

The impact of values on sustainable behaviour – A study among Russian and Finnish university students

Raija Komppula ^{1*}, Antti Honkanen ², Sanna Rossi ³ and Natalia Kolesnikova ⁴

Received: 15/10/2017 Accepted: 25/02/2018

¹ University of Eastern Finland, Business School, Centre for Tourism Studies, Yliopistokatu 2, FI-80100 JOENSUU, Tel: +358 50 438 7475, e-mail: raija.komppula@uef.fi

² University of Lapland, Finland, Multidimensional Tourism Institute, e-mail: antti.honkanen@ulapland.fi

³ University of Eastern Finland, Business School, e-mail: sanna.rossi@outlook.com

⁴ Petrozavodsk State University, Russia, Institute of Physical Education, Sport and Tourism Department of Tourism, e-mail: Natalia.v.kolesnikova@mail.ru

* Corresponding author

Abstract

Schwartz's (1992, 1994) classification of human values is applied when comparing a group of Finnish and Russian university students in terms of their environmentally and socially benign orientation, which is measured by including all three dimensions of sustainability in the measures of consumers' self-reported travelling preferences. A total of 872 responses were included in the data, which were analyzed by using K-mean cluster analysis and a principal component analysis (PCA). Differences between Finnish and Russian students were compared using independent samples t-test with equal variances assumed. The respondents divided evenly into two clusters, which could be named according to Schwarz as Self-Enhancers and Self-Transcenders. The majority of Finnish respondents (67%) were Self-Transcenders, and among Russian students the majority were Self-Enhancers (84%). The findings indicate that among the Russian students the concept of sustainability is understood as an ecological question, but for Finns, it is a comprehensive concept covering ecological, economic and social aspects. In the Finnish sample the value based groups seemed to explain the sustainability concerns, but in the Russian sample, the value based group explained only the attitude towards ecological sustainability.

© 2018 Varna University of Management. All rights reserved

Keywords: sustainable consumer, Schwartz's value dimensions, young travelers, Russian consumer, sustainable orientation.

Citation: Komppula, R., A. Honkanen, S. Rossi and N. Kolesnikova (2018) The impact of values on sustainable behaviour - A study among Russian and Finnish university students. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 19 pp. 116-131

Introduction

Although it is widely accepted that an individual's values are a psychological aspect

of their personal decision making that influences their sustainable consumption behaviour (Belz & Peattie, 2010; Sirakaya-

Turk, Baloglu & Uecker-Mercado, 2014), it has received limited empirical attention in the tourism literature (Li & Cai, 2012). This current study is an attempt to fill this research gap, by comparing a Finnish and a Russian group of university students. Schwartz's (1992, 1994) classification of human values is applied, and environmentally and socially benign orientation of the two groups of students is measured by including all three dimensions of sustainability (ecological, social-cultural and economic) in the measures of consumers' self-reported travelling preferences, which are supposed to reflect their sustainable behaviours during a trip.

A literature review shows that majority of the studies combining values, sustainability and tourism are focused on the environmental and ecological aspect of sustainability: social, cultural and economic dimensions have received very little attention. Additionally, the majority of studies concerning environmental values have been conducted in the United Kingdom and other Anglo-Saxon countries, and the research in general does not consider the cultural implications of the research context (Papaoikonomou, Ryan, & Valverde, 2011). Because values are an outcome of the culture and ethnicity of a society (Kim, Forsythe, Gu & Moon, 2002), the cultural context should be taken into account as it shapes ethical beliefs and moral values (Arnocky, DeCicco, & Stroink 2007). A rare example of studies linking cultural values at the national level to individual pro-environmental value orientations is the study by Soyez (2012), reporting results of a study conducted in four western countries and Russia. Her results showed that influence of a pro-environmental value orientation differed substantially according to national cultural values. Also the results of Choi, Parsa, Sigala and Putrevu (2009) showed that differences in culture and social structure determine consumers' green orientation as well as their willingness to pay more for environmentally responsible practices. Hence, comparing the values and preferences of two groups of young people in a similar kind of life situation but in different kind of culture and life circumstances might be a subject for research.

The university campuses where the data were collected are located in eastern Finland and in

north-western Russia, the distance being some 370 kilometers and five hours by car. In spite of the close location, the economic and social disparity in terms of standards of living on the Finnish- Russian border region is claimed to be almost as high as between US and Mexico (Hannonen, 2017). People, their values and experiences may also be different. In the Finnish value hierarchy conformity is emphasized, indicating that Finns are regarded as the obedient "model students" of the European union, those who follow the rules and behave as expected, also in terms of sustainable behaviour (Puohiniemi, 2011). In Russia, the structure of the value orientations of modern young people reflects orientation to achievement of personal success, and the reducing importance of other people's welfare (Molchanov, 2005), which might refer to less attention to sustainability issues. Also the travel experience of Russian and Finnish youth differs. The overwhelming majority (86%) of Russian young people like travelling, but only one third can afford one or two trips every year (Bulganina, Ananieva, Tyumina & Shutova, 2016). Russian youth prefer to travel domestically, and more than half of young Russian people have never been abroad (Bulganina *et al.*, 2016). In Finland, travelling abroad is even more popular than domestic trips. In the year 2015 50% of 15-24 years old Finns have had leisure trip abroad with overnight at destination country at least once, but only 48 % of young Finns have made a similar domestic trip (Official Statistics Finland, 2016).

It is acknowledged that because of the restricted nature of this sample, any excessive generalization should be avoided. Nevertheless, the results offer a valuable enhancement of the knowledge of possible differences in sustainable values among people with different cultural backgrounds.

Sustainable lifestyles and consumption during a trip

A wide range of different definitions and closely related notions for sustainability, sustainable consumption or sustainable tourism exist in the literature. Sustainability emphasizes concepts of social equity, economic viability and environmental protection (Jamrozny, 2007).

Green thinking focuses mainly on the natural environment (Twomey, Twomey, Farias & Ozgur, 2010) but studies on green consumption have also included social aspects, such as buying local or Fairtrade products, admitting that it might be more appropriate to refer to such activities as sustainable consumption or purchasing (e.g. Gilg, Barr & Ford, 2005). Responsible consumption in general refers conventionally to awareness of the impact of consumption decisions on the environment, on consumer health and on society (Giesler & Veresiu, 2014), taking into account a product's origin, manufacturing process, labour work conditions, environmental impacts as well as the dealer's social responsibility (Díaz-Méndez, 2010). Finally, ethical consumption refers to consumer decisions concerned with the social, environmental and political consequences of consumption (Hall, 2014). Concepts of sustainability and ethicality are often used interchangeably (Bohn, 2015). Although in this study the concept of sustainable tourism is mostly used, it is acknowledged that sustainable, responsible and ethical are very closely related terms in the context of tourism consumption.

