



The Influence of Awareness of Consequences, Internal Locus of Control, and External Locus of Control on Pro-Environmental Behavior in Students

Sholihul Hadi¹, Rizma Fithri², Moh. Sholeh³

^{1,2,3} Psychology Department, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this research is to determine whether there is a relationship between Awareness of Consequences, Internal Locus of Control, and External Locus of Control with Pro-Environmental Behavior among students. This study is correlational and comparative, with data collected using a Likert scale consisting of scales for pro-environmental behavior, Awareness of Consequences, Internal Locus of Control, and External Locus of Control. The population of this study is students, and the sample taken was 320 individuals using proportional random sampling. Multiple linear regression analysis was used for data analysis. The results showed that there is no relationship between awareness of consequences and external locus of control with pro-environmental behavior among students, while there is a relationship between internal locus of control and pro-environmental behavior among students.

KEYWORDS: Awareness of consequences, Internal locus of control, External locus of control, pro-environmental behavior.

INTRODUCTION

Sustainable environmental development is a deliberate and planned effort to integrate environmental resources into development processes to ensure the welfare, capabilities, and quality of life of current and future generations (Saptari, 2014). Currently, sustainable development policies in many countries focus more on the economic sector, utilizing science and technology to achieve maximum economic value. However, this often results in the overexploitation of natural resources (Saptari, 2014). Indonesia, as a developing country, still relies on commodities and natural resources for economic development. One of the major obstacles to sustainable development in Indonesia is the degradation and depletion of natural resources, leading to a reduction in their availability. Consequently, in the National Medium-Term Development Plan for 2020-2024 (RPJMN), efforts to build environmental resilience, address climate change, and enhance disaster preparedness are prioritized (BPS, 2020).

In 2020, according to data from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK), the largest source of waste in Indonesia was household waste, indicating a low level of environmental awareness among the population. In 2021, the World Resources Institute reported that Indonesia was among the top 10 largest greenhouse gas emitters in the world, largely due to human activities such as fossil fuel emissions, forest and peatland use, agriculture, industrial activities, and waste (BPPT, 2021). Environmental damage and resource depletion should prompt individuals to adopt pro-environmental behaviors. Despite numerous environmental conservation efforts from various sectors, challenges such as the preservation of natural resources, including water, forests, and biodiversity, remain in sustainable development (Gabriella & Sugiarto, 2020).

To prevent the consequences of environmental damage, pro-environmental behavior is necessary (Arlinkasari et al., 2018). Pro-environmental behavior reflects concern for the environment, involving efforts to prevent, conserve, manage, and restore the environment from damage (Sujana et al., 2018). Various dimensions of pro-environmental behavior, such as eco-friendly consumption, recycling, energy conservation, and transportation, are the focus of efforts to build pro-environmental behavior (Gabriella & Sugiarto, 2020).

The role of students as agents of change, role models, and social controllers requires them to have environmental awareness and pro-environmental attitudes (Sushanti, 2012; Istichomaharani & Habibah, 2016). Research conducted by Bronfman and colleagues (Ariestianingsih et al., 2018) also indicates that several factors support pro-environmental behavior. These factors include values, ecological paradigms, awareness of consequences, responsibility, and personal norms. Furthermore, research by Widiantari (2019) states that personal norms are also shaped by awareness of the impact of one's actions (awareness of consequences) and individual



responsibility for those actions (responsibility belief). In other words, an individual's awareness of consequences can influence pro-environmental behavior (Arlinkasari et al., 2018).

Rucas & Miller, as cited in Dasi et al., (2019), state that locus of control (LC) is a stable behavior in each individual, involving the belief that success and failure are influenced by one's own actions (internal locus of control) or external factors (external locus of control). Research by Dasi et al., (2019) shows a significant and positive relationship between locus of control (LC) and the intention of pro-environmental behavior, as evidenced by the contribution and determination of locus of control towards pro-environmental intention. Previously, Trivedi et al., (2015) found that environmental locus of control (LC) is positively related to pro-environmental behavior, indicating that locus of control (LC) has a significant positive impact on pro-environmental behavior. Sarigolu & Huang (2011) suggested that individuals with an internal locus of control are more likely to care about the environment and thus are more inclined to engage in activities to protect it. In contrast, those with an external locus of control believe that their actions are unimportant and that change can only be made by others in power (Kollmus & Agyeman, 2002). This is consistent with Yang & Weber (2019), who found that individuals with an external locus of control believe that environmental conservation and care are the responsibilities of government institutions and companies, not themselves.

