

# MILLENNIAL PERCEPTION TOWARDS THE PURCHASE DECI-SIONS OF GREEN PRODUCTS – A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY



Check for updates

Dr. K. Vasuki<sup>1</sup> <sup>I</sup>, Dr. K. Shoba<sup>2</sup> <sup>I</sup> ond Dr. V. Balaji<sup>3</sup> <sup>I</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor & Head, Department of Commerce, Sir Theagaraya College, Chennai, 600 021, India
 <sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor of Commerce, Sir Theagaraya College, Chennai, 600 021, India
 <sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Sir Theagaraya College, Chennai, 600 021, India



The study is executed to assess the millennial perception towards the purchase decisions of green products in Chennai city. The study used both primary and secondary data. The secondary data obtained through research articles, magazines, and daily newspapers. The primary data was gathered from the millennial that are purchasing the green products in Chennai city. The sample size of the study is 591. A simple convenience sampling method was used. The study found that the factors i.e., Environmentally Friendly, Environmental Responsibility, Healthy, Natural products, and environmentally protection, and Social Appeal significantly influenced green products' purchase decisions among the millennial in the study region. The study also originates that there is significant difference among the age group of millennials concerning the purchase decisions of green products certain aspects like Environmentally friendly, and Healthy. The study results also exhibited that the male and female millennial have similar perception on purchase of green products in the study region.

Keywords: Green Products, Millennial, Purchase Decisions

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

Humans have a natural sense of attachment to wild things Babu et al. (2021). People groups are centered on shoppers the all through the latest decade, client use of work and items has extended hugely across the world. It leads fatigue of natural resources and ruthless environmental damage Joshi and Rahman (2015). The solemn repercussion of ecological harm is worldwide warming, increased environmental pollution, and refuse in plants and fauna Chen and Chai (2010). Many nations universal beginning to appreciate this risk and have initiated working on decrease the dangerous impact on trade activities on the surroundings. This comprehension and apprehension on the environment and civilization have led to appearance of 'sus-

Received 5 June 2021 Accepted 17 June 2021 Published 30 June 2021

Corresponding Author Dr. K. Vasuki, vasukihodstc@gmail .com

#### DOI 10.29121/ granthaalayah.v9.i6.2021.4008

**Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Copyright:** © 2021 The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.



tainable development, it highlights the need to encourage sustainability the structure of development that diminishes the unenthusiastic impact on surroundings and civilization. Sustainable growth additional supports eco-modernism and green consumption. Eco modernism focuses on include ecological sustainability practices at any phase of creating services Veleva and Ellenbecker (2001). 'Green consumption' is generally transmitted to environmentally responsible consumption. The consumers consider the environmental influence of purchase, using, and disposing of assorted products or using different green services Moisander (2007). Due to enhancing the awareness level of global warming, consumers preferred to consume green products. In the course of recent many years, the current circumstance firmly proves that the Environmental issues are expanded because of a worldwide temperature alteration, environmental change, loss of biodiversity, contamination, and consumption of normal assets. Individuals additionally transform into more cognizant about natural issues and changing their conduct for safe environmental factors. Indian buyers in various class items and administrations from naturally generous associations and is getting hard to please in their conduct of procurement in articulations of preference for results of green, nature of item, their vivacious qualities, and their duty in the stores of the item Singh (2013). Green products defined the products manufactured with utilization of toxic mechanism and environmentally cordial process; it specialized the distinguished organization Kumar et al. (2020). The consumers felt that the green products satisfy needs lacking damaging the surroundings and contribute more sustainable globe. The green products are environmentally better-quality and have a low environmental impact. Therefore, the present research focused on assessing the millennial perception on purchase of green products.

# 2. MILLENNIAL PREFERENCES FOR PURCHASE OF GREEN PRODUCTS

The millennial of green products is portrayed the ecological significances of consumption models and suggest to modify their purchase intentions and behavior of utilization for declining the environmental characteristic. The millennial purchase decision originates from being the core subject in the existing study on the behavior of millennial related to green products. The choice to buy supports the green organizations', eating green commodities, and possible to use additional for green products. Mainly two imperative factors are anxiety the purchase decision of green products.

