Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

THE PREDICTIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ECO-ANXIETY AND ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY BEHAVIOR AMONG INDONESIAN GENERATION Z

Angelina Henias Sugianto[a1*], Siti Jaro'ah[b2]

[12]Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

[*a]*E-mail: angelinahenias.23035@mhs.unesa.ac.id*
[b]*E-mail: sitijaroah@unesa.ac.id*

(*) Corresponding Author
angelinahenias.23035@mhs.unesa.ac.id

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received : 29-08-2026
Revised : 12-11-2026
Accepted : 20-11-2026

KEYWORDS
eco-anxiety; environmental behavior; Generation Z; linear regression; stress coping

ABSTRACT

Environmental crises can trigger ecological anxiety (eco-anxiety), particularly among Generation Z, who increasingly have easy access to information about climate change and environmental degradation. This study aimed to examine the predictive relationship between eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior among Generation Z aged 17–29 years. A quantitative approach with a non-experimental correlational design was applied through a cross-sectional online survey. The participants were 150 individuals selected through purposive sampling. Eco-anxiety was measured using the Indonesian version of the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS-13), while environmentally friendly behavior was measured using the five-item Indonesian version of the Environmentally-Friendly Behavior scale. All items met the validity criterion of a corrected item-total correlation of at least 0.30 (0.484–0.780). Internal reliability was high, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.943 for eco-anxiety and 0.838 for environmentally friendly behavior. Simple linear regression showed a positive and significant predictive relationship between eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior ($b = 0.150$; 95% CI [0.094, 0.206]; $\beta = 0.401$; $p < 0.001$; $R^2 = 0.161$), and the coefficient remained significant with HC3 robust standard errors. Thus, the higher the eco-anxiety, the higher the tendency toward environmentally friendly behavior among the respondents. Because of the cross-sectional design, the findings indicate a statistical association rather than causality.

This is an open access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

INTRODUCTION

The climate crisis and environmental degradation are global problems that affect not only the physical condition of the environment but also have the potential to influence human psychological well-being (Nurfitria, 2025). Climate change, increasing disaster risks, and ecosystem damage can give rise to concerns about environmental sustainability

Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

and living conditions in the future. One psychological response to these threats is eco-anxiety, namely anxiety related to the ecological crisis and the worsening condition of the environment (Pihkala, 2020). Hogg et al. (2021) explained that eco-anxiety is a multidimensional construct that encompasses various emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses to environmental problems. In the Indonesian context, this issue is relevant because society faces various disaster risks, including hydrometeorological disasters. The National Disaster Management Agency (*Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana* [BNPB]) recorded 3,472 disaster events in Indonesia in 2024, dominated by floods (1,420 events), forest and land fires (973 events), and extreme weather (733 events) (BNPB, 2025). In the same year, the Meteorology, Climatology, and Geophysical Agency (*Badan Meteorologi, Klimatologi, dan Geofisika* [BMKG]) reported a national mean air temperature of 27.5 °C, 0.8 °C above the 1991–2020 normal, making 2024 the warmest year in its observation record since 1981 (BMKG, n.d.). Cahyaningrum et al. (2026) highlighted the importance of understanding ecological anxiety in the context of increasing environmental threats and climate change.

Generation Z is a relevant group in eco-anxiety research because it has grown up amid advances in information technology and increasingly easy access to information about the environmental crisis. Exposure to information about climate change, disasters, and ecosystem damage can increase awareness of environmental threats, but it can also give rise to concerns about the future. Hickman et al. (2021), in a global survey of about 10,000 young people aged 16–25 years in ten countries, found that worry about climate change was a widespread experience among young people. This worry was related not only to environmental conditions but also to their views of the future and of government responses to climate change. In this study, the Generation Z group of interest comprised respondents aged 17–29 years. This age range allows the study to examine anxiety about the environmental crisis among young people who are going through various life stages, including education, preparation for entering the workforce, and the development of personal independence.

