to fine-tune the clusters assuming four groups. The mean factor scores for each of these four groups are provided in **Table 3**. The descriptive profiles for each of the four groups were developed based upon these mean ratings, and the results of a series of ANOVAs (using post-hoc Scheffe tests) to identify any pair-wise differences in mean factor scores.

The first group (Socialites) were found to have the highest friendship, sense of belong-

Table 1. Factor loadings for scale items

Item	Factor								
	Friendship	Sense of belonging	Sense of duty	Anti-consumption	Parental mediation	Frugality	Materialism	Toy library efficacy	Sharing
I socialise with other toy library members outside of opening hours	0.85								
I have a good bond with others in this toy library	0.80								
Being able to see other toy library members is one reason I look forward to going to this toy library	0.76								
I can confide in people at this toy library	0.76								
I feel like a member of this toy library		0.87							
I belong in this toy library		0.86							
I feel connected to this toy library		0.76							
I feel good after I have done my duties at the toy library			0.89						
I enjoy participating in the duties at the toy library			0.88						
I try to recycle as much as I can				0.92					
We must all do our part to conserve				0.90					
Avoiding branded toys was one of the reasons I joined a toy library					0.92				
Avoiding certain types of toys was one of the reasons I joined a toy library					0.90				
I am willing to wait on a purchase I want so that I can save money						0.91			
There are things I resist buying today so I can save for tomorrow						0.89			
My dream in life is to be able to own expensive things							0.88		
It is really true that money can buy happiness							0.87		
This toy library gets a lot done in my community								0.84	

(Continues)

Table 1. (Continued)

Item	Factor								
	Friendship	Sense of belonging	Sense of duty	Anti-consumption	Parental mediation	Frugality	Materialism	Toy library efficacy	Sharing
This toy library is respected in my community								0.82	
I would try to share toys even if there were not a toy library									0.85
Wherever possible I share toys rather than buy them									0.83
Variance explained (percentage)	26.96	10.80	8.17	7.51	6.45	5.89	5.55	5.09	4.83

ing, sense of duty and toy library efficacy ratings. Overall, people in this group perceived their toy library as having strong social and community benefits, and enjoyed the social benefits of active participation in their library both as a member and a helper. There were 102 respondents in this group (25.7% of the sample). The second group (Market Avoiders) also perceived social and community benefits of toy library participation, but less so than the Socialites. They were the only group to rate parental mediation as being important, were interested in sharing and were the least materialistic of the groups. There were 103 respondents in this group (25.9% of the sample). The third group (Quiet Anti-Consumers) felt a sense of belonging to their toy library, but were quite neutral in terms of friendship and their sense of duty. Like the Socialites and Market Avoiders, they held strong anti-consumption, frugality and sharing values. There were 104 respondents in this group (26.2% of the sample). The final group (Passive Members) were lowest in their friendship and sense of belonging ratings. They also held a similar sense of duty towards toy library duties as the Quiet Anti-Consumers. This group also held the lowest anti-consumption, frugality and sharing values. In essence, while they were toy library members, they did not seem socially involved, nor did they hold strong anti-consumption values. There were 88 respondents in this group (22.2% of the sample).

To further understand the characteristics of each of the four groups, the demographic information provided by respondents was used to see if any demographic differences existed between the groups. No differences were found in terms of respondent gender, age, ethnicity or household composition. Using one-way ANOVA, Socialites were found to have a greater number of children in their household ($F = 4.828, p = 0.003$), while also having a greater number of children in their household using a toy library ($F = 10.358, p = 0.000$). Household income was highest amongst the Passive Members, followed by Quiet Anti-Consumers, with Socialites and Market Avoiders having similar income levels

