E-ISSN: 2618-0618
P-ISSN: 2618-060X

NAAS Rating (2025): 5.20
www.agronomyjournals.com
2025; SP-8(7): 442-446
Received: 23-05-2025
Accepted: 27-06-2025

K Chitrambigai
Assistant Professor, Education Cell, Madras Veterinary College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

M Prabu
Professor and Head, Department of Animal Husbandry Economics, Madras Veterinary College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

G Kathiravan
Professor and Head, Department of Animal Husbandry Statistics and Computer Applications, Madras Veterinary College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

C Sreekumar
Professor and Head, Department of Wildlife Science, Madras Veterinary College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

K Senthilkumar
Associate Professor, Department of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Extension Education, VC & RI, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India

Corresponding Author:
K Chitrambigai
Assistant Professor, Education Cell, Madras Veterinary College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

Economic approaches in the conservation of nature: A comprehensive review

K Chitrambigai, M Prabu, G Kathiravan, C Sreekumar and K Senthilkumar

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/2618060X.2025.v8.i7Sf.3448

Abstract
The urgent need for environmental conservation arises from the rapid loss of biodiversity, climate change and the unsustainable use of natural resources. While traditional strategies like legal protections, designating protected areas, and community-based stewardship are crucial, there is growing recognition that economic mechanisms can enhance and support these efforts. This review explores economic approaches to nature conservation, focusing on strategies that align financial incentives with environmental goals. Key instruments discussed include Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES), green accounting, environmental taxation, circular economy principles, and community-led conservation. These tools demonstrate how economic incentives can encourage sustainable resource use, reduce pollution and protect biodiversity. The review considers both the opportunities and limitations of each method, emphasizing the importance of long-term collaboration, inclusive stakeholder engagement, and effective valuation practices. Ultimately, it provides a comprehensive analysis of how economically driven strategies, when applied with policy coherence and ecological sensitivity, can foster effective and sustainable environmental stewardship.

Keywords: Nature conservation, economic approaches, payment for ecosystem services (PES), green accounting, circular economy, environmental taxation, community-based conservation, macroeconomic models, microeconomic models, econometric analysis

Introduction
Conservation of nature remains one of the most pressing challenges of our time, necessitating innovative and integrated strategies to address the growing threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services. Recent advancements increasingly acknowledge the deep interconnection between economic and ecological systems, challenging traditional paradigms that treat economic development and environmental preservation as mutually exclusive goals. Achieving sustainable development, therefore, requires the harmonization of these interlinked systems through multidimensional frameworks (Balmford *et al.*, 2002) [7].

A key conceptual framework for understanding this relationship is the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC), which suggests an inverted U-shaped relationship between economic growth (measured by income) and environmental degradation. Empirical evidence from South and Southeast Asia supports this pattern in the context of biodiversity loss and ecosystem decline, where environmental degradation initially worsens with rising income but eventually declines beyond a certain threshold (Panayotou, 1997) [44]. However, this relationship is not uniform across emerging economies, where diverse economic structures and the nature of structural transitions result in varying environmental outcomes (Grossman and Krueger, 1995) [27].

In response to these evolving dynamics, integrated economic approaches have emerged as promising mechanisms for aligning economic incentives with conservation outcomes. Instruments such as Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES), green accounting with natural capital valuation, circular economy frameworks, environmental taxation, and community-based conservation are increasingly used to promote environmental stewardship while supporting livelihoods (Turner *et al.*, 2003; Geissdoerfer *et al.*, 2017) [55, 22]. For example, PES programs in Costa Rica and China have shown potential in fostering reforestation, conserving biodiversity, and reducing rural poverty. However, their success hinges on sound design, equitable

distribution of benefits and strong institutional legitimacy (Pagiola, 2008) [43].