In addition to being related to psychological conditions, the environmental crisis also requires individual involvement through changes in everyday behavior. Environmentally friendly behavior consists of actions that can help reduce the impact of human activities on the environment, among others through more efficient use of resources and consumption decisions that consider ecological impacts (Tam, 2025). Examples include bringing one's own shopping bag, using energy-saving lamps, choosing energy-efficient household appliances, and buying environmentally friendly food. Adishesa et al. (2024) adapted the Environmentally-Friendly Behavior scale to the Indonesian context and retained five items to measure environmentally friendly behavior. Accordingly, environmentally friendly behavior in this study is focused on personal habits and consumption behavior covered by this instrument, rather than on all forms of environmental action such as activism or participation in environmental movements.

The relationship between eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior is important to examine because anxiety about the environmental crisis does not always produce the same behavioral response. On the one hand, anxiety can encourage individuals to look for ways of coping with the perceived threat, including actions considered capable of reducing environmental impact. On the other hand, excessive anxiety can disrupt daily activities and psychological well-being. Pihkala (2020) explained that eco-anxiety needs to be understood by considering how individuals experience and respond to the anxiety. In line with this, Verplanken et al. (2020) discussed the difference between constructive and unconstructive ecological worry. Jain and Jain (2022) also examined eco-anxiety and environmental concern as predictors of eco-activism, while Sampaio et al. (2023) investigated the association between eco-anxiety and environmental action among young adults. These findings indicate that anxiety about the environment is potentially related to individual action, although the relationship needs to be tested according to the characteristics of the population and the type of behavior studied.

Theoretically, the relationship between eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior can be understood through stress and coping theory (Folkman, 2020). This theory describes two forms of appraisal. In primary appraisal, individuals evaluate whether a situation is relevant to their well-being and whether it represents harm, threat, or challenge; in secondary appraisal, they evaluate what can be done and which resources are available. Coping then

Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

takes the form of emotion-focused efforts to regulate distress or problem-focused coping, that is, efforts directed at dealing with or changing the source of stress. Applied to the ecological crisis, eco-anxiety can be viewed as an outcome of appraising environmental degradation as a threat to one's future and well-being. When individuals also appraise that some actions are within their reach, the anxiety can be channeled into problem-focused coping, such as seeking information about what can be done, changing consumption habits, and using resources more sparingly (Fahik et al., 2023). Among children, problem-focused coping with climate change has been positively correlated with environmental efficacy and pro-environmental behavior (Ojala, 2012). Environmentally friendly behavior can therefore be understood as one possible problem-focused response to environmental threat. However, anxiety does not always result in adaptive action; when the threat is appraised as exceeding one's capacity to act, very strong anxiety can also disrupt daily activities (Verplanken et al., 2020). Therefore, the direction and strength of the relationship between eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior need to be tested empirically rather than assumed from the outset.

Testing the relationship between the two variables also needs to be supported by appropriate instruments. In this study, eco-anxiety was measured using the Indonesian version of the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS-13) adapted by Cahyaningrum et al. (2026). This instrument consists of 13 items covering four dimensions: affective symptoms, rumination, behavioral symptoms, and anxiety about personal impact. Affective symptoms relate to emotional responses such as anxiety and restlessness; rumination relates to repetitive thoughts about environmental problems; behavioral symptoms include disruption in carrying out daily activities; and anxiety about personal impact relates to concerns about responsibility and the impact of one's own actions on the environment. Meanwhile, environmentally friendly behavior was measured using the five-item Indonesian version of the Environmentally-Friendly Behavior scale adapted by Adishesa et al. (2024). Using both instruments allows the study to test the relationship between overall eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior measured through personal habits and consumption behavior.