In practice, ecological sustainability is often the only approach in which sustainability is perceived by many travellers. The role of individual consumers and their possibility to impact on environmental problems both globally and locally has been a growing public interest in recent years (Barr, Shaw, Coles & Prillwitz, 2010). People's environmental awareness has increased over the last few decades (Lück, 2003) as has concern about environmental issues (Millar, Mayer & Baloglu, 2012). The relationship between environmentalism and materialism has also been an interest in academic literature, due to their contradictory values (e.g. Banerjee & McKeage, 1994).

Environmentally sustainable consumption in general and particularly in tourism has had remarkable attention from scientists and practitioners. Several scales have been developed to measure pro-environmental attitudes and behaviours. Environmentally sustainable activities often refer to recycling

practices, efficiency of resource use, limiting the waste production, water use and air pollution as well as animal welfare concerns. Individuals may choose specific sustainable issues to respond and connect with, such as organic produce, ethical consumption or animal cruelty, instead of the whole spectrum of sustainable consumption (Belz & Peattie, 2010).

The profile of pro-environmental consumers has got lots of attention in recent studies on values and sustainability. Some argue that males might be less environmentally active (e.g. Gilg *et al.*, 2005) and that women show more environmental concern (e.g. Jones & Dunlap, 1992; Zelezny, Chua & Aldrich, 2000) or behave more pro-environmentally (e.g. Dolnicar & Leisch, 2008) than men. The study of Dolnicar & Leisch (2008) indicated that older respondents had behaved more environmentally friendly way at the destination than younger ones. Claims also exist that groups of young adults, well-educated and politically liberals express more environmental concern than others (e.g. Jones & Dunlap, 1992).

While global environmental attitudes and the impact of tourism are widely researched, the data and attention towards sustainable economic, social and cultural development are much more limited (Leiserowitz, Kates & Parris, 2006; Swarbrooke, 1999). Economic sustainability refers to ensuring that the equitable distribution of the costs and benefits of tourism throughout the host community is occurs (Swarbrooke, 1999). Consumers have an opportunity to enhance the wellbeing of the destination locations in various ways, including but not limited to avoiding the purchase of harmful souvenirs, such as those made from endangered species (Budeanu, 2007), and by supporting ethically and locally-produced and -owned goods (Shaw, Grehan, Shiu, Hassan & Thomson, 2005). As Thompson, O'Hare and Evans (1995) stated, the development and use of local food production can diminish the reliance of the destination to other countries and increase its independence. Consumption of local products in general relate to local materials and employment which all are

concepts related to sustainability (Pereira, Mykletun & Hippolyte, 2012).

The objectives of socially sustainable tourism include respect for the socio-cultural authenticity of the host community, protection of their cultural heritage and traditional values and advancement of the understanding and tolerance between different cultures (UNWTO, 2010). The wellbeing of the local community is influenced by tourists' behaviour, which is why visitors should behave respectfully towards local residents (Budeanu, 2007). Some local people can feel their privacy and dignity threatened when they and their homes are used as tourist attractions without permission or equitable compensation (Cole & Eriksson, 2011).

The choice of travel mode proceeds often naturally from the selection of destination, which is why the choice of the destination itself has a major impact on the ecological sustainability of the travel (Böhler, Grischat, Hausteiner & Hunecke, 2006). Even if people are committed to environmental behaviour during their vacation, one of the most damaging parts of that holiday, travelling by plane to the destination, is not seen such a crucial issue that they would be ready to reduce it (Barr, Shaw, Coles & Prillwitz, 2010). Böhler *et al.* (2006) found out that higher ecological awareness does not seem to lead people to give up from overseas travels. Hence, the authors claimed that ecological values and behaviour do not seem to match.

In reality, the perceived additional cost, time taken, or poor comfort might encourage people to forego more pro-environmental modes of transport (Dickinson & Dickinson, 2006), but there is also evidence that tourists may be willing to pay an additional tax to support environmental and social protection in the destination (Dodds, Graci & Holmes, 2010), or to pay more for pro-environmental accommodation (Wight, 1997). However, contradictory results by Kasim (2004) suggested that the majority of tourists were undecided or refused to pay extra for a hotel that demonstrates socio-environmentally responsible behaviour. As Hedlund (2011) suggests, in the future tourists may demand

pro-environmental travels to be even cheaper than more resource-consuming ones. In consequence the willingness to sacrifice more money for environmental protection during a travel process may become an outdated concept (Hedlund, 2011).

Values

Although the importance of values has been generally accepted as impacting on behaviour, it has received only limited empirical attention among tourism researchers, especially those focusing on values related to sustainable behaviour (Li & Cai, 2012; Hedlund, Marell & Gärling, 2012). The value-basis theory for environmental attitudes presented by Stern and Dietz (1994) has been utilized by Hansla, Gamble, Juliusson and Gälling (2008a) and Doran, Hanss and Larsen (2016). Nevertheless, out of those few studies, which have combined values and ethical or environmental consumption, many have used Schwartz's (1992, 1994) classification of human values. For example, Shaw *et al.*, (2005) concentrated on the role and meaning of values in ethical consumption. In the context of tourism, Hedlund (2011) studied the impact of values on tourists' intentions to buy ecologically sustainable tourism alternatives, and Hedlund, Marell and Gärling (2012) examined how tourists' value orientation mediates the relationships between socio-demographic factors and environmental concern in vacation choice. Following the approach chosen by Hedlund (2011), Hedlund, Marell and Gärling (2012) as well as Hansla *et al.* (2008b), the bipolar self-transcendence and self-enhancement continuum by Schwartz (1992) has been utilized in this study, as in most researches examining the relationship between values and environmental behaviour (Sirakaya-Turk *et al.*, 2014).

