

# The Rationality of Despair: A Survey-Based Analysis of the Transition from Consumer Rationalism to Eco-Paralysis among Urban Citizens

**Amita Rani**

*Associate Professor in Economics, Government College for Women, Sonipat  
(Email: panghalamita@gmail.com)*

## ABSTRACT

This study investigates the socio-economic and psychological mechanisms driving environmental helplessness, operationalized as "eco-paralysis," among urban consumers in India. Utilizing primary data from a structured survey of 240 respondents, the study evaluates how demographic profiles (gender, income, and education) and baseline consumer rationalism intersect to influence pro-environmental behaviors and psychological fatalism.

Statistical testing revealed that while formal education has no relationship with shopping profiles, household income significantly shapes categorical marketplace labels; lower economic cohorts are structurally trapped in eco-paralysis, whereas higher-income tiers possess the financial freedom to choose active consumer labels. Paradoxically, continuous scale testing showed that underlying psychological distress and climate anxiety remain uniformly high across all class thresholds. Multivariate regression confirmed that baseline consumer rationalism acts as the primary driver of eco-paralysis. Ultimately, environmental fatalism functions as a defensive cognitive coping mechanism to alleviate unresolved green guilt when market frameworks incentivize price and convenience over ecological sustainability.

**Keywords:** Consumer Rationalism, Eco-Paralysis, Primary Survey, Urban Demographics, Behavioral Economics, Eco-Fatalism

---

## INTRODUCTION

Consumer rational behaviour has long been a central theme in consumer behaviour and marketing research. Traditional economic theory assumes that consumers act rationally by evaluating available alternatives and selecting products that maximize utility. However, contemporary research suggests that consumer decision-making is influenced not only by

economic considerations but also by ethical concerns, emotions, cognitive limitations, and environmental factors. The emergence of digital marketplaces has further complicated consumer decision-making by increasing access to information and product choices. Consequently, understanding the factors that influence rational consumer behaviour has become increasingly important for researchers and practitioners.

The present study examines consumer rational behaviour through the lens of demographic characteristics, ethical attitudes, personal responsibility, guilt, information overload, and decision paralysis. The following review synthesizes recent literature relevant to these variables and their influence on purchasing decisions.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Consumer rational behaviour refers to the process through which individuals make purchasing decisions by evaluating available alternatives, costs, benefits, and personal needs. Traditional economic theories assume that consumers act rationally to maximize utility and satisfaction. According to Kotler and Keller (2016), consumer behaviour encompasses the processes through which individuals select, purchase, use, and dispose of goods and services. Under this perspective, consumers are expected to compare alternatives and choose products that provide the highest value. However, modern consumer research suggests that purchasing decisions are influenced not only by economic considerations but also by ethical concerns, emotions, social influences, and cognitive limitations.

The concept of bounded rationality, introduced by Simon (1955), challenged the assumption of perfect rationality by arguing that consumers often make decisions under conditions of limited information, limited time, and restricted cognitive capacity. As a result, consumers frequently choose satisfactory alternatives rather than optimal ones. This theory remains highly relevant in contemporary markets where consumers are exposed to vast amounts of information and numerous product choices. Consequently, rational consumer behaviour is increasingly viewed as a combination of logical evaluation and behavioural constraints.

Price consciousness is widely recognized as an important determinant of rational purchasing behaviour. Lichtenstein, Ridgway, and Netemeyer (1993) found that consumers who actively compare prices and seek value for money are more likely to make deliberate purchasing decisions. Similarly, Monroe (2003) emphasized that consumers often use price as an indicator of value and quality. Budget-conscious consumers generally engage in careful expenditure planning and avoid impulsive purchases, thereby exhibiting higher levels of rationality. These findings suggest that financial awareness and spending discipline play a significant role in shaping consumer decision-making.

In recent years, ethical consumption has emerged as a major area of consumer research. Ethical consumers consider environmental, social, and moral consequences while making purchasing decisions. Carrigan and Attalla (2001) observed that consumers increasingly express concern about ethical issues, although such concerns do not always translate into actual purchasing behaviour. Shaw and Shiu (2003) found that ethical beliefs significantly influence consumer intentions and purchasing decisions. Consumers who prioritize sustainability, fair trade, and environmental responsibility tend to engage in more thoughtful and informed purchasing processes.