Complementing these market-based approaches, green accounting and Environmental Profit and Loss (E P&L) frameworks enable governments and corporations to incorporate ecosystem service valuations into financial and policy decision-making. These methods support the internalization of ecological costs, promote transparency and enhance stakeholder accountability, thereby encouraging the sustainable management of natural capital (Balmford *et al.,* 2002) [7]. Tools such as the Natural Capital Indicator Framework offer structured, indicator-based methodologies for national-level natural capital accounting and reporting (Atkinson *et al.*, 2007) [4].

This review synthesizes theoretical models and empirical case studies from a range of geographical contexts to evaluate how economic instruments can contribute to effective nature conservation. It critically assesses the strengths and limitations of market-based tools, advancements in green accounting and natural capital valuation, the implementation of circular economy principles for resource efficiency and biodiversity conservation, the role of community-based approaches in fostering participatory governance, and the contributions of macroeconomic, microeconomic, and econometric models to evidence-based conservation policymaking.

Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES)

Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) has emerged as a widely used economic instrument in conservation policy, offering financial incentives to landowners or resource users to preserve or enhance ecosystem services such as biodiversity, water purification, and climate regulation. Foundational studies by Balmford *et al.* (2002) [7] and Turner *et al.* (2003) [55] have contributed to the growing consensus that conserving ecosystems generates net benefits across a range of socio-ecological contexts, often substantiated by willingness-to-pay (WTP) estimates.

A notable example is in coffee production systems, where PES has been used to justify rainforest conservation even on high-value agricultural land. Proximity to forest remnants enhances key ecosystem services such as pollination and pest control, thereby supporting long-term sustainable yields. This case highlights how PES mechanisms can effectively align economic incentives with conservation outcomes.

Despite its promise, PES has faced critiques. Pearce (2007) [45] cautioned that many valuation studies tend to emphasize favourable outcomes, potentially overstating WTP figures and masking the true willingness or capacity of stakeholders to fund biodiversity conservation. This raises concerns about the robustness of PES as a global conservation strategy. In response, scholars have improved survey methodologies and incorporated psychological and behavioural insights to better capture the motivations behind WTP, enhancing the credibility of PES assessments (Sugden, 2005) [51].

Looking ahead, PES must overcome challenges such as the high opportunity costs of land use and the difficulties in valuing non-use ecosystem services. Strengthening PES requires embracing long-term decision-making frameworks and designing schemes that integrate considerations of economic efficiency, social equity, institutional legitimacy, and ethical concerns. Moreover, fully embedding PES within the broader Ecosystem Services Framework (ESF) can provide a more comprehensive foundation for sustainable and effective conservation interventions.

Green accounting

Green accounting is an integrated approach that combines economic performance with environmental responsibility to promote sustainable business practices. It aims to optimize resource use, reduce environmental impact and align corporate growth with ecological sustainability (Balmford *et al.,* 2002; Datta and Deb, 2016) [7,]. Beyond financial reporting, green accounting incorporates environmental valuation, including costs of resource depletion, pollution control and emissions into business decision-making processes (Nguyen, 2020) [41].

In developing countries, such as Bangladesh and India, green accounting faces challenges like limited awareness, regulatory compliance, and balancing economic growth with environmental protection (Nguyen, 2020; Yadav *et al.,* 2022) [41, 59]. However, stakeholder pressure, management commitment and the integration of environmental costs into financial metrics are driving wider adoption (Khare *et al.,* 2023; Almaliki, 2020; Dhar *et al.,* 2022) [34, 3, 17]. By fostering resource optimization and transparency, green accounting acts as a catalyst for sustainable corporate behaviour and offers a strategic pathway towards nature conservation and long-term economic-ecological harmony (Dura and Suharsono, 2022) [18].

Circular economy

The circular economy model presents a transformative alternative to the unsustainable resource use characteristic of the traditional linear economy, which follows a "take-make-dispose" trajectory. By emphasizing resource efficiency, waste minimization and closed-loop production systems, circular economy principles contribute significantly to both environmental protection and long-term economic sustainability (Geissdoerfer *et al.,* 2017; Ghisellini *et al.,* 2016) [22, 24].