Although research on eco-anxiety and environmental action has grown, empirical findings on the relationship between the two variables are not uniform. In a survey of 12,246 participants in 32 countries, climate anxiety was positively associated with pro-environmental behavior in 24 countries but with environmental activism in only 12 countries (Ogunbode et al., 2022). In the United Kingdom, climate anxiety predicted some but not all types of pro-environmental action (Whitmarsh et al., 2022), whereas in Australia eco-anxiety was associated with a lower likelihood of collective climate action, in contrast with eco-anger (Stanley et al., 2021). Among Portuguese young adults, only the rumination and anxiety about personal impact dimensions of the HEAS predicted higher engagement in pro-environmental behavior (Sampaio et al., 2023), and Jain and Jain (2022) examined eco-anxiety together with environmental concern as predictors of eco-activism. In Indonesia, Yasinda et al. (2023) found that eco-anxiety did not significantly predict overall pro-environmental behavior among 147 young adults in Jakarta, although rumination and anxiety about personal impact were related to participatory action. These differences in country, type of behavior, and instrument indicate that the relationship cannot be assumed to be the same across contexts. This study specifically tests the predictive relationship between eco-anxiety, measured using the Indonesian version of HEAS-13, and environmentally friendly behavior, measured through the Indonesian version of the scale and focused on personal habits and consumption. Thus, this study is expected to provide more contextual empirical evidence on the link between psychological responses to the ecological crisis and the everyday behavior of Generation Z aged 17–29 years in Indonesia.

Based on the above description, this study aimed to examine the predictive relationship between overall eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior among Generation Z aged 17–29 years. Theoretically, this study is expected to add empirical evidence in the field of environmental psychology on the link between anxiety about the environmental crisis and individual behavior. Practically, the results are expected to inform the development of environmental education and campaigns that not only raise awareness of the ecological crisis but also provide concrete

Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

steps that young people can take. Because the study used a non-experimental cross-sectional survey design, the results are interpreted as a statistical predictive relationship and do not prove a cause-and-effect relationship.

Based on stress and coping theory and previous findings, the hypothesis of this study is that eco-anxiety positively predicts environmentally friendly behavior among Generation Z aged 17–29 years in Indonesia. Statistically, the null hypothesis (H0) states that the regression coefficient of eco-anxiety is equal to zero, and the alternative hypothesis (H1) states that the regression coefficient of eco-anxiety is not equal to zero, with a positive direction expected.

METHOD

Research design

This study used a quantitative approach with a non-experimental correlational design to examine the predictive relationship between eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior among Generation Z. The quantitative approach was chosen because both variables were measured numerically and analyzed using statistical techniques. Data were collected through a cross-sectional survey, that is, data collection in a single measurement period. In this study, eco-anxiety was set as the predictor variable (X), while environmentally friendly behavior was set as the criterion variable (Y).

The participants were individuals belonging to Generation Z, aged 17–29 years at the time of data collection. They were recruited using non-probability sampling, a sampling technique that does not give every member of the population an equal chance of being selected. Specifically, purposive sampling was used by considering the suitability of participants' characteristics to the research objective. The participant criteria were individuals aged 17–29 years who were willing to participate voluntarily, gave consent after reading the research information, and completed the questionnaire in full. The final data analyzed came from 150 respondents.

This study used two measuring instruments to measure eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior. Eco-anxiety was measured using the Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS-13), which was adapted into Indonesian by Cahyaningrum et al. (2026). The scale consists of 13 items covering four dimensions, namely affective symptoms, rumination, behavioral symptoms, and anxiety about personal impact. Respondents were asked to answer based on their experience over the past two weeks using four response options: 0 (not at all), 1 (several days), 2 (more than half the days), and 3 (nearly every day). In this study, item validity and the internal reliability of the scale were re-examined using the respondents' data.

Environmentally friendly behavior was measured using the Environmentally-Friendly Behavior scale, adapted into Indonesian by Adishesa et al. (2024) from the instrument of Liobikienė and Juknys (2016). The Indonesian version consists of five items that measure individuals' tendency to perform everyday environmentally friendly behavior. Examples of the behaviors measured include bringing a personal shopping bag, using energy-saving lamps, choosing energy-efficient household appliances, and buying environmentally friendly products. Scores were obtained by summing the responses to all items; a higher total score indicates a higher tendency toward environmentally friendly behavior. Item validity and internal reliability of the scale were re-examined using the data of this study.

