

## Role of Environmental Ethics and Values in Pro-environment Consumer Behaviour

**Neelam Rathee**

Post Graduate Government College for Girls, Chandigarh

**Jasleen Kour**

Panjab University, Chandigarh.

The present study explores into the nature of pro-environment behaviours, environmental ethics and environmental values among young adults with a view that resonates with the idea that younger generation has greater stake in long term sustainability. Pro-environment behaviour refers to actions that result out of environment friendly attitudes. Since, values and ethics both represent fundamental principles that guide behaviours, the study also studies these as predictors of recurring pro-environment behaviour. Significant positive correlations were observed between environmental ethics and recurring pro-environment behaviour; environmental ethics and ethically minded consumer behaviour; biospheric values and recurring pro-environment and biospheric values and ethically minded consumer behavior. Environmental ethics and biospheric values were also found to be significant predictors of pro-environment behaviour and ethically minded consumer behaviour. The study provides perspective to see values and ethics as a prescription for reducing the mindless consumerism in our society.

**Keywords:** Environmental ethics, ethically minded consumer behaviour, pro-environment behaviour, values.

A recent report of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change urged all sections of society to make rapid and comprehensive changes to avert the catastrophic outcomes of climate change (Calvin et al., 2023). Role of consumers and human lifestyle has been widely discussed as a crucial factor behind environmental sustainability. In India, it can be said that the widespread concern for environment sustainability is quite recent. The so called “developed countries”, until recently, have enormously exploited nature for commercial purposes. Environment problems have also come to challenge our ethical and value systems (Jamieson, 2008). While consumers have shown concern for environment by making changes in their lifestyle, marketers have also made a green shift by providing consumers with sustainable choices.

The concept of responsible consumption first emerged in 1990s (Fisk, 1973). Managing environmental crisis call for bringing about a change in behaviours that lead to such problems, at the first place. Consumption patterns need to be studied to identify the lacks in as well as stimulate conservation or conscious behaviours related to environment. Another interesting theme to environment protection is the role values and ethics. Rights based approach plays an equal role towards responsible consumption. It was first initiated under Stockholm Declaration at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in the year 1972 (United Nations, n.d.). Because youth have greater stake in long term sustainability, it is believed that they must take lead environment protection (UN, 2004). As one of the change agents, young can adopt

pro-environmental behaviours through routine activities like riding to school or college, opting for cloth bags and reusing them, sorting rubbish or even through studying about environmental issues. The present study explores into the nature of pro-environment behaviours, environmental ethics, and environmental values among young adults in promoting positive environment behaviour. Pro-environment consumer behaviour is driven by ethical considerations premised on sustainability before purchase, during and after consumption (Joshi & Rahman, 2015).

### **Pro-environment behaviour**

To put it simply, pro-environment behaviour refers to any responsible behaviour that occurs keeping in mind the sustainability of the environment. Two types of pro-environment are discussed in environment literature, private sphere and public sphere. Private sphere behaviours vary among acts of using or disposing things in an eco-friendly manner and green consumerism that is, buying or boycotting certain products for environment reasons (Stern, 1999). Public sphere behaviours mainly includes policy making and activism for the sake of the environment (Stern, 1999). Pro-environment behaviour originates from positive attitudes towards environment and gets turned into action when supported by intentions. Theories like theory of planned behaviour and value belief norm theory have all been drawn on same paradigm (Ajzen, 1991; Stern et al.1999). These theories contest interplay of mainly two types factors behind pro-environment behaviour, namely, extrinsic and intrinsic factors. Extrinsic factor can include financial capacity and time constraints and intrinsic factor involve consumer's values, education and attitudes (Joseph, 2019). Sharma & Bansal (2013) showed empirical evidence for attitude action gap by studying both these factors. They found that intrinsic factors do not impact

actual behaviour immensely and extrinsic factors are equally important. Many perspectives have been amassed on pro-environment consumer behaviour, for instance, green consumption under the green viewpoint, morally conscientious consumption under the social perspective, and ethically minded consumer behaviour with a focus on consumer ethics (Roberts, 1995; Sudbury-Riley & Kohlbacher, 2016; Vitell & Muncy, 1992; Kim et al., 2012; Gleim et al., 2013).