According to Schwartz's theory, the values are arranged to opposite directions by the extent to which they motivate people to enhance their own personal interests, even at the expense of others, or how they motivate people to transcend selfish concerns and enhance the welfare of others and nature (Schwartz, 1992). So achievement and power, with selfish interests of success, authority and social esteem of oneself, are in an opposite side of

universalism and benevolence, which include acceptance of others as equals and concern for their welfare. The values of universalism emphasize the goals of tolerance and concern which include understanding, accepting and showing concern for the welfare of all people, even if their ways of life differ from one's own (Schwartz, 1994). The value type of benevolence encompasses dedication on the welfare of one's in-group in everyday interaction (Schwartz, 1992; 1994).

According to Schwartz (1992), in collectivist cultures benevolence values might be emphasized more than universalism values, as in contrast in individualist cultures there is a more equal emphasis on both value types. This is supported by the findings of Soyez (2012), indicating that in the countries holding individualistic values an eco-centric value orientation was important, meaning that individuals value nature for its own sake. In the Russian sample, which according to Soyez (2012) is characterized by collectivistic values, an anthropocentric value orientation was salient, meaning that the individuals have a view that environmental deterioration might have negative consequences for humankind. Nevertheless, it must be noted that the findings of studies of Buravleva (2011), Molchanov (2005) and Atabieva and Vindizheva (2014) show that among the Russian youth, the collectivistic values are diminishing and a change towards greater individualism is taking place. Molchanov (2005) states that the structure of the value orientations of modern Russian young people reflects orientation to achievement of personal success and the reducing importance of the of other people welfare.

The goal in achievement values is the success of oneself by demonstrating competence and following social standards in a more concrete interaction. In the meanwhile, power emphasizes control or dominance over others and the achievement of social status and authority as abstract outcomes of action in the general social system (Schwartz, 1992). Schwartz (1992) suggested that power values have generally a stronger conflict with universalism and benevolence values than achievement values do.

A person may commit oneself to environmental issues because of the threatening and harmful consequences that environmental problems can cause for themselves, others or biosphere (Hansla, Gamble, Juliusson & Gärling, 2008a). The value orientation of self-transcendence can be related to environmental concern about consequences for humans and the biosphere, while self-enhancement values may reflect concern about consequences for oneself (Hansla, Gamble, Juliusson & Gärling, 2008b). The value types in self-transcendence dimension have turned out to be positively related with environmentally friendly attitudes and behaviour as in the contrast the self-enhancement dimension seems to have a negative relationship with them (Hedlund, 2011; Hansla *et al.*, 2008a).

Data collection and analysis

Student samples are widely used in studies concerning consumer behaviour both in general and also in tourism context, such as when exploring consumers' attitudes and behavioural intentions towards environmentally responsible practices of hotels (e.g. Choi *et al.*, 2009), studying potential tourists (e.g. Phau, Shanka & Dhayan, 2010) or focusing on students' destination images and seeing this group as a party of the educational tourism market (e.g. Son & Pearce, 2005). Student samples have been common also in research on values relating to environmental concern (e.g. Arnocky, Stroink & DeCicco, 2007; Schultz, 2001; Schultz *et al.*, 2005). In this study, a student sample was chosen for the current study in order to attempt to maintain similarity across other demographic dimensions across participants in two different cultures.

For the Finnish sample, an electronic questionnaire was sent by e-mail to 2 782 students of the University of Eastern Finland (UEF) from school of humanities, department of business and department of geographical and historical studies. In total 508 answers were collected, representing a response rate of 18.3 %. The Russian sample was gathered among students of the Institute of Physical Education, Sport and Tourism of Petrozavodsk State University. Three student interviewers delivered the questionnaires to students from selected departments and asked them to fill in the paper

form questionnaires. 418 students of the Petrozavodsk State University from eleven different departments responded the questionnaire. The majority of the respondents were from Institutes of Forestry and Engineering (123 students), Physical Education, Sport and Tourism (114 students), Faculty of Economics (61 students), Faculty of Law (42 students), the rest representing mostly students of humanities.

The questionnaire began with the definition that in this study “travelling” means a trip abroad as a vacation trip or a business travel. This was given to ensure that all respondents were thinking the same image of travelling abroad and not the behaviour in domestic travels. Following Hedlund (2011), Hedlund, Marell and Gärling (2012) and Hansla *et al.* (2008b), a short-version lists from the original value model of Schwartz was applied, meaning that 29 values were selected from self-transcendence and self-enhancement dimensions. It is suggested that values such as equality and social justice from universalism value type can be considered to be part of sustainable social and economic values. Shaw *et al.* (2005) stated that both values were essential guiding principles for ethical consumers and they are described to indicate pro-social concern towards people outside individual’s own in-group (Shaw *et al.*, 2005). The 29 values selected should measure the values towards the welfare of others or in contrast the wellbeing of oneself. The respondents were asked to indicate the importance of the values as guiding principles in their lives. Five point Likert scale were used, ranging from 5 (very important) to 1 (not at all important).

Sustainable decisions during the travel process were measured with 10 items, based on Hedlund 2011 (item 1), Dolnicar & Leisch 2008 (items 2-3), Goodwin & Francis 2003 (item 4), Millar *et al.* 2012 (item 5), Kasim (2004) (items 6-7) and Shaw *et al.* 2005 (items 8-10). Utilizing a five point Likert scale (5=very important, 1=not at all important), the respondents were asked to rate how important the listed attributes are for them in a holiday. The question included the word “holiday” and not “travel” so that respondents would consider paying the travel themselves and not for

example by an employer on a business trip. The study of Hedlund (2011) also excluded business travel when examining value-attitude-behaviour relations in sustainable tourism, in order to point out that the respondents should have paid their accommodation themselves.

Finally, the respondents were asked to indicate their agreement on statements related to familiarity of the concept of sustainable tourism (“I am familiar with the concept of sustainable tourism”), awareness of the environmental and social consequences of travel, willingness to pay more for the services than local people, as well as the willingness to use time for searching for more responsible travel alternatives. 5-point Likert style scales were used, with answering options from strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree=5. While willingness to pay extra for environmental protection or otherwise sustainable practices can be criticized of the possible intention-behaviour gap, it may help on defining if tourists are ready to take any responsibility of their own (Hedlund, 2011; Dodds *et al.*, 2010).

The items on the questionnaire were originally in English, and for the Finnish version, the translation of the value items followed Puohiniemi’s earlier studies (e.g. Puohiniemi, 2011), and other items were translated by the researchers. The questionnaire was pre-tested among a small group of business students, and a few revisions were made in wordings. For the Russian version, all the items were first translated by the Russian researcher, and then back-translated into English and Finnish by a bilingual (Russian and Finnish) colleague, whose command of English is excellent. At this point it was realized that especially the items related to concepts such as ecolabel, or Fairtrade, needed additional descriptions instead of just a direct translation. The questionnaire was pre-tested among a group of tourism students before final acceptance.