Based on the issues presented above, the researcher is interested in conducting a study to determine whether there is an influence of awareness of consequences (AC), internal locus of control (LCI), and external locus of control (LCE) on pro-environmental behavior among students, who typically have strategic plans and business partnerships that support behavior and responsibility towards environmental sustainability. This is also supported by the commitment to environmental sustainability that aligns with the teachings of Islam Rahmatan Lil Alamin, which advocate that environmental utilization and management should be based on love and are considered part of worship (Rhofita, 2019).

METHODS

This research is quantitative with a correlational research design. The purpose of this study is to explore the influence of awareness of consequences (X1), internal locus of control (X2), and external locus of control (X3) on pro-environmental behavior among students. Data analysis in this study used multiple linear regression analysis. The research population comprised 8th-semester students, totaling 4,625 students, consisting of both males and females. This number was drawn from nine faculties. The sampling technique used was Probability Sampling with proportionate stratified random sampling, where samples were taken proportionally based on the number of subjects in each stratum or region.

Based on calculations by Sugiyono (2018), the sample size used was 5% of the population, resulting in a sample of 228 students who met the following criteria: 1) Active students, 2) Male and female, 3) Aged 18-25 years, 4) In their 8th semester. The study utilized four research instruments: the pro-environmental behavior scale, adapted from research by Kaiser, F. G., the awareness of consequences scale, modified from research by Ryan & Spash, and the internal and external locus of control scales, modified from research by Sandi Irawan Nugroho. The measurement scale applied was a Likert scale, which included both positive (favorable) and negative (unfavorable) statements regarding the research variables. The scale had four response options: Strongly Agree (SS), Agree (S), Disagree (TS), and Strongly Disagree (STS).

RESULTS

The following is a description and breakdown of the number of subjects who participated, the minimum score, maximum score, mean, and standard deviation.

Table I: Description of Number of Subjects

| Variable | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Pro-Environmental Behavior (Y) | 320 | 63 | 114 | 85.71 | 8.494 |
| Awareness Of Consequences (X1) | 320 | 34 | 60 | 51.42 | 5.593 |
| Locus Of Control Internal (X2) | 320 | 26 | 51 | 41.43 | 4.752 |
| Locus Of Control External (X3) | 320 | 24 | 42 | 33.19 | 3.289 |



Table I shows that the minimum score for the Pro-Environmental Behavior variable is 63, the maximum score is 114, the mean score is 85.71, and the standard deviation is 8.494. The Awareness of Consequences (AC) variable has a minimum score of 34, a maximum score of 60, a mean score of 51.42, and a standard deviation of 5.593. The Internal Locus of Control (LCI) variable has a minimum score of 26, a maximum score of 51, a mean score of 41.43, and a standard deviation of 4.752. The External Locus of Control (LCE) variable has a minimum score of 24, a maximum score of 42, a mean score of 33.19, and a standard deviation of 3.289.

Based on the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values of these variables, the categorization of the research subjects is as follows:

Table II: Categorization of All Research Variables

| Variable | Categorization | Criteria | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------|------------|
| Pro-Environmental Behavior | Bad | $X \leq 85,71$ | 161 | 50,3 |
| | Good | $X > 85,71$ | 159 | 49,7 |
| | Total | | 320 | 100 |
| Awareness of Consequences (AC) | Low | $X \leq 51.42$ | 132 | 41,2 |
| | Hight | $X > 51.42$ | 188 | 58,8 |
| | Total | | 320 | 100 |
| Locus of Control Internal (LCI) | Low | 36 | 37 | 11,6 |
| | Medium | $36 \leq X < 46$ | 219 | 68,4 |
| | High | 46 | 64 | 20,0 |
| | Total | | 320 | 100 |
| Locus Of Control External (LCE) | Low | 30 | 41 | 12,8 |
| | Medium | $30 \leq X < 36$ | 198 | 61,9 |
| | High | 36 | 81 | 25,3 |
| | Total | | 320 | 100 |