Data were collected online using a questionnaire created in Google Forms. At the beginning of the questionnaire, participants received information about the research objective, the participation criteria, the voluntary nature of their involvement, and the confidentiality of their data. Consent to participate was obtained before participants continued to complete the questionnaire. Participants then answered questions about relevant demographic characteristics and responded to all items on both research instruments. The collected data were checked to ensure the completeness of responses and their conformity with the participant criteria. Data that did not meet the criteria or were not completely filled in were excluded from the analysis.

Data were analyzed using statistical software. The analysis began with descriptive statistics to describe participant characteristics and the distribution of eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior scores. Next, instrument quality was examined through item validity and internal reliability tests. Regression assumptions were

Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

checked on the residuals, covering normality of residuals, independence of residuals, and heteroscedasticity. When heteroscedasticity was found, inference on the regression coefficients was complemented with HC3 robust standard errors. Hypothesis testing was conducted using simple linear regression at a significance level of 0.05.

Simple linear regression was used to determine the direction and magnitude of the predictive relationship between eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior. This analysis tested whether eco-anxiety scores could predict variation in respondents' environmentally friendly behavior scores. The hypothesis testing decision was based on the 0.05 significance level. The results were interpreted by considering the regression coefficient, the significance value, the confidence interval, and the coefficient of determination. Because the research design was cross-sectional and non-experimental, the regression results were not interpreted as evidence of causality.

The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles of psychological research. Participation was voluntary, participants received adequate information before giving their consent, and the data were used only for research purposes. The confidentiality of participants' information was maintained during the processing, analysis, and reporting of the research results.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Respondent characteristics and descriptive statistics

This study involved 150 Generation Z respondents aged 17–29 years. By gender, the majority of respondents were women (117 respondents, 78.0%), while 33 respondents (22.0%) were men, as presented in Table 1. This shows that the research sample was dominated by women.

Table 1. Respondent characteristics by gender

Gender	*n*	%
Women	117	78.0
Men	33	22.0
Total	150	100.0

Descriptive statistics (Table 2) show that eco-anxiety had a mean score of 18.15 with a standard deviation of 9.84, while environmentally friendly behavior had a mean score of 14.47 with a standard deviation of 3.69. Within the eco-anxiety variable, the affective symptoms dimension obtained the highest mean (5.54), followed by rumination (4.35), anxiety about personal impact (4.33), and behavioral symptoms (3.93).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the research variables

Variable	Number of items	Theoretical range	*M*	*SD*
Eco-anxiety	13	0–39	18.15	9.84
Environmentally friendly behavior	5	5–20	14.47	3.69

Based on score categorization using the mean ± one standard deviation, most respondents fell into the moderate category for both eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior (Table 3). For eco-anxiety, 86 respondents (57.3%) were in the moderate category, 31 respondents (20.7%) in the low category, and 33 respondents (22.0%) in the high category. For environmentally friendly behavior, 106 respondents (70.7%) were in the moderate category, 27 respondents (18.0%) in the low category, and 17 respondents (11.3%) in the high category.

Table 3. Score categorization of the research variables

Variable	Category	Score limit	*n*	%
Eco-anxiety	Low	< 8.31	31	20.7
Eco-anxiety	Moderate	8.31 to < 27.99	86	57.3
Eco-anxiety	High	≥ 27.99	33	22.0

Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

Variable	Category	Score limit	*n*	%
Environmentally friendly behavior	Low	< 10.79	27	18.0
Environmentally friendly behavior	Moderate	10.79 to < 18.16	106	70.7
Environmentally friendly behavior	High	≥ 18.16	17	11.3

Instrument validity and reliability

Item validity is presented in Table 4, where items X1–X13 are the eco-anxiety items and items Y1–Y5 are the environmentally friendly behavior items. An item was retained when its corrected item-total correlation was at least 0.30. All corrected item-total correlations met this criterion, with the lowest values of 0.652 (X5) on the eco-anxiety scale and 0.484 (Y1) on the environmentally friendly behavior scale. All calculated item-total correlations (0.667–0.862) also exceeded the critical value of 0.160 for n = 150 (α = 0.05, two-tailed). Therefore, all 18 items were declared valid, and no items were removed from the analysis.