Cluster analysis

The first part of the analysis was to make a K-mean cluster analysis based on the 29 values from Schwartz’s Value Model. The division of clusters can be explained by the theory of Schwartz, where the self-transcendence values are in the opposite direction in bipolar

Table 1. Results of the Cluster analysis

	Clusters		F-value
	Self-Enhancers (n=499)	Self-Transcenders (n=373)	
Equality (equal opportunity for all)	-0.327	0.444	149.02***
Inner harmony (at peace with myself)	-0.307	0.402	124.20***
Social power (control over others, dominance)	0.406	-0.553	249.5***
Spiritual life (emphasis on spiritual not material)	-0.064	0.101	5.88*
Meaning in life (a purpose in life)	-0.137	0.217	27.86***
Wealth (material possessions, money)	0.456	-0.605	329.80***
Self-respect (belief in one's own worth)	-0.096	0.116	9.72**
A world at peace (free of war and conflict)	-0.140	0.215	27.95***
Mature love (deep emotional and spiritual intimacy)	-0.286	0.350	96.08***
Social recognition (respect, approval by others)	0.149	-0.189	24.95***
Unity with nature (fitting into nature)	-0.234	0.286	62.28***
Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)	-0.143	0.166	20.92***
Authority (the right to lead and command)	0.582	-0.776	719.26***
True friendship (close, supportive friends)	-0.205	0.281	54.45***
A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)	-0.140	0.165	20.05***
Social justice (correcting injustice, care for the weak)	-0.356	0.474	175.62***
Loyal (faithful to my friends, group)	-0.189	0.272	49.72***
Ambitious (hardworking, aspiring)	0.347	-0.470	168.82***
Broad-minded (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)	-0.272	0.350	91.76***
Protecting the environment (preserving nature)	-0.199	0.290	54.90***
Influential (having an impact on people and events)	0.478	-0.619	368.52***
Capable (competent, efficient, effective)	0.201	-0.293	54.31***
Honest (genuine, sincere)	-0.374	0.486	192.64***
Preserving my public image (protecting my "face")	0.318	-0.417	133.17***
Intelligent (logical, thinking)	0.096	-0.132	11.03**
Helpful (working for the welfare of others)	-0.291	0.385	108.28***
Responsible (dependable, reliable)	-0.259	0.335	81.53***
Forgiving (willing to forgive others)	-0.207	0.288	55.59***
Successful (achieving goals)	0.397	-0.518	227.42***
N	477	396	

dimension from selfish interests of self-enhancement values towards acceptance of others as equals and concern for their welfare (Schwartz, 1994). In this part all the respondents, who left one or more value rating empty, were excluded from the comparison part of clusters. This meant that 455 respondents from 508 Finnish responses and 417 respondents from 418 Russian responses were included. The total N was 872.

To avoid respondents' answering pattern influence to clusters, the mean score across all motivation statements was calculated for each respondent and it was used to calculate the relative importance of each item for each respondent. Cluster analysis was tested with two to eight clusters. The result of two clusters was chosen (Table 1). The respondents divided very successfully and evenly into two clusters,

which were clearly distinguishable. In other cluster alternatives, respondents did not divide as well as in the solution of two clusters. The ANOVA results show that all 29 items make a significant ($p < 0.05$) contribution to the clustering process. Also a discriminant analysis was conducted. One discriminant function was generated with eigenvalue 2.185, 96,8% of original grouped cases were correctly classified.

Respondents loading onto cluster 1 are those who value more the welfare of oneself and the group in cluster 2 presents in contrast those who see the wellbeing of others more important. Consequently, two cluster solution was consistent with the value theory by Schwartz. Based on Schwartz's dimensions the clusters were named as Self-Enhancers and Self-Transcenders. Two cluster solution was

also suitable for the purpose of this study to compare the group that values the welfare of others from the differing group that does not see this as important as the wellbeing of oneself.

Among the Finnish students 149 (33 %) responders were classified as the Self-Enhancers and 306 as the Self-Transcenders (67 %). Russian students were divided into 350 the Self-Enhancers (84 %) and only 67 into the Self-Transcenders (16 %). Egoist values were stronger than universalist among Russian students.

Next the aim was to compare and find possible differences between the Self-Enhancers and Self-Transcenders and the importance that they give to sustainable attributes related to a travel process. For that purpose, a set of questions concerning on sustainable decisions during the travel process was taken under analysis. A principal component analysis (PCA) (n=894) was performed through SPSS 22 statistical package in order to summarize the information of 10 original variables into a smaller set of new composite dimensions (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Different rotation methods were tested but the results were quite similar. The Varimax rotation produced logical and easy to interpret solution. Two items were excluded because they shared loadings in two

components and/or decreased Cronbach's alpha. However, the item 'Hotel is certified as a green hotel' were taken in further analysis as a single item factor.

Variables with loadings greater than 0.50 were included and three components with eigenvalues 1 or greater were retained in the solution. Three components were extracted and named according to their content (Table 2). The components accounted for 73% of explained variance. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to assess reliability. The Cronbach's alphas varied from 0.73 to 0.80. Components were considered acceptable as coefficients exceeded 0.70 (Hair & al., 2014; Nunnally 1978).

Because sustainable development is often divided into ecological, economic, and social dimensions or pillars established in the Sustainable Development Congress in Johannesburg in 2002 (Black, 2007), the components of sustainability were named following these dimensions and according to the items loaded to them. The first component 'Social Sustainability' emphasized the meaning of social issues in a destination. The second component concerned Ecological sustainability and the third component Economic sustainability.

