The Concept of Greenwashing and its Impact on Green Trust, Green Risk, and Green Consumer Confusion: A Review-Based Study

Dr. Noor Un Nisa[1*], Sophia Abnerine J. Mendoza[2], Shakhnoza Shamsuddinova[3]

[1] Exeed College, Westford Education Group, Sharjah, UAE

[2] Bath Spa University, Academic Center, RAK, UAE

[3] Exeed College, Westford Education Group, Sharjah, UAE

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to provide a review of literature on the effect of 'greenwashing' on consumer various attitude towards their purchase. This paper will discuss the consequences of greenwashing on consumer purchase decision, more particularly its impact on consumer green trust, green consumer confusion, and green risk. The objective of this paper is to convey the gap in consumers' shopping behavior who are environmentally conscious. The first step was to evaluate the research on "greenwashing, green consumer confusion, green risk, and green trust, and the second step was to provide literature on assumptions settled by the study. Moreover, the study focuses on consumers who purchase environmentally friendly goods and highlights the consequences if organizations are using them.The findings of this study suggest limiting greenwashing to increase customers' faith in environmental issues. Advertising that claims to be "green" is more effective and can encourage sustainable purchases when consumers do not take "greenwashing, green misunderstanding, green danger, or a loss of green trust" into account. The conclusion showed that there were significant links between the five assumptions that were explored to determine the relationship.

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by TAF Publishing.

INTRODUCTION

As public awareness of environmental problems such as a change in climate, animal destruction, and rising seas has grown in recent years, customers have been more concerned about minimizing the environmental footprint of their expenditures (Chen, 2010). Many people want to buy things that are less damaging to the environment. As a result, a marketplace for ecologically responsible goods or services has emerged (Chekima, Wafa, Igau, Chekima, & Sondoh Jr, 2016), as well as the requirement for green products, firms have tried to respond to market demands, and the "green trend" has been a movement in the industry. Many businesses invest in sustainable construction and realize the advantages of being more environmentally conscious (Lu, Bock, & Joseph, 2013). There are already numerous green offerings established, ranging from eco-fuel to ecologically responsible agriculture and livestock substitutes.

However, several corporations are suspected of false advertising in the context of the increased impact of CSR as well as environmental marketing. Greenwashing is defined as a mismatch between a company's ecological promises and its real sustainability practices (Delmas & Burbano, 2011); (Lyon & Montgomery, 2015). Greenwashing is when a company tries to enjoy the rewards of a "green image" without actually being sustainable. Greenwashing's popularity has fuelled CSR distrust (Aji & Sutikno, 2015; Jahdi & Acikdilli, 2009; Nyilasy, Gangadharbatla, & Paladino, 2014; Skarmeas & Leonidou, 2013). The green movement has recently become popular in business, as organizations fre-

---

quently acknowledge their responsibility to be environmentally aware. Nevertheless, several corporations continue to take advantage of the "green trend" by publicizing interesting information about their sustainability impact, when the actuality is quite the opposite (Lyon & Maxwell, 2011). The term greenwashing is used to refer to companies that are misleading their consumers about the goods and services they offer (Lyon & Maxwell, 2011). Greenwashing is a concern because fooling customers about a corporation's sustainability impact reduces customers' capacity to believe the messaging of manufacturers producing "green claims," potentially harming the green sector overall (Polonsky, Grau, & Garma, 2010).

One of the most common indicators of sustainable buying habits, according to (Gleim & Lawson, 2014), is the customer's comprehension of the consequences of their actions. Consumers are less inclined to buy ecologically sustainable goods if they believe their lifestyle decisions are unimportant (Gleim & Lawson, 2014). As a result, greenwashing would influence customers who want to buy sustainable goods and believe that their decisions affect the planet. Customers' opinions and perceived behavior control towards another corporation are negatively affected whenever greenwashing is revealed, according to a previous study (Aji & Sutikno, 2015); (Chen & Chang, 2013). The amount that these consequences are harmful is still a point of issue. Greenwashing may turn on a company, according to (Nyilasy et al., 2014), while De Jong, Harkink, and Barth (2018) believe that greenwashing, when compared to the corresponding behavioral intention, is much more prone to have tiny and insignificant beneficial effects on a firm's "green image". Since then, studies on the repercussion of greenwashing have concentrated on extreme cases in which businesses mislead blatantly regarding their sustainability impact. In fact, nevertheless, many instances of greenwashing are associated with cases that are more unclear and far less evident (Mitchell & Ramey, 2011).

