Business, Management and Economics Engineering
ISSN: 2669-2481 / eISSN: 2669-249X
2024 Volume 22 Issue 01

FACADE OR FACT? DELVING INTO GLOBAL CORPORATE COMPLIANCE IN GREENWASHING

Maria Pynadath*
Research Scholar, Lincoln University, Malaysia, Assistant Professor, Rajagiri College of Social Sciences, mpynadath@lincoln.edu.my

Dr. Sangeetha K L
Assistant Professor, Rajagiri College of Social Sciences
sangeetha@rajagiri.edu

Prof. Dr. Amiya Bhaumik
Faculty of Business, Lincoln University, Malaysia
amiya@lincoln.edu.my

* Corresponding author: mpynadath@lincoln.edu.my

Abstract
Greenwashing, the practice of misleading consumers about the environmental benefits of a product or company, has prompted increasing regulatory scrutiny worldwide. This article examines corporate strategies in response to greenwashing regulations, focusing on transparency, accountability and long-term sustainability commitments. The analysis identifies key strategies such as public apologies, financial restructuring, corporate reorganization and long-term commitments to sustainability. Transparency and accountability are crucial for rebuilding consumer trust and addressing environmental concerns. Case studies including Volkswagen's emissions scandal, Nestlé's water usage claims and Coca-Cola's recycling program, illustrate how companies navigate regulatory scrutiny and align with societal expectations. Institutional Theory and Stakeholder Theory frameworks elucidate the motivations behind these strategies, emphasizing the importance of normative, cognitive and regulative conformity to maintain legitimacy and meet stakeholder demands. Despite variations in effectiveness, these corporate responses underscore a broader effort to enhance sustainability practices and foster stronger relationships with consumers and stakeholders. The findings provide valuable insights for policymakers, regulators and companies in promoting genuine sustainability and enhancing trust.
Keywords: *Greenwashing, Sustainability claims, Greenwashing Accusations, Corporate responses, Regulatory Actions*

1. Introduction

In an era increasingly driven by the urgency of environmental stewardship, the allure of green products and sustainable practices has never been stronger. Yet, lurking behind the vibrant veneer of eco-friendly branding lies a troubling truth: not all that glitters is green (Rodrigues et al., 2013) In a world where environmental consciousness is not just a trend but a necessity, businesses and consumers alike are navigating the complex landscape of sustainability. As sustainability continues to ascend as a key consideration for consumers, companies are under increasing pressure to align with environmentally friendly practices (Polonski, 1994). However, amidst this demand, some entities resort to greenwashing - a deceptive strategy aimed at portraying products or practices as more eco-friendly than they truly are. From ambiguous labeling and misleading advertisements to selective disclosure of environmental impacts, greenwashing can take many forms, making it difficult for consumers to distinguish between authentic and deceptive practices (Motta, S.L.S., 2008). However, the lack of stringent regulations and standardized criteria for what constitutes "green" allows companies to exploit this demand through superficial or outright false claims (Ottman, J., & Miller, D.,1998).

Greenwashing, a portmanteau of "green" and "whitewashing," refers to the practice of conveying a false impression or providing misleading information about how a company's products are more environmentally sound than they truly are. It isn't just a minor hiccup in the green revolution—it's a significant roadblock (Budisnky & Bryant, 2013). Rather than making genuine changes, some companies resort to greenwashing as a way to capitalize on the growing demand for eco-friendly products without incurring the costs associated with implementing sustainable practices (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). This cunning practice dupes consumers into believing they're making environmentally sound choices, while the reality is far murkier. From vague claims of sustainability to bold-faced lies about environmental impact, greenwashing undermines the integrity of the green movement and impedes real progress. It erodes trust in brands and confuses consumers who are striving to make responsible choices (Chen, Y. & Chang, C.,2013). Moreover, it can have far-reaching environmental implications by diverting attention and resources away from truly sustainable initiatives. In response, regulatory bodies globally have enacted stricter regulations to curb this practice (Lyon, T., & Maxwell, J., 2011). This paper aims to analyze corporate responses to these regulations, drawing on reported cases from different regions to understand the effectiveness and outcomes of these regulatory measures.

The phenomenon of greenwashing has grown in prominence alongside the rise of the global environmental movement (Friedman, A. L., & Miles, S., 2001). Companies from diverse industries, including automotive, fashion, food and beverage and consumer goods, have been accused of greenwashing. For instance, a 2010 report titled "The Sins of Greenwashing" found that out of 5,296 products making environmental claims in North America, over 95% committed at least one of the "Seven Sins of Greenwashing" (TerraChoice, 2010). Furthermore, a 2020 study by the European Commission found that 42% of green claims made by companies were exaggerated, false or deceptive, leading to the creation of stricter regulations to ensure the credibility of environmental claims (European Commission, 2020). This deceptive practice not only undermines consumer trust but also hampers progress towards genuine sustainability by allowing companies to superficially address environmental issues without making substantial changes (Parguel, Benoît-Moreau, & Larceneux, 2011).

Regulatory bodies and watchdog organizations have been increasingly vigilant in identifying and addressing greenwashing. Initiatives such as stricter advertising standards, mandatory disclosure of environmental impact and third-party certifications are part of a broader effort to combat this deceptive practice (TerraChoice, 2010). Nonetheless, the challenge remains substantial, as greenwashing tactics evolve and become more sophisticated (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). Understanding greenwashing involves examining both the motivations behind it and the various forms it takes. Companies may engage in greenwashing through misleading labels, unverified sustainability claims or selective disclosure of positive environmental impacts while omitting negative ones (Polonsky et al., 2010). Recognizing and addressing greenwashing requires a multi-faceted approach that includes consumer education, regulatory oversight and corporate accountability (Parguel et al., 2011).