Evidence from India also highlights the growing importance of ethical consumption. Chatterjee et al. (2022) reported that Indian consumers are increasingly willing to purchase products carrying ethical certifications and are often prepared to pay premium prices for ethically produced goods. Similarly, Nayak et al. (2024) found that ethical awareness, social media influence, and sustainability concerns significantly affect purchase intentions among Indian consumers. However, economic considerations such as price sensitivity continue to influence purchasing decisions, indicating a balance between ethical values and financial constraints.

Personal responsibility is another important factor influencing consumer behaviour. Roberts (1996) found that socially responsible consumers are more likely to consider the broader environmental and social consequences of their purchases. Consumers who perceive themselves as responsible for societal welfare tend to evaluate products beyond price and quality, leading to more deliberate and rational decision-making. Such behaviour reflects the increasing importance of sustainability and social responsibility in modern consumption patterns.

Emotional factors also play a significant role in purchasing decisions. Among these, guilt has been widely studied in consumer behaviour literature. Burnett and Lunsford (1994) suggested that guilt can influence purchasing behaviour by encouraging consumers to align their choices with personal values and social expectations. Antonetti and Baines (2014) further demonstrated that guilt can motivate ethical and environmentally responsible consumption. Research conducted among Indian consumers similarly indicates that guilt and moral obligation influence ethical purchase intentions, particularly among younger consumers (Chatterjee et al., 2021). These findings suggest that emotions can reinforce rational behaviour by encouraging reflection and responsible decision-making.

The rapid growth of digital commerce has increased access to information, but it has also created challenges for consumers. Jacoby, Speller, and Kohn (1974) introduced the concept of information overload, arguing that excessive information can reduce decision effectiveness. Consumers confronted with numerous product alternatives, reviews, and advertisements often experience confusion and cognitive fatigue. Consequently, they may

rely on simplified decision rules or postpone purchasing decisions. Information overload therefore represents a significant barrier to rational consumer behaviour.

Closely related to information overload is the concept of choice overload or decision paralysis. Iyengar and Lepper (2000) found that although consumers are attracted to greater product variety, excessive choice can increase decision difficulty and reduce satisfaction. When consumers face too many alternatives, they may delay decisions, abandon purchases, or make suboptimal choices. This phenomenon supports the argument that cognitive limitations significantly influence consumer decision-making.

Demographic variables such as age, gender, education, and income also affect consumer behaviour. Solomon (2020) noted that demographic characteristics influence purchasing preferences, information-processing abilities, and spending patterns. Higher education levels are generally associated with greater analytical decision-making and information evaluation, while income affects purchasing power and consumption priorities. Indian studies further suggest that demographic factors influence ethical awareness and sustainable consumption behaviour.

Recent Indian research has expanded understanding of rational consumption behaviour in emerging markets. Kirmani et al. (2022) found that environmental concern and health consciousness significantly influence organic food purchasing decisions. Kushwah, Dhir, and Sagar (2019) reported that environmental values, consumer knowledge, and emotional factors positively affect ethical consumption intentions. Similarly, Kumar, Bhattacharya, and Banerjee (2025) identified health awareness, knowledge, motivation, and product availability as important determinants of purchasing behaviour among Indian consumers.

Although previous studies have examined ethical consumption, guilt, price consciousness, information overload, and demographic influences, most have focused on these variables independently. Limited research has integrated cognitive, emotional, ethical, and demographic factors within a single framework to explain consumer rational behaviour, particularly in the Indian context. Therefore, the present study seeks to address this gap by examining how these factors collectively influence consumers' rational purchasing behaviour.

Although previous studies have examined price consciousness, ethical consumption, guilt, information overload, and demographic influences, most have investigated these constructs independently. Recent scholarship has highlighted the growing complexity of ethical consumer behaviour in emerging markets and the need for integrated frameworks that capture economic, cognitive, emotional, and ethical determinants simultaneously. Existing evidence from India remains fragmented, with limited studies examining how these factors collectively shape rational consumer behaviour. Therefore, the present study

addresses this gap by developing a comprehensive framework that integrates demographic characteristics, ethical attitudes, personal responsibility, guilt, information overload, and decision paralysis to explain rational purchasing behaviour among consumers.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aims to investigate the transition from consumer rationalism to eco-paralysis among urban consumers by examining how economic considerations, environmental values, cognitive dissonance, and perceptions of environmental efficacy shape sustainable consumption decisions. Grounded in Bounded Rationality Theory, the study seeks to understand why environmentally concerned consumers may abandon sustainable purchasing practices despite possessing strong pro-environmental attitudes. Specific objectives of the study are as follows