Table 2. Means, standard deviations and reliabilities of measures used

Factor/item wording	Mean	SD	α
<i>Friendship</i>	3.16	0.85	0.87
I socialise with other toy library members outside of opening hours			
I have a good bond with others in this toy library			
Being able to see other toy library members is one reason I look forward to going to this toy library			
I can confide in people at this toy library			
<i>Sense of belonging</i>	4.26	0.64	0.88
I feel like a member of this toy library			
I belong in this toy library			
I feel connected to this toy library			
<i>Sense of duty</i>	3.67	0.83	0.90
I feel good after I have done my duties at the toy library			
I enjoy participating in the duties at the toy library			
<i>Anti-consumption</i>	4.32	0.57	0.83
I try to recycle as much as I can			
We must all do our part to conserve			
<i>Parental mediation</i>	2.36	0.82	0.83
Avoiding branded toys was one of the reasons I joined a toy library			
Avoiding certain types of toys was one of the reasons I joined a toy library			
<i>Frugality</i>	3.91	0.78	0.81
I am willing to wait on a purchase I want so that I can save money			
There are things I resist buying today so I can save for tomorrow			
<i>Materialism</i>	2.18	0.79	0.70
My dream in life is to be able to own expensive things			
It is really true that money can buy happiness			
<i>Toy library efficacy</i>	3.76	0.64	0.68
This toy library gets a lot done in my community			
This toy library is respected in my community			
<i>Sharing</i>	3.50	0.76	0.66
I would try to share toys even if there were not a toy library			
Wherever possible I share toys rather than buy them			

after that ($\chi^2 = 43.739$, $p = 0.001$). Finally, Socialites were found to visit their toy library more often than respondents from each of the other three groups ($\chi^2 = 40.529$, $p = 0.000$).

Additional comparisons were made between the groups in terms of their toy library participation and experience using a series of one-way ANOVAs. When responding to the

Table 3. Final cluster centres (mean factor scores for each cluster)

Factor	Group			
	Socialites	Market avoiders	Quiet anti-consumers	Passive members
Friendship	3.88	3.49	2.73	2.44
Sense of belonging	4.78	4.38	4.03	3.78
Sense of duty	4.44	3.87	3.08	3.24
Anti-consumption	4.38	4.41	4.41	4.06
Parental mediation	2.05	3.33	2.09	1.89
Frugality	4.09	4.02	4.17	3.24
Materialism	1.96	2.39	2.04	2.33
Toy library efficacy	4.16	3.89	3.44	3.51
Sharing	3.65	3.73	3.78	2.70

statement 'I think it is fun to go to the toy library and borrow toys', Socialites were the most positive, followed by Market Avoiders, with Quiet Anti-Consumers and Passive Members having similar means after that ($F = 26.771$, $p = .000$). Similarly, when responding to the statements 'I enjoy participating in the duties at the toy library' and 'I feel good after I have done my duties at the toy library', the same pattern emerged. For both statements, Socialites were the most positive, followed by Market Avoiders, with Quiet Anti-Consumers and Passive Members having similar means after that, ($F = 84.983$, $p = 0.000$) and ($F = 83.405$, $p = 0.000$), respectively.

Discussion and conclusions

The community toy libraries examined in this research provide an alternative, consumer controlled service that provides both functional and structural goals to members (Herrmann, 1993), and thus a variety of groups may be served by these libraries. This research identifies four groups of toy library participants. The Socialites who appear to enjoy the social benefits of active toy library participation and construct sharing in the toy library as a form of 'sharing in' or as an expression of community (Belk, 2010: 725). The Market Avoiders also appreciated the social benefits of the toy library, although to a lesser degree than the Socialites, appreciated the ability to mediate the influence of the market, and were the least materialistic of the groups. The Quiet Anti-Consumers held strong anti-consumption, frugality and sharing values. Finally, the Passive Members were not socially involved, nor did they hold strong anti-consumption values.

The demographic information provided by respondents also helped shed light on the characteristics of each of the four groups. Socialites were found to have more children in their household, more children in their household using a toy library, and the highest use of toy libraries overall. They were the most positive group in terms of describing their toy library participation and experience, while

also being one of the two lowest income groups. Market Avoiders represented the other low-income group, while consistently being the second highest scoring for each of the statements about toy library participation and experience. The Passive Members had the highest incomes, but were typically the least positive about their toy library participation and experience, while also using toy libraries the least.

Similar to the research of Shaw and Newholm (2002), who explored whether a group of ethical consumers hold anti-consumption attitudes (Zavestoski, 2002), this research asks whether a group of individuals who choose to share communally owned goods hold anti-consumption attitudes. In fact, two groups of toy library participants; the Market Avoiders and the Quiet Anti-Consumers, representing 52 per cent of the sample, appear to hold anti-consumption attitudes. Thus, the findings suggest that some consumers who choose to share products also consider the extent of their consumption. However, the existence of two additional groups of sharers suggests that similar behaviour may be supported by different motivations, such as the Socialites who appear to be motivated by the social benefits of sharing.

