International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
Volume 2, Issue 1, Jan-Feb-2024, PP: 33-37

Exploring the Impact of Greenwashing on Consumers' Brand Trust

Dr. Manish Singh
Rector
Karwan University (Division of American University of Malta, Europe)

***Abstract* – In today's world, consumers are increasingly conscious of their environmental impact. They seek out brands that not only offer quality products or services but also demonstrate a genuine commitment to Sustainability. This heightened awareness has created an opportunity for businesses to connect with their audience on a deeper, values-driven level. Brand Trust, the bedrock of any successful long-term relationship between a company and its customers, is heavily influenced by this perception of environmental responsibility. Greenwashing, at its core, is the deceptive marketing practice where a company portrays itself as more environmentally friendly than it truly is. This can manifest in various forms, from misleading advertising campaigns that exaggerate a product's green attributes to subtle yet pervasive public relations efforts designed to create a false image of corporate environmentalism. Essentially, it's a disconnect between a brand's proclaimed environmental values and its actual practices. The impact of greenwashing on brand trust is direct and damaging. When consumers discover that a brand's environmental claims are exaggerated or outright false, it erodes the very foundation of their relationship. Trust, once broken, is notoriously difficult to rebuild.**

Keywords* – *Greenwashing, Consumer Trust, Brand Loyalty, Sustainability

I. INTRODUCTION

Greenwashing refers to the act of making false or misleading claims about the positive environmental impact that a company, product or service has on the environment. Greenwashing occurs when organizations present untrue actions or statements that appear more environmentally friendly than they actually are. The term greenwashing was first coined in 1986 by environmentalist Jay Westerveld in an article where he decried the common practice of hotels asking guests to reuse towels to help conserve energy. Westerveld claimed that those same hotels did little to help the environment and that the towel request was an act of greenwashing. In an era where an increasing number of consumers and governments are interested in taking environmentally responsible actions, there has been a growing emphasis on environmental, social and governance (ESG) initiatives in companies. The need to demonstrate ESG efforts -- for either marketing or to improve brand perception -- has led to many organizations making environmental claims that have turned out to be greenwashing.

Greenwashing, in its simplest form, is when a company deceptively markets its products or policies as environmentally friendly. This practice can severely erode Brand Trust because consumers are increasingly seeking out and valuing sustainable options. When a brand misleads consumers about its environmental efforts, it creates a gap between the perceived image and the reality of its operations. This discrepancy can lead to consumer disillusionment and a loss of faith in the brand.

Imagine a clothing company claiming to use recycled materials when only a small percentage of their products actually do. Or consider a fast-fashion brand promoting a "sustainable collection" while continuing to engage in unethical labor practices. These are classic examples of greenwashing that can backfire spectacularly when exposed. This is particularly true in the realm of sustainability, where consumers are often driven by ethical considerations and a desire to make a positive impact. Discovering greenwashing feels like a betrayal of these values, leading to significant reputational damage and customer attrition.

II. HOW DOES GREENWASHING WORK?

Greenwashing happens when a company makes an environmental claim about something it's doing that is intended to promote a sense of environmental impact that, at best is misleading, and at worst, doesn't exist. The green claim is typically about some form of positive effect on the environment. It could have some elements of truth but fails to consider the total impact on the environment. For example, a car vendor could claim that a vehicle is eco-friendly because it's more fuel-efficient, while failing to mention or consider the larger industrial impact of vehicle manufacturing on the environment. Previously existing products are generally greenwashed through a process of rebranding -- for example, by renaming them or changing their packaging. The rebranding is done to convey a message that the product is more environmentally friendly or natural. Advertisements might also be made to promote the rebranding.

Companies can also greenwash initiatives with vague claims that don't provide real data or scientific validation for the claims. Using terms such as sustainable, green or eco-friendly -- or just claiming to be "good for the planet" or "better for the environment" -- can help organizations appear to be greener. However, the reality of such

nonspecific terms is that they can be -- and often are -- used without supporting evidence or facts that could be easily relayed to the consumer. As such, an organization is simply labeling or promoting a product or service as being green when, in fact, there's no undeniable, verifiable evidence that it's more environmentally sustainable.