### **Environmental values**

Desirable effect of value orientation on pro-environmental behaviour has been discussed broadly (Bouman et al., 2018; de Groot and Steg, 2007). Values are often looked upon as relatively stable and constant goals which vary in degree of importance and guiding force in one's life (Schwartz, 1994). Personally relevant values often find an edge over the irrelevant ones in situations where two conflicting values arise (de Groot and Steg, 2007). It can be said that values act as an important antecedent of behaviour may explain individual differences.

Four major types of values have been discussed related to environment related behaviours, hedonic, altruistic, biospheric and egoistic (Stern et al., 1998; De Groot and Steg, 2008; Steg et al., 2014). These values have been first identified by Shwartz (1994) as either being value of self-transcendence (biospheric and altruistic) or self enhancement (hedonic and egoistic). Biospheric values echo a concern of environment without considering any benefits to humans. Altruistic value showcases care for other people and fair treatment. Egoistic value focuses on cost benefit analysis in decision making related to power and achievement. Hedonic value aim at pleasure, limiting hard work and positive feelings. People with hedonic or egoistic value show less eco-friendly behaviours than those with

biospheric or altruistic value (Schwartz, 1994; Stern et al., 1998; de Groot & Steg, 2008; Schwartz et al., 2012; Steg et al., 2014).

The promotion of pro-environmental ideas, norms, and behaviours may be significantly influenced by biospheric values. The intrinsic worth of the environment and nature is emphasised by biospheric values. Nordlund & Garvill (2002) argue that of all the values, biospheric values are most strongly positively related to pro-environment behaviour. All PEBs involve personal cost for the benefits of nature and society. These values lead to behaviour even on the face of personal costs. Biospheric values motivate people to act pro-environmentally, even when the behavior is somewhat costly (Steg et al., 2014). For instance, people with biospheric values recycle more, eat less meat and choose eco-friendly transport options and adopt green energy appliances at home (van der Werff & Steg, 2016).

### **Environmental Ethics**

Environment ethics emerged as a new sub discipline of philosophy in 1970s, contesting against the traditional anthropocentrism. Literature on environment ethics distinguishes between nature's intrinsic and instrumental value. It argues that best way to conserve the nature is by believing it has intrinsic value and not treat it as a means to achieve some other ends. We should protect it for its own sake. Bordeau (2004) also suggests a pragmatic approach to environment ethics by prioritising primary human needs followed by needs of other living organisms and nature. Secondary human needs should not be prioritized over needs of nature.

Environmental ethics talk about responsible or ethical consumption. It refers to conscious consumption with due consideration to ethics and social issues. After investigating plethora of studies the term is rampant with few major themes. Some of

them are, environment related behaviour and issues, social justice and human rights issues (Gilg et al., 2005; Kim and Choi, 2005; Niva and Timonen, 2001). Apart from these typical issues, it also includes issues related to animals and local community (Megicks et al., 2008; Carrigan et al., 2011; Grau and Garretsen Folse, 2007; Mattingly and Berman, 2006). Another widely used theme under ethical consumption is boycotting or refusing to buy certain products (Carrigan et al., 2004). Main reason for boycotting is found to be lack of corporate social responsibility. Boycotting is more prevalent than buying a product for ethical reasons (Trudel and Cotte, 2008.) Another central theme of ethical consumption is the readiness to pay more for eco-friendly ethical products (Riley and Kolbacher, 2015).

### **Environment values, Ethics and Pro-environment behaviour**

Values and their impact on pro-environmental behaviours has widely been discussed, for instance, it is said to predict willingness to accept policies related to environment conservation, reduce car usage, increase social environmentalism and citizenship (Nilsson et al., 2004; Nordlund and Garvill, 2003; van Riper et al., 2019). Based on these finding different values have different impact on environment. Biospheric values have been found to be positively correlated to positive environment behaviours while egoistic values have been found to be negatively correlated with positive environment behaviours (de Groot and Steg, 2008; Nordlund and Garvill, 2003). Biospheric values emphasize the intrinsic value of nature and the environment. Ethics are more abstract and broad term than values and apply to general human-nature interaction (Manning, 1999). Manning (1999) studied the impact of both on attitudes towards behaviour like forest management and found that values and ethics explained 60 percent of variation in attitudes. Aziz et

al. (2021) also explored the theory of planned action and found ethics to indirectly impact pro- environment behaviour through norms and intentions. The interplay of ethics and behaviour was further explained by Batavia et al. (2020) where he argues that ethics relate to our moral obligations and help humans to engage in less damaging behaviours. On the basis of the review of literature, following hypotheses have been formulated.