Table 2. Components of sustainability

Items	Components		
	Social sustainability	Ecological sustainability	Economical sustainability
Hotel employs local people	0.823		
The staff of a hotel is well-paid	0.802		
Your holiday benefits the people of the destination	0.761		
In the destination, there is little traffic in the village / town		0.841	
An unspoilt nature and natural landscapes of the holiday-resort		0.813	
The chosen travel mode do not harm the environment		0.702	
Local services (e.g. restaurants, guides)			0.909
Local-produced products (e.g. food, souvenirs)			0.838
Eigenvalue	3.28	1.54	1.00
Variance explained (%)	41.0	19.3	12.4
Cronbach's alpha	0.78	0.73	0.80

Table 3. Differences in attitudes towards sustainability components between Finnish and Russian students

	Finnish				Russians			
	Self-Enhancers (FSE) (n=136)		Self-Transcenders (FST) (n=320)		Self-Enhancers (RSE) (n=341)		Self-Transcenders (RST) (n=76)	
	Mean	95% C.I.	mean	95% C.I.	Mean	95% C.I.	Mean	95% C.I.
Social	-0.387	-0.557 ÷ -0.217	0.195	0.088 ÷ 0.301	-0.047	-0.152 ÷ 0.057	0.217	0.005 ÷ 0.428
							t=-2.027*	
								t=-5.926***
Ecological	-0.715	-0.863 ÷ -0.567	-0.341	-0.440 ÷ -0.243	0.450	0.361 ÷ 0.539	0.738	0.526 ÷ 0.952
								t=-2.536*
								t=-4.209***
Economic	0.009	-0.147 ÷ 0.166	0.277	0.168 ÷ 0.387	-0.218	-0.319 ÷ -0.117	0.126	-0.403 ÷ 0.151
								t=-.695
								t=-2.764**

Note: Level of significance: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

Three new variables were created by calculating factor scores (regression) and named according to the components. All variables had $n=894$, a mean of zero and a standard deviation of 1.00. Self-Enhancers and Self-Transcenders were analyzed in relation to the sustainability components separately in Russian and Finnish samples. The differences of attitudes towards sustainable components between clusters were compared by using independent samples t-test with equal variances assumed (Table 3). Among Finnish students the Self-Transcenders regarded all dimensions of sustainability when travelling as more important than the Self-Enhancers. T-tests were significant at $p < 0.01$. With Russians the difference was slightly statistically significant in the case of social ($p < 0.05$) and ecological sustainability ($p < 0.05$).

Also differences between Finnish and Russian students were compared using independent samples t-test with equal variances assumed. The Russian Self-Enhancers (RSE) were more worrying about social sustainability than the Finnish Self-Enhancers (FSE) ($t=-3.421$, $p=0.001$) but less than the Finnish Self-Transcenders (FST) ($-4,136$, $p=0.000$). Correspondingly, the Finnish Self-Transcenders were more interested in social sustainability than the Russian Self-Enhancers ($t=3.174$, $p=0.002$) but not more than the Russian Self-Transcenders (RST) ($t=-0.174$, $p=0.862$). The Russian Self-Enhancers (->FSE: $t=-13.707$, $p=0.000$; ->FST: $t=-11.029$,

$p=0.000$) and the Self-Transcenders (->FSE: $t=-11,762$, $p=0.000$; ->FST: $t=-9,194$, $p=0.000$) were more concerned about ecological sustainability than both Finnish clusters at statistically significant levels. Also the Finnish Self-Enhancers were more distressed about economic sustainability than the Russian Self-Enhancers ($t=2.398$, $p=0.017$) and the Finnish Self-Transcenders more than the Russian Self-Enhancers ($t=3.000$, $p=0.003$) and the Russian Self-Transcenders ($t=-11,762$, $p=0.000$).

The item 'Hotel is certified as a green hotel' was analysed using Mann-Whitney U-tests. The ecolabel was more important to Finnish Self-Transcenders than Finnish Self-Enhancers ($U= 17131.00$, $p=0.000$) but between Russians statistically significant difference was not found ($U=10502,50$, $p=0.138$). Other statistically significant differences were that Russian Self-Enhancers ($U= 19466,00$, $p=0.000$) and Russian Self-Transcenders ($U=8692,00$, $p=0.000$) appreciate more ecolabeled hotels than Finnish Self-Enhancers. Nationality predicted at least as well sustainable travel as Schwartz's value orientation but among Finnish students the latter explained well for sustainable travel behaviour.

In the questionnaire there were also statements about familiarity with the concept of sustainable tourism, awareness of the environmental and social consequences of traveling behaviour, willingness to pay more for services than local people do and readiness to use more time to

search for more responsible travel alternatives. Comparisons between pairs were made using Mann-Whitney U-tests.

According to the results, Finnish students were quite well familiar with the concept of sustainable tourism (Table 4) and more familiar than the Russians, who rather disagreed with the statement “I am familiar with the concept of sustainable tourism. There was a slight difference between the Finnish Self-Enhancers and the Self-Transcenders ($p < 0.001$) but not between Russian students ($p = 0.549$).

Overall, the awareness of the environmental/societal consequences of people’s travel behaviour seemed to be quite high among both nationality groups. Schwartz’s value orientation seemed to influence the awareness (Table 5): The Finnish Self-Transcenders were as aware of the environmental and social consequences of travel as the Russian Self-Transcenders ($p < 0.001$) and more aware than the Finnish Self-Enhancers ($p = 0.002$). The Russian Self-

Enhancers were the least aware of the consequences.

Between the Finns there were only minor differences ($p = .035$) for willingness to pay more for services than local people do (Table 6). The Russian Self-Transcenders and the Russian Self-Enhancers were not ready to pay as eagerly ($p < .001$). The effect of Schwartz’s value orientation to willingness to pay is comparatively slight.

When asked about readiness to use more time to search for more responsible travel alternatives the results were different than in previous question (Table 7). The Finnish Self-Enhancers were the least ready to use time for searching more responsible travel alternatives (all $p < .001$). The Finnish Self-Transcenders were as ready as the Russian Self-Transcender ($p < .001$) and more ready than the Russian Self-Enhancers ($p = 0.559$) to use more time to search for responsible travel options.