Table 4. Item validity of the eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior scales

Item	Calculated *r*	Item-test *r*
X1	0.762	0.721
X2	0.816	0.777
X3	0.786	0.740
X4	0.776	0.734
X5	0.705	0.652
X6	0.784	0.742
X7	0.712	0.660
X8	0.765	0.708
X9	0.767	0.717
X10	0.750	0.698
X11	0.816	0.780
X12	0.795	0.755
X13	0.789	0.760
Y1	0.667	0.484
Y2	0.813	0.661
Y3	0.862	0.765
Y4	0.695	0.556
Y5	0.860	0.768

Reliability testing (Table 5) yielded Cronbach's alpha of 0.943 for the eco-anxiety scale, which falls in the very high category, and 0.838 for the environmentally friendly behavior scale, which falls in the high category.

Table 5. Reliability of the research scales

Scale	Number of items	Cronbach's α	Category
Eco-anxiety	13	0.943	Very high
Environmentally friendly behavior	5	0.838	High

Regression assumption tests

The assumption checks (Table 6) showed that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test found no significant deviation from normality of the residuals ($D = 0.083$; $p = 0.234$). However, the Shapiro-Wilk test yielded $p = 0.049$, slightly below the 0.05 significance limit. Because the two tests did not give entirely the same indication, the normality of the residuals should be interpreted cautiously. The Durbin-Watson value of 1.83 did not indicate strong autocorrelation.

Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

The Breusch-Pagan test indicated heteroscedasticity (LM = 5.12; p = 0.024), so the inferential estimates were complemented with HC3 robust standard errors.

Table 6. Regression assumption tests

Test	Statistic	*p*	Conclusion
Kolmogorov-Smirnov (residuals)	D = 0.083	0.234	Normally distributed
Shapiro-Wilk (residuals)	W = 0.982	0.049	Borderline normality
Durbin-Watson	1.83	–	No autocorrelation
Breusch-Pagan	LM = 5.12	0.024	Mild heteroscedasticity

Hypothesis testing

The simple linear regression showed that the regression model was significant, $F(1, 148) = 28.44$, $p < 0.001$, with $R = 0.401$, $R^2 = 0.161$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.156$. This means that eco-anxiety explained 16.1% of the variation in environmentally friendly behavior. The regression coefficient of eco-anxiety was positive and significant ($b = 0.150$; $\beta = 0.401$; $t = 5.33$; $p < 0.001$), as shown in Table 7. The regression equation was $Y = 11.742 + 0.150X$. The 95% confidence interval of the eco-anxiety coefficient ranged from 0.094 to 0.206. The standard errors in Table 7 are conventional ordinary least squares standard errors; with HC3 robust standard errors, the coefficient of eco-anxiety remained significant ($p < 0.05$).

Table 7. Results of the simple linear regression analysis

Predictor	*b*	*SE (OLS)*	β	*t*	*p*	95% CI
(Constant)	11.742	0.582	–	20.18	< 0.001	[10.592, 12.892]
Eco-anxiety	0.150	0.028	0.401	5.33	< 0.001	[0.094, 0.206]

Note. SE (OLS) = conventional ordinary least squares standard error; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval based on the conventional standard error. With HC3 robust standard errors, the coefficient of eco-anxiety remained significant ($p < 0.05$).