Green Washing: The Overview

The repercussion of greenwashing on consumer buying behavior has previously been examined. Chen and Chang (2013) was able to conduct a study on the repercussion of greenwashing on consumer buying behavior such as consumer uncertainty, discern possibility, and green trust. Greenwashing involves reducing faith in environmental promises by making them confusing and dishonest. Greenwashing, they discovered, raises consumer uncertainty and discern possibility involvements. as a result, customers are baffled by environmental claims that lack adequate sub-

stantiation or contain unclear details, lowering their faith in the goods in question.

Nevertheless, these concepts have never really been researched by Taiwanese consumers outside of data communication technology goods, leaving a void in consumer behavior literature. This research expanded on (Chen & Chang, 2013) work by examining theories about western civilization. The findings may vary in various nations due to historical variances. Examining the concept in a foreign culture could support the results and strengthen the analytical foundations. This thesis further builds on the prior research by putting the structure towards the trial in a variety of sectors. Greenwashing occurs in a variety of businesses and goods. As a result, examining the theories primarily within users of technology and information devices is insufficient to draw firm results.

Customers may have varied insights and levels of involvement in various market segments, that can change the outcome. The findings would be much more comprehensive and reliable if the concept was studied in diverse sectors. As a result, this research aims to fill that gap in customer behavior research by examining the method in the circumstances of many cultures and businesses.

Applying Chen and Chang (2013) existing structural methodology, this research tries to address a gap in research by researching customers of several environmental product lines.

Research Objectives

Research objective of the study is : To understand the repercussion of greenwashing on green risk, green trust, and green consumer confusion and to know greenwashing influences purchase decision of environment-friendly consumers.

Significance of the Study

To the consumers

The research aims to provide awareness to consumers to avoid the impact of greenwashing on their green trust, the risk of buying, and their confusion when purchasing goods.

To the researchers

As the search to fill in the research gap is still ongoing, students may utilize this paper as a guide to the previous research done by the researcher and the cited works by the researcher.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Green Marketing

As stated by Martínez et al. (2020) green marketing, also known as sustainable marketing, brand management, organic marketing, and ecological marketing, has no clear meaning. The integration of ecological sustainability in business messaging is, therefore, a regular trait of the definition (Martínez et al., 2020). Sustainable marketing, as per (Leal Filho, Finisterra Do Paco, & Raposo, 2009), is a system that incorporates growth and efficiency by understanding, meeting, and predicting societal and customer demands. Green marketing's purpose is to highlight the relevance of pollution prevention from the perspective of the consumer (Moravcikova, Krizanova, Kliestikova, & Rypakova, 2017). According to Polonsky et al. (2010), the purpose of green marketing is to enhance the ecological systems even while improving customer services connected and standard of living. This is to help customers comprehend the issues around goods use as well as acknowledge that by changing their consumption behavior, they may reduce emissions. Green marketing also amplitude understanding of climate change, resulting in greater total environmental advantages (Fliegelman, 2010).

Increasing awareness, particularly in an era of climate change, has resulted in the development of eco-friendly goods. Because of ecological issues, customers have acknowledged the need to change their purchasing habits (Chen & Chang, 2013). As a response, people are seeking to be more concerned about the environment by purchasing things that are less detrimental to the planet (Chen & Chang, 2013). Corporations are taking advantage of the sustainable trend by advertising sustainable and ethical goods and services to customers using "green marketing". Moreover, businesses can improve wider social well-being and influence the market situation to be more helpful to the planet. But, according to (Polonsky, 2011), certain businesses use the sustainable marketing trend to stay ahead of the competition and achieve a competitive edge by catering to customers' ecological issues.