Table II explains that pro-environmental behavior in the poor category ($X \leq 85.71$) is held by 161 people (50.3%), while the good category ($X > 85.71$) is held by 159 people (49.7%). Awareness of Consequences (AC) in the poor category ($X \leq 51.42$) is held by 132 people (41.3%), while the good category ($X > 51.42$) is held by 188 people (58.8%). The Internal Locus of Control (LCI) in the lowest category (with a score of less than 36) is held by 37 people (11.6%), in the poor category (36-41) by 96 people (30.0%), in the good category (41-46) by 135 people (42.2%), and in the highest category (more than 46) by 52 people (16.2%). The External Locus of Control (LCE) in the lowest category (with a score of less than 30) is held by 59 people (18.4%), in the poor category (30-33) by 116 people (36.2%), in the good category (34-36) by 113 people (35.3%), and in the highest category (more than 36) by 33 people (10.3%).

To test the influence of the variables Awareness of Consequences (AC), Internal Locus of Control (LCI), and External Locus of Control (LCE) on the pro-environmental behavior of students, multiple linear regression was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 20. The results of the test are as follows:

Table III: Partial Test (T)

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|-------|--|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 78.339 | 8.885 | | 8.817 | .000 |
| | <i>Awareness Of Consequences (AC)</i> | -.129 | .088 | -.085 | -1.477 | .141 |
| | <i>Locus Of Control Internal (LCI)</i> | .454 | .108 | .254 | 4.222 | .000 |
| | <i>Locus Of Control External (LCE)</i> | -.145 | .153 | -.056 | -.945 | .345 |



Based on Table III, we can see that the significance value for the Awareness of Consequences (AC) variable is $0.141 > 0.05$, and the t-value is $-1.477 < \text{the t-table value of } 1.64963$. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Awareness of Consequences (AC) variable is not partially related to the pro-environmental behavior variable. The significance value for the Internal Locus of Control (LCI) variable is $0.000 < 0.05$, and the t-value is $4.222 > \text{the t-table value of } 1.64963$. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Internal Locus of Control (LCI) variable is partially related to the pro-environmental behavior variable. Meanwhile, the significance value for the External Locus of Control (LCE) is $0.345 < 0.05$, and the t-value is $-9.45 < \text{the t-table value of } 1.64963$. Therefore, it can be concluded that the External Locus of Control (LCE) variable is not partially related to the pro-environmental behavior variable.

To determine the influence of all the independent variables (Awareness of Consequences (AC), Internal Locus of Control (LCI), and External Locus of Control (LCE)) simultaneously on the dependent variable (pro-environmental behavior), an F-test was conducted with the following results:

Table IV: Simultaneous Test (F)

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------|------------|-------------------|------------|-------------|-------|-------|
| 1 | Regression | 1.616.853 | 3 | 538.951 | 7.960 | .000b |
| | Residual | 21.396.697 | 316 | 67.711 | | |
| Total | | 23.013.550 | 319 | | | |

Based on the F-test, it can be seen that the significance value is $0.000 < 0.05$, and the calculated F value is $7.960 > 3.878$ (the F-table value), so it can be concluded that the independent variables Awareness of Consequences (AC), Internal Locus of Control (LCI), and External Locus of Control (LCE) are simultaneously related to the dependent variable, pro-environmental behavior.

