International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Sustainability or Deception? Unpacking the Ethical Dilemmas of Greenwashing

Prof. Saroja S

Assistant Professor, MBA Programme, BIET, Davangere, India

Abstract
As consumer demand for sustainable products rises, many companies engage in **greenwashing**—misleading marketing tactics that exaggerate or falsely represent their environmental efforts. This paper explores the ethical dilemmas associated with greenwashing, including its impact on consumer trust, market competition, and genuine sustainability initiatives. It examines various forms of greenwashing, such as vague labels, hidden trade-offs, false endorsements, and overstated environmental benefits, highlighting real-world examples from industries including fashion, finance, and consumer goods. Additionally, the paper discusses regulatory efforts to combat greenwashing, this also study advocates for stricter regulations, third-party certifications, consumer education, and independent audits**.** By addressing these challenges, businesses can transition from deceptive marketing to authentic sustainability while maintaining credibility and meeting ethical standards.

Introduction

In an era of heightened environmental awareness, businesses face increasing pressure to adopt sustainable practices. However, some companies resort to greenwashing—deceptively marketing products or policies as eco-friendly to capitalize on consumer demand. Greenwashing raises significant ethical concerns, undermining consumer trust, distorting market competition, and impeding genuine sustainability efforts. This shift has driven growing concern around widely used labels such as “net zero,” “carbon neutral,” “eco-conscious,” “environmentally friendly,” “sustainable development,” and “Paris-aligned.” Stakeholder activism, a practice where shareholders leverage their equity stake in a corporation to influence behavior, is increasingly pressuring companies to adopt “greening” practices or engage in environmentally sustainable, socially responsible, and ethically sound conduct. Terms such as the “ESG revolution” and “greenwashing backlash” have been used to describe the rising interest in corporate environmental disclosures. The past decade has also seen the rapid emergence of new Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) reporting frameworks and metrics, including the triple-bottom-line, integrated reporting, and the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosure (TCFD) framework. Alongside this, regulatory activity worldwide has intensified, reflecting the growing importance of these issues.

Pressures for increased sustainability disclosure have led many corporations to overstate, misrepresent, or outright lie about their environmental, social, and governance (ESG) performance. This phenomenon, known as "greenwashing," was first coined by environmentalist Jay Westerveld in 1986. In an essay, Westerveld criticized the hotel industry’s practice of encouraging towel reuse under the guise of environmental conservation, when it was primarily a cost-saving measure for an industry with otherwise poor environmental policies. The term entered academic discourse a decade later, with Greer and Bruno’s

1996 book analyzing the marketing strategies of large corporations in relation to their environmental claims and actions. Greenwashing is broadly defined as misleading or unsubstantiated claims about sustainability performance made by businesses or investment funds regarding their products or activities. Despite its growing use, the concept remains subject to considerable definitional ambiguity.

Concerns about greenwashing have grown alongside the rapid expansion of ESG reporting practices worldwide. Recent studies have criticized ESG and sustainability reporting, pointing to widespread deception, obfuscation, and diversion in corporate disclosures. Early research on greenwashing emerged in the fields of marketing, management, and corporate social responsibility (CSR). More recently, it has gained attention in accounting research. However, empirical studies on the relationship between greenwashing and corporate performance have produced mixed and often contradictory results. Additionally, research into the underlying characteristics and determinants of greenwashing remains relatively limited, leaving significant gaps in understanding this complex issue.

DEFINITION

The term "greenwashing" was first introduced by New York environmentalist Jay Westervelt in 1986 (Romero, 2008). However, it remained relatively obscure until 1996, when it gained prominence through a book on environmental marketing (Greer & Bruno, 1996). Since then, academic research on the topic has expanded significantly.