Definition and Concept of Greenwashing

Consumers are changing their purchasing habits to lessen the negative impact of their consumption (Perera, Auger, & Klein, 2018). As consumer interest in eco-friendly goods has grown, some corporations have felt the urge to attract green customers. Corporations prioritize green customers and strive to link their goods' reputation with environmental initiatives to increase revenues (Furlow, 2010). Corporations strive to represent that their firm is following what consumers want and perceives as appropriate, by linking their goods with ecological and sustainability principles (Correa, Junior, & Da Silva, 2017). Meanwhile, several efforts to project a sustainability practice have been labeled as "greenwashing" (Furlow, 2010).

Greenwashing is defined as two continuous firm techniques: deteriorating environmental execution and favorable advertising about better environmental efficiency (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). Greenwashing as the process of deceptive advertising about the green features of a product or the corporation's policies (Parguel, Benoit-Moreau, & Russell, 2015). Green marketing is a practice used by firms to improve customer loyalty by projecting a much more eco-responsible reputation than would be realistic (Laufer, 2003). Green washing is a misleading form of advertisement (Martínez et al., 2020). Green marketing is an easy way to stay on top of buyers because changing operations to become greener could be complicated and costly (Chen & Chang, 2013).

Simply saying to be ecologically responsible will not be sufficient to build transparency and honest marketing strategies; substantial proof and data must always be disclosed for the customer to make a sensible purchase intention (Hoedeman, 2002). A greenwashing anomaly occurs in the customer's mental capacity to make a decision (Martínez et al., 2020). Greenwashing conceals all ethical, economical, and environmental damage by convincing the customer to believe that the serious impacts of the good's manufacturing are negligible, if not non-existent.

Consumers are being warier of corporations that seek to profit from a sustainable environment, as per (Nguyen, Yang, Nguyen, Johnson, & Cao, 2019). The major 10 concern in today's marketing strategy is a lack of consumer trust in the environmental facts conveyed by corporations (Chen & Chang, 2013). Greenwashing can even have a serious adverse influence on customer trust in green goods, resulting in a decline in sustainable goods and services advertising (Furlow, 2010). Because people are concerned about the discrepancy between both the appearance and truth of green promoted items, the great amount of misleading sustainable marketing promises makes it harder for green corporations to establish the industry (Nguyen et al., 2019). A lot of environmental marketing asserts are deceiving and vague (Chen & Chang, 2013). According to Hamann and Kapelus (2004), consumers depend on the information on the product given through advertising message. As an outcome, whether the information is regarded to be false advertising, consumers may lose faith in the brand and the corporation, resulting in a consumer purchasing failure as

stated by (Chen & Chang, 2013). As a result, going green undermines public faith in green products and may harm the green industry overall (Hamann & Kapelus, 2004). As a consequence, some claim that greenwashing could kill the green business by increasing customer distrust of sustainable goods (Polonsky et al., 2010).

Consumer Behaviour and Environmental Concerns

The purpose of this research paper is to look over greenwashing from the perspective of the behavior of a consumer, mainly the repercussion of greenwashing on "green risk", "green trust", and "green consumer confusion". The research looks at how is it affecting the consumers on greenwashing, which aims to change individuals' views of a corporation or brand. Greenwashing has fundamental communication qualities; the corporation separates its brand from reality by deceiving and misleading the consumers through marketing (De Jong et al., 2018).

The environmental issue is one of several important developmental metrics used to determine green consumption habits (Jaiswal & Kant, 2018). Environmentally conscious consumers are most likely to search for sustainable goods and are pleased to spend more money for the item (Guyader, Ottosson, & Witell, 2017). Consumers who seek sustainable goods may be more vulnerable to false advertising because corporate messaging is their primary news source (Hamann & Kapelus, 2004) Buyer perceptions of greenwashing, have a significant influence on purchasing decisions and brand culture since the buyer cannot rely on the data given by the corporation (Parguel, Benoît-Moreau, & Larceneux, 2011). As a result, the likelihood of the consumer being unable to make a buying decision rises(Chen & Chang, 2013).