To determine the extent of the influence of the independent variables (Awareness of Consequences (AC), Internal Locus of Control (LCI), and External Locus of Control (LCE)) on the dependent variable (pro-environmental behavior) in this study, the coefficient of determination (R-Squared) test was conducted. The results are as follows:

Table V: Coefficient of Determination Test

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .265a | .070 | .061 | 8.229 |

a Predictors: (Constant), Locus of Control External (LCE), Awareness of Consequences (AC), Locus of Control Internal (LCI)

Based on Table V, the R Square value is 0.070, which means that 7% of the pro-environmental behavior variable can be explained by the Awareness of Consequences (AC), External Locus of Control (LCE), and Internal Locus of Control (LCI) variables. The remaining 99.3% is influenced by other variables.

DISCUSSIONS

This study aimed to determine the existence of a relationship between Awareness of Consequences (AC), Internal Locus of Control (LCI), and External Locus of Control (LCE) with pro-environmental behavior among students. Validity, reliability, and prerequisite tests, including normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity tests, were conducted before moving on to hypothesis testing using multiple linear regression analysis with IBM SPSS Statistics 16 for Windows. The research sample consisted of 320 students. According to Bronfman et al. in Ariestianingsih et al., (2018), several factors can support pro-environmental behavior, including values, ecological paradigms, awareness of consequences, responsibility, and personal norms. Gifford in Putra (2019) mentioned that factors influencing pro-environmental behavior include childhood experiences, personality, locus of control, values, political and worldviews, goals, sense of responsibility, and place attachment. Kurniawan (2019) describes locus of control as an individual's characteristic in assessing success in protecting themselves from the harmful effects of the environment based on internal and external locus of control. The following is a discussion of the results of hypothesis testing for each variable:



I The Relationship Between Awareness of Consequences (AC) and Pro-Environmental Behavior

Referring to the hypothesis test result, no influence was found between Awareness of Consequences (AC) and Pro-Environmental Behavior. This is evident from the obtained t-value of -1.477, which is less than the t-table value of 1.64963, and a significance value of 0.141, which is greater than 0.05. From these results, H_0 is accepted, and H_a is rejected, meaning that Awareness of Consequences (AC) does not influence pro-environmental behavior. Partially, Awareness of Consequences (AC) does not affect pro-environmental behavior. This aligns with the study by Fang et al., (2019), which showed no influence between Awareness of Consequences (AC) and pro-environmental behavior. This research was conducted among local government employees, where awareness of consequences did not directly impact their pro-environmental behavior. This could occur because local government employees primarily handle operational and administrative tasks to implement policies from higher-level central government agencies. As a result, they are less concerned with broader environmental issues (e.g., global climate change) and less attentive to surrounding environmental problems.

In the categorization table of Awareness of Consequences (AC), the awareness level is still low at 41%, and pro-environmental behavior is still considered poor. Therefore, it can be said that students' low concern for the environment indicates no correlation between Awareness of Consequences and pro-environmental behavior. According to the VBN (Value-Belief-Norm) theory, the determinant of the intention to engage in pro-environmental behavior includes awareness of consequences—understood as an individual's belief in the adverse consequences of environmental issues. To engage in pro-environmental behavior, awareness of consequences should evoke a sense of responsibility to act accordingly. However, in reality, the sense of responsibility is still relatively low. Pane (2013), in Gabriella & Sugiarto (2017), stated that students' environmental awareness is still relatively low. Moreover, students in their final semesters are less focused on environmental issues. Additionally, the pandemic has brought significant changes to pro-environmental behavior. Fauziyyah et al., (2021) mentioned that students' stress and anxiety during the COVID-19 pandemic were relatively high, affecting their physical and daily activities. This explanation also contributes to why Awareness of Consequences (AC) is not related to pro-environmental behavior. Haryanto & Prahara (2017) in their study of 292 students, stated that increasing awareness of pro-environmental behavior needs to be addressed. Furthermore, the position of subjects in their final semesters also influences their environmental awareness and behavior, as they are preoccupied with completing final assignments to achieve their goals. In line with this, according to Hawthorne and Alabaster (1999), for the 18-24 year age group, the main reason for environmental behavior indifference is the feeling of no alternatives, with a greater focus on saving money and lack of time.