## **2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**

The shoppers willing to purchase eco-accommodating products are likewise able to pay more for such merchandise than basic products. Along these lines, it tends to be inferred that clients' premium to think about eco-accommodating merchandise and their eagerness to suggest others demonstrate an uplifting perspective, though their reluctance to purchase eco-accommodating products whenever estimated higher calls for consideration and ought to be centered around the social advertising efforts pointed toward changing their conduct for eco-accommodating merchandise Ram et al. (2021). Shore up natural stronghold is central reasons for clients to perform earth benevolent in purchasing choices. The clients recognize the obligation of stocks of green in expanding the greatness level of the air, and shopper's exhibit environmental wellbeing by purchasing and claiming results of green. The customers can communicate the accuracy of prevalent level costs of items classification of green advantages recommended by them and develop a positive impression of purchasers' pieces of knowledge.

## 2.2 RESPONSIBILITY OF ENVIRONMENT

The environmental responsibility constrain is related to buyer's commitment level on the safety challenges and personage focuses on attractive the excellence of the impression. Realizing the uncooperative impact of ambiance on consumers know errands for ecological protection. The client motivated by environment believes about the fineness of globe and inhabitants make to be over all connected in environmental fortification. The consumer's environmental uneasiness is sympathy and confidence in the survival of environmental quandary at the character level to perform environmentally congenial.

#### 2.3 PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF USAGE OF GREEN PRODUCTS

The marketers contemplate on attitudinal issues, they desire to deal organically created food products to developed civilization Boobalan et al. (2021). The Consumers understand green products as a further influential changeable to influence green product business decisions. The clients struggle to study green effects on individuals and improve comprehension related to ingredients of green products Laroche et al. (2001). Moreover, the users share the in turn and familiarity of green products with companions Anand (2011). The product measurement facilitates them to identify the environmental improvements of green items and outcomes productively increasing a disposition towards green items Babu et al. (2021).

## 2.4 SOCIAL APPEAL

Consumers boost and comprehend the connotation of products; the users interrelate with others and gather related sequences Nath et al. (2012). Consumer's portion of a civilization or social group, gain and give to the details, and recognize others consider for scrupulous items Seenivasan et al. (2018) and evaluate the products plinth on the examinations and judgment of others Manaktola and Jauhari (2007). Besides, the buyers are frequently magnetized to the product that improves self-intelligence, and the loom wants to be differentiated by others. Thus, the extensive relevance creates influence in mounting the favorite of products. Nevertheless, users are set to purchase products that go after the perceptions of civilization and construct their

social identities Gurău and Ranchhod (2005). In the society environmental affable, users lengthily distinguish the reputational and fashionable lifestyle method to execute environmentally-friendly Laroche et al. (2001). It has the symbolic connotation of principles, thoughts, and eco-objectives. It shows to important practical conclusions for buyers, i.e., pro-social of reliable, exclusive companion, and position.

## **3. METHODOLOGY**

The study executed to assess the millennial perception towards the purchase decisions of green products in Chennai city. The study used both primary and secondary data. The secondary data obtained through research articles, magazines, and daily newspapers. The primary data was gathered from the millennial that are purchasing the green products in Chennai city. Overall, 600 questionnaires distributed across the Chennai city. Out of 600 responses, nine responses rejected due to inadequate information provided by the respondents. Therefore, 591 samples used for the final study. The study used a convenience sampling method. The responses are collected from the millennial through structured questionnaires. The study used simple frequency distribution, one-sample t-test, and independent t-test, and Analysis of variance (ANOVA).