From an ESG perspective, greenwashing also occurs when a company has stated corporate policies about being green that don't match what the company has publicly implemented. Greenwashing can also include a company marketing a minor environmental improvement as having a major impact. Similarly, a company could promote a move meant to meet local minimum regulatory requirements as if it's making the move to improve the environment.

The following examples show several general greenwashing techniques that organizations use today to help make a product or service appear to be more sustainable for the environment than it might be.

Less is More: This is perhaps the most common greenwashing example and is rooted in the genesis of the term greenwashing itself. When hotel chains advise guests that towels won't be washed daily to be greener, the idea is that less washing is better for the environment.

Efficiency Claims: Another common example is claiming to be more efficient with energy consumption. By being more energy-efficient, the idea is that less energy needs to be produced, leading to less environmental impact. Automobile manufacturer Volkswagen was caught greenwashing with its diesel emissions scandal in 2015. In that incident, the company fraudulently reported that its diesel engine vehicles were more fuel-efficient than they really were. The company's diesel fuel vehicles were marketed as being a more environmentally sustainable type of vehicle when, in fact, that wasn't the truth.

"Recycle this" Approach: Greenwashing also occurs when an organization claims that one approach is better for the environment than another by implying that the new approach is somehow recyclable. For example, McDonald's began to replace its single-use plastic straws in 2019 with paper straws that the company described as being eco-friendly. It turned out that the paper straws weren't recyclable and weren't necessarily better than the alternative.

Green Targets: Organizations and governments can come up with targets for sustainability that are publicly declared to make it appear as though they're doing the right thing for the environment. Targets on their own are nice goals to strive for, but they're little more than wishful thinking if they aren't achieved.

Eco-shrinkflation: Similar to the less-is-more approach, this is when a company shrinks the size of its products while charging the same, if not more, for the same product. Some food and drink companies, like Gatorade for example, have shrunk the size of their product or packaging, claiming that the new packaging is more environmentally friendly.

Carbon Offsets: When an organization can't decrease the carbon impact of a product, they commonly turn to the idea of offsetting greenhouse gas emissions by buying into a carbon offset, like the planting of trees. Carbon offsets are a credit that an organization can buy into to decrease its carbon footprint. When the number of carbon offset credits obtained is equal to the organization's carbon footprint, that organization is said to be carbon-neutral. Many companies, however, have invested in carbon offsets that either have a lack of verification processes, participate in making fraudulent claims, or grow trees that might be cut down within a decade or could burn down in wildfires.

III. HOW TO SPOT GREENWASHING

Recognizing greenwashing is the first step in protecting yourself from deceptive marketing. Here are some common tactics to watch out for:

- **Vague Language** → Look for terms like “eco-friendly” or “sustainable” without specific details or certifications.
- **Hidden Trade-Offs** → A product may highlight one environmental benefit while ignoring other negative impacts.
- **Lack of Proof** → Claims are made without providing evidence or third-party verification.
- **Irrelevant Claims** → Emphasizing a small, insignificant environmental feature while ignoring larger issues.
- **False Labels** → Misleading or fake certifications that are not recognized by reputable organizations.

Ways Greenwashing Erodes Trust

- **Misleading Labels** → Products labeled as “eco-friendly” or “natural” without substantial evidence can quickly trigger consumer skepticism.
- **Vague Language** → Terms like “sustainable” or “green” used without clear definitions or quantifiable metrics appear as empty buzzwords.
- **False Claims** → Advertising campaigns that highlight minor environmental improvements while ignoring significant negative impacts are easily exposed in the age of information.
- **Hidden Trade-Offs** → Promoting one environmentally friendly aspect of a product while concealing other detrimental features creates a deceptive impression.