### Objectives

1. To study the relationship among environment ethics, values, recurring pro-environment behaviour and ethically minded consumer behaviour.
2. To investigate whether environment ethics and environment values are predictors of pro-environment consumer behaviour.
3. To study whether environment ethics and environment values are predictors of ethically minded consumer behaviour.

### Method

#### Sample

The study was carried out on 150 young adults (male and females both) within the age group of 20-30 years. The sample was selected randomly using online and offline mode for data collection. Subjects were administered self-report measures. Two subjects' responses were incomplete, hence were dropped from the data analysis. Informed consent was taken from the participants. Participation was voluntary, anonymous, and conducted following ethical approvals.

#### Tools

The following scales were used in the study for data collection-

*Recurring Pro-environmental Behaviour Scale (REBS)*: The scale was developed by

Brick, Sherman, and Kim in 2017. The REBS consists of 20 items that measure a range of pro-environmental behaviours, such as recycling, using public transportation, reducing energy consumption, and buying environmentally friendly products. The scale is designed to measure both the frequency and the consistency of these behaviours over time. It has been found to be a reliable and valid measure of pro-environmental behaviour, with good internal consistency and test-retest reliability. It has also been shown to be related to other measures of environmental concern, such as environmental attitudes and values.

*The Ethically Minded Consumer Behaviour Scale (EMCBS)*: This scale measures individuals' ethical consumption behaviours and was developed by Riley and Kohlbacher in 2016. The EMCBS consists of 23 items that measure a range of ethical consumption behaviours, such as purchasing fair trade products, choosing environmentally friendly products, and supporting companies that treat their employees fairly. The EMCBS has the potential to be a useful tool for researchers and practitioners interested in understanding and promoting ethical consumption behaviour. It can be used to measure the effectiveness of interventions aimed at promoting such behaviour and to identify individuals who may need additional support in adopting ethical consumption behaviours.

*Environment Ethics Scale (ESS)*: The scale was developed by Haseen Taj in to measure social responsibility with respect to consequences of one's consumption. The measure consists of 45 items split over items measuring favourable and unfavourable ethics for environment. The items are based on 3-point Likert scale.

*Environmental-Portrait Value Questionnaire*: The scale is developed by Bouman et al., (2018) based on Schwartz

typologies (Shwartz, 1992). The questionnaire is based on a 7-point Likert scale where 1=(overall not like me) to 7=(very much like me). The measure consists of four main types of values, namely, biospheric (EPVQ\_B), altruistic (EPVQ\_A), egocentric (EPVQ\_E) and hedonistic (EPVQ\_H). Each sub-scale has an acceptable reliability ranging from (0.81 to 0.90).

### Results

After analysis of the data, the results were analysed. Descriptive statistics are shown in the Table 1. There were no missing values and outliers in the data. The scores were normally distributed and homogeneity of variance was established.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (N=150)

Variables	Mean	S.D.
Environment ethics	123.04	10.034
Environment value	83.67	8.644
Recurring Pro Environment Behaviour	36.14	6.875
Ethically Minded Consumer Behaviour	71.14	8.991

A Pearson bivariate correlation analysis was conducted to examine the associations among environment ethics, environmental values, recurring pro-environmental behaviour (PEB), and ethically minded consumer behaviour (ECB) (Table 2a). Environment ethics showed a significant positive correlation with PEB ( $r = .417, p < .01$ ) and with ECB ( $r = .501, p < .01$ ), indicating that stronger ethical orientation toward the environment is associated with greater engagement in daily pro-environmental actions and ethical consumer practices. As expected, PEB and ECB were moderately and significantly correlated ( $r = .471, p < .01$ ), indicating that individuals who frequently perform everyday pro-environmental behaviours also tend to make ethically oriented consumer choices.