Table 4. *Familiarity with the concept of sustainable tourism*

		Mean	Median	FST	RSE	RST
Finnish	(FSE)	3.51	4	U=22048.5, $p=0.549$	U=14950.5, $p=0.000$	U=2663.5, $p=0.000$
	(FST)	3.56	4		U=30795.0, $p=0.000$	U=5488.5, $p=0.000$
Russians	(RSE)	2.71	3			U=10843.5, $p=0.305$
	(RST)	2.61	2			

Table 5. *Aware on environmental/social consequences of travel behaviour*

		Mean	Median	FST	RSE	RST
Finnish	(FSE)	3.68	4	U=18884.0, $p=0.002$	U=20728.5, $p=0.000$	U=4602.5, $p=0.354$
	(FST)	3.94	4		U=35354.0, $p=0.000$	U=9322.5, $p=0.219$
Russians	(RSE)	3.29	4			U=8802.5, $p=0.001$
	(RST)	3.75	4			

Table 6. *Willingness to pay more for services than local people do*

		Mean	Median	FST	RSE	RST
Finnish	(FSE)	3.11	3	U=19998.0, $p=0.035$	U=20761.0, $p=0.000$	U=3389.0, $p=0.000$
	(FST)	3.34	3		U=35996.0, $p=0.000$	U=5627.0, $p=0.000$
Russians	(RSE)	2.72	3			U=10436.0, $p=0.136$
	(RST)	2.51	2			

Table 7. *Readiness to use more time to search for more responsible travel alternatives*

		Mean	Median	FST	RSE	RST
Finnish	(FSE)	2.99	3	U=14759.5, p=0.000	U=20175.0, p=0.000	U=3386.0, p=0.000
	(FST)	3.63	4		U=44624.5, p=0.000	U=9743.5, p=0.559
Russians	(RSE)	3.37	3			U=10400.0, p=0.118
	(RST)	3.58	3			

Discussion

The aim of this paper was to study the values related to sustainable consumption of Finnish and Russian young consumers and particularly the sustainable behaviours of these youngsters in the context of travel. Students of one Finnish and one Russian university were chosen as a sample group, as it was assumed that life conditions and circumstances of university students might be more comparable than in other stages of the life cycle of consumers. Relying on earlier literature 29 values from Schwarz's value theory were selected to measure the self-transcendence and self-enhancement dimensions, which have been connected to sustainable behaviours by Hedlund (2011), Hedlund, Marell and Gärling (2012), Hansla *et al.* (2008b) as well as Shaw *et al.* (2005). Sustainable decisions during the travel process were measured with items referring to self-paid activities, referring to e.g. choice of local products or accommodations owned by the locals. Finally, questions related to familiarity of the concept of sustainable tourism, awareness of the environmental and social consequences of travel, as well as the willingness to take concrete responsibility for sustainable travelling were asked.

First of all, according to the results, the respondents divided very successfully and evenly into two clusters, which could be named according to Schwarz as Self-Enhancers and Self-Transcenders. Interestingly, the shares of these groups among Finnish and Russian student samples differed significantly, as the majority of Finnish respondents (67 %) were Self-Transcenders, and among Russian students the majority were Self-Enhancers (84 %). The results concerning the Russian student group are in line with findings of Buravleva (2011), Molchanov (2005) and Atabieva and Vindizheva (2014). Comparable current data based on Schwartz's theory on Finnish

students or youngsters have not been available.

Next the aim was to compare possible differences between Self-Enhancers and Self-Transcenders and the importance that they give to sustainable attributes related to travel process. This can be seen to reflect the intentions that respondents have concerning sustainable purchasing decisions in tourism. It could be assumed, that sustainable values would lead to sustainable purchasing decisions in a travel process as well. When the effect of Schwartz's value orientation was tested, it was found that it explains quite well different aspects of sustainable travel behaviour among the Finnish students but not so well in the case of Russian students. Finnish Self-Transcenders appreciated all dimensions of sustainability as more important than the Self-Enhancers, which is very much in line with earlier studies, indicating that Self-Transcendent values have been shown to correlate positively with macro-level environmental concerns (Sirakaya-Turk *et al.* 2014). In the Russian sample, the value based group explained slightly the attitude towards social sustainability and ecological sustainability, and interestingly, in general, Russian students were more concerned about ecological sustainability than the Finnish students. On the contrary, the Finns were more concerned about economic sustainability. In spite of the differences in awareness of the concept of sustainability, the recognition of the environmental and social consequences of tourism was reasonably high in both nationality groups. In line with earlier studies, in both nationality groups the Self-Transcenders were more aware of the consequences than the Self-Enhancers.

The above result may be connected to the next finding, according to which the Finnish students seemed to be more familiar with the concept of

sustainable tourism than the Russians. The study of Kask, Kull and Orru (2016) shows that the awareness and understanding of sustainable tourism is still shallow even among Russian tourism managers. It may be assumed that for Finns, ecological sustainability is part of their everyday life practices in form of recycling and sorting the household waste. According to the Finnish youth barometer, 54 % of Finnish young people between 15 and 29 years consider themselves as “green”, meaning that they put emphasis on environmental values (Myllyniemi, 2014). Finns are also used to buy environmentally friendly and Fair Trade products, which may represent social responsibility in consumption. According to the results of Haanpää (2007), based on Finnish data, consumers’ consumption styles have a notable effect on their commitment to environmentally conscious decisions. These behaviours are not common yet in Russia, and e.g. in Western countries well-known brand Fair Trade is not as known as in Finland. One reason can be that in Russia the term ecological tourism is more often used than sustainable tourism, which indicates that there the emphasis is more on ecological aspect of sustainability and other dimensions are ignored. Nevertheless, also ecological sustainability is still a new concept in Russia, and according to Sosunova (2010), there is a need for a fundamental change towards more ecological attitudes both among individual people and on the policy level. According to her, the lack of everyday pro-environmental practices in households is a consequence of incomplete ecological consciousness, including legislation and corporate culture.

The willingness to pay more for services than local people was asked as representing a measure of social responsibility of travelling. According to the results, the Finnish students were more willing to pay more for the local services than the Russians. This finding could be explained to be a result of generally better living conditions in Finland. The lack of economic resources as a reason is supported by the fact that both the Finnish Self-Transcenders and the Russian Self-Transcenders were as ready to use more time to search for more responsible travel alternatives. But interestingly, among the

Russians, the Self-Enhancers were more ready to pay more for services than local people than the Self-Transcenders. This finding may be interpreted to be in contrast with earlier studies, which emphasize the connection with self-transcendent values and altruistic concerns (e.g. Sirakaya-Turk *et al.* 2014), but on the other hand, it may be related to the Self-Enhancers’ motives of behaviour, which may emphasize personal success and independency, which seem to be common among young Russians of today (Mareeva, 2013). This assumption is supported also by the results of Schultz *et al.* (2005) who found out that Russian students were most concerned for the consequences of environmental problems to self, for other people being the second and the biosphere the third important concern.