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the predictive relationship between eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior among Generation Z aged 17–29 years in Indonesia. Before the hypothesis test, instrument quality was examined. All items of the HEAS-13 and of the environmentally friendly behavior scale were valid, and the internal reliability obtained was 0.943 for eco-anxiety and 0.838 for environmentally friendly behavior. These values indicate good internal consistency in the sample of this study. Nevertheless, high reliability does not in itself prove that an instrument measures all aspects of a construct; interpretation still needs to consider the coverage of dimensions and the characteristics of the sample.

Descriptively, the mean eco-anxiety score was 18.15 (SD = 9.84) out of a theoretical range of 0–39, and most respondents (57.3%) were in the moderate category. This finding shows that anxiety about the environmental crisis was experienced by many respondents, although its level varied. This is in line with the finding of Hickman et al. (2021) that worry about climate change is a widespread experience among young people. Among the four dimensions, affective symptoms had the highest mean, followed by rumination, anxiety about personal impact, and behavioral symptoms. Comparisons across dimensions need to be interpreted carefully because the number of items in each dimension is not the same. This pattern may indicate that emotional responses and repetitive thoughts were more prominent in this sample, but it is not sufficient to conclude that these dimensions are substantively the most dominant without considering the number of items and the score range of each dimension.

Environmentally friendly behavior had a mean score of 14.47 (SD = 3.69) out of a theoretical range of 5–20, with 70.7% of respondents in the moderate category. The mean score was above the theoretical midpoint of the scale, so respondents showed a tendency to carry out several environmentally friendly habits. However, the instrument used

Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

covers only five personal and consumption habits. Therefore, these results cannot be generalized to describe all forms of environmental behavior, such as activism, advocacy, or involvement in environmental movements.

The simple linear regression showed that eco-anxiety had a positive and significant predictive relationship with environmentally friendly behavior ($b = 0.150$; $\beta = 0.401$; $p < 0.001$). The regression model was significant, $F(1, 148) = 28.44$, $p < 0.001$, and eco-anxiety explained 16.1% of the variation in environmentally friendly behavior scores ($R^2 = 0.161$). Statistically, each one-point increase in the eco-anxiety score was associated with a 0.150-point increase in the environmentally friendly behavior score predicted by the model.

The results are consistent with studies that found positive associations between climate or eco-anxiety and pro-environmental behavior (Ogunbode et al., 2022; Whitmarsh et al., 2022) and with the finding that specific eco-anxiety dimensions predict environmental action (Sampaio et al., 2023), but they differ from the non-significant overall relationship reported among young adults in Jakarta (Yasinda et al., 2023), which used a different measure of pro-environmental behavior. In addition, this study measured a more limited form of behavior, namely personal and consumption habits, so its results cannot be directly equated with eco-activism (Jain & Jain, 2022). Several psychological and social mechanisms may underlie the positive association. First, in terms of stress and coping theory, appraising the ecological crisis as a threat can prompt problem-focused coping, and personal and consumption habits such as bringing one's own shopping bag or saving energy are low-cost actions within individuals' control, so they may be the most accessible way to act on the worry (Folkman, 2020; Ojala, 2012). Second, worry about global warming can function as a constructive response that is linked to pro-environmental values, a green identity, and past pro-environmental behavior (Verplanken et al., 2020), so eco-anxiety and environmentally friendly behavior may share an underlying environmental concern. Third, cultural and social factors, such as shared norms about consumption, can shape whether concern is expressed in behavior (Tam, 2025). These mechanisms were not measured in this study and remain explanations to be tested. The positive relationship also does not mean that increased anxiety is always beneficial: eco-anxiety has been associated with lower well-being and, in some contexts, with a lower likelihood of collective action (Stanley et al., 2021).