In the context of these challenges, this paper explores the complexities of greenwashing, analyzing corporate responses to greenwashing regulations and the effectiveness of these measures. By examining notable global cases, we aim to shed light on the strategies employed by companies to either genuinely embrace or merely simulate sustainability. This analysis provides insights into the effectiveness of regulatory frameworks and offers recommendations for promoting authentic sustainable practices in the corporate world by addressing the following research questions:

R1: How do corporations respond to greenwashing regulations globally?

R2: What strategies are employed by companies to comply with or circumvent these regulations?

R3: How effective are regulatory actions in fostering genuine sustainable practices?

2. Review of Literature

Jay Westerveld coined the term "greenwashing" in 1986 with reference to a hotel policy that encouraged guests to reuse towels in an effort to 'save the environment', but in reality, it was only a measure to appeal to their environmental concerns and cut back on laundry expenses (Orange and Cohen, 2010). Federal Trade Commission (1998) developed 'Green Guidelines' that provided definitions for different terminologies used in environmental marketing. In the next year, FTC discovered that the Nuclear Energy Institute's claims to be an environmentally friendly organization were untrue. The agency took no action because the advertisements fell outside its jurisdiction. This caused the FTC to realize they required new, distinct and enforceable standards. Subsequently, the term 'greenwashing' was incorporated into the Oxford English Dictionary in 1999.

The literature on greenwashing is extensive, exploring various facets including its impact on consumer trust, market dynamics and environmental goals. Greenwashing can severely undermine consumer trust, a critical factor for brand loyalty and long-term business success. Parguel, Benoît-Moreau and Larceneux (2011) delve into the psychological effects of greenwashing on consumers. Their research highlights that when consumers perceive a company's environmental claims as deceptive, their trust in the brand diminishes significantly. This erosion of trust can lead to a negative brand perception and a reduction in customer loyalty (Szabo, S., & Webster, J., 2021). The study further shows that consumers who feel misled are more likely to share their negative experiences, exacerbating the damage to the brand's reputation. Perceived deception leads to a significant drop in consumer trust, and negative experiences related to greenwashing are likely to be shared, amplifying reputational damage (Rosenberg, M. Berrone, P. Rousseau, H, 2019).

Research has shown that companies have developed various strategies to address greenwashing, including: (a) Transparency and disclosure: Companies are increasingly adopting sustainability reporting and third-party verification to demonstrate their environmental performance (Global Reporting Initiative, 2020). (b) Stakeholder engagement: Companies are engaging with NGOs, consumers, and investors to address concerns and build trust (Shumate, M., & O'Connor, A., 2010)). (c) Certification and labeling: Companies are seeking eco-labels and certifications, such as ISO 14001 and the EU Ecolabel, to demonstrate their environmental credentials (European Commission, 2020). (d) Supply chain management: Companies are extending their sustainability efforts to their supply chains, recognizing the risks and opportunities for environmental and social impact (McKinsey, 2019).

Studies have also highlighted regional and industry-specific differences in corporate responses to greenwashing. For example: European companies tend to prioritize sustainability reporting and stakeholder engagement (Eurosif, 2018), Asian companies are more likely to focus on eco-innovation and product development (Jo, Jang-Hwan et al., 2015), Companies in the extractive industries tend to prioritize community engagement and development (ICMM, 2019).

Delmas and Burbano (2011) investigate the economic consequences of greenwashing, revealing that while greenwashing can offer short-term financial gains by attracting eco-conscious consumers, it poses long-term risks. Companies found guilty of greenwashing may face legal penalties, loss of consumer trust and damage to their brand image. These consequences can outweigh any temporary financial benefits. The authors also discuss how greenwashing can distort market dynamics by creating unfair competition between genuinely sustainable companies and those merely pretending to be green. Short-term financial gains from greenwashing are often offset by long-term risks, including legal penalties, loss of consumer trust and reputational damage, which distort market dynamics and create unfair competition (Nguyen et al., 2019)

The implications of greenwashing are significant. For consumers, it erodes trust in brands and makes it challenging to make informed choices (Polonsky, Grau, & Garma, 2010). For the environment, it means that the actual impact of corporate operations may remain unmitigated, despite publicized claims of sustainability (Lyon & Maxwell, 2011). Moreover, it creates an uneven playing field where genuinely sustainable businesses are at a competitive disadvantage compared to those that merely appear green.

Regulatory frameworks play a crucial role in curbing greenwashing. Testa et al. (2018) examine the effectiveness of various regulatory measures in preventing greenwashing. Their study compares different approaches such as mandatory disclosure requirements, third-party certifications and advertising standards. The findings suggest that stringent regulatory frameworks, particularly those requiring third-party verification of environmental claims, are more effective in reducing greenwashing practices. Additionally, consumer awareness and education initiatives are highlighted as essential components of effective regulation. Stringent regulatory frameworks, especially those involving third-party verification, are effective in reducing greenwashing and consumer awareness and education are critical for the success of regulatory measures.

Building on the aforementioned studies, this paper explores how corporations respond to regulatory pressures concerning greenwashing. While some companies adopt more genuine sustainable practices, others may employ sophisticated tactics to appear compliant without making substantive changes. Understanding greenwashing involves examining both the motivations behind it and the various forms it takes. Companies may engage in greenwashing through misleading labels, unverified sustainability claims or selective disclosure of positive environmental impacts while omitting negative ones. Recognizing and addressing greenwashing requires a multi-faceted approach that includes consumer education, regulatory oversight and corporate accountability (Parguel et al., 2011).