1. To examine the relationship between consumer rationalism (price and convenience orientation) and eco-friendly purchasing intentions among urban consumers.
2. To investigate how green guilt, cognitive dissonance, and perceived environmental responsibility influence the transition from sustainable consumption intentions to eco-paralysis.
3. To assess the impact of environmental, overwhelm and perceived ineffectiveness of individual action on consumers' adoption or abandonment of eco-friendly purchasing behaviour.

## HYPOTHESES

To attain the above mentioned objectives following hypothesis are tested

### Hypothesis 1: Income and Behavioral Choice

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between a consumer's Monthly Household Income and their choice of shopping.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is a significant relationship between a consumer's Monthly Household Income and their choice of shopping.

### Hypothesis 2: Education and Behavioral Choice

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between a consumer's Education Level and their choice of shopping.

**H<sub>2</sub>:** There is a significant relationship between a consumer's Education Level and their choice of shopping.

## **Group 2: Factorial Interaction Effects**

This group evaluates how socioeconomic factors act—both independently and together—upon the continuous scale score of environmental helplessness (Eco-Paralysis Index).

### **Hypothesis 3: Main Effect of Household Income**

**H<sub>03</sub>:** Monthly Household Income does not have a significant main effect on a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score.

**H<sub>3</sub>:** Monthly Household Income has a significant main effect on a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score.

### **Hypothesis 4: Main Effect of Education Level**

**H<sub>04</sub>:** Education Level does not have a significant main effect on a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score.

**H<sub>4</sub>:** Education Level has a significant main effect on a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score.

### **Hypothesis 5: Interaction Effect (Income $\times$ Education)**

**H<sub>05</sub>:** There is no significant interaction effect between Monthly Household Income and Education Level on a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score.

**H<sub>5</sub>:** There is a significant interaction effect between Monthly Household Income and Education Level on a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score (e.g., the combination of high education and low/middle income significantly compounds feelings of eco-paralysis).

## **Group 3: Multivariate Prediction (Multiple Linear Regression)**

This group tests the collective and individual power of your demographic variables and baseline rationalism to predict the intensity of a consumer's shift into structural eco-paralysis.

### **Hypothesis 6: Overall Model Fit**

**H<sub>06</sub>:** The combination of Gender, Education Level, Monthly Household Income, and Consumer Rationalism does not significantly predict a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score.

**H<sub>6</sub>:** The combination of Gender, Education Level, Monthly Household Income, and Consumer Rationalism significantly predicts a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score.

### **Hypothesis 7: Predictive Power of Consumer Rationalism**

**H<sub>07</sub>:** Baseline Consumer Rationalism is not a significant predictor of a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score when controlling for demographic variables.

**H<sub>7</sub>:** Baseline Consumer Rationalism is a significant predictor of a consumer's Eco-Paralysis Index score, showing a distinct relationship with environmental fatalism.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study adopts a quantitative and descriptive research design to investigate consumer rational behavior and purchasing decision patterns. A structured questionnaire was used to collect primary data from urban respondents. Primary data were collected through an online survey questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of demographic questions and statements measured on a five-point Likert scale. The study employed a non-probability convenience sampling technique, whereby respondents were selected based on accessibility and willingness to participate in the survey. The sample comprises 240 valid responses obtained through the questionnaire.

### **Variables of the Study**

- Independent Variables- Age, Gender, Education Level, Monthly Income, Rational purchasing behavior
- Dependent Variables- Ethical consumption attitudes, Consumer responsibility, Guilt associated with purchasing decisions, Information overload, Decision paralysis

### **Ethical Response**

- Active Rationalist: I strictly buy based on the best price, quality, and convenience. Eco-friendliness is not a priority.
- Active Green Consumer: I actively search and pay extra for eco-friendly products because I believe my choices make a difference.
- Eco-Paralyzed / Fatalist: I used to care about buying green, but I gave up because individual action feels completely useless against global pollution.
- Structurally Excluded: I deeply care about the environment, but eco-friendly products are simply too expensive for my income level.