-		
	Frequency	%
Gender		
Male	315	53.3
Female	276	46.7
Age (Years)		
22-26	171	28.9
27-29	163	27.6
30-34	149	25.2
35-38	108	18.3
Marital Status		
Married	380	64.3
Single	211	35.7
Educational qualific	ation	
Up to HSC	70	11.8
UG	212	35.9
PG	172	29.1
Professional	137	23.2
Monthly Income ( Fa	mily)	
< Rs.40,000	156	26.4
Rs.40,001 - Rs.80,000	227	38.4
Above Rs.80,000	208	35.2

## 4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 MillennialDemographic Profile n=591

Continued on next page

Table 1 continued

Occupational S	Status	
Salaried	234	39.6
Business	140	23.7
Professional	126	21.3
Home maker	91	15.4

Table 1 reveals outcome personal profile of millennial. Out of 591 millennial, majority 315(53.3%) of the millennial are male category, and 276(46.7%) of the millennial are female category. Regarding the age group of millennials, majority 28.9% of the millennial in the age group between 22-26 years. It followed by 27.6% of the millennial between 27-29 years, 25.2% of the millennial 30-34 years, and 18.3% were35-38 years. Marital status concern, 64.3% of the millennial are married, and 35.7% are unmarried. Regarding millennial educational qualification concern, the majority, 35.9% of the millennial educational background, is under-graduates. It is followed by 29.1% of the millennial is post-graduation, 23.2% of the millennial educational background is professional, and 11.8% of the millennial educational background is up to HSC. Regarding the family monthly income, majority 38.4% of the millennial monthly income between Rs.40, 001 - Rs.80, 000, followed by 35.2% of the millennial are above Rs.80, 000, and 26.4% of the millennial educational background is up to Rs.40, 000. Regarding the occupation of millennial, the majority of the millennial are salaried (39.6%), followed by business (23.7%), professional (21.3%), and Homemaker (15.4%).

#### **Hypothesis 1**

The Millennial do not have the positive perception on purchase decisions of green products in the study region

 Table 2 One-sample t-test Results for factors influencing toward the Purchase of decisions of Green Products (n=591)

Factors	Mean	SD	t	р
Environmentally Friendly	3.35	1.332	15.492	<0.001**
Healthy	3.31	1.380	14.204	< 0.001**
Natural products	3.39	1.281	16.902	<0.001**
Environment Protection	3.40	1.272	17.117	<0.001**
Product Recycling	3.29	1.331	14.359	<0.001**
Social Appeal	3.36	1.273	16.404	<0.001**

Table 2 exhibits the results of One-sample t-testresults for factors influencing toward the Purchase of decisions of Green Products. The study results reveals that the t & p-value for predominant factors i.e., Environmentally Friendly (t=15.492 & p=<0.001), Healthy (t=14.204 & p=<0.001), Natural products (16.902 & p=<0.001), environmentally protection (t=14.117 & p=<0.001), Product Recycling (t=14.359 & p=<0.004) and Social Appeal (t=16.404 & p=<0.004). The p-value of entire factor

is <0.01. Therefore, the framed  $H_{0=1}$  rejected and concluded that factors i.e., Environmentally Friendly, Environmental Responsibility, Healthy, Natural products, and environmentally protection, and Social Appeal significantly influenced green products' purchase decisions among the millennial in the study region.

#### **Hypothesis-2**

The Male and Female Millennial have the similar Perception on Purchase Decision of Green Products in the study area

Table 3 Independent t-test Results of Male and Female Millennial have the

similar Porcontion on Purchase Decision of Croon Products

similar Perception on Purchase Decision of Green Products								
	Gender	Ν	Mean	SD	t	р		
<b>Environmentally Friendly</b>	Male	315	3.43	1.258	1.625	.105		
	Female	276	3.25	1.407				
Healthy	Male	315	3.31	1.381	.032	.975		
	Female	276	3.30	1.381				
Natural products	Male	315	3.34	1.281	973	.331		
	Female	276	3.45	1.282				
<b>Environment Protection</b>	Male	315	3.48	1.209	1.705	.089		
	Female	276	3.30	1.338				
Product Recycling	Male	315	3.25	1.313	686	.493		
	Female	276	3.33	1.352				
Social Appeal	Male	315	3.42	1.224	1.323	.186		
	Female	276	3.28	1.325				
Overall score	Male	315	3.3727	.79501	.780	.436		
	Female	276	3.3192	.87289				