Mitrovic *et al.* (2017) [39] illustrated the practical challenges and benefits of implementing circular economy practices through a case study in Serbia, highlighting outcomes such as cleaner production methods and chemical leasing. While initial investments posed challenges, the case demonstrated clear economic and environmental benefits. Globally, successful circular transitions have been observed in key sectors such as manufacturing and agriculture. Notable examples include Philips' circular business model and the Netherlands' systemic integration of circular practices (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2013; WRAP, 2015) [19, 58].

Beyond economic advantages, the circular economy contributes directly to biodiversity conservation by reducing pollution, preserving habitats, and promoting sustainable resource use (Geng *et al*., 2019; European Environment Agency, 2018) [23,].

The integration of ecosystem services including provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural services which reflects the circular economy's holistic approach to environmental and social sustainability, reinforcing its importance in the broader sustainable development agenda.

The social and cultural dimensions of the circular economy are equally vital. Circular practices encourage community engagement, enhance environmental education, and foster a sustainability-oriented mindset essential for enduring behavioural change (Stahel, 2016) [50]. The review underscored the need for stronger policy frameworks, cross-sector collaboration and continued research to mainstream circularity as a global strategy aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Community-based conservation

Community-based conservation (CBC) integrates local

communities into environmental decision-making, fostering sustainable nature conservation through stakeholder engagement. This approach is justified by two broad arguments: normative and pragmatic.

Normative claims emphasize democratic values, equity and social justice. CBC promotes active citizenship by reducing marginalization and building trust through transparent participatory processes (Martin and Sherington, 1997; Richards *et al.*, 2004) [37, 48]. It empowers communities by co-generating knowledge and enhancing their capacity to manage natural resources effectively (Greenwood *et al.*, 1993; Okali *et al.*, 1994) [26, 42]. Such participation is believed to lead to holistic and equitable environmental decisions by acknowledging diverse values and facilitating social learning where stakeholders collaboratively build understanding and transform conflict dynamics (Blackstock *et al.*, 2007) [10].

Pragmatic claims focus on the practical benefits of community involvement. By adapting conservation interventions to local socio-cultural and ecological contexts, CBC improves adoption, relevance and research robustness (Reed, 2007) [47]. Early integration of local concerns informs project design to better align with community priorities. Moreover, enhanced information quality from participation anticipates negative outcomes, fostering ownership that may reduce implementation costs for long-term (Beierle, 2002; Richards *et al.*, 2004) [9, 48].

However, CBC also faces challenges. Power asymmetries can perpetuate privilege and suppress minority voices. Consultation fatigue may weaken enthusiasm and undermine legitimacy (Burton *et al.*, 2004) [11]. Evaluations suggest that while CBC can improve decision quality, its success heavily depends on the integrity and inclusivity of the participatory process itself. Including stakeholders in evaluation fosters nuanced understanding and continuous refinement (Blackstock *et al.*, 2007). [10]

Environmental taxes

Environmental taxes are important policy tools designed to reduce pollution and promote nature conservation by financially incentivizing lower emissions and environmentally friendly practices. Empirical studies have used diverse methods and variables, such as environmental tax revenues and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, to assess their impact on pollution mitigation (Castiglione *et al.*, 2014; Abdullah and Morley, 2014; Tsakas and Katharaki, 2014) [12, 1, 54]. Integrating GHG emissions (including CO_2, methane, and nitrogen oxide) as key dependent variables aligns with international pollution standards like those under the Kyoto Protocol (Morley, 2012; Im and Wonhyuk, 2010; Jackson, 2009) [40, 29, 30].