Table 2a. Intercorrelations for environment ethics, values, recurring pro-environment behaviour and ethically minded consumer behaviour.

Variables	Eth	Val	PEB	ECB
Environment ethics(Eth)	1.00	-.141	.417**	.501**
Environment value(Val)		1.00	.134	.072
Recurring Pro-Environment Behaviour (PEB)			1.00	.471**
Ethically Minded Consumer Behaviour (ECB)				1.00

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$

Table 2b. Intercorrelations for environment ethics, biospheric values, recurring pro-environment behaviour and ethically minded consumer behaviour.

Variables	Eth	Bio Val	PEB	ECB
Environment ethics(Eth)	1.00	.387**	.417**	.501**
Biopsheric value (Bio val)		1.00	.369**	.373**
Recurring Pro Environment Behaviour(PEB)			1.00	.471**
Ethically Minded Consumer Behaviour(ECB)				1.00

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$

Environmental values demonstrated weak, non-significant correlations with both PEB ( $r = .134$ ) and ECB ( $r = .072$ ). The correlation between environment ethics and environmental values was negative but non-significant ( $r = -.141$ ), the reason being the environment values measure included items for four different types of values, namely, biospheric, altruistic, egocentric and hedonistic, which didn't pertain to environment only. Whereas, biospheric values positively significantly correlated with environment ethics ( $r = .387, p < .01$ ), PEB ( $r = .369, p < .01$ ) and ECB ( $r = .373, p < .01$ ) (Table2b). Therefore only biospheric values were used for further analysis.

A hierarchical linear regression was conducted to examine the predictors of recurring pro-environmental behaviour (PEB) and Ethically Minded Consumer Behaviour (ECB). Table 3a shows that environmental ethics significantly predicted recurring pro-environmental behaviour in Model 1, accounting for 17.4% of the variance ( $R^2 = .174, p < .001$ ). Adding environmental (biospheric) values in Model 2 significantly improved the model, increasing explained variance to 22.5% ( $R^2 = .225$ ), with a significant  $R^2$  change of .051 ( $p = .003$ ). This shows that both ethics and values

contribute to predicting pro-environmental behaviour.

The standardized regression coefficients further clarify the relative contribution of each predictor to recurring pro-environmental behaviour (Table 3b). Environmental ethics was a significant positive predictor of recurring pro-environmental behaviour ( $\hat{\alpha} = .417, p < .001$ ). After adding environmental values, they also emerged as a significant predictor ( $\hat{\alpha} = .244, p = .003$ ). Ethics had the stronger effect, but both predictors uniquely contributed to explaining behaviour.

Table 3a. Linear regression for recurring pro-environment behaviour

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.417 <sup>a</sup>	.174	.168	6.270	.174	30.759	1	146	<.001
2	.474 <sup>b</sup>	.225	.214	6.095	.051	9.468	1	145	.003

Table 3b. Beta Coefficients of predictors of recurring pro-environment behaviour

Coefficients <sup>a</sup> Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	.974	6.362		.153	.879
Ethics	.286	.052	.417	5.546	<.001
2 (Constant)	-5.521	6.535		-.845	.400
BioValues	.656	.213	.244	3.077	.003

a. Dependent Variable: Pro Environment Behaviour

Further the predictors of ethically minded consumer behaviour (ECB) were examined in a second regression analysis (Table 4a & 4b). In Model 1, environmental ethics was entered as the sole predictor and significantly predicted ECB,  $F(1, 146) = 48.99, p < .001$ , explaining 25.1% of the variance ( $R^2 = .251$ ). In Model 2, environmental values were added to the model and produced a significant improvement, increasing the explained variance to 28.9% ( $R^2 = .289$ ;  $\Delta R^2 =$

.038),  $F$  change(1, 145) = 7.68,  $p = .006$  (Table 4a).