Conclusions

According to the results of this study, it seems that within the Russian sample the concept of sustainability is understood as an ecological question, but for Finns, it is a comprehensive concept covering ecological, economic and social aspects. In the Finnish sample the value based groups seemed to explain the sustainability concerns, as stated in earlier literature (Sirakaya-Turk *et al.* 2014), but in the Russian sample, the value based group explained the attitude towards ecological sustainability but only slightly towards social sustainability. Hence, it can be concluded that the results of this study support Soyez’s (2012) claim that the value orientation may differ between nationalities, but is the difference a consequence of differing value structures among nationalities, or a result of more general societal circumstances, or a combination of these two, this remains partly as an open question. During the last two decades Russia has been on the path of reforming political, economic and social spheres of life, and young Russians have been forming their identity, norms and values in the period of constant transformations. Due to this change, young Russians are rejecting collectivism values towards individualism, emphasizing personal success, choice of their own goals, independence, well-being and social inequality (Mareeva, 2013). In the same vein, the Finns tends to get “harder” during the economic

recession, meaning the willingness of Finns to sacrifice their achieved living standard for reduction of pollution and ecological problems has decreased during the last decade (Haavisto & Kiljunen, 2011). As Haanpää (2007) notes, many of the consumers in Western societies are aware of environmental issues at an attitudinal level, but still their consumption behaviour is often an expression of going along with social norms.

This study was a modest attempt to examine the sustainability concerns from a broader point of view, not only focusing the environmental aspect, which is widely researched also in tourism studies. The results show that more research is needed and better measures for the economic and social aspects of sustainability should be developed.

Limitations

It is acknowledged that the sample of students representing consumers has run up against a lot of criticism and that students should not be handled as typical consumers (Wells, 1993). For instance, they may have different expectations and experience level compared to various consumer groups and more general population (Choi *et al.*, 2009). Nevertheless, as the majority of students are quite young, they represent future tourists in both business and leisure travel and therefore are an essential future segment for tourism industry to be taken into consideration. As Vermeir (2009) stated, when studying the sample of young adults following higher education, this fairly uniform group should not have major differences based on their age, income and social class.

References

- Arnocky, S., Stroink, M. L., & Decicco, T. (2007). Self-construal predicts environmental concern, cooperation, and conservation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 27(4), 255–264. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2007.06.005
- Atabieva, Z.A. & Vindizheva, S.A. (2014). Current state and trends of the youth moral values. *Actual problems of modern science*, 37, 17-25.
- Banerjee, B., & McKeage, K. (1994). How Green is My Value: Exploring the Relationship Between Environmentalism and Materialism. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 21(1), 147–152.
- Barr, S., Shaw, G., Coles, T. & Prillwitz, J. (2010). 'A holiday is a holiday': practicing sustainability, home and away. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), 474–481.
- Belz, F-M. & Peattie, K. (2010). *Sustainability Marketing: A Global Perspective*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Black, A. (2007). Pillars, bottom lines, capitals and sustainability: a critical review of the discourses. *International Journal Environment Cultural Economic and Social Sustainability*, 2(5), 107–117.
- Bohn, D. (2015). A Review of "Managing ethical consumption in tourism/Tourism and social marketing", edited by Clare Weeden and Karla Boluk/C.Michael Hall. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(7), 1117-1120.
- Budeanu, A. (2007). Sustainable tourist behaviour – a discussion of opportunities for change. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(5), 499–508.
- Bulganina, S.V., Ananieva, K.V., Tyumina, N.S. & Shutova, Yu. G. (2016). Market research of young people priorities in tourism area. *Internet-journal Naukovedenie*, 8(4). <http://naukovedenie.ru/PDF/06EVN416.pdf>
- Buravleva, N.A. (2011). Valuable orientations of students. *Bulletin of the Tomsk State Pedagogical University*, 6, 124-129.
- Böhler, S., Grischkat, S., Haustein, S. & Hunecke, M. (2006). Encouraging environmentally sustainable holiday travel. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and practice*, 40(8), 652–670.
- Choi, G., Parsa, H. G., Sigala, M. & Putrevu, S. (2009). Consumers' Environmental Concerns and Behaviours in the Lodging Industry: A Comparison between Greece and the United States. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 10(2), 93–112.
- Cole, S. & Eriksson, J. (2011). Tourism and Human Rights. In Cole, S. & Morgan, N. (Eds.), *Tourism and Inequality: Problems and Prospects*, Wallingford: CABI, 107–125.
- Díaz-Méndez, M. (2010). Ethics and consumption: a difficult balance.

- International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 7(1), 1-10.
- Dickinson, J. E. & Dickinson, J. A. (2006). Local Transport and Social Representations: Challenging the Assumptions for Sustainable Tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(2), 192–208.
- Dodds, R., Graci, S. R. & Holmes, M. (2010). Does the tourist care? A comparison of tourists in Koh Phi Phi, Thailand and Gili Trawangan, Indonesia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(2), 207–222.
- Dolnicar, S. & Leisch, F. (2008). Selective marketing for environmentally sustainable tourism. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 672–680.
- Doran, R., Hanss, D. & Larsen, S. (2016). Intentions to make sustainable tourism choices: do value orientations, time perspective, and efficacy beliefs explain individual differences? *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 1-16, DOI:10.1080/15022250.2016.1179129.
- Giesler, M. & Veresiu, E. (2014). Creating the Responsible Consumer: Moralistic Governance Regimes and Consumer Subjectivity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(October), 840-857.
- Gilg, A., Barr, S. & Ford, N. (2005). Green consumption or sustainable lifestyles? Identifying the sustainable consumer. *Futures*, 37(6), 481–504.
- Goodwin, H. & Francis, J. (2003). Ethical and responsible tourism: Consumer trends in the UK. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, Vol. 9. No. 3, 271–284.
- Haanpää, L. (2007). Consumers' green commitment: indication of a postmodern lifestyle? *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31, 478-486.
- Haavisto, J. & Kiljunen, P. (2011). *Maailman paras maa. EVAn kansallinen arvo- ja asennetutkimus 2011*. Helsinki: Taloustieto Oy.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., Anderson, B. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. (7th ed.) Harlow: Pearson
- Hall, C.M. (2014). You can check out anytime you like but you can never leave. Can ethical consumption in tourism ever be sustainable? In Clare Weeden & Karen Boluk (eds.): *Managing Ethical Consumption in Tourism*, Oxfordshire, England, New York, New York: Routledge, 32-55.
- Hannonen, O. (2017). *Peace and quiet beyond the border: the trans-border mobility of Russian second home owners in Finland*. Doctoral Dissertation Summary. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 17, 261-264.
- Hansla, A., Gamble, A., Juliusson, A. & Gärling, T. (2008a). The relationships between awareness of consequences, environmental concern, and value orientations. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 28(1), 1–9.
- Hansla, A., Gamble, A., Juliusson, A. & Gärling, T. (2008b). Psychological determinants of attitude towards and willingness to pay for green electricity. *Energy Policy*, 36(2), 768–774.
- Hedlund, T. (2011). The impact of values, environmental concern, and willingness to accept economic sacrifices to protect the environment on tourists' intentions to buy ecologically sustainable tourism alternatives. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(4), 278–288.
- Hedlund, T., Marell, A. & Gärling, T. (2012). The mediating effect of value orientation on the relationship between socio-demographic factors and environmental concern in Swedish tourists' vacation choices. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 11(1), 16-33.
- Jamrozy, U. (2007). Marketing of tourism: a paradigm shift toward sustainability. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1(2), 117–130.
- Jones, R. E. & Dunlap, R. E. (1992). The Social Bases of Environmental Concern: Have They Changed Over Time? *Rural Sociology*, 57(1), 28–47.
- Kasim, A. (2004). Socio-Environmentally Responsible Hotel Business: Do Tourists to Penang Island, Malaysia Care? *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 11(4), 5–28.
- Kask, S., Kull, T. & Orru, K. (2016). Understanding of sustainable tourism among Russian tourism managers. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 14, 101-105.
- Kim, J.-O., Forsythe, S. Gu, Q., Moon, S.J. (2002). Cross-cultural consumer values,