Corporations' responses to greenwashing regulations vary widely. Some companies choose to comply fully with regulations, adopting genuine sustainable practices and obtaining third-party certifications to validate their claims. Others may seek loopholes or adopt superficial measures that create an illusion of compliance without making substantive changes. This literature review highlights the complex and multifaceted nature of corporate responses to greenwashing. As companies navigate the challenges and opportunities of sustainability, it is essential to consider the global perspective, regional differences, and industry-specific approaches to addressing greenwashing. This paper aims to provide a nuanced understanding of greenwashing, its impacts and corporate responses to regulatory pressures. The following sections will delve into specific case studies to explore these dynamics in greater detail.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study employs Institutional Theory and Stakeholder Theory to understand corporate behavior in the context of greenwashing regulations. Institutional Theory suggests that organizations conform to regulatory and normative pressures to gain legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Stakeholder Theory posits that companies must balance the interests of various stakeholders, including regulators, consumers and investors, to achieve sustainable success (Freeman, R., & McVea, J.,2001)

Institutional Theory, as proposed by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), emphasizes the importance of organizations conforming to institutional pressures to gain legitimacy within their environment. These pressures can be coercive, mimetic or normative in nature. Coercive pressures involve regulations and legal requirements enforced by external entities such as government entities like the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Mimetic pressures refer to organizations imitating the actions of others in their industry, particularly those perceived as successful or legitimate (Islam, M. A., & Deegan, C., 2010). Normative pressures stem from societal norms, values and expectations regarding appropriate behavior. In the context of greenwashing regulations, Institutional Theory suggests that companies may feel compelled to adopt green practices or comply with sustainability standards to gain legitimacy and maintain their reputation. This could involve aligning their operations with environmental regulations, obtaining eco-certifications or engaging in green marketing campaigns to signal their commitment to sustainability.

Stakeholder Theory, as proposed by Freeman (2015), emphasizes the importance of companies balancing the interests of various stakeholders to achieve sustainable success. Stakeholders include not only shareholders but also employees, customers, suppliers, communities and regulatory bodies. According to this theory, companies must consider the expectations and demands of these stakeholders when making decisions and formulating strategies. In the context of greenwashing regulations, Stakeholder Theory suggests that companies need to consider the interests and concerns of stakeholders such as regulators, consumers, environmental advocacy groups and investors. For example, companies may face pressure from environmental activists or consumer groups to adopt more transparent and genuine sustainability practices. Failure to address these stakeholders' concerns could lead to reputational damage, loss of consumer trust or regulatory sanctions (Junior et al.,2019)

By employing both Institutional Theory and Stakeholder Theory, this study seeks to understand how companies navigate the complex landscape of greenwashing regulations. It examines how organizations respond to external pressures to adopt green practices, comply with regulations and maintain stakeholder relationships while striving for legitimacy and sustainable success in their operations.

4. Research Methodology

This conceptual paper employs a qualitative approach to analyze corporate responses to greenwashing regulations. The study relies on secondary data from various sources, including detailed case studies, regulatory reports and academic literature. By examining well-documented greenwashing cases across multiple regions such as North America, Europe, Asia and Oceania, the research aims to identify patterns and strategies in how corporations respond to regulatory pressures. The methodology involves the following steps:

4.1 ***Case Selection:*** Five prominent cases of greenwashing were selected for analysis. These cases include the Volkswagen Emissions Scandal (2015), H&M Conscious Collection (2021), Nespresso Sustainability Claims (2022), Nestlé's Water Usage Claims (2018) and Coca-Cola's Recycling Program (2019). These cases were chosen based on their significant regulatory and public impact and the availability of comprehensive data.

4.2 ***Data Collection:*** Secondary data was collected from various sources such as government and regulatory agency reports, industry analyses, academic research and media coverage. Specific sources include the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reports, Greenpeace reports, European Commission studies and publications from relevant industry watchdogs and advocacy groups.

4.3 ***Data Analysis:*** The collected data was systematically analyzed to identify corporate responses to greenwashing allegations and regulatory actions. The analysis focused on:

a) The nature and background of each greenwashing incident.
b) The regulatory actions taken in response to these incidents.
c) The corporate responses following regulatory scrutiny.
d) The effectiveness and outcomes of these responses in terms of compliance, market performance and public perception.

4.4 ***Synthesis and Interpretation:*** The findings from the case analyses were synthesized to interpret how different companies have adapted to regulatory pressures. This synthesis highlights best practices, challenges and areas for improvement in corporate sustainability practices.

This qualitative approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved in corporate responses to greenwashing regulations, providing insights that can inform policy-making and corporate strategy development in the realm of sustainability.

5. Case Analysis

5.1 CASE 1. Volkswagen Emissions Scandal (2015): Analysis of how Volkswagen responded to regulatory actions post scandal

The Volkswagen emissions scandal, also known as "Dieselgate," emerged in 2015 when it was revealed that Volkswagen (VW) had installed software in 11 million diesel vehicles worldwide to cheat emissions tests. This "defeat device" enabled the cars to meet regulatory standards during testing while emitting up to 40 times the permissible levels of nitrogen oxides during normal driving conditions.

5.1.1 Accusations of Greenwashing:

➔ ***Misleading Marketing:*** Volkswagen falsely marketed their cars as "clean diesel" and promoted them as environmentally friendly, suggesting that they were producing vehicles with lower emissions and greater environmental benefits.

➔ ***False Environmental Claims:*** The company made claims about the environmental performance of their vehicles that were not accurate or truthful, leading consumers to believe that they were purchasing eco-friendly cars when, in fact, they were emitting pollutants at levels far exceeding regulatory limits.

➔ ***Deceptive Practices:*** Volkswagen installed illegal software, known as defeat devices, in their vehicles to cheat emissions tests. These devices detected when the car was undergoing emissions testing and altered the performance to meet regulatory standards.

However, during normal driving conditions, the vehicles emitted pollutants at levels much higher than allowed by regulations.

- ➔ ***Violation of Regulatory Standards:*** By installing defeat devices in their vehicles, Volkswagen violated emissions regulations in multiple countries, including the United States and those in the European Union.
- ➔ ***Environmental Impact:*** The emissions produced by Volkswagen's vehicles, due to the use of defeat devices, had significant environmental consequences, including increased air pollution and harm to public health.
- ➔ ***Consumer Deception:*** Consumers who purchased Volkswagen vehicles were misled into believing that they were making an environmentally responsible choice, only to discover that the cars emitted pollutants at levels far higher than advertised.