The standardized coefficients showed that environmental ethics was a strong, significant predictor of ECB ( $\hat{\alpha} = .501, p < .001$ ). After adding environmental values, they also emerged as a significant predictor ( $\hat{\alpha} = .210, p = .006$ ). Although ethics remained the stronger predictor, both variables contributed uniquely to explaining ethically minded consumer behaviour.

Table 4a. Linear regression for ethically minded consumer behaviour

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.501 <sup>a</sup>	.251	.246	7.807	.251	48.988	1	146	<.001
2	.537 <sup>b</sup>	.289	.279	7.634	.038	7.681	1	145	.006

Dependent Variable: Consumer Behaviour

a. Predictors: (Constant), Ethics

b. Predictors: (Constant), Ethics, BioValues

Table 4b. Beta Coefficients of predictors of ethically minded consumer behaviour

Coefficients <sup>a</sup> Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	15.872	7.922		2.004	.047
1 Ethics	.449	.064	.501	6.999	<.001
2 (Constant)	8.546	8.185		1.044	.298
2 BioValues	.740	.267	.210	2.771	.006

a. Dependent Variable: Consumer Behaviour

### Discussion

The present study examined the role of environmental ethics and environmental values in predicting two important domains of pro-environmental engagement: recurring pro-environmental behaviour (PEB) and ethically minded consumer behaviour (ECB). Multiple studies have been conducted to study the antecedents of pro-environment behaviour (PEB), for instance, Hines et al. (1987) presented meta-analysis of 128 studies and discussed various psychosocial factors. Gifford & Nilssen (2014) discussed 18 different types of personal and social factors. Similarly, this study was conducted to study the interrelationship among these variables; environment ethics, environmental values and PEB. Ethically minded consumer behaviour (ECB), a subtype of PEB, was also studied as a separate factor.

Correlations were computed among these four variables and predictors of PEB and ECB

were explored. The results proved that biospheric values and environment ethics significantly influenced both, PEB and ECB. Overall, the findings demonstrate that ethical orientation toward the environment is a strong and consistent predictor of both behavioural outcomes, while environmental values provide additional but comparatively smaller contributions to explaining behavioural variance. These results extend existing literature on psychosocial determinants of pro-environmental behaviour by empirically showing that ethics, beyond values alone, play a central role in motivating environmentally responsible actions.

Individuals with stronger ethical concern for the environment reported higher engagement in routine pro-environmental practices as well as greater commitment toward ethical consumption. These findings reinforce the notion that ethical beliefs shape moral obligations and intentions, which in

turn translate into observable behaviours. The moderate effect sizes observed in both regression models further support the idea that ethics function as an important internalized driver of environmentally responsible action. Environmental values, on the other hand, displayed weaker and non-significant correlations with both behavioural measures. However, when only biospheric values were taken into consideration, they showed strong positive relationship with both PEB and ECB, as well as accounted for additional unique variance in both PEB and ECB. Although the magnitude of this contribution was modest, it suggests that values may operate in conjunction with ethical reasoning, enhancing behavioural consistency once ethical orientation is established. These findings suggest that deeply internalised ethical beliefs exert a more direct influence on behaviour than general value orientations. The significant correlations observed among the four constructs aligns with value-belief-norm frameworks and the Theory of Planned Behaviour, both of which posit that moral appraisals and internal value systems operate as key drivers of sustainable behaviour (Stern, 2000).

The findings of the study are consistent with many earlier studies. The correlation of environment values and ethics has been extensively studied (Schwartz, 1992; McShane, 2007). Values and ethics both represent fundamental principles that guide behaviours (Schwartz, 1992). Many studies, suggest that ethics make the conceptual basis for pro-environment values and impact social perspectives and practices related to the environment. The relationship has been explored through the theory of planned behaviour in plethora of studies (Thøgersen & O'lander, 2002). Stern et al. (1993) argue that ethical consumption is impacted by three types of value orientations; biospheric, altruistic and egoistic. Biospheric values

pertain to caring about nature for its own sake, altruistic values focus on taking care of others and egoistic values pertain to caring about nature for safeguarding our own interest. (Steg et al., 2014). The fourth orientation called as hedonic value has a negative correlation with PEB. Steg et al. (2005) believes that biospheric and altruistic values together can explain the ethical consumption choices that point towards social justice, equality and togetherness with nature. Environment ethics converse about various ways humans must reason out to care for nature. They argue that biospheric value orientation is the best way one can truly connect with nature and respect its needs (McShane, 2007). In all countries, including India, Germany, South Korea, and Israel, the biospheric value type demonstrated a positive and significant link with all measures of environmental behaviour (Katz-Gerro et al., 2017). Cultural values associated to South Asian societies like collectivism and long-term orientation influence the degree of our ascription of responsibility (Awanis et al., 2017). This may further impact one's willingness to make changes involving personal sacrifices.