Research indicates environmental taxes can reduce emissions of pollutants such as sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides, with effects amplified by factors like technological progress, economic development, and industrial structure changes (Chen *et al.*, 2022; Zhang *et al.*, 2022) [13,]. Tax revenues share in total tax income is significant for policy efficiency despite exemptions for energy-intensive sectors. Other factors influencing environmental performance include population growth, GDP per capita, industrial production growth and the distinction between absolute and relative decoupling of economic growth from environmental impacts. The holistic approach integrates these variables to better understand the complex interactions shaping environmental tax effectiveness.

Several studies, particularly from China's environmental tax reforms, have shown positive outcomes such as reduced industrial water pollution and enhanced green innovation by enterprises, especially under supportive governance and law enforcement (Wang *et al.*, 2023) [57]. However, challenges persist, particularly in balancing policy exemptions and ensuring that investments in environmental protection lead to meaningful reductions in pollution.

In essence, environmental taxes contribute to nature conservation by internalizing pollution costs, driving cleaner technologies and curtailing emissions when designed and implemented with consideration of broader economic, demographic and industrial contexts.

Macroeconomic Models

Macroeconomic models are vital for understanding the complex interplay between economic development and environmental conservation. These models are generally categorized into analytical and numerical types, each serving distinct methodological functions. Four key modelling techniques are prominent in this field. Monetary Input-Output Analysis investigates financial flows between industries and their environmental implications, incorporating dynamic growth components (Barrett *et al.*, 2013; Davis and Caldeira, 2010) [6, 15]. Physical Input-Output Analysis, on the other hand, emphasizes the physical stocks and flows of materials and energy in economic systems (Dafermos *et al.*, 2017) [14]. System Dynamics models capture the behaviour of complex systems through the use of stocks and flows, as demonstrated in the seminal "Limits to Growth" study (Meadows *et al.*, 1972; Elsawah *et al.*, 2012; Dafermos *et al.*, 2017) [38, 20, 14]. Stock-Flow Consistent Modelling ensures the accounting coherence of monetary stocks and flows and is frequently applied in ecological macroeconomics, grounded in post-Keynesian growth theory (Godley and Lavoie, 2012; Jackson and Victor, 2015) [25, 31].

Many of these models are underpinned by post-Keynesian growth theories, which highlight the centrality of aggregate demand and investment in driving economic growth, while also addressing issues such as capital-output ratios and firm behaviour (Kemp-Benedict, 2014; Taylor *et al.*, 2016) [33, 53]. Additionally, the literature increasingly emphasizes post-growth policy agendas vital for sustainable development, including themes such as environmental integration, inequality reduction, monetary reform, shifts in production and consumption, changes in work patterns, evolving business models, multilevel governance, and the use of well-being indicators (Jackson and Victor, 2015) [31]. Models are often classified by their theoretical foundations into post-Keynesian, other demand-driven and supply-driven frameworks (Fontana and Sawyer, 2016; Kronenberg, 2010) [21, 36].

Microeconomic Models

Microeconomic models offer nuanced insights into how decisions at the household, community and firm levels, both influence and are influenced by natural resource dependence and conservation. Key studies have examined various dimensions of this dynamic, such as household livelihood strategies and forest dependence, highlighting the link between micro-level economic behaviour and sustainability (Babul *et al.*, 2008) [5] and rural development through peasant contributions, showcasing how microeconomic approaches integrate environmental and livelihood concerns (Diepart, 2010) [16]. The economic valuation of wild resources within indigenous communities has also been explored, emphasizing the intersection of economic and cultural conservation values. Additionally, trade-offs between agriculture and forest resource extraction are critical for understanding

resource competition and long-term sustainability (Illukpitiya and Yanagida, 2010) [28]. The role of forest income in supporting rural livelihoods further underscores the socio-economic and environmental interdependencies (Kamanga *et al.*, 2009) [32]. Other studies have analysed rural labour decisions and migration patterns, providing insight into their environmental implications (Knight and Song, 2003; Wang and Li, 2007) [35, 56], while research on deforestation in West Africa contextualizes these effects within specific regional dynamics (Pouliot *et al.*, 2012) [46]. Finally, broader reviews synthesize these themes across developing countries, offering a comprehensive perspective on the intersection of livelihoods and conservation (Sunderlin *et al.*, 2005) [52].