IV. WHY CONSUMERS CARE

Consumers are more informed and environmentally conscious than ever before. They actively research brands, read labels, and seek out certifications to verify sustainability claims. Social media has also amplified

consumer voices, allowing them to quickly share information and call out deceptive practices. This increased scrutiny means that brands are under greater pressure to be transparent and authentic in their sustainability efforts. Transparency is key to building and maintaining brand trust in the age of sustainability. Consumers want to know where products come from, how they are made, and what impact they have on the environment. Brands that are open and honest about their operations, even when they are not perfect, are more likely to gain the trust and loyalty of consumers.

Effects of Greenwashing

Undermining Brand Image

Consumers today are more aware of greenwashing than ever before. They are also more likely to choose products and services from companies that they perceive to be honest and transparent about their environmental practices. When a company is outed as greenwashing, it can have a devastating impact on its brand image. Consumers may feel cheated and misled, and they may be less likely to trust the company in the future. This can lead to a decline in sales and customer loyalty. The consumer who felt lied to by the company is likely to share her negative experience with others. This could be through online reviews, social media, or word-of-mouth. Other consumers who hear about the company's greenwashing may also be less likely to trust the company or buy its products.

The negative impact of greenwashing on brand image is not limited to the immediate aftermath of being caught. Even if a company apologizes and makes changes to its marketing practices, it can take time to rebuild trust with consumers.

In some cases, the damage to a company's brand image can be irreparable. For example, in 2015, Volkswagen was caught cheating on emissions tests for its diesel vehicles. The scandal caused widespread outrage and led to a sharp decline in sales. Volkswagen is still recovering from the damage to its brand image today.

Adverse Environmental Impacts

Greenwashing can also have several adverse environmental impacts. When consumers are misled about the environmental impact of products and services, they are more likely to make choices that are harmful to the environment. For example, a consumer who believes that a product is made from recycled materials may be more likely to buy it, even if it is not the most environmentally friendly option available. Or, a consumer who believes that a company is committed to sustainability may be more likely to support that company, even if it is a major polluter.

Greenwashing can also lead to the development of products and services that are not as environmentally friendly as they claim to be. For example, a company that greenwashes its products may use less sustainable materials or manufacturing processes to save money. This can lead to increased pollution and resource depletion.

Examples of Adverse Environmental Impacts of Greenwashing:

- **Increased Pollution:** Greenwashing can lead to an increase in pollution from manufacturing processes, transportation, and product disposal.
- **Resource Depletion:** Greenwashing can lead to the depletion of natural resources, such as water, minerals, and forests.
- **Biodiversity Loss:** Greenwashing can contribute to biodiversity loss by harming habitats and ecosystems.
- **Climate Change:** Greenwashing can contribute to climate change by increasing greenhouse gas emissions.

Losing Consumer Trust

Greenwashing can have a devastating impact on consumer trust. When consumers discover that a company has been greenwashing, they are likely to feel betrayed and misled. This can lead to a loss of trust in the company, its products, and its services.

The loss of consumer trust can have many negative consequences for businesses. These include:

- **Decline in Sales:** Consumers are less likely to buy products and services from companies that they do not trust.
- **Increase in Customer Churn:** Customers who lose trust in a company are more likely to switch to a competitor.
- **Damage to Reputation:** A negative reputation can make attracting new customers and partners more difficult.
- **Regulatory Scrutiny:** Companies that are caught greenwashing may face regulatory scrutiny and fines.

Investigation Resulting from Misleading Marketing Claims

Suppose an environmental claim made by your company seems noticeably misleading, and the public starts questioning it. In that case, it's possible that someone might report your advertisement or communications to the local consumer protection authority. Meanwhile, it is also possible for the local consumer protection authority to open its own independent investigation on such marketing claims. In such cases even if the authorities investigate the claims and find that the brand has everything in order when it comes to the precision and accuracy of the claims, therefore giving them a clean bill of performance, the time during which the investigation is open can cause much-added stress to the organization under inquiry.