Table 3 highlights theindependent t-test Results of Male and Female Millennial have the similar Perception on Purchase Decision of Green Products. The study inferred that the p-value of whole factors are >0.05, therefore the null hypothesis accepted at 5% level and concluded that the male and female millennial have the similar perception on purchase decisions of green products. The study also found that the male millennial (3.3727) is significantly satisfied with the purchase decisions of green products than the female millennial (3.3192)

#### Hypothesis-3

The different Age group of Millennial has similar Perception of Purchase Decision of Green Products in the study region

Table 4ANOVA test for Perception of Purchase Decision of Green Products among the differ-ent Age group of Millennial							
Factors		Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.	
		Squares		Square			
Environmentally	Between	22.091	3	7.364	4.221	0.006**	
Friendly	Groups						

Continued on next page

GroupsWithin1085.9775871.850GroupsTotal1123.567590Total1123.567590MaturalBetween5.38731.7961.094productsGroupsTotal963.3245871.641GroupsTotal968.711590ProtectionBetween3.50531.168.7200.540ProtectionGroupsProductBetween3.5055871.622ProductBetween1034.4725871.622ProductBetween1034.4725871.623RecyclingGroupsSocial AppealBetween5.06031.687GroupsMithin1034.4725871.619GroupsMithin950.4935871.619GroupsProductBetween5.060 <td< th=""><th>Table 4 continued</th><th>!</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>	Table 4 continued	!					
Total1046.196590HealthyBetween37.590312.5306.773<0.001**		Within	1024.106	587	1.745		
Healthy GroupsBetween Groups37.590312.5306.773<0.01**		Groups					
GroupsWithin1085.9775871.850GroupsTotal1123.567590Total1123.567590MaturalBetween5.38731.7961.094productsGroupsTotal963.3245871.641GroupsTotal968.711590ProtectionBetween3.50531.168.7200.540ProtectionGroupsProductBetween3.5055871.622ProductBetween1034.4725871.622ProductBetween1034.4725871.623RecyclingGroupsSocial AppealBetween5.06031.687GroupsMithin1034.4725871.619GroupsMithin950.4935871.619GroupsProductBetween5.060 <td< th=""><th></th><th>Total</th><th>1046.196</th><th>590</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>		Total	1046.196	590			
Within Groups1085.9775871.850GroupsTotal1123.567590Natural productsBetween5.38731.7961.0940.351productsGroups </th <th>Healthy</th> <th>Between</th> <th>37.590</th> <th>3</th> <th>12.530</th> <th>6.773</th> <th>&lt; 0.001**</th>	Healthy	Between	37.590	3	12.530	6.773	< 0.001**
GroupsInterfact of the series of		Groups					
Total1123.567590NaturalBetween5.38731.7961.0940.351productsGroupsWithin963.3245871.641GroupsTotal968.711590ProtectionBetween3.50531.168.7200.540ProtectionGroupsTotal955.350590ProductBetween10.20133.4001.9290.124RecyclingGroupsTotal955.350590Social AppealBetween1.034.4725871.613GroupsOterall Score of factorsBetween1.0113.337.4860.692Oterall Score of factorsMithin407.406587.694Within407.406587.694Mithin407.406587.694Mithin407.406587.694Mithin407.406587.694Mithin407.406587 <th< th=""><th></th><th>Within</th><th>1085.977</th><th>587</th><th>1.850</th><th></th><th></th></th<>		Within	1085.977	587	1.850		
Natural productsBetween5.38731.7961.0940.351productsGroupsWithin963.3245871.641Within963.3245871.641Total968.711590Environment ProtectionBetween3.50531.1687200.540ProtectionGroupsProtectionGroupsProductBetween10.20133.4001.9290.124RecyclingGroupsProductBetween10.20133.4001.9290.124RecyclingGroupsOtal955.5535871.622Social AppealBetween5.06031.6871.0420.374GroupsOverall Score of factorsBetween1.0113Within407.406587Mithin407.406587Mithin407.406587Mithin407.406587Mithin407.406587<		Groups					
productsGroupsWithin963.3245871.641GroupsTotal968.711590EnvironmentBetween3.50531.168.7200.540ProtectionGroupsTotal951.8455871.622GroupsProductBetween10.20133.4001.9290.124RecyclingGroupsTotal1034.4725871.762GroupsTotal1044.673590Social AppealBetween5.06031.6871.0420.374GroupsTotal955.553590Mithin950.4935871.619GroupsTotal955.553590Mithin955.553590Mithin955.553590Mithin955.553590Mithin955.553590Mithin955.553590 <th></th> <th>Total</th> <th>1123.567</th> <th>590</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>		Total	1123.567	590			
Within Groups963.3245871.641Total968.711590Environment ProtectionBetween3.50531.168.7200.540Groups	Natural	Between	5.387	3	1.796	1.094	0.351
IdealIdeal968.711590EnvironmentBetween3.50531.168.7200.540ProtectionGroupsWithin951.8455871.622ProductBetween955.350590ProductBetween10.20133.4001.9290.124RecyclingGroupsTotal955.3505871.762Social AppealBetween5.06031.6871.0420.374GroupsWithin950.4935871.619Overall Score of factorsBetween1.0113.337.4860.692Within407.4065876.694Within407.4065876.694Within407.4065876.694Hithin407.4065876.694Hithin407.4065876.694Hithin407.4065876.694Hithin407.4065876.694Hithin407.4065876.694Hithin	products	Groups					