Econometric Models

Econometric models apply statistical and econometric techniques to quantify and analyze the complex interactions between economic behaviour and environmental outcomes, thereby enhancing the precision of policy inference and the estimation of environmental benefits. Notable studies include meta-analyses of woodland recreation benefits, which utilize both conventional regressions and advanced multi-level models to account for heterogeneity across valuation methods (Bateman and Jones, 2003) [8]. Research on modelling preference heterogeneity in choice experiments for environmental goods has revealed distinct latent preference classes through the use of stated preference data (Scarpa *et al.*, 2008) [49]. Innovative econometric approaches, such as empirical likelihood methods, have been employed to evaluate fisheries compliance and assess policy adherence using time series data (Abusin, 2015) [2]. Furthermore, rigorous analyses of the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) hypothesis have employed both non-parametric and parametric techniques to examine the inverted U-shaped relationship between economic development and environmental quality (Grossman and Krueger, 1995) [27].

Conclusion

In summary, integrating economic perspectives into nature conservation is essential for tackling the interconnected challenges of biodiversity loss, ecosystem degradation, and sustainable development. Tools such as PES, green accounting, environmental taxation, circular economy frameworks and community-based conservation offer practical solutions to align financial incentives with ecological stewardship and social equity. Supported by robust economic models, these approaches enable informed, evidence-based policymaking. Ultimately, achieving lasting conservation outcomes requires not only innovative economic instruments but also adaptive, inclusive governance that harmonizes environmental integrity with human well-being.

References

1. Abdullah S, Morley B. Environmental taxes and economic growth: Evidence from panel causality tests. Energy Econ. 2014;42:27-33.
2. Abusin S. Approaches and methods used in analyzing compliance with fishery regulations. Afr J Agric Res. 2015;10(19):2104-12. doi:10.5897/AJAR2014.9289
3. Almaliki N. Impact of green accounting on improving environmental costs and performance: An analytical study from an academic point of view. Int J Eng Technol Res Manag. 2020;4(3):127-41.
4. Atkinson G, Dietz S, Neumayer E. Handbook of sustainable development. Edward Elgar; 2007.
5. Babul B, Muys B, Nega F, Tollens E, Nyssen J, Deckers J, *et al*. Household livelihood strategies and forest dependence in the highlands of Tigray, Northern Ethiopia. Agric Syst. 2008;98(2):147-55.
6. Barrett J, Peters G, Wiedmann T, Scott K, Lenzen M, Roelich K, *et al*. Consumption-based GHG emission accounting: a UK case study. Clim Policy. 2013;13(4):451-70. doi:10.1080/14693062.2013.788858
7. Balmford A, Bruner KA, Cooper G, Costanza R, Farber SR, Greenwald SA, *et al*. Economic reasons for conserving wild nature. Science. 2002;297(5583):950-3.
8. Bateman IJ, Jones AP. Woodland recreation benefit estimates: A meta-analysis. Land Econ. 2003;79(4):479-94.
9. Beierle TC. The quality of stakeholder-based decisions. Risk Anal. 2002;22(4):739-49.
10. Blackstock KL, Kelly GJ, Horsey BL. Developing and applying a framework to evaluate participatory research for sustainability. Ecol Soc. 2007;12(2):33.
11. Burton P, Wilson A, Satterfield L. Consultation fatigue: Environmental management and marginalized communities. Soc Nat Resour. 2004;17(8):732-45.
12. Castiglione C, Infante D, Minervini MT, Smirnova J. Environmental taxation in Europe: What does it depend on? Cogent Econ Finance. 2014;2(1). doi:10.1080/23322039.2014.967362
13. Chen K, Zhang Y, Lu L. Environmental protection tax's impact on pollutant emissions in China. Int J Environ Res. 2022;19(8):4767.
14. Dafermos Y, Nikolaidi M, Galanis G. A stock-flow-fund ecological macroeconomic model. Ecol Econ. 2017;131:191-207. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2016.08.0
15. Davis JC, Caldeira K. Consumption-based accounting of CO2 emissions. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2010;107(12):5687-92. doi:10.1073/pnas.0906974107
16. Diepart JC. Cambodian peasant's contribution to rural development: A perspective from Kampong Thom Province. Biotechnol Agron Soc Environ. 2010;14(2):321-40.
17. Dhar BK, Sarkar SM, Ayittey FK. Impact of social responsibility disclosure on the implementation of green accounting and sustainable development: A study on heavily polluting companies in Bangladesh. Corp Soc Responsib Environ Manag. 2022;29(1):71-8. doi:10.1002/csr.2174
18. Dura J, Suharsono R. Application of green accounting to sustainable development improves financial performance: A study in the green industry. J Akuntansi. 2022;26(2):192-212. doi:10.24912/ja.v26i2.893
19. Ellen MacArthur Foundation. Towards the Circular Economy: Economic and business rationale for an accelerated transition. 2013. https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/publications
20. Elsawah S, Haase D, Van Delden H, Pierce S, Elmahdi A, Voinov AA, *et al*. Using system dynamics for environmental modelling: Lessons learnt from six case studies. Int Congr Environ Model Softw. 2012;380.
21. Fontana G, Sawyer M. Towards post-Keynesian ecological macroeconomics. Ecol Econ. 2016;121:186-95. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.03.017
22. Geissdoerfer M, Savaget P, Bocken NMP, Hultink EJ. The circular economy - A new sustainability paradigm? J Clean Prod. 2017;143:757-68. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.048
23. Geng Y, Fu J, Sarkis J, Xue B. How to examine the progress of circular economy practices in China? J Clean