5.1.2 Regulatory Actions:

- ➔ ***United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA):*** Issued a notice of violation of the Clean Air Act to Volkswagen.
- ➔ ***Financial Penalties:*** VW faced substantial fines, including $2.8 billion in criminal fines in the U.S., and additional billions in civil fines and compensation funds.
- ➔ ***Recalls and Repairs:*** The company was mandated to recall affected vehicles and fix the emission systems to comply with regulations.

5.1.3 Corporate Responses:

- ➔ ***Public Apology and Accountability:*** VW publicly apologized while several top executives, including the CEO, resigned.
- ➔ ***Financial Restructuring:*** VW set aside approximately $18 billion to cover the costs of fines, recalls and legal expenses.
- ➔ ***Corporate Reorganization:*** The company restructured its management to improve oversight and prevent future misconduct. This included the creation of a new integrity and legal affairs board.
- ➔ ***Focus on Electric Vehicles (EVs):*** VW announced a strategic shift towards electric mobility, aiming to produce one million electric cars by 2025. They launched new EV models and invested heavily in battery technology and charging infrastructure.
- ➔ ***Sustainability Initiatives:*** VW increased its focus on sustainability, launching initiatives such as the "TOGETHER - Strategy 2025," which aims for a comprehensive transformation towards a more sustainable and digitally advanced company.
- ➔ ***Legal Settlements and Compensation:*** VW settled numerous lawsuits and compensation claims with customers, dealers and governments, committing billions of dollars to buybacks, repairs and environmental remediation.

5.1.4 Effectiveness and Outcomes:

- ➔ ***Rebuilding Trust:*** While VW has made significant strides in promoting transparency and sustainability, regaining consumer trust has been challenging. The shift towards EVs has been well-received but is seen as a necessary move to restore brand reputation.

- ➔ ***Market Performance:*** Despite initial setbacks, VW's commitment to innovation and sustainability has helped it regain market position, especially in the EV segment.

5.2 CASE 2. H&M Conscious Collection (2019): Examination of accusations of greenwashing and subsequent corporate adjustments

H&M's Conscious Collection, launched as part of the company's effort to promote sustainable fashion, faced accusations of greenwashing. Critics argued that the collection's environmental claims were misleading and the brand was not transparent about the actual sustainability impact of its products.

5.2.1 Accusations of Greenwashing:

- ➔ ***Lack of Transparency:*** Critics pointed out that H&M did not provide clear information about the environmental impact of the materials used in the Conscious Collection.
- ➔ ***Misleading Claims:*** Reports suggested that the collection's "sustainable" materials were often blended with conventional ones, diluting the overall environmental benefits.
- ➔ ***Overproduction:*** Despite the Conscious Collection, H&M's business model of fast fashion and mass production was seen as inherently unsustainable.

5.2.2 Regulatory Actions:

- ➔ ***Industry Guidelines Compliance:*** H&M faced scrutiny from industry-specific organizations that set guidelines for sustainable fashion. These entities reviewed H&M's practices against their established standards and issued recommendations and warnings.
- ➔ ***Ethical Standards Audits:*** Independent auditors and third-party organizations specializing in ethical and sustainable practices conducted audits of H&M's supply chain and manufacturing processes. These audits assessed whether the company's claims of sustainability are substantiated by their practices.
- ➔ ***Consumer Awareness Campaigns:*** Consumer advocacy groups and NGOs launched awareness campaigns to educate the public about greenwashing practices in the fashion industry. These campaigns highlighted H&M's Conscious Collection to encourage consumers to make informed purchasing decisions.
- ➔ ***Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Reporting:*** H&M was required to disclose detailed information about their sustainability initiatives and progress in their annual CSR reports allowing regulatory bodies to review these reports to ensure transparency and accountability in H&M's sustainability efforts.

5.2.3 Corporate Responses:

- ➔ ***Increased Transparency:*** H&M responded by enhancing the transparency of its supply chain and providing more detailed information about the materials and processes used in its Conscious Collection.
- ➔ ***Sustainability Reporting:*** The company improved its sustainability reporting, setting more ambitious targets and publishing detailed sustainability reports to communicate progress.

- ***Circular Fashion Initiatives:*** H&M launched initiatives to promote circular fashion, including garment recycling programs and the development of a new business model focused on renting and recycling clothing.
- ***Sustainable Materials Commitment:*** The brand committed to using 100% sustainably sourced materials by 2030 and increased investment in sustainable textile innovations.

5.2.4 Effectiveness and Outcomes:

- ***Consumer Perception:*** While H&M's efforts have been recognized, skepticism remains among consumers and watchdog groups regarding the depth of these changes.
- ***Market Response:*** H&M's enhanced focus on sustainability has helped it maintain its market position, but the fast fashion industry's inherent sustainability challenges continue to pose significant hurdles.

5.3 CASE 3. Nespresso Sustainability Claims (2020): Exploration of regulatory scrutiny and corporate strategies to bolster genuine sustainable practices

Nespresso, a subsidiary of Nestlé, faced scrutiny over its sustainability claims, particularly regarding the environmental impact of its coffee pods and sourcing practices. Regulatory scrutiny ensued following allegations that Nespresso's marketing assertions regarding sustainability were misleading or unsubstantiated. Authorities launched investigations to evaluate the accuracy and transparency of Nespresso's sustainability claims, particularly concerning their environmental impact and social responsibility efforts.