Theoretically, these findings support the application of stress and coping theory in environmental psychology by showing that, in this sample, a higher level of anxiety about the ecological crisis was associated with more environmentally friendly personal and consumption habits, which is consistent with viewing such habits as one possible problem-focused response to environmental threat. Because eco-anxiety was analyzed as a total score and coping was not measured, the findings do not show which component of eco-anxiety is related to behavior or through which coping process. Practically, environmental education and campaigns should not only convey the magnitude of the ecological crisis but also provide realistic, affordable, and consistently doable action options. This approach is important so that concern for the environment can be directed toward adaptive action without increasing individuals' psychological burden.

This study has several limitations. First, the cross-sectional design does not allow conclusions about the direction of the relationship; environmentally friendly habits may also increase attention to environmental problems and thereby eco-anxiety. Second, purposive non-probability sampling and a sample dominated by women (78.0%) limit generalization to Generation Z in Indonesia. Third, both variables were measured by self-report in one questionnaire, which may bias the relationship through shared method variance and social desirability. Fourth, the environmentally friendly behavior scale covers only five personal and consumption habits, and eco-anxiety was analyzed only as a total score, so the roles of its dimensions and of other forms of environmental action were not examined. Fifth, the residuals showed mild heteroscedasticity and borderline normality according to the Shapiro-Wilk test, although inference with HC3 robust standard errors led to the same conclusion. Finally, eco-anxiety explained 16.1% of the variance in environmentally friendly behavior; the remaining 83.9% is unexplained by the model and may reflect variables that were not measured, such as personal values, social norms, self-efficacy, and access to environmentally friendly products, as well as measurement error.

Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

CONCLUSION

Based on the data from 150 Generation Z respondents aged 17–29 years, eco-anxiety had a positive and significant predictive relationship with environmentally friendly behavior (b = 0.150; 95% CI [0.094, 0.206]; β = 0.401; $p < 0.001$; $R^2 = 0.161$), and the relationship remained significant with HC3 robust standard errors. Respondents with higher eco-anxiety scores tended to report more environmentally friendly personal and consumption habits. Eco-anxiety explained 16.1% of the variation in environmentally friendly behavior, while 83.9% remained unexplained by the model. Theoretically, the findings are consistent with stress and coping theory, in which appraising the ecological crisis as a threat may be accompanied by problem-focused action, but the cross-sectional design does not show that anxiety causes behavior change. Practically, environmental education programs can combine awareness-raising with concrete, realistic, and easily applied action steps so that concern is directed toward adaptive action without adding psychological burden. Future research is recommended to use longitudinal or experimental designs and more diverse samples, to analyze the dimensions of eco-anxiety separately, to measure coping strategies, self-efficacy, and social norms as possible mechanisms, and to include broader forms of environmental action.

REFERENCES

Adishesa, M. S., Rocky, & Suwartono, C. (2024). Adaptation of environmentally-friendly behavior scale to Indonesian. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengukuran Psikologi, 13*(1), 55–64. https://doi.org/10.21009/JPPP.131.07

Badan Meteorologi, Klimatologi, dan Geofisika. (n.d.). *Anomali suhu udara rata-rata tahun 2024*. https://www.bmkg.go.id/iklim/anomali-suhu-udara/anomali-suhu-udara-rata-rata-tahun-2024

Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana. (2025). *Data bencana Indonesia 2024* (Vol. 3). Pusat Data, Informasi dan Komunikasi Kebencanaan BNPB. https://bnpb.go.id/storage/app/media/Buletin%20Info%20Bencana/Buku%20Data%20Bencana%202024/20250613_Buku%20Data%202024.pdf

Cahyaningrum, N., Jaro'ah, S., & Santosa, R. P. (2026). Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale (HEAS-13): Adaptation and validation of the ecological anxiety scale for the Indonesian context. *Indigenous: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi, 11*(1), 14–26. https://doi.org/10.23917/indigenous.v11i1.15444

Fahik, A. S., Musika, A., Damaina, M., Roga, T., Fallo, A., Djuang, G., Augustin, M., & Amaral, L. (2023). Keputusan pembelian kembali: Kepedulian konsumen terhadap produk ramah lingkungan. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research, 3*, 3818–3831.