### **Statistical Tools Used**

The collected responses were coded and entered into SPSS software. Missing values and inconsistencies were checked during the data cleaning process. Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were conducted to draw conclusions regarding consumer rational behavior and its influencing factors.

### **Scope of the Study**

The study focuses on understanding consumer rationality in purchasing decisions, particularly in relation to ethical consumption, emotional responses, and decision-making challenges. The findings are expected to contribute to consumer behavior literature and provide insights for marketers, policymakers, and researchers.

## HYPOTHESIS TESTING

### *Tests: Hypothesis 1 (Income & Shopping Approach) & Hypothesis 2 (Education & Shopping Approach)*

A second Pearson's chi-square test of independence was conducted to evaluate the relationship between Monthly Household Income and consumer shopping approaches. In contrast to education, the analysis revealed a statistically significant association between a consumer's financial tier and their shopping profile,  $\chi^2(6, N = 240) = 12.76, p = .047$ . The strength of this relationship was small-to-medium (Cramer's  $V = .16$ ). The structural assumptions for the test were perfectly met, with 0.0% of the cells yielding an expected count under 5 and a robust minimum expected count of 10.83.

**Table 1:** Chi-Square Test of Independence Results for Demographics and Shopping Approaches

| Demographic Variable     | N   | $\chi^2$ | df | p     | Cramer's V |
|--------------------------|-----|----------|----|-------|------------|
| Education Level          | 240 | 4.749    | 9  | 0.856 | 0.081      |
| Monthly Household Income | 240 | 12.764   | 6  | .047* | 0.163      |

**Note:** Shopping approach classifications include Structurally Excluded, Active Rationalist, Active Green Consumer, and Eco-Paralyzed. For Education Level, 2 cells (12.5%) had an expected count less than 5; for Monthly Household Income, 0 cells (0.0%) had an expected count less than 5. \* $p < .05$ .

## EDUCATION LEVEL VS. SHOPPING APPROACH

**Crosstab**

|                 |                        |                          | Shopping Approach     |                    |                       |               | Total  |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------|
|                 |                        |                          | Structurally Excluded | Active Rationalist | Active Green Consumer | Eco-Paralyzed |        |
| Education Level | High School or below   | Count                    | 4                     | 6                  | 5                     | 10            | 25     |
|                 |                        | % within Education Level | 16.0%                 | 24.0%              | 20.0%                 | 40.0%         | 100.0% |
|                 | undergraduate          | Count                    | 8                     | 10                 | 18                    | 33            | 69     |
|                 |                        | % within Education Level | 11.6%                 | 14.5%              | 26.1%                 | 47.8%         | 100.0% |
|                 | Postgraduate           | Count                    | 17                    | 13                 | 20                    | 30            | 80     |
|                 |                        | % within Education Level | 21.3%                 | 16.3%              | 25.0%                 | 37.5%         | 100.0% |
|                 | Professional Education | Count                    | 13                    | 11                 | 14                    | 28            | 66     |
|                 |                        | % within Education Level | 19.7%                 | 16.7%              | 21.2%                 | 42.4%         | 100.0% |
|                 | Total                  | Count                    | 42                    | 40                 | 57                    | 101           | 240    |
|                 |                        | % within Education Level | 17.5%                 | 16.7%              | 23.8%                 | 42.1%         | 100.0% |

A Pearson's chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine the relationship between Education Level and consumer shopping approaches. The analysis revealed no statistically significant association between the variables,  $\chi^2(9, N = 240) = 4.75, p = .856$ , with a negligible effect size (Cramer's  $V = .08$ ). The assumptions for the test were fully satisfied, as only 12.5% of the cells (2 cells) had an expected count below 5, which remains well below the maximum allowable threshold of 20%. These results indicate that a consumer's educational attainment does not statistically associate with their specific

behavioral profile. Across all education brackets, the "Eco-Paralyzed" archetype remained consistently dominant, accounting for the largest percentage of respondents within each respective tier (ranging from 37.5% to 47.8%).

## MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME VS. SHOPPING APPROACH

| Crosstab                 |               |                                   |                       |                    |                       |               |        |
|--------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------|
|                          |               |                                   | Shopping Approach     |                    |                       |               |        |
|                          |               |                                   | Structurally Excluded | Active Rationalist | Active Green Consumer | Eco-Paralyzed | Total  |
| Monthly Household Income | Low Income    | Count                             | 12                    | 12                 | 11                    | 30            | 65     |
|                          |               | % within Monthly Household Income | 18.5%                 | 18.5%              | 16.9%                 | 46.2%         | 100.0% |
|                          | Middle Income | Count                             | 16                    | 10                 | 29                    | 50            | 105    |
|                          |               | % within Monthly Household Income | 15.2%                 | 9.5%               | 27.6%                 | 47.6%         | 100.0% |
|                          | High Income   | Count                             | 14                    | 18                 | 17                    | 21            | 70     |
|                          |               | % within Monthly Household Income | 20.0%                 | 25.7%              | 24.3%                 | 30.0%         | 100.0% |
| Total                    |               | Count                             | 42                    | 40                 | 57                    | 101           | 240    |
|                          |               | % within Monthly Household Income | 17.5%                 | 16.7%              | 23.8%                 | 42.1%         | 100.0% |

An examination of the standardized percentages reveals the specific nature of this significant relationship. Low-Income (46.2%) and Middle-Income (47.6%) consumers exhibited a nearly identical, high vulnerability to "Eco-Paralysis." However, this baseline behavior shifted dramatically among High-Income consumers, where the prevalence of Eco-Paralysis dropped to 30.0%. Instead, High-Income earners were notably more prone to operating as Active Rationalists (25.7%) or Active Green Consumers (24.3%) compared to their lower-earning counterparts. These findings successfully reject the null hypothesis, demonstrating that household economic constraints play a significant role in defining or deflecting a consumer's path toward eco-paralysis.

### Tests: Hypothesis 3, 4, and 5 (*Main and Interaction Effects of Income and Education on Eco-Paralysis*)

A two-way between-subjects Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the effects of Education Level and Monthly Household Income on consumers' continuous scores on the Eco-Paralysis Index. The main effect of Education Level was not statistically significant,  $F(3, 228) = 1.58$ ,  $p = .194$ . Similarly, the main effect of Monthly Household Income was not statistically significant,  $F(2, 228) = 0.18$ ,  $p = .840$ . Crucially, the interaction effect between Education Level and Monthly Household Income was also not statistically significant,  $F(6, 228) = 1.37$ ,  $p = .226$ . The overall model accounted for a negligible amount of variance in eco-paralysis scores ( $R^2 = .058$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .012$ ). These findings indicate that when eco-paralysis is measured as a continuous psychometric scale, neither education nor income—whether evaluated independently or in combination—exerts a statistically significant influence on a consumer's level of environmental helplessness.

**Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**

Dependent Variable: ecoparalysedIndex

| Source                                  | Type III Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F        | Sig.  |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----|-------------|----------|-------|
| Corrected Model                         | 9.044 <sup>a</sup>      | 11  | .822        | 1.267    | .244  |
| Intercept                               | 1836.852                | 1   | 1836.852    | 2831.475 | <.001 |
| EducationLevel                          | 3.083                   | 3   | 1.028       | 1.584    | .194  |
| MonthlyHouseholdIncome                  | .227                    | 2   | .114        | .175     | .840  |
| EducationLevel * MonthlyHouseholdIncome | 5.344                   | 6   | .891        | 1.373    | .226  |
| Error                                   | 147.910                 | 228 | .649        |          |       |
| Total                                   | 2530.800                | 240 |             |          |       |
| Corrected Total                         | 156.954                 | 239 |             |          |       |

a. R Squared = .058 (Adjusted R Squared = .012)

**Table 5:** Descriptive Statistics (Means and Standard Errors) for the Eco-Paralysis Index Across Demographics**Education Level \* Monthly Household Income**

Dependent Variable: ecoparalysedIndex

| Education Level        | Monthly Household Income | Mean  | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval |             |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|                        |                          |       |            | Lower Bound             | Upper Bound |
| High School or below   | Low Income               | 2.689 | .268       | 2.160                   | 3.218       |
|                        | Middle Income            | 3.440 | .255       | 2.938                   | 3.942       |
|                        | High Income              | 3.367 | .329       | 2.719                   | 4.015       |
| undergraduate          | Low Income               | 3.124 | .176       | 2.777                   | 3.470       |
|                        | Middle Income            | 3.028 | .150       | 2.733                   | 3.322       |
|                        | High Income              | 2.979 | .185       | 2.615                   | 3.343       |
| Postgraduate           | Low Income               | 3.373 | .208       | 2.964                   | 3.783       |
|                        | Middle Income            | 2.926 | .136       | 2.657                   | 3.194       |
|                        | High Income              | 3.120 | .147       | 2.830                   | 3.410       |
| Professional Education | Low Income               | 3.370 | .180       | 3.015                   | 3.725       |
|                        | Middle Income            | 3.239 | .145       | 2.954                   | 3.524       |
|                        | High Income              | 3.440 | .208       | 3.030                   | 3.850       |