5.3.1 Accusations of Greenwashing:

- ***Misleading Product Claims:*** Nespresso faced allegations of overstating the environmental benefits of their coffee pods, particularly regarding recyclability and the overall environmental footprint of their packaging materials.
- ***Greenwashing through Marketing:*** Critics accused Nespresso of greenwashing by using imagery and language that implied greater environmental friendliness than their products and practices actually achieved. This included claims of sustainability without sufficient evidence to support them.
- ***Questionable Recycling Programs:*** Nespresso's recycling program, touted as a key sustainability initiative, faced scrutiny for its limited accessibility and effectiveness. Critics argued that Nespresso overstated the environmental benefits of their recycling efforts while downplaying the environmental impact of single-use coffee pods.
- ***Sourcing Practices:*** Allegations were made against Nespresso regarding the sustainability of their coffee bean sourcing practices. Critics pointed out concerns about the company's engagement with suppliers in regions associated with deforestation and other environmental degradation.
- ***Packaging Waste:*** Nespresso was criticized for excessive packaging waste associated with their coffee pods, including single-use plastic capsules and non-recyclable packaging materials. Critics argued that Nespresso's packaging choices contradicted their sustainability claims and contributed to environmental harm.

5.3.2 Regulatory Actions:

- ➔ ***Investigations:*** Regulatory bodies and consumer protection agencies examined Nespresso's sustainability claims, focusing on the recyclability of coffee pods and the authenticity of its sustainable sourcing certifications.
- ➔ ***Media Coverage:*** Investigative journalism highlighted discrepancies between Nespresso's marketing messages and actual practices, prompting further public and regulatory scrutiny.

5.3.3 Corporate Responses:

- ➔ ***Pod Recycling Programs:*** Nespresso expanded its coffee pod recycling programs, making it easier for consumers to return used pods for recycling. They introduced more collection points and partnerships with local recycling facilities.
- ➔ ***Sustainable Sourcing:*** Nespresso strengthened its commitment to sustainable coffee sourcing, aiming for 100% of its coffee to be sustainably sourced through the AAA Sustainable Quality™ Program by 2025. This includes direct engagement with farmers and investment in sustainable agricultural practices.
- ➔ ***Transparency and Reporting:*** The company increased transparency by publishing detailed sustainability reports and third-party audits of its environmental and social practices.
- ➔ ***Innovative Packaging Solutions:*** Nespresso invested in developing new, more sustainable packaging solutions, including compostable and fully recyclable coffee pods.
- ➔ ***Carbon Neutrality Goal:*** Nespresso set a goal to achieve carbon neutrality across its operations by 2022, focusing on reducing emissions, investing in renewable energy, and supporting reforestation projects.

5.3.4 Effectiveness and Outcomes:

- ➔ ***Improved Credibility:*** These efforts have helped Nespresso improve its credibility and address consumer concerns, although ongoing scrutiny means the company must continually demonstrate its commitment to sustainability.
- ➔ ***Market Differentiation:*** By positioning itself as a leader in sustainable coffee, Nespresso has been able to differentiate itself in a competitive market, appealing to environmentally conscious consumers.

5.4 CASE 4: Nestlé's Water Usage Claims (2018)

In 2018, Nestlé came under fire for allegedly making misleading claims about its water sustainability practices. Activists and environmental organizations accused Nestlé of overstating its commitment to water conservation and sustainable sourcing, particularly in regions facing water scarcity. The controversy primarily revolved around Nestlé's bottled water brands, including Poland Spring and Pure Life.

5.4.1 Accusations of Greenwashing:

- ➔ ***Excessive Water Extraction:*** Nestlé faced allegations of greenwashing due to its perceived unsustainable water extraction practices, particularly in regions experiencing water scarcity. Critics argued that Nestlé's claims of responsible water stewardship were contradicted by their high-volume water extraction for bottled water production, which was seen as exacerbating local water stress.

- ➔ ***Misleading Sustainability Messaging:*** Critics accused Nestlé of greenwashing by using misleading or vague language in its sustainability messaging related to water usage. Despite promoting initiatives such as water efficiency and community water projects, Nestlé faced criticism for failing to provide sufficient evidence or transparency regarding the actual environmental impact of its water extraction activities.
- ➔ ***Environmental Impact of Packaging:*** Nestlé's bottled water products also faced scrutiny for their environmental impact beyond water extraction. Critics raised concerns about the excessive use of single-use plastic packaging, which contributed to plastic pollution and environmental degradation, undermining Nestlé's claims of environmental responsibility.
- ➔ ***Community Displacement and Social Impact:*** Allegations were made against Nestlé regarding the social and community impacts of its water extraction activities. Critics argued that Nestlé's operations in some regions led to the displacement of local communities and conflicts over water resources, raising questions about the company's commitment to sustainable and equitable water management.
- ➔ ***Regulatory Compliance and Accountability:*** Nestlé faced accusations of greenwashing due to perceived gaps in regulatory compliance and accountability regarding its water usage practices. Critics called for greater transparency, independent monitoring, and regulatory oversight to ensure that Nestlé's water extraction activities aligned with environmental sustainability and social responsibility objectives.

5.4.2 Regulatory Actions:

- ➔ ***Legal Challenges:*** Nestlé faced several lawsuits, particularly in the United States, where plaintiffs alleged that Poland Spring water did not meet the criteria for "spring water" as defined by federal regulations. Additionally, there were accusations that Nestlé was extracting more water than permitted by its permits, impacting local water supplies.
- ➔ ***Public Backlash:*** Environmental groups like the Sierra Club and local activist groups staged protests and launched campaigns to raise awareness about Nestlé's water extraction practices, further fueling public criticism.

5.4.3 Corporate Responses:

- ➔ ***Revisions of Marketing Materials:*** In response to the backlash, Nestlé revised its marketing and advertising materials to ensure greater accuracy and transparency about its water sourcing and sustainability practices. The company also adjusted its claims to better reflect its environmental impact and efforts.
- ➔ ***Enhanced Water Stewardship Programs:*** Nestlé strengthened its water stewardship initiatives, including projects aimed at reducing water usage, protecting water sources, and improving water access in communities where it operates. This included

collaboration with local stakeholders and governments to develop sustainable water management plans.