A person, whether natural or legal is not guilty of wrongdoing before an official ruling has been given. However, in practice, a company that wishes to keep up its image as a reliable partner does not wish to have a public investigation opened into its marketing or other communications. While routine checks and mapping of the

state of the industry is a chance to show up as an industry leader in sustainability and transparency, having an official investigation opened on a company's marketing claims is rarely a good thing.

Risk of Being Sued

In the worst-case scenario, misleading environmental claims can end up getting your company sued for the damages caused by them. Litigation is expensive, time-consuming, and resource-intensive. The process is often public enough to generate adverse media coverage. Some companies succeed in handling these types of matters through closed-door arbitration, but this is not always an option. Here are some examples of companies that have been sued for greenwashing:

- **Volkswagen:** Volkswagen was sued in the United States and Europe for cheating on emissions tests for its diesel vehicles. The company was ordered to pay billions of dollars in fines and settlements.
- **Tesla:** Tesla was sued in the United States for misleading consumers about the range and capabilities of its electric vehicles. The company was ordered to pay millions of dollars in damages.
- **Nestle:** Nestle was sued in the United States for misleading consumers about the sustainability of its KitKat chocolate bars. The company was ordered to pay millions of dollars in damages.

Losing B2B Partners

Before signing significant partnership contracts, before investing in a company, before receiving a quote for insurance or business financing, companies, investors, insurance companies and banks will conduct their own due diligence into the history of your company. If it looks like a company comes with a reputational risk because of a lot of adverse media associated with it, or it is facing legal risks due to loosely formatted and liberally used marketing claims, oftentimes it will result in increased costs of financing and business insurances, deterring investors and limiting the number of companies willing to work with the company due to the risk of being associated with making misleading claims themselves.

Loss of Revenue

If consumers start boycotting a product or brand due to greenwashing, the result will be a loss of revenue. This can be a significant financial loss, especially if the boycott is widespread.

Other Financial Losses

In addition to the direct financial losses listed above, greenwashing can also lead to other financial losses, such as:

- Increased difficulty attracting investors and partners
- Higher cost of insurance
- Decreased employee morale
- Damage to the company's brand reputation

The Impact on Brand Perception

When consumers discover that a brand is greenwashing, the consequences can be significant. A damaged reputation can lead to a decline in sales, negative publicity, and difficulty attracting new customers. In some cases, brands may even face legal action for deceptive marketing practices.

The loss of trust extends beyond just the individual brand. Greenwashing can also erode trust in the entire sustainability movement. When consumers feel that they have been misled, they may become cynical and skeptical of all environmental claims. This can make it more difficult for genuinely sustainable brands to stand out and gain recognition.

How to Avoid or Prevent Greenwashing

For organizations, there are several ways to avoid or prevent greenwashing that leadership can consider -- assuming, of course, that the organization has good intentions and isn't deliberately trying to mislead anyone about its environmental commitments.

- **Be Specific:** Organizations shouldn't use generic terms that don't have a specific meaning. For example, saying a product is eco-friendly is generic and doesn't specifically identify how the product or service is green.
- **Use Data:** When making specific claims, it's imperative that organizations use data. The data should support the claim and numerically detail the effects of the actions being taken.
- **Avoid Misleading Images:** Using pictures from nature to somehow evoke environmental friendliness can be a form of greenwashing when not backed by specific, data-driven claims.
- **Be Truthful:** Fact-based statements that are truthful should be the standard for all types of marketing or claims about the environment. False statements will inevitably be discovered.

Keep the long term in mind. Ensure that green efforts aren't made for just a short-term marketing strategy benefit, but instead have the potential for a long-lasting environmental benefit. There's little use investing in offsets for trees that already exist and weren't likely to be cut down in the first place.

V. CONCLUSION

Ultimately, the fundamental impact of greenwashing on brand trust is the creation of Distrust and Disillusionment. It teaches consumers to be skeptical of environmental messaging, making it harder for authentic sustainable brands to gain recognition and support. Building genuine brand trust in the sustainability era requires transparency, accountability, and a demonstrable commitment to

environmental responsibility that goes far beyond mere marketing claims.