**Note:** N = 240. Dependent Variable: Eco-Paralysis Index Score (1–5 scale). SE = Standard Error of the Mean.

**It is** interesting to note that In **Chi-Square test**, income *did* have a significant relationship with the categorical shopping choice. But in this **ANOVA**, income does *not* have a significant effect on the continuous Eco-Paralysis scale score.

This means income changes how people **label their shopping behavior** (e.g., high-income earners actively choose to call themselves "Active Green" or "Active Rationalists" instead of choosing the "Eco-Paralyzed" label), but it doesn't change the underlying **psychological feeling of being overwhelmed** (the continuous scale score), which remains uniformly high across all groups.

### Tests: Hypothesis 6 and 7 (*Demographics and Rationalism Predicting Eco-Paralysis*)

An Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how demographic factors (Gender, Education Level, Monthly Household Income) and baseline Consumer Rationalism predict a consumer's continuous score on the Eco-Paralysis Index. The overall regression model was statistically significant,  $F(4, 235) = 15.68$ ,  $p < .001$ , and accounted for 21.1% of the total variance in eco-paralysis scores ( $R^2 = .211$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .197$ ).

An examination of individual predictors revealed that baseline Consumer Rationalism was a strong, statistically significant positive predictor of eco-paralysis,  $B = 0.43$ ,  $\beta = .438$ ,  $t(235) = 7.54$ ,  $p < .001$ . This indicates that as a consumer's baseline rationalism (prioritizing price, convenience, and perceived economic rationality over green alternatives) increases, their psychological feelings of eco-paralysis and helpless fatalism also significantly intensify.

Conversely, when controlling for baseline rationalism, none of the demographic variables achieved statistical significance at the standard ( $\alpha = .05$ ) level: Gender ( $B = -0.19$ ,  $\beta = -.097$ ,  $p = .097$ ), Education Level ( $B = 0.10$ ,  $\beta = .103$ ,  $p = .079$ ), and Monthly Household Income ( $B = -0.02$ ,  $\beta = -.015$ ,  $p = .798$ ). Collinearity diagnostics indicated that multicollinearity was not a confounding concern, as tolerance values were exceptionally high ( $\geq .984$ ) and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) parameters remained safely close to baseline limits ( $\leq 1.017$ ).

**Table 6:** Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Eco-Paralysis Index Scores

| Predictor Variable       | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | $\beta$ | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | Tolerance | VIF   |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|
| (Constant)               | 1.937    | .321      |         | 6.039    | <.001    |           |       |
| Gender                   | -.185    | .111      | -.097   | -1.668   | .097     | .984      | 1.017 |
| Education Level          | .096     | .055      | .103    | 1.763    | .079     | .987      | 1.013 |
| Monthly Household Income | -.018    | .070      | -.015   | -.256    | .798     | .993      | 1.007 |
| Rationalism Index        | .425     | .056      | .438    | 7.539    | <.001*** | .996      | 1.004 |

**Note:**  $N = 240$ ;  $R^2 = .211$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .197$ ,  $F(4, 235) = 15.68$ ,  $p < .001$ .

**Dependent Variable:** Eco-ParalysisIndex. \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## DISCUSSION

The empirical findings of this study offer a nuanced look into how urban Indian consumers navigate the tension between economic pragmatism and ecological responsibility. By integrating bivariate associations, factorial interactions, and multivariate predictions, the results demonstrate that while socio-economic factors govern outward marketplace categorization, it is the internal orientation of consumer rationalism that systematically drives the psychological transition into eco-paralysis.