Ethical consumption is also said to be one of the many dimensions of pro-environment behaviour explaining the positive correlation between PEB and ECB. Ethical consumption incorporates considerations of the both, the environment and the human welfare. The results also resonate with cross-national evidence indicating that environmental ethics consistently predict sustainable behaviour across cultural contexts, including collectivistic societies such as India (Katz-Gerro et al., 2017; Awanis et al., 2017). The results also highlight conceptual differences between recurring PEB and ECB. While both behaviours were moderately correlated, ECB exhibited stronger associations with environmental ethics and a higher proportion of explained variance. This may be because

consumption decisions often involve moral evaluations, trade-offs, and deliberation, making ethical reasoning particularly salient. In contrast, recurring PEB may rely more on habitual or contextual factors not captured in the present study, such as convenience, access, or social norms. Recently, consumer behaviour related to environment, that is getting popular is “boycotting” some products because they damage environment (Carrigan et al., 2004). Recycling has been the most common consumer behaviour among European households (Dinu et al., 2020). Biospheric values have also been found to be well correlated to recycling, use of energy efficient modes of transportation (van der Werff et al., 2014). These values motivate people to engage in different forms of environmental activism, save water and eat less meat (Thøgersen & Ölander, 2002; Stern et al., 1999; Steg et al., 2014b; Steg et al., 2011). Biospheric values have been found to predict pro-environment behaviour via self-identity (Wang et al., 2021). Environmental self-identity indicates the extent an individual sees himself to be engaged in environmentally friendly behaviour (van der Werff et al., 2013).

Overall, the findings of this study highlight the primacy of environment ethics in shaping environmentally responsible actions and suggest that environment values, while important, may operate more indirectly through biospheric values-driven identity processes. They also imply that interventions aimed at enhancing pro-environmental engagement should incorporate ethical framing rather than relying solely on value-based appeals. Strengthening individuals’ moral connection with the environment—through education, ethical reasoning, community dialogue, or exposure to ecological consequences—may be more effective in promoting both everyday sustainable actions and ethically oriented consumer choices. At the same time,

cultivating environmental values may serve as a supportive foundation that reinforces ethical decision-making.

### **Limitations and Suggestions**

Despite its contributions, the study has limitations that warrant consideration. The reliance on self-report measures may introduce social desirability bias, and the cross-sectional design restricts causal interpretations. Future research should continue exploring additional factors and mechanisms—such as environmental identity, emotions, and situational barriers—to further deepen our understanding of what drives sustainable behaviour.

### **Conclusion**

By emphasising the moral dimensions of environmental behaviour, this research emphasizes that although values matter, their influence becomes more meaningful when guided by ethical principles. Environmental knowledge remains one of the essential antecedents of conscious consumption. The findings underscore the need for ethically grounded environmental education, policy framing, and behavioural interventions. By strengthening individuals’ ethical connection to the environment, society can foster more consistent and meaningful pro-environmental engagement. Curran & Sherbinin (2004) proposed values can also be incorporated in marketing strategies to create awareness and product-design. It is also proposed that ethics and values can help overcome the ‘green gap’, the difference between environmental concern and pro-environmental behaviour. Nevertheless, likelihood of other mediating factors must not be ruled out.