REFERENCES

1. Kang, J., & Hustvedt, G. (2014). Building trust between consumers and corporations: The role of consumer perceptions of transparency and social responsibility. i, 253–265. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1916-7
2. Cañibano, A. and Avgoustaki, A. (2022). To telework or not to telework: Does the macro context matter? A signaling theory analysis of employee interpretations of telework in times of turbulence. Human Resource Management Journal, 34(2), 352-368. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12457
3. Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. Journal of Marketing, 65(2), 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.65.2.81.18255
4. Chen, Y. S., & Chang, C. H. (2013). Greenwash and green trust: The mediation effects of green consumer confusion and perceived risk. Journal of Business Ethics, 114(3), 489–500. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1360-0
5. Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. Journal of Management, 37(1), 39–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419
6. Drover, W., Wood, M., & Corbett, A. (2017). Toward a cognitive view of signaling theory: individual attention and signal set interpretation. Journal of Management Studies, 55(2), 209–231. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12282
7. Jong, M., Harkink, K., & Barth, S. (2017). Making green stuff? Effects of corporate greenwashing on consumers. Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 32(1), 77–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651917729863
8. Leonidou, C. N., Katsikeas, C. S., & Morgan, N. A. (2013). "Greening" the marketing mix: Do firms do it, and does it pay off? Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 41(2), 151–170. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-012-0317-2
9. Li, H., Fang, Y., Wang, Y., Lim, K., & Liang, L. (2015). Are all signals equal? Investigating the differential effects of online signals on the sales performance of e-marketplace sellers. Information Technology and People, 28(3), 699-723. https://doi.org/10.1108/itp-11-2014-0265
10. Liu, G., Qian, H., Shi, Y., Yuan, D., & Zhou, M. (2024). How do firms react to capital market liberalization? Evidence from ESG reporting greenwashing. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 31(5), 4329–4344. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2808
11. Lyon, T. P., & Montgomery, A. W. (2015). The means and end of greenwash. Organization & Environment, 28(2), 223–249. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575332
12. Miao, X., Li, G., Fu, J., Meng, S., & Zhang, Y. (2023). The mechanism of green finance on the greenwashing behavior of companies in high carbon industries: a heterogeneous environmental regulation perspective, 630–639. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-098-5_72
13. Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. Journal of Marketing, 58(3), 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800302
14. Nemes, N., Scanlan, S., Smith, P., Smith, T., Aronczyk, M., Hill, S., … & Stabinsky, D. (2022). Anintegrated framework to assess greenwashing. Sustainability, 14(8), 4431. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14084431
15. Parguel, B., Benoît-Moreau, F., & Larceneux, F. (2011). How sustainability ratings might deter greenwashing': A closer look at ethical corporate communication. Journal of Business Ethics, 102(1), 15–28.https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0901-2
16. Pedersen, E. and Andersen, K. (2023). Greenwashing: a broken business model. Journal of Business Models, 11(2). https://doi.org/10.54337/jbm.v11i2.7352
17. Wu, L., Wang, M., Kumar, A., & Choi, T. (2024). Mitigating the bullwhip effect through supply chain ESG transparency: roles of digitalization and signal strength. International Journal of Operations & Production
18. Management, 44(9), 1707-1731. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-08-2023-0667 Xiang, Y., Gershman, S., & Gerstenberg, T. (2024). A signaling theory of self-handicapping. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/84tvm
19. Yang, Z., Hường, N., Nam, N., Nguyen, T., & Cao, T. (2020). Greenwashing behaviors: causes, taxonomy, and consequences based on a systematic literature review. Journal of Business Economics and Management, 21(5), 1486-1507. https://doi.org/10.3846/jbem.2020.13225
20. Zhang, C. & Hao, P. (2015). Generalized sampling theory with rational sampling factors. Iet Signal Processing, 9(3), 235–247. https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-spr.2014.0042
21. Zhang, D. (2023). Talk the talk, but walk the walk? Female-managed firms and greenwashing behavior. Environment and Behavior, 55(5), 364–394. https://