- needs and purchase behaviour, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 19(6), 481 - 502
- Leiserowitz, A. A., Kates, R. W. & Parris, T. M. (2006). Sustainability values, attitudes, and behaviours: a review of multinational and global trends. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 31, 413–444.
- Li, M. & Cai. L. A. (2012). The Effects of Personal Values on Travel Motivation and Behavioural Intention. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(4), 473–487.
- Lück, M. (2003). The 'New Environmental Paradigm': Is the scale of Dunlap and Van Liere applicable in a tourism context? *Tourism Geographies*, 5(2), 228–240.
- Mareeva, S.V. (2013). Russian youth: identity, values and ideas about the optimal social order. *Reforming Russia*, 12, 361-380.
- Millar, M., Mayer, K. J. & Baloglu, S. (2012). Importance of Green Hotel Attributes to Business and Leisure Travelers. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 21(4), 395–413.
- Molchanov, S.V. (2005). Features of value orientations of the teenagers and youth. *Psychological Science and Education*, 3, 16-25.
- Mylyniemi, S. (2014). *Youth barometer 2014. Summary*. Ministry of Education and Culture, Youth Research Network, Advisory Council for Youth Affairs. Internet Publications (Finnish Youth Research Society). https://tietoanuorista.fi/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Youth_Barometer_2014_Summary_WEB.pdf , accessed 8.11.2016.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Official Statistics of Finland (OSF) (2017). Finnish Travel [e-publication]. Helsinki: Statistics Finland [referred: 24.1.2017]. http://www.stat.fi/til/smat/index_en.html
- Papaoikonomou, E., Ryan, G. & Valverde, M. (2011). Mapping Ethical Consumer Behaviour: Integrating the Empirical Research and Identifying Future Directions. *Ethics & Behaviour*, 21(3), 197-221.
- Phau, I., Shanka, T. & Dhayan N. (2010). Destination image and choice intention of university student travellers to Mauritius. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(5), 758–764.
- Pereira, E. M. V., Mykletun, R. J. & Hippolyte, C. (2012). Sustainability, daily practices and vacation purchasing: are they related? *Tourism Review*, 67(4), 40–54.
- Puohiniemi, M. (2011). Arvot, asenteet ja ympäristönsuojelu. In Harju-Autti, Neuvonen & Hakkarainen (Eds.), *Ympäristötietoisuus. Suomalaiset 2010-lukua tekemässä*. Helsinki: Ympäristöministeriö, Rakennustieto Oy, 31-48.
- Schultz, P.W. (2001). The Structure of environmental concern: concern for self, other people, and the biosphere. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21, 327-339.
- Schulz, P.W., Gouveia, V.V., Cameron, L.D., Tankha, G., Schmuck, P. & Franěk, M. (2005). Values and their relationship to environmental concern and conservation behaviour. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36(4), 457-475.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In Zanna, M. P. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol 25. San Diego: Academic Press, 1–65.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are There Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human Values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50(4), 19–45.
- Shaw, D., Grehan, E., Shiu, E., Hassan, L. & Thomson, J. (2005). An exploration of values in ethical consumer decision making. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4(3), 185–200.
- Sirakaya-Turk, E., Baloglu, S. & Uecker-Mercado, H. (2014). The Efficacy of Sustainability Values in Predicting Travelers' Choices for Sustainable Hospitality Businesses. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 55(1), 115-126.
- Son, A. & Pearce, P. (2005). Multi-Faceted Image Assessment: International Students' Views of Australia as a Tourist Destination. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 18(4), 21–35.
- Sosunova, I.A. (2010). Ecological behaviour as a sociological category. *Bulletin MNEPU*, 1, 191-196.

- Soyez, K. (2012). How national cultural values affect pro-environmental consumer behaviour. *International Marketing Review*, 29(6), 623-646.
- Swarbrooke, J. (1999). *Sustainable Tourism Management*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (4th ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Thompson, C., O'Hare, G. & Evans, K. (1995). Tourism in The Gambia: problems and proposals. *Tourism Management*, 16(8), 571–581.
- Twomey, D. F., Twomey, R. F., Farias, G. & Ozgur, M. (2010). Human Values and Sustainability: Can Green Swim Upstream? *People & Strategy*, 33(1), 52–59.
- UNWTO. (2010). *Joining Forces: Collaborative Processes for Sustainable and Competitive Tourism*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- Vermeir, I. (2009). Sustainable Food Consumption, Involvement and Knowledge: An Application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour. In Saito, F. (Ed.), *Consumer Behaviour*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 87–103.
- Wells, W. D. (1993). Discovery-oriented Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(4), 489–504.
- Wight, P. A. (1997). Ecotourism accommodation spectrum: does supply match the demand? *Tourism Management*, 18(4), 209–220.
- Zelezny, L.C., Chua, P.P., & Aldrich, C. (2000). Elaborating on gender differences in environmentalism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 443-457.
-