يَسْعُرُونَ لَا وَلَكِنَّ الْمَقْسِدُونَ هُمْ إِنَّهُمْ ۝ آ لَا

“Indeed, they are the ones who make mischief, but they do not perceive it” (Al Baqarah verse 12).

At-Thabari, in his interpretation of Jami'ul Bayan fi Tafsiril Qur'an, says this is Allah's rebuttal to the false claims of the hypocrites in Medina. When asked to obey Allah's commands and abstain from His prohibitions, they reply, “We are the ones who promote good, not corruption. We follow Allah's guidance in actions you disapprove of, not in deviation.” Allah refutes them, stating, “Indeed, they are the ones who cause corruption,” by defying Allah's commands, overstepping bounds, committing sins, and neglecting obligations, “but they do not perceive it,” unaware that they are the ones causing mischief, not believers who enjoy justice or Muslims who forbid others from rebellion on earth (At-Thabari).

II The Relationship Between Internal Locus of Control (LCI) and Pro-Environmental Behavior

Referring to the hypothesis test result, a relationship was found between Internal Locus of Control (LCI) and Pro-Environmental Behavior. This is evident from the obtained t-value of 4.222, which is greater than the t-table value of 1.64963, and a significance value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05. From these results, H_0 is rejected, and H_a is accepted, meaning that Internal Locus of Control (LCI) affects pro-environmental behavior. Partially, Internal Locus of Control (LCI) influences pro-environmental behavior. The study by Jonsson & Nilsson (2014) on office employees found that self-transcendent values and internal locus of control positively influence pro-environmental behavior, with an r value of 0.330. The study also found that locus of control moderates the influence between values and societal behavior; individuals with lower levels of self-transcendence values exhibit pro-environmental behavior if they have an internal locus of control.



The study by Trivedi et al., (2015) found that environmental locus of control (LC) is positively related to pro-environmental behavior. The study by Jonsson & Nilsson (2014) on office employees found that self-transcendent values and internal locus of control are positively related to pro-environmental behavior, and that locus of control moderates the relationship between values and societal behavior; individuals with lower levels of self-transcendence values exhibit pro-environmental behavior if they have an internal locus of control. Furthermore, in the categorization of the Internal Locus of Control variable, there are 219 individuals in the medium category and 64 in the high category, which is more than the 37 in the low category. Internal Locus of Control leans more towards the medium and high categories, indicating that they believe that effort, ability, and interest determine pro-environmental behavior.

It is explained in the Quranic verse Ar-Rum that any damage to the Earth in any form is strongly influenced by human behavior and actions.

يَرْجِعُونَ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَعْلَمُوا الَّذِينَ بَعَضَ لِيذِيقَهُمُ النَّاسِ آيَدِي كَسَبَتْ بِمَا وَالْبَحْرُ الْبَرِّ فِي الْفَسَادِ ظَهَرَ

“Corruption has appeared throughout the land and sea by (reason of) what the hands of people have earned so He may let them taste part of (the consequence of) what they have done that perhaps they will return (to righteousness). Say, ‘Travel through the land and observe how was the end of those before; most of them were polytheists.’” (QS. Ar-Rum 41-42).

Ibn Abbas, Ikrimah, Ad-Dahhak, As-Saddi, and others say that the term “al-barr” in this verse refers to deserts, and “al-bahr” refers to cities and all other towns. According to another narration from Ibn Abbas and Ikrimah, “al-bahr” means cities located on riverbanks. Other scholars say that “al-barr” refers to the land as we know it, and “al-bahr” refers to the sea. Zaid ibn Rafi' said regarding the meaning of the verse “Corruption has appeared...” (Ar-Rum: 41) that it refers to the cessation of rain that does not water the land, resulting in drought; and “al-bahr” refers to animals of the land. This is according to what was narrated by Ibn Abu Hatim. From this explanation, it can be concluded how the current environmental condition is strongly influenced by our beliefs in managing it.