Lyon and Maxwell (2011) offer a more precise perspective, describing greenwashing as the selective disclosure of favorable information about a company's environmental or social actions while omitting negative aspects, ultimately creating an overly positive corporate image. However, this definition primarily focuses on the verifiable aspects of environmental performance and does not account for more subtle forms of greenwashing, such as image-based marketing, visual symbolism, and ambiguous claims. Some scholars have drawn definitions of greenwashing from the Oxford English Dictionary, which describes it as the dissemination of misleading information by an organization to project an environmentally responsible public image (Ramus & Montiel, 2005; Gillespie, 2008; Mitchell & Ramey, 2011; Wang & Sarkis, 2017). However, both general usage and academic discussions of the term remain broad and sometimes ambiguous. Researchers across disciplines have interpreted greenwashing in various ways, leading to a range of definitions.

Literature Review

A review of existing literature reveals the complexity and widespread impact of greenwashing. Several scholars have contributed to understanding this deceptive practice: The phenomenon of greenwashing has been extensively studied across various disciplines, with researchers exploring its drivers, implications, and consequences for corporate behavior. A key area of focus has been understanding why companies engage in greenwashing.

- Walker et al. (2008) investigate the drivers and barriers to adopting environmentally sustainable supply chain practices, a domain where greenwashing is particularly prevalent. Their findings reveal that while companies are incentivized to adopt green practices due to stakeholder expectations and potential reputational benefits, significant barriers such as high costs, lack of legitimacy, and operational complexities often hinder genuine progress. This tension between incentives and barriers creates fertile ground for greenwashing, as companies may opt for superficial measures rather than substantive changes.
- **Seele and Gatti (2017),** Seele and Gatti (2017) emphasize the critical role of stakeholders, particularly

consumers and investors, in enabling or discouraging greenwashing. They argue that stakeholders' perceptions and responses to greenwashing can significantly shape a company's environmental strategies. The study highlights how consumer skepticism and investor scrutiny can act as deterrents to deceptive practices. It also underscores the importance of transparency and accountability in corporate sustainability efforts. The authors suggest that companies must align their actions with their environmental claims to maintain stakeholder trust. This research provides a framework for understanding the dynamics between corporate behavior and stakeholder expectations. It also calls for greater stakeholder engagement to combat greenwashing effectively. The findings highlight the need for companies to prioritize genuine sustainability over superficial claims. Overall, the study underscores the power of stakeholders in driving corporate accountability.

- **Du et al. (2010),** explore how consumers' perceptions of a company's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) practices influence their responses to greenwashing. The study finds that consumers are more likely to penalize companies they perceive as engaging in deceptive environmental claims. It highlights the importance of aligning CSR practices with genuine sustainability efforts. The authors argue that consumer trust is a critical factor in shaping corporate reputations. They also emphasize the role of clear and consistent communication in building trust. The research suggests that companies must prioritize authenticity in their sustainability initiatives. It also calls for greater consumer awareness to identify and discourage greenwashing. The findings provide valuable insights into the relationship between CSR and consumer behavior. Overall, the study underscores the need for companies to adopt transparent and credible sustainability practices.
- Marquis et al. (2016) advocate for more stringent regulation and standardization in sustainable finance to prevent greenwashing. They argue that regulatory bodies must play a more proactive role in monitoring and enforcing compliance with environmental standards. The study highlights the challenges of ensuring accountability in the rapidly growing ESG sector. It also calls for the development of standardized metrics to evaluate sustainability claims. The authors emphasize the importance of aligning financial incentives with genuine environmental goals. They suggest that stricter regulations can help build trust in sustainable finance. The research provides a roadmap for policymakers to address greenwashing effectively. It also underscores the need for collaboration between regulators, investors, and companies. Overall, the study highlights the critical role of regulation in promoting transparency and accountability.
- Mitchell et al. (2010) highlight the importance of education and awareness in combating greenwashing. They argue that consumers must be better informed about companies' environmental practices to make sustainable choices. The study emphasizes the role of media and advocacy groups in raising awareness about greenwashing. It also calls for greater transparency in corporate reporting. The authors suggest that consumer education can act as a powerful tool in discouraging deceptive practices. They also advocate for the development of accessible resources to help consumers identify genuine sustainability efforts. The research underscores the need for collective action to address greenwashing. It provides valuable insights into the role of education in promoting sustainability. Overall, the study highlights the importance of empowering consumers to make informed decisions.
- Laufer (2003) argues that greenwashing undermines sustainable development by diverting resources from genuinely sustainable projects. He highlights how deceptive environmental claims create a false perception of sustainability, leading to inefficient resource allocation. The study emphasizes that greenwashing can erode public trust in corporate sustainability efforts. It also underscores the long-