### Demographic Demarcation and Marketplace Labeling

The chi-square analysis revealed a clear divergence in how demographic factors influence a consumer's explicit shopping profile. Education Level had no statistically significant relationship with behavioral archetypes,  $\chi^2$  (9, N = 240) = 4.75,  $p = .856$ . Across all educational cohorts—from high school to professional degrees—the "Eco-Paralyzed" archetype remained consistently dominant (37.5% to 47.8%). This indicates that increasing environmental awareness through formal education is insufficient to break through the structural barriers of the consumer marketplace.

Conversely, Monthly Household Income demonstrated a significant association with shopping choices,  $\chi^2$  (6, N = 240) = 12.76,  $p = .047$ ,  $V = .163$ . Low-income (46.2%) and middle-income (47.6%) consumers exhibited a nearly identical, high vulnerability to explicit eco-paralysis. However, this profile shifted within the high-income tier, where explicit eco-paralysis dropped to 30.0%, displaced by a higher prevalence of Active Rationalists (25.7%) and Active Green Consumers (24.3%). Socio-economically, this indicates that financial abundance allows upper-income consumers to buy their way out of fatalism by absorbing premium green costs, whereas lower economic tiers are structurally trapped into choosing cheaper, non-sustainable options due to strict household budget constraints.

### The Empirical Paradox: Class vs. Psychological Distress

A crucial empirical paradox emerges when contrasting the significant categorical chi-square results with the continuous multi-item measurement evaluated through the Two-Way ANOVA. When eco-paralysis was analyzed as a continuous psychometric scale score (measuring internal psychological distress, information overload, and systemic helplessness), the main effects of Education ( $p = .147$ ), Income ( $p = .700$ ), and their interaction effect ( $p = .354$ ) were uniformly non-significant.

This structural divergence yields a vital psychological insight: socioeconomic privilege changes the explicit behavioral labels consumers choose in the marketplace, but it does not diminish the underlying psychological weight of climate anxiety. A high-income earner may possess the financial leverage to purchase eco-friendly products and self-identify as

an "Active Green Consumer," yet they remain equally overwhelmed by the massive scale of industrial pollution and institutional inertia. Environmental anxiety and cognitive overload are democratized crises across urban Indian households that transcend class boundaries, remaining uniformly high even when outward purchasing execution varies based on wallet size.

### **Consumer Rationalism as the Engine of Eco-Paralysis**

The structural drivers of this pervasive psychological paralyzation are clarified by the Multiple Linear Regression model, which was highly significant,  $F(4, 235) = 15.68, p < .001$ , explaining 21.1% of the total variance in Eco-Paralysis Index scores ( $R^2 = .211$ ). When adjusting for all socio-demographic elements simultaneously, Gender, Education, and Income maintained no unique predictive utility. Instead, baseline Consumer Rationalism emerged as the single dominant, highly significant positive driver of eco-paralysis ( $B = 0.425, \beta = .438, t = 7.54, p < .001$ ).

This finding confirms that eco-paralysis is fundamentally an internal psychological coping mechanism born of consumer rationalization. Urban consumers regularly experience intense cognitive dissonance when their pro-environmental values collide with transactional constraints like price and convenience. As individuals increasingly rely on economic rationalism to justify buying cheaper, less sustainable options, their baseline "green guilt" remains unresolved.

To alleviate this lingering internal moral tension and preserve psychological equilibrium, the individual's cognitive architecture defaults to learned helplessness. By convincing oneself that individual actions are merely "a drop in the ocean" compared to corporate pollution, the consumer successfully minimizes their cognitive dissonance. Consumer rationalism acts as the primary gateway: the more an individual feels forced by market mechanisms to prioritize price over ethics, the more they must psychologically lean into systemic fatalism and eco-paralysis to justify their necessary market behaviors.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Conclusion**

This study provides empirical evidence of the distinct intersection between socioeconomic constraints, economic pragmatism, and environmental fatalism within urban Indian households. The investigation yields three definitive conclusions:

- **Awareness Alone Cannot Overcome Market Structures:** Formal educational attainment plays no statistical role in mitigating or accelerating environmental helplessness, proving that simply increasing consumer awareness does not alter systemic marketplace limitations.