Total968.711590EnvironmentBetween3.50531.168.7200.540ProtectionGroups </th <th></th> <th>Within</th> <th>963.324</th> <th>587</th> <th>1.641</th> <th></th> <th></th>		Within	963.324	587	1.641		
Environment ProtectionBetween Groups3.50531.168.7200.540Within Groups951.8455871.622Total955.350590Product RecyclingBetween10.20133.4001.9290.124Mithin Groups1034.4725871.762Vithin Groups1044.673590Social AppealBetween5.06031.6871.0420.374GroupsTotal1044.673590Social AppealBetween5.06031.619Total1054.553590Overall Score of factorsBetween1.0113.337.4860.692Within GroupsMithin407.406587.694Mithin407.406587Mithin407.406587Mithin407.406587 <td< th=""><th></th><th>Groups</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>		Groups					
ProtectionGroupsWithin951.8455871.622GroupsTotal955.350590ProductBetween10.20133.4001.9290.124RecyclingGroupsWithin1034.4725871.762GroupsSocial AppealBetween5.06031.6871.0420.374GroupsTotal950.553590Overall Score of factorsBetween1.0113.337.4860.692Within407.406587.694		Total	968.711	590			
Within       951.845       587       1.622         Groups       -       -       -         Total       955.350       590       -         Product       Between       10.201       3       3.400       1.929       0.124         Recycling       Groups       -       -       -       -       -       -         Within       1034.472       587       1.762       -       -       -       -         Groups       -	Environment	Between	3.505	3	1.168	.720	0.540
Groups         Infer         Infer           Total         955.350         590         590           Product         Between         10.201         3         3.400         1.929         0.124           Recycling         Groups         587         1.762         590         590           Within         1034.472         587         1.762         590         590           Groups         Total         1044.673         590         590         590         590           Social Appeal         Between         5.060         3         1.687         1.042         0.374           Groups         Total         1044.673         590	Protection	Groups					
Total       955.350       590         Product       Between       10.201       3       3.400       1.929       0.124         Recycling       Groups		Within	951.845	587	1.622		
Product RecyclingBetween10.20133.4001.9290.124RecyclingGroups <th></th> <th>-</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>		-					
RecyclingGroups5871.762587Within1034.4725871.762587Groups590-Social AppealBetween5.06031.6871.042GroupsTotal950.4935871.619-GroupsTotal955.553590Overall Score of factorsBetween1.0113.337.486Within407.406587.694-		Total		590			
Within       1034.472       587       1.762         Groups       1044.673       590         Social Appeal       Between       5.060       3       1.687       1.042       0.374         Groups       -	Product	Between	10.201	3	3.400	1.929	0.124
Groups       70tal       1044.673       590         Social Appeal       Between       5.060       3       1.687       1.042       0.374         Groups       - <td< th=""><th>Recycling</th><th>Groups</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>	Recycling	Groups					
Total       1044.673       590         Social Appeal       Between       5.060       3       1.687       1.042       0.374         Groups       Vithin       950.493       587       1.619       Vertical       Second Secon		Within	1034.472	587	1.762		
Social Appeal         Between         5.060         3         1.687         1.042         0.374           Groups		Groups					
Groups       Within       950.493       587       1.619         Groups       Total       955.553       590       1000000000000000000000000000000000000		Total	1044.673	590			
Within         950.493         587         1.619           Groups         -	Social Appeal	Between	5.060	3	1.687	1.042	0.374
Groups         590           Total         955.553         590           Overall Score of factors         Between         1.011         3         .337         .486         0.692           factors         Groups         587         .694         587         .694							
Total         955.553         590           Overall Score of factors         Between         1.011         3         .337         .486         0.692           factors         Groups         Vithin         407.406         587         .694         Verticities			950.493	587	1.619		
Overall Score of factors         Between         1.011         3         .337         .486         0.692           Mithin         407.406         587         .694         587         .694		Groups					
factorsGroupsWithin407.406587.694GroupsGroups.694		Total	955.553	590			
Within 407.406 587 .694 Groups	<b>Overall Score of</b>	Between	1.011	3	.337	.486	0.692
Groups	factors	-					
-			407.406	587	.694		
		-					
Total 408.417 590		Total	408.417	590			