➔ ***Third-Party Audits:*** To enhance credibility, Nestlé increased the frequency and scope of third-party audits of its water extraction and sustainability practices. These audits were conducted by independent organizations to ensure compliance with environmental standards and transparency in reporting.

5.4.4 Effectiveness and Outcomes:

➔ ***Improvement in Public Perception:*** These measures led to some improvement in Nestlé's public image concerning water sustainability. By adopting more transparent and accountable practices, Nestlé managed to regain a degree of trust from consumers and stakeholders.

➔ ***Ongoing Scrutiny:*** Despite these efforts, Nestlé continues to face scrutiny from environmental groups and activists. Ongoing challenges include addressing the broader impact of bottled water on plastic waste and ensuring sustainable water management in all its operations. The company must continuously demonstrate its commitment to sustainable practices to mitigate future criticisms.

5.5 CASE 5: Coca-Cola's Recycling Program (2018)

Coca-Cola has been a significant contributor to global plastic pollution, given its extensive use of plastic bottles. In 2019, the company faced heightened criticism for its environmental impact, with environmental groups accusing it of making insufficient efforts to address plastic waste. Coca-Cola's recycling claims were seen as inadequate in light of the increasing visibility of plastic pollution issues.

5.5.1 Accusations of Greenwashing:

➔ ***Limited Effectiveness:*** Critics argued that Coca-Cola's recycling program was insufficient in addressing the environmental impact of its packaging waste. Despite promoting recycling initiatives, Coca-Cola faced accusations of greenwashing due to the limited effectiveness of its programs in reducing plastic pollution and increasing overall recycling rates.

➔ ***Emphasis on Recycling Over Reduction:*** Coca-Cola's recycling messaging was criticized for prioritizing recycling efforts over reduction and reuse strategies. Critics argued that the company's focus on recycling initiatives, such as bottle collection and recycling partnerships, diverted attention from the need to reduce plastic usage and invest in more sustainable packaging alternatives.

➔ ***Plastic Pollution and Environmental Harm:*** Coca-Cola's reliance on single-use plastic packaging contributed to plastic pollution and environmental harm, undermining the credibility of its recycling program. Critics raised concerns about the environmental impact of Coca-Cola's packaging waste, highlighting the disconnect between its recycling messaging and the reality of plastic pollution.

➔ ***Lack of Transparency and Accountability:*** Coca-Cola faced accusations of greenwashing due to perceived gaps in transparency and accountability regarding its recycling program. Critics called for greater transparency in reporting on recycling rates, the destination of collected recyclables, and the overall environmental impact of Coca-Cola's packaging materials.

- ➔ ***Promotional Tactics and Brand Image:*** Coca-Cola's recycling program was criticized for serving as a promotional tactic to enhance the company's brand image rather than addressing systemic issues related to plastic pollution and waste management. Critics argued that Coca-Cola's recycling messaging was designed to greenwash its image and deflect attention from its role in contributing to environmental degradation.

5.5.2 Regulatory Actions:

- ➔ ***Pressure from Environmental Groups:*** Organizations such as Greenpeace and Break Free From Plastic highlighted Coca-Cola as one of the top polluters in their annual brand audits of plastic waste. These groups called for greater accountability and action from the company.
- ➔ ***Regulatory Bodies:*** Governments and regulatory bodies in various countries increased pressure on Coca-Cola to reduce its plastic footprint and improve recycling rates. This included legislative efforts to impose stricter regulations on plastic use and waste management.

5.5.3 Corporate Responses:

- ➔ ***Commitments to 100% Recyclable Packaging:*** Coca-Cola committed to ensuring that all its packaging would be 100% recyclable by 2025. The company also pledged to use at least 50% recycled material in its plastic bottles by 2030.
- ➔ ***Investment in Recycling Infrastructure:*** Coca-Cola invested significantly in improving recycling infrastructure, both independently and through partnerships with other companies and organizations. This included initiatives to enhance collection and recycling systems, particularly in regions with poor waste management practices.
- ➔ ***Increased Transparency:*** The company made efforts to increase transparency about its plastic usage and recycling practices. This involved publishing detailed sustainability reports and providing regular updates on progress towards its environmental goals.

5.5.4 Effectiveness and Outcomes:

- ➔ ***Positive Steps Towards Sustainability:*** Coca-Cola's commitments and investments have been seen as positive steps towards reducing its environmental impact. The company's efforts to improve recycling infrastructure and increase the use of recycled materials have been acknowledged as critical moves in the right direction.
- ➔ ***Challenges in Changing Consumer Behavior:*** Despite these initiatives, Coca-Cola faces significant challenges in changing consumer behavior and ensuring effective recycling practices. The global scale of plastic pollution and the complexities of waste management mean that comprehensive solutions require ongoing effort and collaboration with multiple stakeholders.
- ➔ ***Reducing Plastic Waste:*** Coca-Cola's strategy has started to yield results, but the company must continue to innovate and engage in sustainable practices to make a

substantial impact on reducing plastic waste. Maintaining transparency and accountability will be crucial in sustaining progress and building consumer trust.

6. Discussion

Greenwashing, the practice of making false or misleading claims about the environmental benefits of a product, service, or company, has become a significant concern in today's global economy (Laufer, 2003). As consumers increasingly demand sustainable and environmentally responsible practices, companies face growing pressure to demonstrate their commitment to environmental stewardship (Porter & Kramer, 2011). The analysis of corporate responses to greenwashing regulations reveals several common strategies adopted by companies globally. These strategies include public apologies and accountability measures, financial restructuring and investment in compliance, corporate reorganization and governance changes, as well as a commitment to sustainability and long-term strategic shifts. These responses are often tailored to address specific environmental challenges and stakeholder expectations, reflecting the diverse nature of sustainability issues across industries.