Folkman, S. (2020). Stress: Appraisal and coping. In M. D. Gellman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of behavioral medicine* (2nd ed.). Springer. ISBN 978-3-030-39903-0. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39903-0_215

Hickman, C., Marks, E., Pihkala, P., Clayton, S., Lewandowski, R. E., Mayall, E. E., Wray, B., Mellor, C., & van Susteren, L. (2021). Climate anxiety in children and young people and their beliefs about government responses to climate change: A global survey. *The Lancet Planetary Health, 5*(12), e863–e873. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00278-3

Hogg, T. L., Stanley, S. K., O'Brien, L. V., Wilson, M. S., & Watsford, C. R. (2021). The Hogg Eco-Anxiety Scale: Development and validation of a multidimensional scale. *Global Environmental Change, 71*, 102391. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2021.102391

Jain, N., & Jain, P. (2022). Eco-anxiety and environmental concern as predictors of eco-activism. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1084*, 012007. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1084/1/012007

Liobikienė, G., & Juknys, R. (2016). The role of values, environmental risk perception, awareness of consequences, and willingness to assume responsibility for environmentally-friendly behaviour: The Lithuanian case. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 112*, 3413–3422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.10.049

Sosioedukasi
JURNAL ILMIAH ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN SOSIAL
ISSN: 2086-6135 E-ISSN: 2541-612x
Volume 15 No. 4 Desember 2026 https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/sosioedukasi/index

Nurfitria, S. (2025). Eco-anxiety pada Gen Z dan implikasinya pada kesehatan mental. *Journal of Linguistics and Social Studies, 3*(1), 23–36. https://doi.org/10.52620/jls.v3i1.351

Ogunbode, C. A., Doran, R., Hanss, D., Ojala, M., Salmela-Aro, K., van den Broek, K. L., Bhullar, N., Aquino, S. D., Marot, T., Schermer, J. A., Wlodarczyk, A., Lu, S., Jiang, F., Maran, D. A., Yadav, R., Ardi, R., Chegeni, R., Ghanbarian, E., Zand, S., . . . Karasu, M. (2022). Climate anxiety, wellbeing and pro-environmental action: Correlates of negative emotional responses to climate change in 32 countries. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 84*, 101887. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101887

Ojala, M. (2012). How do children cope with global climate change? Coping strategies, engagement, and well-being. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 32*(3), 225–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2012.02.004

Pihkala, P. (2020). Anxiety and the ecological crisis: An analysis of eco-anxiety and climate anxiety. *Sustainability, 12*(19), 7836. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12197836

Sampaio, F., Costa, T., Teixeira-Santos, L., Pinho, L. G. de, & Sequeira, C. (2023). Validating a measure for eco-anxiety in Portuguese young adults and exploring its associations with environmental action. *BMC Public Health, 23*, 1905. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16816-z

Stanley, S. K., Hogg, T. L., Leviston, Z., & Walker, I. (2021). From anger to action: Differential impacts of eco-anxiety, eco-depression, and eco-anger on climate action and wellbeing. *The Journal of Climate Change and Health, 1*, 100003. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joclim.2021.100003

Tam, K. (2025). Culture and pro-environmental behavior. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 62*, 101986. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2024.101986

Verplanken, B., Marks, E., & Dobromir, A. I. (2020). On the nature of eco-anxiety: How constructive or unconstructive is habitual worry about global warming? *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 72*, 101528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101528

Whitmarsh, L., Player, L., Jiongco, A., James, M., Williams, M., Marks, E., & Kennedy-Williams, P. (2022). Climate anxiety: What predicts it and how is it related to climate action? *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 83*, 101866. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101866

Yasinda, A. S., Wulandari, I. R., & Waldah, A. (2023). Cemas tak selalu buruk: Peran eco-anxiety terhadap perilaku pro-lingkungan pada anak muda Jakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah Penelitian Psikologi: Kajian Empiris & Non-Empiris, 9*(2), 13–23.