term consequences of misleading claims on environmental progress. Laufer calls for greater accountability and transparency in corporate reporting. The research highlights the need for stricter regulations to prevent greenwashing. It also stresses the importance of aligning corporate actions with their stated environmental goals. Overall, the study provides a critical perspective on the detrimental effects of greenwashing on sustainable development.

- TerraChoice (2010) finds that greenwashing leads to cynicism and distrust among consumers, hindering the adoption of sustainable practices. The study identifies common deceptive strategies used by corporations, such as vague claims and hidden trade-offs. It emphasizes the importance of transparency in corporate sustainability communications. The research highlights the role of consumer awareness in combating greenwashing. It also calls for standardized reporting frameworks to ensure credibility. TerraChoice's findings underscore the need for stricter regulations to address deceptive practices. The study provides valuable insights into the impact of greenwashing on consumer behavior. Overall, it highlights the importance of building trust through genuine sustainability efforts.
- Dauvergne and Lister (2010) examine the prevalence of greenwashing in the palm oil industry. They highlight how companies use misleading claims to portray their operations as environmentally friendly. The study emphasizes the challenges of ensuring sustainability in complex supply chains. It also calls for greater transparency and accountability in the palm oil sector. The research underscores the need for independent verification of sustainability claims. It provides valuable insights into the role of certification schemes in addressing greenwashing. Overall, the study highlights the pervasive nature of greenwashing in the palm oil industry.
- Lyon and Maxwell (2011) focus on greenwashing in the automobile industry. They highlight how companies use deceptive marketing to promote their vehicles as environmentally friendly. The study emphasizes the challenges of ensuring sustainability in a highly competitive industry. It also calls for stricter regulations to prevent misleading claims. The research underscores the importance of aligning marketing with actual environmental performance. It provides valuable insights into the role of consumer awareness in combating greenwashing. Overall, the study highlights the need for sector-specific strategies to address greenwashing.
- Netto et al. (2020) explore the intertwining of greenwashing and sustainable finance. They highlight the challenges of ensuring transparency and accountability in ESG investments. The study emphasizes the need for standardized metrics to evaluate sustainability claims. It also calls for greater regulatory oversight to prevent greenwashing. The research underscores the importance of aligning financial incentives with genuine environmental goals. It provides valuable insights into the role of technology in promoting transparency. Overall, the study highlights the complex relationship between greenwashing and sustainable finance.
- Yang et al. (2020) examine the role of technological innovations in sustainable finance. They highlight how digital solutions can enhance transparency and accountability. The study emphasizes the potential of Fintech in combating greenwashing. It also calls for greater collaboration between regulators and industry stakeholders. The research underscores the importance of aligning technological advancements with sustainability goals. It provides valuable insights into the role of innovation in promoting sustainable finance. Overall, the study highlights the potential of technology to address greenwashing.
- Vergara and Agudo (2021) emphasize how digital financial solutions can enhance transparency and consumer protection. They highlight the potential of Fintech in mitigating greenwashing practices.

The study underscores the importance of aligning technological advancements with sustainability goals. It also calls for greater regulatory oversight to ensure accountability. The research provides valuable insights into the role of innovation in promoting sustainable finance. Overall, the study highlights the potential of digital solutions to address greenwashing.