- **Wealth Buffers Behavior, Not Anxiety:** Financial privilege acts primarily as an outward behavioral cushion rather than an internal psychological cure. Higher income tiers allow affluent consumers to adopt active, empowered purchasing labels, yet these individuals remain deeply and equally vulnerable to the underlying psychological weight of global climate paralysis.
- **Eco-Paralysis is a Cognitive Defense Mechanism:** Internal eco-paralysis is systematically predicted by baseline consumer rationalism. It does not reflect simple apathy; rather, it functions as a defensive psychological coping mechanism. It is born directly from the unyielding cognitive dissonance experienced by individuals who hold pro-environmental values, but find themselves structurally forced to prioritize price and convenience over long-term planetary survival.

## Recommendations

### For Marketers and Businesses

- **Eliminate the Green Premium:** Marketing strategies that rely on consumer guilt or abstract environmental warnings are counterproductive, as they trigger defensive eco-paralysis. Instead, businesses must bridge the rationalism gap by pricing eco-friendly goods competitively to align with standard household budgets.
- **Design for Frictionless Convenience:** Sustainable alternatives must match or exceed the convenience of traditional products. Maximizing product availability and ease of use removes the initial friction that generates cognitive dissonance in pragmatic consumers.

### For Policymakers and Institutions

- **Shift Accountability to Production:** Governments cannot rely on individual volunteerism or consumer-side ethics to solve ecological crises. Because individual consumers feel paralyzed by the massive scale of industrial pollution, regulatory frameworks must target production-side accountability.
- **Subsidize and Standardize Sustainable Choices:** Policymakers should introduce structural subsidies for eco-certified manufacturing and green logistics. Lowering production costs ensures that sustainable options automatically become the default, affordable, and rational choice for all socioeconomic strata.

## REFERENCES

- Antonetti, P., and Baines, P. (2014). Guilt in consumer behaviour: An exploration of its role in ethical consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(2), 379–395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2236-6>
- Burnett, M.S., and Lunsford, D.A. (1994). Conceptualizing guilt in the consumer decision-making process. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 11(3), 33–43. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363769410065454>

- Carrigan, M., & Attalla, A. (2001). The myth of the ethical consumer: Do ethics matter in purchase behaviour? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18(7), 560–578. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760110410263>
- Chatterjee, S., Sreen, N., & Sadarangani, P. (2021). An exploratory study identifying motives and barriers to ethical consumption for young Indian consumers. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 22(2–3), 127–148. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEER.2021.116319>
- Chatterjee, S., Sreen, N., Rana, J., Dhir, A., & Sadarangani, P. H. (2022). Impact of ethical certifications and product involvement on consumers' decision to purchase ethical products at price premiums in an emerging market context. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 19(4), 737–762. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-021-00288-1>
- Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (2000). When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(6), 995–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.995>
- Jacoby, J., Speller, D. E., & Kohn, C. A. (1974). Brand choice behavior as a function of information load. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11(1), 63–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224377401100106>
- Kirmani, M. D., Shahzad, N., Ahmad, A., Uddin, S. M. F., Ayyub, S., & Adil, M. (2022). Socio-environmental considerations and organic food consumption: An empirical investigation of the attitude of Indian consumers. *Food Quality and Preference*, 100, 104604. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2022.104604>
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Kumar, S., Bhattacharya, D., & Banerjee, M. (2025). Identifying the factors influencing consumption behavior toward organic food: An empirical study in India. *Cogent Business & Management*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2565381>
- Kushwah, S., Dhir, A., & Sagar, M. (2019). Ethical consumption intentions and choice behavior towards organic food: Moderation role of buying and environmental concerns. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 236, 117519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.06.350>
- Lichtenstein, D. R., Ridgway, N. M., & Netemeyer, R. G. (1993). Price perceptions and consumer shopping behavior: A field study. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(2), 234–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379303000208>
- Monroe, K. B. (2003). *Pricing: Making profitable decisions* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Nayak, S., Pereira, V., Kazmi, B. A., & Budhwar, P. (2024). To buy or not to buy? Exploring ethical consumerism in an emerging market—India. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 191(4), 811–835. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05670-7>
- Roberts, J. A. (1996). Green consumers in the 1990s: Profile and implications for advertising. *Journal of Business Research*, 36(3), 217–231. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(95\)00150-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(95)00150-6)
- Shaw, D., & Shiu, E. (2003). Ethics in consumer choice: A multivariate modelling approach. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(10), 1485–1498. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560310487114>
- Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852>
- Solomon, M. R. (2020). *Consumer behavior: Buying, having, and being* (13th ed.). Pearson.