Table 4 describes the exhibits the results of ANOVA test for Perception of Purchase Decision of Green Products among the different Age group of Millennial in the study region. The p-value of 'Environmentally Friendly, and Healthy factors are <0.01. The hypothesis supported and concluded that there is significant difference among the age group of millennials concerning the purchase decisions of green products certain aspects like Environmentally friendly, and Healthy. The rest of the factors namely Natural products, Environment Protection, Product Recycling, and Social Appeal p-values are >0.05. Based on the p-values the hypothesis not supported and concluded that there is no significant difference among the different age group of millennials in the study area.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

The study proposed to assess the millennial perception towards the purchase decisions of green products. It is scrutinized from the existing study; the green marketing is instrument for defensive the environment for future. It will appear with severe change in the world wide. It makes stringent roles since green marketing is indispensable to save world from the contamination. The study also exhibits that the enhancing environmental mindfulness of millennial motivated the buying decisions of green products. The continuous improvement in green category study, present research has contemplated on eating patterns. The study found that the factors i.e., Environmentally Friendly, Environmental Responsibility, Healthy, Natural products, and environmentally protection, and Social Appeal significantly influenced green products' purchase decisions among the millennial in the study region. The study also originates that there is is significant difference among the age group of millennials concerning the purchase decisions of green products certain aspects like Environmentally friendly, and Healthy. Furthermore, the study described that the that there is no significant difference among the different age group of millennials concerning the Natural products, Environment Protection, Product Recycling, and Social Appeal. The study results also exhibited that the male and female millennial have similar perception on purchase of green products in the study region.