“You cannot get through a single day without having an impact on the world around you. What you do makes a difference and you have to decide what kind of a difference you want to make.” ~ Jane Goodall

## References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Awanis, S., Schlegelmilch, B. B., & Cui, C. C. (2017). Asia's materialists: Reconciling collectivism and materialism. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(8), 964-991.
- Aziz, F., Md Rami, A. A., Zaremohzzabieh, Z., & Ahrari, S. (2021). Effects of emotions and ethics on pro-environmental behavior of university employees: A model based on the theory of planned behavior. *Sustainability*, 13(13), 7062.
- Batavia, C., Bruskotter, J. T., & Nelson, M. P. (2020). Pathways from environmental ethics to pro-environmental behaviours? Insights from psychology. *Environmental Values*, 29(3), 317-337.
- Bouman, T., Steg, L., & Kiers, H. A. (2018). Measuring values in environmental research: A test of an environmental portrait value questionnaire. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 564.
- Bourdeau, P. (2004). The man-nature relationship and environmental ethics. *Journal of environmental radioactivity*, 72(1-2), 9-15.
- Calvin, K., et al. (2023). *IPCC, 2023: Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, H. Lee and J. Romero (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.* <https://doi.org/10.59327/ipcc/ar6-9789291691647>
- Carrigan, M., Szmigin, I., & Wright, J. (2004). Shopping for a better world? An interpretive study of the potential for ethical consumption within the older market. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 21(6), 401-417.
- Carrington, M. J., Zwick, D., & Neville, B. A. (2016). The ideology of the ethical consumption gap. *Marketing Theory*, 16(1), 21-38.
- Clayton, S. D. (Ed.). (2012). *The Oxford handbook of environmental and conservation psychology*. Oxford University Press.
- De Groot, J. I., & Steg, L. (2007). Value orientations and environmental beliefs in five countries: Validity of an instrument to measure egoistic, altruistic and biospheric value orientations. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 38(3), 318-332.
- De Groot, J. I., & Steg, L. (2008). Value orientations to explain beliefs related to environmental significant behavior: How to measure egoistic, altruistic, and biospheric value orientations. *Environment and behavior*, 40(3), 330-354.
- Dinu, M., Pătărlăgeanu, S. R., Petrariu, R., Constantin, M., & Potcovaru, A. M. (2020). Empowering sustainable consumer behavior in the EU by consolidating the roles of waste recycling and energy productivity. *Sustainability*, 12(23), 9794.
- Fisk, G. (1973). Criteria for a theory of responsible consumption. *Journal of Marketing* 32(2): 24-31
- Harland, P., Staats, H., & Wilke, H. A. (1999). Explaining proenvironmental intention and behavior by personal norms and the Theory of Planned Behavior<sup>1</sup>. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 29(12), 2505-2528.
- Gifford, R., & Nilsson, A. (2014). Personal and social factors that influence pro-environmental concern and behaviour: a review. *International journal of psychology : Journal internationale de psychologie*, 49(3), 141-157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12034>
- Gilg, A., Barr, S., & Ford, N. (2005). Green consumption or sustainable lifestyles? Identifying the sustainable consumer. *Futures*, 37(6), 481-504.
- Gleim, M. R., Smith, J. S., Andrews, D., & Cronin Jr, J. J. (2013). Against the green: A multi-method examination of the barriers to green consumption. *Journal of Retailing*, 89(1), 44-61.