- Moodaley and Telukdarie (2023) explore the role of artificial intelligence in scrutinizing sustainability reports for signs of greenwashing. They highlight AI's potential to enhance the credibility of corporate environmental disclosures. The study emphasizes the importance of aligning technological advancements with sustainability goals. It also calls for greater collaboration between regulators and industry stakeholders. The research provides valuable insights into the role of AI in promoting transparency. Overall, the study highlights the potential of AI to address greenwashing.

Greenwashing occurs when companies mislead consumers about their environmental practices (firm-level) or the environmental benefits of a product or service (product/service-level).

TYPES OF GREEN WASHING

Firm-level greenwashing happens when a company presents itself as environmentally responsible while engaging in contradictory practices. A notable example is General Electric's "Ecomagination" campaign, which promoted the company's sustainability efforts while it simultaneously lobbied against stricter clean air regulations proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Product/service-level greenwashing involves falsely marketing a product or service as environmentally friendly. For instance, LG's Energy Star-certified refrigerators were advertised as energy-efficient, yet investigations revealed that 10 models failed to meet the certification's efficiency standards.

Greenwashing can occur in various methods and forms and found across different industries and in different countries. Below are some examples of greenwashing practices identified:

1) Vague or Misleading Labels:

Some products may feature labels or packaging that give the impression of being environmentally friendly without providing specific details or credible certifications. Companies may overly simplify a complex issue and use vague or immeasurable terms like "Good for the Planet" to deceptively look "greener". Other commonly used terminology include "natural", "eco-friendly" or "green" without any clear substantiation or explanation of the methodology used, but using wording and imagery of nature to create a perception of sustainability.

2) Irrelevant Environmental Claims:

Companies may make environmental claims that are unrelated to their products or services. For instance, a company advertising a product as "green" or "sustainable" based on a single environmentally friendly aspect while ignoring other significant negative environmental impacts. For example, companies may focus on green packaging and energy reduction while ignoring the sourcing of sustainable raw materials of the products.

3) Hidden Trade-offs:

Greenwashing can occur when a company emphasizes a particular environmentally friendly aspect of its product while disregarding other harmful aspects. For instance, a car manufacturer promoting a vehicle's fuel efficiency but failing to mention its high emissions of other pollutants or the environmental impact of its product process.

4) Lack of Proof or Certification:

Greenwashing can involve making broad claims about a product's environmental benefits without prov-

iding verifiable evidence or certifications. Companies may use generic terms like “natural” or “organic” without meeting specific industry standards or certifications. Some companies may mention they cooperate with a certain environmental NGO, but lack any proof of the benefits and impact to protect the environment.

5) Incomplete Comparisons:

Greenwashing can occur when a company selectively compares its product to less sustainable alternatives, giving the impression of being environmentally friendly. This leads to withholding information and misleading information leading to false advertising. By ignoring more sustainable options available in the market, companies can mislead consumers about their true environmental impact.

6) False Endorsements:

Some companies may use fabricated endorsements or certifications to create an illusion of environmental credibility. They may display logos or labels that resemble legitimate eco-certifications or endorsements, misleading consumers into believing that their products have been vetted by independent third parties. For example, some internationally recognized sustainability standards have their own logos to endorse its certified products. However, some companies may use this logo falsely, where in fact, the company did not undergo the process of sustainable production and processing and verification and official endorsement.

7) Overstating Environmental Benefits

Greenwashing can involve exaggerating or overemphasizing the environmental benefits of a product or service. Companies may make grand claims that are not supported by evidence, or manipulate data to make their environmental impact appear smaller than it actually is. For example, plant-based milks such as Oat milk claim they are healthier and better for the planet, but ignore some of the negative impacts of oat milk.

WHAT COMPANIES ARE PRACTICING?

Greenwashing strategies have become increasingly elaborate, making it difficult for consumers and investors to distinguish between true sustainability efforts and misleading claims. A common approach involves the use of ambiguous terminology like "eco-friendly," "green," or "natural" without providing concrete evidence or certifications. This lack of clarity can create confusion and erode public trust.