This research extends the anti-consumption literature by identifying an additional behavioural manifestation of those who hold anti-consumption attitudes, sharing. Sharing is obviously not an extreme form of active market rebellion (Dobscha, 1998), but possibly more similar to minimisation behaviours such as downsizing (Fournier, 1998). Sharing may also be conceptualised as a 'futile' form of market resistance (Ritson and Dobscha, 1999), which enables consumers to consume less by choosing to share rather than purchase and own goods. As Craig-Lees (2006) explained, consumption reduction may occur across all consumption or the reduction of the purchase of specific products and brands. This research has explored consumption reduction through sharing (Belk, 2007), by examining sharing in one product category, toys. Future research should explore other forms of sharing such as

car sharing, home sharing through co-housing, freecycling (Nelson *et al.*, 2007) or clothes swapping to determine whether other groups of sharers also hold anti-consumption attitudes. This research was also restricted to one geographic region, and future research should explore sharing in other geographic settings. For instance, one would not expect those from collectivist cultures to ascribe anti-consumption values to sharing activity but would be more a result of a collective orientation, but there is also a need for further research here.

Given our findings it is likely that a number of other behaviours may be underpinned by anti-consumption sentiments. For instance, for those consumers who wish to move to more sustainable consumption, they may seek to reduce their consumption in a variety of ways. As an example, the slow travel movement represents an attempt by consumers to counteract today's fast paced lifestyle by fundamentally changing travel practices (Keates, 2010); however, it may also represent a desire to reject traditional forms of travel and reduce overall consumption. Future research should explore whether anti-consumption motivations support such behaviours or alternative market structures.

Public policy makers charged with encouraging consumers to reduce their consumption and thus move to more sustainable consumption, should recognise that a variety of motivations may underlie desired behaviours, not simply altruistic motivations. In this regard, the results of this study could be used by toy libraries themselves to more effectively target toy library users. For example, toy libraries could communicate to Socialites the social benefits of participating in a toy library. Conversely, by recognising that these social aspects are not as important to Passive Members, toy library members in this group may find it desirable to pay a higher subscription fee if it allowed them to forgo toy library duties. However, before undertaking social marketing campaigns to encourage consumption reduction, formative research will be necessary to understand the full range

of relevant motivations and to accurately target each motivational group, as suggested by the findings of this study.

Biographical notes

Lucie Ozanne is a Senior Lecturer in Marketing at the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand. Lucie's current research interests include corporate environmental responsibility and alternative forms of consumption. Recent research publications have appeared in the *Journal of Business Ethics* and the *Journal of Business Research*.

Paul Ballantine is a Senior Lecturer in Marketing at the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand. He was formerly based at the University of Auckland, before returning to his home city of Christchurch. His research interests include retailing, consumption behaviour (particularly the negative aspects of consumption), and social and ethical issues in marketing.

References

- Bagozzi RP. 1978. Marketing as exchange: a theory of transactions in the marketplace. *American Behavioral Sciences* **21**: 535-556.
- Belk R. 2007. Why not share rather than own? *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **611**(1): 126-140.
- Belk R. 2010. Sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research* **36**: 715-734.
- Brodin J, Bjorck-Akesson E. 1992. Toy libraries/Lekoteks in an international perspective. *Euro-Rehab* **2**: 97-102.
- Capacity and Play Matters. 2007. *Toy Libraries: Their Benefits for Children, Families and Communities*. Capacity and Play Matters: London.
- Cherrier H. 2009. Anti-consumption discourses and consumer-resistant identities. *Journal of Business Research* **62**(2): 181-190.
- Craig-Lees M. 2006. Anti-consumption: concept clarification and changing consumption behavior. *Paper presented at the anti-consumption seminar*, International Centre for Anti-