One of the key findings is the importance of transparency and accountability in corporate responses to greenwashing allegations. Companies that issue public apologies and take responsibility for past missteps demonstrate a commitment to rectifying wrongdoing and rebuilding trust with consumers. For example, Volkswagen's public apology and subsequent financial commitments following the emissions scandal signal a willingness to address environmental concerns and comply with regulatory standards. Similarly, Nestlé's revision of marketing materials and increased third-party audits reflect a commitment to transparency and accountability in its water usage practices.

Financial restructuring and investment in compliance measures are also crucial components of corporate responses to greenwashing regulations. By allocating resources to cover fines, recalls and legal expenses, companies like Volkswagen demonstrate their commitment to addressing environmental violations and complying with regulatory requirements. Similarly, investments in sustainable sourcing, innovative packaging solutions and recycling infrastructure indicate a financial commitment to genuine sustainability practices, as seen in the cases of Nespresso and Coca-Cola.

Corporate reorganization and governance changes are evident in responses to greenwashing allegations, highlighting the importance of effective oversight and accountability mechanisms. Volkswagen's restructuring of management and creation of a new integrity and legal affairs board aim to prevent future misconduct and ensure compliance with environmental regulations. Similarly, Nestlé's increased third-party audits demonstrate a commitment to transparency and accountability in its water extraction practices, enhancing trust with stakeholders.

Furthermore, the analysis underscores the significance of long-term strategic shifts towards sustainability in corporate responses to greenwashing regulations. Companies that commit to using 100% sustainably sourced materials, achieving carbon neutrality or transitioning to electric vehicles demonstrate a fundamental shift in their approach to sustainability. These long-term commitments signal a genuine commitment to environmental stewardship and can contribute to positive changes in consumer perceptions and market dynamics.

However, variations in the effectiveness of corporate responses highlight the complexity of addressing sustainability challenges and changing consumer perceptions. While some companies have made significant strides in promoting transparency and sustainability, others continue to face challenges in regaining consumer trust and changing behavior. Ongoing scrutiny from environmental groups underscores the need for sustained efforts in transparency, accountability, and genuine commitment to environmental stewardship.

From the perspective of Institutional Theory, companies conform to greenwashing regulations as part of a broader effort to align with the normative, cognitive and regulative pressures within their industry and society. This alignment helps organizations gain legitimacy and maintain their social license to operate. Public apologies and accountability measures are prime examples of normative conformity, where companies like Volkswagen and Nestlé issue public apologies and revise their practices to align with societal expectations and norms about corporate responsibility. By doing so, they aim to restore legitimacy and trust among their stakeholders. Financial restructuring and investment in compliance measures, such as Volkswagen's $18 billion allocation for fines and recalls, demonstrate regulative conformity. Companies invest significant resources to adhere to legal requirements and avoid penalties, thereby complying with institutional regulations. Similarly, investments by Nespresso and Coca-Cola in sustainable practices and infrastructure represent efforts to meet regulatory standards and societal expectations for corporate sustainability.

Stakeholder Theory emphasizes the importance of addressing the interests and concerns of all stakeholders, including customers, employees, investors and the broader community. Corporate reorganization and governance changes, as seen in Volkswagen's creation of a new integrity and legal affairs board, illustrate efforts to enhance oversight and accountability in response to stakeholder demands for ethical conduct and transparency. These changes aim to rebuild trust and ensure that the company’s actions align with stakeholder values. Commitment to sustainability and long-term strategic shifts, such as H&M's goal of using 100% sustainably sourced materials by 2030 and Volkswagen's transition to electric vehicles, highlight the proactive approach companies take to meet the evolving expectations of stakeholders. These long-term commitments reflect an understanding that stakeholders increasingly value environmental stewardship and sustainable practices. By aligning their strategies with these expectations, companies can enhance their reputation and build stronger relationships with stakeholders.

Overall, the analysis provides valuable insights into corporate responses to greenwashing regulations, emphasizing the importance of transparency, accountability and long-term strategic shifts towards sustainability. Institutional Theory and Stakeholder Theory both offer frameworks for understanding why companies adopt certain strategies and how these strategies impact their legitimacy and relationships with stakeholders. By understanding these common strategies and variations, policymakers, regulators and companies can collaborate to promote genuine sustainability practices and enhance trust with consumers and stakeholders.

7. Conclusion

The analysis of corporate responses to greenwashing regulations highlights several common strategies adopted by companies globally. These strategies encompass public apologies, financial restructuring, corporate reorganization and a commitment to sustainability. The findings underscore the importance of transparency, accountability and long-term strategic shifts towards sustainability in addressing greenwashing allegations. Transparency and accountability emerge as key factors in effective corporate responses. Companies that acknowledge past missteps and demonstrate a commitment to rectifying wrongdoing can rebuild trust with consumers. Financial restructuring and investment in compliance measures signal a dedication to addressing environmental violations and complying with regulations. Corporate reorganization and governance changes aim to enhance oversight and prevent future misconduct, while long-term strategic shifts towards sustainability indicate a fundamental change in approach.

Despite variations in effectiveness, companies strive to align with normative, cognitive and regulative pressures within their industry and society. Institutional Theory and Stakeholder Theory provide frameworks for understanding these responses, emphasizing the importance of meeting stakeholder expectations and enhancing legitimacy. Overall, by understanding these common strategies and their implications, policymakers, regulators and companies can work together to promote genuine sustainability practices and foster trust with consumers and stakeholders. Through continued collaboration and commitment, progress can be made towards a more sustainable future.