III The Relationship Between External Locus of Control (LCE) and Pro-Environmental Behavior

Referring to the hypothesis test result, no influence was found between External Locus of Control (LCE) and Pro-Environmental Behavior. This is evident from the obtained t-value of -9.45, which is less than the t-table value of 1.64963, and a significance value of 0.345, which is greater than 0.05. From these results, H_0 is accepted, and H_a is rejected, meaning that External Locus of Control (LCE) does not influence pro-environmental behavior. Partially, External Locus of Control (LCE) does not affect pro-environmental behavior. Although external LOC does not influence pro-environmental behavior, this is influenced by other cognitive factors such as perceived social norms or moral obligations (Newhouse, 1990; Dunlap et al., 2000; Buritan, 2000; Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Jonsson & Nilsson, 2014).

Considering that campus culture has a high Islamic value, it is possible to assume that trust in fate and circumstances beyond human control is interpreted as a form of tawakkal (reliance) on God. However, this differs from the resignation to fate intended in this study, where resignation to fate means how individuals wholly surrender to other people. This is also reflected in the table showing that the students' level of external locus of control is relatively high. In some studies, social norms and morals can overcome external LOC to produce the desired behavior (Newhouse, 1990). Therefore, the cause of the lack of connection is the presence of this assumption. Similarly, Engqvist Jonsson and Nilsson (2014) found that individuals with an external LOC are more motivated by their values; they speculate that this is because individuals with high transcendent values have this belief. Therefore, the absence of this relationship is due to a bias in this problem, where individuals with an external locus of control feel that their situation is fully controlled by themselves based on their actions.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis results, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. There is no significant relationship between awareness of consequences and pro-environmental behavior among students.
2. There is a significant relationship between internal locus of control and pro-environmental behavior among students.
3. There is no significant relationship between external locus of control and pro-environmental behavior among students.



These findings indicate that students with a higher internal locus of control tend to exhibit more pro-environmental behavior, while external factors are less influential. This underscores the importance of fostering internal responsibility and self-efficacy to promote environmental sustainability among students.