- Consumption Research, 20–21 June, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Craig-Lees M, Hill C. 2002. Understanding voluntary simplifiers. *Psychology & Marketing* **19**(2): 187–210.
- Cronbach L. 1951. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika* **16**(3): 297–334.
- Dobscha S. 1998. The lived experience of consumer rebellion against marketing. *Advances in Consumer Research* **25**: 91–97.
- Fournier S. 1998. Consumer resistance: societal motivations, consumer manifestations, and implications in the marketing domain. *Advances in Consumer Research* **25**: 88–90.
- Funches V, Markley M, Davis L. 2009. Reprisal, retribution and requital: investigating customer retaliation. *Journal of Business Research* **62**(2): 231–238.
- Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson RE, Tatham RL. 2006. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Pearson Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Herrmann R. 1993. The tactics of consumer resistance: group action and marketplace exit. *Advances in Consumer Research* **20**: 130–134.
- Hoffmann S, Muller S. 2009. Consumer boycotts due to factory relocation. *Journal of Business Research* **62**(2): 239–247.
- Huneke ME. 2005. The face of the un-consumer: an empirical examination of the practice of voluntary simplicity in the United States. *Psychology & Marketing* **22**(7): 527–550.
- Iyer R, Muncy J. 2009. Purpose and object of anti-consumption. *Journal of Business Research* **62**(2): 160–168.
- Keates N. 2010. Easyrider, *Wall Street Journal*, 29 April. Available at: <http://magazine.wsj.com/features/big-trip/easy-rider/>
- Kotler P. 1972. A generic concept of marketing. *Journal of Marketing* **36**: 46–54.
- Kozinets RV, Handelman JM. 2004. Adversaries of consumption: consumer movements, activism, and ideology. *Journal of Consumer Research* **31**: 691–704.
- Lastovicka JL, Bettencourt LA, Hughner RS, Kuntze RJ. 1999. Lifestyle of the tight and frugal: theory and measurement. *Journal of Consumer Research* **26**: 85–98.
- Lee MSW, Fernandez KV, Hyman MR. 2009a. Anti-consumption: an overview and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research* **62**(2): 145–147.
- Lee MSW, Motion J, Conroy D. 2009b. Anti-consumption and brand avoidance. *Journal of Business Research* **62**(2): 169–180.
- Milligan GW. 1980. An examination of the effect of six types of error perturbation on fifteen clustering algorithms. *Psychometrika* **45**(3): 325–342.
- Moore JE. 1995. A history of toy lending libraries in the united states since 1935. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*, Kent State University.
- Nelson MR, Rademacher MA, Paek H-J. 2007. Downshifting consumer = upshifting citizen? An examination of a local freecycle community. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **611**(1): 141–156.
- Nielsen IK, Jex SM, Adams GA. 2000. Development and validation of scores on a two-dimensional workplace friendship scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* **60**(4): 628–643.
- Ozanne LK, Ozanne JL. 2009. Parental mediation of the market's influence on their children: toy libraries as safe havens. *Paper presented at the Academy of Marketing*, Leeds, UK, 7–9 July.
- Penaloza L, Price L. 2003. Consumer resistance: a conceptual overview. *Advances in Consumer Research* **20**: 123–128.
- Peterson NA, Speer PW, McMillan DW. 2008. Validation of a brief sense of community scale: confirmation of the principal theory of sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology* **36**(1): 61–73.
- Ritson M, Dobscha S. 1999. Marketing heretics: resistance is/is not futile. *Advances in Consumer Research* **26**: 159.
- Rumbo J. 2002. Consumer resistance in a world of advertising clutter: the case of Adbusters. *Psychology & Marketing* **19**(2): 127–148.
- Sandikci O, Ekici A. 2009. Politically motivated brand rejection. *Journal of Business Research* **62**(2): 208–217.

- Shaw D, Newholm T. 2002. Voluntary simplicity and the ethics of consumption. *Psychology & Marketing* 19(2): 167-185.
- Toy Library Federation. 2010. Press Release. Available at: <http://toylibrary.co.nz/media.pdf> [7 May 2010].
- Ward S, Wackman D. 1971. Family and media influences on adolescent consumer learning. *American Behavioral Scientist* 14: 415-427.
- Zavestoski S. 2002. Guest editorial: anti-consumption attitudes. *Psychology & Marketing* 19(2): 121-126.