Consumers respond to greenwashing in different ways, often influencing a company’s reputation and financial performance. As corporate social responsibility gains prominence, businesses that resort to greenwashing may fail to meet growing expectations, leading to skepticism, decreased sales, and damaged brand perception. When companies falsely market products as environmentally friendly, consumers may feel misled and opt to avoid such brands altogether.

Obstacles in implementing green supply chain management are often linked to credibility concerns arising from greenwashing. Companies exaggerating their environmental efforts risk losing consumer confidence. Studies indicate a U-shaped relationship between corporate social performance (CSP) and corporate financial performance (CFP), meaning businesses with either very low or very high CSP tend to outperform those with moderate efforts. Organizations that engage in greenwashing often find themselves in the middle ground, struggling to achieve solid financial success due to inconsistencies between their public claims and real actions.

These instances highlight the necessity of transparency and honesty in corporate sustainability messaging. Greenwashing not only weakens consumer and investor trust but also poses significant threats to a

company's reputation, financial stability, and long-term viability. As awareness of these deceptive tactics increases, companies must prioritize authentic environmental commitments to maintain credibility and meet the growing expectations of corporate social responsibility.
In the consumer goods sector, companies like Nestlé, Coca-Cola, and Starbucks have faced scrutiny for overstating the recyclability of their packaging and the sustainability of their operations. The financial industry is also implicated, with major banks such as JP Morgan Chase, Citibank, and Bank of America marketing green investment opportunities while simultaneously funding fossil fuels and deforestation.
The food and beverage industry has not been exempt from greenwashing allegations. In 2019, McDonald's launched an initiative to phase out plastic straws in favor of paper alternatives, only for it to be revealed that the new straws were not actually recyclable. These examples highlight the various tactics corporations use to appear eco-conscious while continuing environmentally harmful practices (Robinson, 2023).
Many well-known brands have been accused of greenwashing—using misleading marketing to appear more environmentally friendly than they actually are. Fast fashion giants like H&M, Zara, and Uniqlo contribute significantly to textile waste while promoting sustainability initiatives that critics argue do little to address the industry's environmental impact. Similarly, BP rebranded itself as "Beyond Petroleum" and installed solar panels at gas stations, yet it continued to allocate over 96% of its budget to oil and gas.

COMBATING GREENWASHING: ETHICAL AND PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS

Stronger Regulatory Frameworks
Governments should implement stricter labeling standards and enforce penalties to deter companies from making misleading environmental claims.
Corporate Transparency and Accountability
Companies must adopt third-party certifications and publicly disclose their sustainability metrics to ensure credibility. Stakeholders should demand corporate responsibility through independent audits and clear reporting mechanisms.
Consumer Awareness and Education
Educating consumers about greenwashing tactics empowers them to make informed purchasing decisions. Advocacy groups and watchdog organizations play a critical role in exposing misleading claims and promoting transparency.
Establishing Clear Standards
One of the first regulatory measures against greenwashing is the development of stringent standards for environmental claims. These standards create a benchmark for evaluating corporate sustainability efforts, making it more difficult for companies to misrepresent their environmental performance (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). For example, the **European Union's EU Taxonomy** was introduced to regulate greenwashing in the financial sector by setting performance thresholds that determine whether economic activities qualify as environmentally sustainable. This classification system provides a clear framework for both companies and investors, reducing the likelihood of misleading sustainability claims.
Enhancing Corporate Transparency
Regulatory bodies also promote transparency by requiring companies to disclose their environmental impact. These disclosure requirements may include **mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions, water consumption, waste management, and other environmental indicators**. Such measures discourage companies from obscuring their environmental footprint and increase corporate accountability (Reid & Toffel, 2009). In the **United States, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)** has issued

guidance on climate-related risk disclosures, encouraging companies to provide accurate and detailed information about their sustainability practices . Similarly, **the European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD)** requires large companies to disclose environmental, social, and governance (ESG) information, reinforcing transparency in corporate sustainability claims.