Prod. 2019;209:287-98. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.308
24. Ghisellini P, Cialani C, Ulgiati S. A review on circular economy: The expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. J Clean Prod. 2016;114:11-32. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.007
25. Godley W, Lavoie M. Monetary economics: An integrated approach to credit, money, income, production and wealth. 2nd ed. Palgrave Macmillan; 2012.
26. Greenwood D, Whyte W, Harkavy I. Participatory action research as a process and as a goal. Hum Relat. 1993;46(2):175-92.
27. Grossman GM, Krueger AB. Economic growth and the environment. Q J Econ. 1995;110(2):353-77.
28. Illukpitiya P, Yanagida JF. Farming vs. forests: Trade-off between agriculture and the extraction of non-timber forest products. Ecol Econ. 2010;69(10):1952-63.
29. Im T, Wonhyuk C. Performance tools and their impact on pollution reduction: An assessment of environmental taxation and R&D. Int Rev Public Adm. 2010;15(3):53-65.
30. Jackson T. Industrial ecology in Europe. J Ind Ecol. 2009;13(4):487-90.
31. Jackson T, Victor PA. Does slow growth lead to rising inequality? Some theoretical reflections and experimental simulations. Ecol Econ. 2015;121:206-19. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.03.019
32. Kamanga O, Vedeld P, Sjaastad E. Forest incomes and rural livelihoods in Chiradzulu District, Malawi. Ecol Econ. 2009;68(3):613-24.
33. Kemp-Benedict E. Shifting to a green economy: Lock-in, path dependence and policy options. Stockholm Environment Institute; 2014. (Working Paper No. 2014-08).
34. Khare VK, Raghuwanshi S, Vashisht A, Verma P, Chauhan R. The importance of green management and its implication in creating sustainability performance on the small-scale industries in India. SDGs Policy Rev. 2023;11(5). doi:10.55908/sdgs.v11i5.699
35. Knight J, Song L. Chinese peasant choices: Migration, rural industry or farming. Oxf Dev Stud. 2003;31(2):123-47.
36. Kronenberg T. Dematerialisation of consumption: A win-win strategy? Munich Pers RePEc Arch. 2010. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/25704/
37. Martin A, Sherington J. Participatory research methods: Implementation, effectiveness and institutional context. Agric Syst. 1997;55(2):195-216.
38. Meadows DH, Meadows D, Randers J, Behrens WW III. The limits to growth. New York: Universe Books; 1972.
39. Mitrovic A, Ignjatijević S, Janićijevic I. Circular economy in Serbia: Challenges and opportunities. In: Proc Int Sci Conf Circular Econ Sustain Dev (CESD 2017); 2017. doi:10.15308/cesd-2017-45-49
40. Morley B. Empirical evidence on the effectiveness of environmental taxes. Appl Econ Lett. 2012;19(18):1817-20.