## REFERENCES

- Anand. (2011). A Study Of Determinants Impacting Consumers Food Choice With Reference To The Fast Food Consumption In India. *Society And Business Review*, 6(2), 176–187.
- Babu, R. S., Balaji, V., & Gajenderan, V. (2021). FACTORS INFLUENCING TOWARDS THE PRUCHASE INTENTIONS OF READY-TO-EAT FOOD PRODUCTS AMONG THE CON-SUMERS IN CHENNAI CITY. International Journal of Research -GRANTHAALAYAH, 8(12), 172–181. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v8.i12 .2020.2702 10.29121/granthaalayah.v8.i12.2020.2702
- Boobalan, K., Nawaz, N., M., H. R., & Gajenderan, V. (2021). Influence of Altruistic Motives on Organic Food Purchase: Theory of Planned Behavior. *Sustainability*, *13*(11), 6023–6023. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su13116023 10 .3390/su13116023
- Chen, T., & Chai, L. (2010). Attitude Towards The Environment And Green Products: Consumers' Perspective. *Management Science And Engineering*, 4(2), 27–39. Retrieved from Http://50.22.92.12/Index.Php/Mse/Article/View/1324
- Gurău, C., & Ranchhod, A. (2005). International Green Marketing: A Comparative Study Of British And Romanian Firms. *International Marketing Review*, *22*(5), 547–561. Retrieved from //Doi.Org/10.1108/02651330510624381
- Joshi, Y., & Rahman, Z. (2015). Factors Affecting Green Purchase Behaviour And Future Research Directions. International Strategic Management Review. Retrieved from Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Ism.2015.04.001
- Kumar, V., Shanthini, A., & Nawaz, N. (2020). Determinants Influencing Towards the Consumption of Green Products among the Consumers: A Structural Equation Approach. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development*, 11(2), 680–680. Retrieved

from https://dx.doi.org/10.37506/v11/i2/2020/ijphrd/194887 10.37506/v11/i2/2020/ijphrd/194887

- Laroche, M., Bergeron, J., & Barbaro-Forleo, G. (2001). Targeting consumers who are willing to pay more for environmentally friendly products. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *18*(6), 503–520. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/eum000000006155 10.1108/eum000000006155
- Manaktola, K., & Jauhari, V. (2007). Exploring consumer attitude and behaviour towards green practices in the lodging industry in India. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *19*(5), 364–377. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09596110710757534 10.1108/09596110710757534
- Moisander, J. (2007). Motivational complexity of green consumerism. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *31*(4), 404–409. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1470 -6431.2007.00586.x 10.1111/j.1470-6431.2007.00586.x
- Nath, V., Kumar, R., Agrawal, R., & Gautam, A. (2012). Green Behaviors Of Indian Consumers Performance Management View Project Building Disaster Resilience Through Corporate Social Responsibility View Project GREEN BEHAVIORS OF INDIAN CONSUMERS. International Journal Of Research In Management, 2(11). Retrieved from //Doi.Org/ 10.13140/RG.2.1.4805.4006
- Ram, V., Thumiki, R., Nawaz, N., Gajenderan, V., & Balaji, V. (2021). Evaluating Customers 'And Retailers ' Eco - Behaviour For Identifying Focus Areas In Social Marketing Campaigns. *Academy Of Strategic Management Journa*, 20(1), 1–13.
- Seenivasan, N., , & and, S. S. (2018). Effect of humic acid on Helicotylenchus multicinctus (Cobb, 1893) Golden, 1956 infesting banana (Musa spp.). *Fruits, 73,* 22–30. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.17660/th2018/73.1.3 10.17660/th2018/73.1.3
- Singh, G. (2013). Green: The New Colour Of Marketing In India. *ASCI Journal Of Management*, 42(2), 52–72.
- Veleva, V., & Ellenbecker, M. (2001). Indicators Of Sustainable Production: Framework And Methodology. In Journal Of Cleaner Production, 9, 10–15. Retrieved from //Doi.Org/ 10.1016/S0959-6526(01)00010-5