REFERENCES

1. Arlinkasari, F., Caninsti, R., Prasetya, M.A. (2018). *Peran Awareness Of Consequences Terhadap Perilaku Pro Lingkungan Pada Warga Jakarta*. Fakultas Psikologi: Universitas YASRI. Vol. 2, No. 3, Desember 2018: 235-241.
2. Ariestianingsih DKK. (2020). *The Role Of Ascription Of Responsibility On Environmental Behavior In Jakarta Communities*. STIKES Delima Persada Gresik & Islamic University Jakarta.
3. Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia. (2020). *Statistik Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia: Air dan Lingkungan*.
4. Dasi, AA., Miarsyah, M & Rusdi. (2019). Hubungan Antar Wilayah Kendali dan Tanggung Jawab Personal Dengan Intensi Pro Lingkungan. *Jurnal Psikologi Ulayat* (2019), 6(1), 69-82. DOI: 10.24854/jpu02019-224.
5. Gabriella, DA & Sugiarto, Agus. (2020). Kesadaran dan Perilaku Ranah Lingkungan Mahasiswa Di Kampus. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*. Vol. 9 No 2, Oktober 2020. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23887/jish-undiksha.v9i2.21061>.
6. Gusmadi, Setiawan. (2018). Keterlibatan Warga Negara (*Civic Engagement*) dalam penguatan karakter peduli Lingkungan. *Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta*. Vol. 9, no. 1 (2018), pp. 105-117.
7. Haryanto, HC & Prahara, SA. (2017). Yakinkah Dengan adanya Perubahan Iklim. *INQUIRY Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, Vol. 8 No. 2 Desember 2017, hlm 88-9.
8. Istichomaharani, I.s, & Habibah, S.S. (2016). Mewujudkan Peran Mahasiswa Sebagai Agen Of Change, Social Control dan Iron Stock. *STIBA Satya Widya Surabaya*.
9. Jonsson, A.K.E & Nilsson, A (2014). *Exploring The Relationship Between Values And Pro Environmental Of Locus Of Control*. University Of Gothenburg. The White Horse Press. doi: 10.3197/096327114X13947900181752.
10. Kelly S. Fielding & Brian W. Head (2012). *Determinants of young Australians' environmental actions: the role of responsibility attributions, Locus Of Control, knowledge and attitudes*. 18: 2, 171-186, DOI: 10.1080 / 13504622.2011.592936.
11. Kollmu, A & Agyeman, J. (2002). *Mind the Gap: Why do People Act Environmentally And what Are The barriers to Pro Environmental Behavior*. *Environmental Education Research*, 8:3, 239-260, DOI: 10.1080/13504620220145401.
12. Kurniawan, Deni. (2019). Pengaruh Kecerdasan Spiritual, Pengetahuan Mengenai Konsep ekologi, dan *Locus of control Terhadap Environmental Altruistic Behavior Pada Mahasiswa Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Jakarta*. Universitas Styra Negara Indonesia.
13. Putra, RP. (2019). Perilaku Pro Lingkungan Pengurus Organisasi Mahasiswa pecinta alam. *Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang*. <http://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/cognicia> 2019, Vol. 7, No. 3, 378-389
14. Ramdani, Denny. (2018). Hubungan Antara Pengetahuan Tentang Pengetahuan ekosistem, *Locus of control dan Kecerdasan Naturalis Dengan Pro Environmental Behavior Masyarakat Grogol Petamburan*. Pemerintah Kota Adm Jakarta Barat, DKI Jakarta. DOI : doi.org/10.21009/jgg.032.04.
15. Rhofita, Ika Erry. (2019). Analisis Tingkat Pemahaman dan Harapan Civitas Akademik UINSA Terkait Konsep Berkelanjutan Lingkungan Dengan Pendekatan Asset Based Community Development. *Fakultas Sains dan Teknologi: UINSA Surabaya. Jurnal Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Alam dan Lingkungan* Vol. 9 No. 1 (Maret 2019): 1-8.
16. Saptari, Ari (2014). *Manajemen Pembanguna Dan Lingkungan*. Edisi 1
17. Sarigollu, E & Huang, R. (2011). *Examining The Relationship Of Locus Of Control, Pro – Environmental Attitude And Pro – Environmental Behavior*. *NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 38*, eds. Darren W. Dahl, Gita V. Johar, and Stijn M.J. van Osselaer, Duluth, MN : Association for Consumer Research.
18. Sugandini, Dyah DKK. (2020). *Perilaku Konsumen Pro Lingkungan*. Zahira Publishing: Yogyakarta
19. Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, R&D, Cet ke-27*. Bandung : alfabeta.
20. Sujana, Kukuh., Hariyadi, Sugeng & Purwanto, Edy. (2018). Hubungan Antara Sikap dan Perilaku Peduli Lingkungan Pada Mahasiswa. *Jurusan Psikologi: UNS. Jurnal Ecopsy, Volume 5 Nomor 2, Agustus 2018*.



21. Trivedi R, Patel JD, Savalia JR (2015) *Pro Environmental Behavior, Locus of control and Willingness to Pay For Environmental Friendly Products..* 33 (1): 67-89. ; doi:10.3390/su11133712.
22. Widiartari, Komang Sri. (2019). *Penaaran Moral Sebagai Pemoderasi Pengaruh Tipe Nilai Personal Pada Sikap Akuntabilitas Lingkungan.* Universitas Pendidikan: Denpasar. Vol 4, No 2, Desember 2019.
23. Yang, X & weber, A. (2019). *Who Can Improve The Enviroment – Me Or The Powerful Others? An Integrative Approach TO Locus of control And Pro – Environmental Behavior in China.* HHL Leipzig Graduate School of Management, Jahnallee 59, Leipzig, 04109, Germany. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.03.005>.

Cite this Article: Sholihul Hadi, Rizma Fithri, Moh. Sholeh (2024). The Influence of Awareness of Consequences, Internal Locus of Control, and External Locus of Control on Pro-Environmental Behavior in Students. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 7(8), 6693-6700