Acknowledgment

Funding information is not available.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References:

Rodrigues, A. R., Gonçalves, E. J. V., Costa, A. P., Nora, E. S., & Rezende, D. C. (2013). *Green Marketing and Conscious Consumption: Segmenting the Lavras/MG Market. Spaces,* 34(4), 12.
https://www.revistaespacios.com/a13v34n04/13340413.html

Polonsky, M. J. (1994). An Introduction to Green Marketing. *Electronic Green Journal,* v.1,n. 2. http://dx.doi.org/10.5070/G31210177

Motta, SLS (2008). Competitiveness based on ecological marketing. *Journal of Administration Science* , *10* (22), 128–145. https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8069.2008v10n22p128

Ottman, J., & Miller, D. (1998). Green marketing: Opportunity for innovation. *The Journal of Sustainable Product Design, 1*, 60. https://doi.org/10.5070/G311010346

Budinsky, J., & Bryant, S. (2013). "It's Not Easy Being Green": The Greenwashing of Environmental Discourses in Advertising. *Canadian Journal of Communication, 38*(2), 207-226. https://doi.org/10.22230/cjc.2013v38n2a2628

Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The Drivers of Greenwashing. *California Management Review, 54*(1), 64-87. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64

Chen, Y.-S., & Chang, C.-H. (2013). Greenwash and Green Trust: The Mediation Effects of Green Consumer Confusion and Green Perceived Risk. *Journal of Business Ethics, 114*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1360-0

Lyon, T. P., & Maxwell, J. W. (2011). Greenwash: Corporate environmental disclosure under threat of audit. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy,* 20(1), 3-41. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9134.2010.00282.x

Friedman, A. L., & Miles, S. (2001). Socially Responsible Investment and Corporate Social and Environmental Reporting in the UK: An Exploratory Study. *The British Accounting Review, 33*(4), 523-548. https://doi.org/10.1006/bare.2001.0172

TerraChoice Environmental Marketing Inc. (2010). *The Sins of Greenwashing: Home and Family Edition.*https://www.twosides.info/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Terrachoice_The_Sins_of_Greenwashing_-_Home_and_Family_Edition_2010.pdf

European Commission. (2020). European Commission Green Claims Initiative. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/smgp/initiative_on_green_claims.htm on 10 May 2024

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*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0901-2

Orange, E., & Cohen, A. M. (2010). From eco-friendly to eco-intelligent. *The Futurist, 44*(5), 28–32.https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-3-642-28036-8

U.S. FTC. Commission Actions for June 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Federal Trade Commission.Retrieved on 15 May 2024 from https://www.ftc.gov/reports/annual-report-1998

Szabo, S., & Webster, J. (2021). Perceived Greenwashing: The Effects of Green Marketing on Environmental and Product Perceptions. *Journal of Business Ethics, 171*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04461-0

Rosenberg, M., Berrone, P., & Rousseau, H. (2019). Environmental sensibility and firm strategic actions: How to become sustainable while avoiding greenwashing. In A. Caldart, J. Ricart, & A. Carrera (Eds.), *General Management in Latin and Ibero-American Organizations* (pp. 20). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429279829-7

Global Reporting Initiative. (2020). Sustainability reporting standards. https://www.globalreporting.org/media/mlkjpn1i/gri-sasb-joint-publication-april-2021.pdf

Shumate, M., & O'Connor, A. (2010). The symbiotic sustainability model: Conceptualizing NGO–corporate alliance communication. *Journal of Communication, 60*(3), 577-609. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01498.x

European Commission. (2020). EU Ecolabel. Retrieved on 14 May 2024 from https://environment.ec.europa.eu/topics/circular-economy/eu-ecolabel/business_en

McKinsey. (2019). Sustainability in the supply chain. Retrieved on 12 May 2024 https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/sustainability/our-insights/starting-at-the-source-sustainability-in-supply-chains

Eurosif. (2020). European SRI study 2018. Retrieved from https://www.eurosif.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/European-SRI-2018-Study.pdf

Jo, Jang-Hwan & Roh, Taewoo & Kim, Seonghoon & Yeo-Chang, Youn & Park, Mi Sun & Han, Ki & Jang, Eun-Kyung. (2015). Eco-Innovation for Sustainability: Evidence from 49 Countries in Asia and Europe. Sustainability. 7. 16820-16835. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su71215849

ICMM. (2019). Community development and engagement. https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/guidance/social-performance/2012/community-development-toolkit

Nguyen, T. T. H., Yang, Z., Nguyen, N., Johnson, L. W., & Cao, T. K. (2019). Greenwash and Green Purchase Intention: The Mediating Role of Green Skepticism. *Sustainability, 11*(9), 2653. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11092653

Polonsky, M. J., Grau, S. L., & Garma, R. (2010). The New Greenwash? Potential Marketing Problems with Carbon Offsets. *International Journal of Business Studies, 18*(1), 49-54.https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/new-greenwash-potential-marketing-problems-with/docview/821544234/se-2

Testa, F., Boiral, O., & Iraldo, F. (2018). Internalization of environmental practices and institutional complexity: Can stakeholders pressures encourage greenwashing? *Journal of Business Ethics, 147*.https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2960-2

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Freeman, R., & McVea, J. (2001). A stakeholder approach to strategic management. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.263511

Islam, M. A., & Deegan, C. (2010). Media pressures and corporate disclosure of social responsibility performance information: A study of two global clothing and sports retail companies. *Accounting and Business Research*, *40*(2), 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2010.9663388

Freeman, R. E. (2015). Stakeholder theory. *Wiley encyclopedia of management* (Vol. 2). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom020179

Junior, S., Pagán Martínez, M., Correa, C., Moura-Leite, R., & Silva, D. (2019). Greenwashing effect, attitudes, and beliefs in green consumption. *RAUSP Management Journal, 2019*(17). https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-08-2018-0070

Laufer, W. S. (2003). Social accountability and corporate greenwashing. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 43(3), 253–261. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022962719299

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review,* 89(1-2), 62- https://hbr.org/2011/01/the-big-idea-creating-shared-value