- Grau, S. L., & Folse, J. A. G. (2007). Cause-related marketing (CRM): The influence of donation proximity and message-framing cues on the less-involved consumer. *Journal of advertising*, 36(4), 19-33.
- Hines, J. M., Hungerford, H. R., & Tomera, A. N. (1987). Analysis and Synthesis of Research on Responsible Environmental Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 18(2), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.1987.9943482>
- Jamieson, D. (2008). *Ethics and the environment: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Joshi, Y., & Rahman, Z. (2015). Factors affecting green purchase behaviour and future directions. *International Strategic Management Review*, 3, 128-143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ism.2015.04.001>
- Katz-Gerro, T., Greenspan, I., Handy, F., & Lee, H. Y. (2017). The relationship between value types and environmental behaviour in four countries: Universalism, benevolence, conformity and biospheric values revisited. *Environmental Values*, 26(2), 223-249.
- Kim, Y., & Choi, S. M. (2005). Antecedents of green purchase behavior: An examination of collectivism, environmental concern, and PCE. *ACR North American Advances*.
- Kim, S. Y., Yeo, J., Sohn, S. H., Rha, J. Y., Choi, S., Choi, A. Y., & Shin, S. (2012). Toward a composite measure of green consumption: an exploratory study using a Korean sample. *Journal of family and economic issues*, 33, 199-214.
- Manning, R., Valliere, W., & Minter, B. (1999). Values, ethics, and attitudes toward national forest management: An empirical study. *Society & Natural Resources*, 12(5), 421-436.
- Mattingly, J. E., & Berman, S. L. (2006). Measurement of corporate social action: Discovering taxonomy in the Kinder Lydenburg Domini ratings data. *Business & Society*, 45(1), 20-46.
- Megicks, P., Memery, J., & Williams, J. (2008). Influences on ethical and socially responsible shopping: evidence from the UK grocery sector. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(5-6), 637-659.
- Nilsson, A., von Borgstede, C., & Biel, A. (2004). Willingness to accept climate change strategies: The effect of values and norms. *Journal of environmental psychology*, 24(3), 267-277.
- Niva, M., & Timonen, P. (2001). The role of consumers in product oriented environmental policy: can the consumer be the driving force for environmental improvements?. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 25(4), 331-338.
- Nordlund, A. M., & Garvill, J. (2002). Value structures behind proenvironmental behavior. *Environment and behavior*, 34(6), 740-756.
- Roberts, J.A. (1995). Profiling levels of socially responsible consumer behavior: a cluster analytic approach and its implications for marketing. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*. 3(4), 97-117.
- Samarasinghe, D. S. (2012). Green consumerism: Individual's ethics and politics as predictors of pro-environmental behaviour. *Delhi Business Review*, 13(1), 41-48.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 19-45.
- Steg, L., Dreijerink, L., & Abrahamse, W. (2005). Factors influencing the acceptability of energy policies: A test of VBN theory. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25(4), 415-425.
- Steg, L., De Groot, J. I., Dreijerink, L., Abrahamse, W., & Siero, F. (2011). General antecedents of personal norms,

- policy acceptability, and intentions: The role of values, worldviews, and environmental concern. *Society and Natural Resources*, 24(4), 349-367.
- Steg, L., Perlaviciute, G., Van der Werff, E., & Lurvink, J. (2014). The significance of hedonic values for environmentally relevant attitudes, preferences, and actions. *Environment and behavior*, 46(2), 163-192.
- Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., & Kalof, L. (1993). Value orientations, gender, and environmental concern. *Environment and Behavior*, 25(5), 322-348
- Stern, P. C., & Dietz, T. (1994). The value basis of environmental concern. *Social Issues*, 50(3), 65-84.
- Stern, P. C. (2000). Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(3), 407-424.
- Sudbury-Riley L, Kohlbacher F. (2016). Ethically minded consumer behavior: Scale review, development, and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8),2697–2710.
- Thøgersen, J. and O'lander, F. (2002), "Human values and the emergence of a sustainable consumption pattern: a panel study", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 23 (5), 605-30.
- Trudel, R., & Cotte, J. (2008). Does being ethical pay. *Wall Street Journal*, 1.
- United Nations. (2004). *World Youth Report, 2003: The Global Situation of Young People*. UN.
- United Nations. (n.d.). *United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm 1972, United Nations* <https://www.un.org/en/conferences/environment/stockholm1972>.
- Van der Werff, E., Steg, L., & Keizer, K. (2014). I am what I am, by looking past the present: The influence of biospheric values and past behavior on environmental self-identity. *Environment and behavior*, 46(5), 626-657.
- Vitell, S. J., & Muncy, J. (1992). Consumer ethics: An empirical investigation of factors influencing ethical judgments of the final consumer. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 585-597.
- Wang, X., Van der Werff, E., Bouman, T., Harder, M. K., & Steg, L. (2021). I am vs. we are: how biospheric values and environmental identity of individuals and groups can influence pro-environmental behaviour. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 618956.

**Neelam Rathee**, PhD., Associate Professor & Head, Department of Psychology, Post Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector – 11, Chandigarh. Email: neelamrathee@hotmail.com

**Jasleen Kour**, Research Scholar, SRF, Department of Psychology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.