41. Nguyen TKT. Studying factors affecting environmental accounting implementation in mining enterprises in Vietnam. J Asian Finance Econ Bus. 2020;7(5):131-44. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no5.131
42. Okali C, Sumberg J, Farrington J. Farmer participatory research: Rhetoric and reality. London: Intermediate Technology Publications; 1994.
43. Pagiola S. Payments for environmental services in Costa Rica: From theory to practice. Ecol Econ. 2008.
44. Panayotou T. Economic growth and the environment. Environ Dev Econ. 1997;2(4):383-400.
45. Pearce DW. Do we really care about biodiversity? Environ Resour Econ. 2007;37(3):313-33.
46. Pouliot M, Treue T, Obiri BD, Oudraougo B. Deforestation and limited contribution of forests to rural livelihoods in West Africa: Evidence from Burkina Faso and Ghana. Ambio. 2012;41(7):738-50.
47. Reed MS. Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. Biol Conserv. 2007;141(10):2417-31.
48. Richards C, Blackstock KL, Carter CE. Practical approaches to participation. SERG Policy Brief No. 1. Aberdeen: Macauley Land Use Research Institute; 2004.
49. Scarpa R, Thiene M, Hensher DA. Modeling taste heterogeneity in choice experiments. Environ Resour Econ. 2008;40(4):493-517.
50. Stahel WR. The circular economy. Nature. 2016;531(7595):435-8. https://doi.org/10.1038/531435a
51. Sugden R. Anomalies and stated preference techniques: A framework for a discussion of coping strategies. Environ Resour Econ. 2005;32(1):1-12.
52. Sunderlin W, Angelsen A, Belcher B, Burgers PA, Nasi R, Santoso L, *et al*. Livelihoods, forests, and conservation in developing countries: An overview. World Dev. 2005;33(9):1383-402.
53. Taylor L, Rezai A, Foley DK. An integrated approach to climate change, income distribution, employment, and economic growth. Ecol Econ. 2016;121:196-205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.05.015
54. Tsakas M, Katharaki M. Impact of environmental factors on the efficiency of tax organizations. Serb J Manag. 2014;9(1):31-4.
55. Turner RK, Paavola J, Cooper P, Farber S, Jessamy V, Georgiou S. Valuing nature: Lessons learned and future research directions. Ecol Econ. 2003;46(3):493-510.
56. Wang C, Li Y. Behavioral decision of employment for rural laborers: Evidence from peasant households in central China. Agric Econ Rev. 2007;8(1):22-36.
57. Wang X, Sun L, Zhao F. Green innovation response to environmental tax policy reforms. J Clean Prod. 2023.
58. WRAP. Valuing our clothes: The cost of UK fashion. 2015. https://www.wrap.org.uk/
59. Yadav A, Joon S, Thakur KS. Green accounting: A path towards achieving sustainability. Int J Adv Res Commer Manag Soc Sci. 2022;5(4[I]):73-7.