Enforcing Accountability and Penalties

To deter greenwashing, regulatory bodies impose penalties on companies that make false or misleading environmental claims. These enforcement actions may include fines, legal sanctions, or reputational consequences, making deceptive sustainability marketing a costly risk. Despite these measures, greenwashing remains a persistent issue, suggesting that **existing regulations may not be sufficient**. Further research is necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of different regulatory approaches and to develop new strategies for combating greenwashing.

For instance, in **2021, the UK's Competition and Markets Authority (CMA)** launched an investigation into misleading green claims within the fashion industry. The CMA examined whether clothing and textile brands were falsely advertising the sustainability of their products and whether such claims complied with consumer protection laws .

Comparing Global Approaches

Different countries have implemented varied anti-greenwashing regulations, reflecting their unique legal, economic, and cultural contexts. Some notable examples include:

- **United States:** The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) enforces the **Green Guides**, which provide guidelines for companies making environmental claims. These guidelines help prevent misleading marketing by requiring clear, substantiated claims.
- **European Union:** The EU has implemented **the Green Claims Directive**, which aims to eliminate misleading sustainability labels and require scientific evidence for environmental claims.
- **China:** The Chinese government has introduced **the Green Development Guidelines**, which regulate environmental claims in industries such as manufacturing, finance, and retail to prevent deceptive green marketing

References

1. Seele, P., & Gatti, L. (2017). Greenwashing Revisited: In Search of a Typology and Accusation-Based Definition Incorporating Legitimacy Strategies. Business Strategy and the Environment, 26(2), 239-252.
2. Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2010). Maximizing Business Returns to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): The Role of CSR Communication. International Journal of Management Reviews, 12(1), 8-19.
3. Akomea-Frimpong, I., Adeabah, D., Ofosu, D., and Tenakwah, E. (2021). A review of studies on green finance of banks, research gaps and future directions. J. Sustain. Financ. Invest. 12, 1241–1264. doi: 10.1080/20430795.2020.1870202
4. Arksey, H., and O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. Int. J. Soc. Res. Methodol. 8, 19–32. doi: 10.1080/1364557032000119616
5. Bain, M. (2019). Norway wants H&M to explain what's so sustainable about its "sustainable" clothes. Quartz. Available at: https://qz.com/quartzy/1648911/norwayquestions-the-sustainability-of-hms-conscious-collection (Accessed July 13, 2023).
6. Greenwashing behaviours: causes, taxonomy and consequences based on a systematic literature revi-

ew zhi yang1, thi thu huong nguyen1, 2*, hoang nam nguyen2, thi thuy nga nguyen1, thi thanh cao journal of business economics and management ISSN 1611-1699/eISSN 2029-4433 2020 Volume 21 Issue 5: 1486–1507

7. Cross washing in Sustainable Investing: Unveiling Strategic Practices Impacting ESG Scores,SSRN (Social Science Research Network), March 18, 2024 **URL:** https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4732871
8. Marquis, C., Toffel, M. W., & Zhou, Y. (2016). Scrutiny, Norms, and Selective Disclosure: A Global Study of Greenwashing. Organization Science, 27(2), 483-504.
9. Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (2010). Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts. Academy of Management Review, 22(4), 853-886 Calma, J. (2023). Earth day 2023: Green or greenwashed? The verge. Available at: https://www.theverge.com/23688450/earth-day-2023-green-greenwashed-brands climate-plastic-pollution (Accessed July 14, 2023).
10. Laufer, W. S. (2003). Social Accountability and Corporate Greenwashing. Journal of Business
11. Marquis, C., Toffel, M. W., and Zhou, Y. (2016). Scrutiny, norms, and selective disclosure: a global study of greenwashing. Organ. Sci. 27, 483–504. doi: 10.1287/ orsc.2015.1039
12. Mishra, T., Park, D., Parhi, M., Uddin, G. S., and Tian, S. (2023). A memory in the bond: green bond and sectoral investment interdependence in a fractionally cointegrated VAR framework. Energy Econ. 121:106652. doi: 10.1016/j.eneco.2023.106652