Consumers are vulnerable to the sheer existence of eco-friendly signals, despite the standard of the reasoning, according to Spack, Board, Crighton, Kostka, and Ivory (2012). This has a beneficial impact on purchasing desire. Environment aspects in sales promotion have been shown to significantly affect customers' perceptions of brand reputation (Parguel et al., 2015), implying the ideas imitating environment, such as green hue or environment icons, influence customers by establishing within them an eco-friendly vision. Greenwashing can effectively boost the purchasing behavior of green consumers by implementing sustainability into advertising messages if the buyer doesn't notice greenwashing and recognizes the green statements. As a result, greenwashing may have a bigger impact on sustainable products and services, who may be quicker to engage with environmental signals and seek out environmental items

(Parguel et al., 2015).

Green Consumer Uncertainty

Greenwashing has become more common in today's modern green marketing, and people have become warier than corporations that profit from the movement(Nguyen et al., 2019). Consumers are aware of greenwashing and this contributes to mistrust of green assurances (Chen, Lin, & Chang, 2014). When customers notice green marketing, they start to doubt the validity of advertising statements and then become skeptical and perplexed because they can't tell if the statement is true or false. People's sentiments toward a corporation that makes sustainable marketing promises may be harmed by negative impressions of false advertising (Peattie, Peattie, & Ponting, 2009). Suspicion toward green marketing promises is inversely associated with a customer's propensity to purchase Twelve green goods, according to (Nguyen et al., 2019). People are unable to make purchasing decisions because they lack faith in the accusations (Chen & Chang, 2013). Many customers regard green promises as advertising techniques, (Lyon & Maxwell, 2011).

According to Turnbull, Leek, and Ying (2000), throughout the processing of information, consumer uncertainty refers to the incapacity to construct a cohesive clarification of the good's trademark. As stated by (Chen & Chang, 2013), uncertainty emerges when the ability of the consumer to accurately process detail is limited. This could happen when a customer is trying to grasp a lot of details, resulting in an information explosion (Mitchell, Walsh, & Yamin, 2005). Hence more facts a client tries to grasp, the greater the chance of experiencing an overload of data (Mitchell et al., 2005). Langer, Eisend, et al. (2007) expand the subject by adding that data processing, which occurs when all that data is provided at the very same time, might generate consumer uncertainty. A consumer could be uncertain if goods and services are too similar, too complex, too ambiguous, or contains too much data (Mitchell, 1999); (Turnbull et al., 2000). As a result, presenting ambiguous sustainable marketing promises confuses people and may erode consumer faith in the brand and the environmental sector overall.

As stated by Mitchell and Papavassiliou (1999) the uncertainty of consumers has three different sets of scenarios that might cause consumer uncertainty: unclear information, product resemblance, and product excess. In brand awareness, vague and deceptive assertions are confusing data that might cause uncertainty and ambiguity (Mitchell, 1999). The uncertainty induced by the resemblance of a product occurs whenever the offered goods have similari-

ties to the characteristics the customer is unable to distinguish among both (Mitchell, 1999). Whenever there is a lot of useful information to comprehend, there will be an overabundance of options for goods and services (Mitchell, 1999). Because there are so many comparable products, the eco-friendly category could be a source of consumer misunderstanding. Green manufacturing may cause an overload of information and customer uncertainty since the buyer cannot understand the dependability and variations of the goods. goods and their environmental benefits As customers become more aware of green credentials, this could be hard for most corporations given the success of the environmental movement for consumers to absorb every pertinent data.

Green consumer uncertainty as "consumer failure to develop a correct interpretation of environmental features of a product or service during the information processing procedure" (Chen & Chang, 2013). As a result, the customer would be unable to effectively absorb the offered knowledge to appreciate the company's potential impacts. As previously said, the purpose of "greenwashing" is to redirect the user's mind away from the industry's or product's bad environment issues, and to mold the corporation's brand persona in the minds of the public (Martínez et al., 2020). The consumer feels perplexed when confronted with vague green marketing that has not been backed up with appropriate verifiable proof. It was because the customer may not rely on the goods or corporation's data to determine whether or not it should believe the environmental statements.

Greenwashing could make it increasingly challenging for customers to assess a company's true sustainability level. This might cause sustainable consumption uncertainty since they had been unable to form a cohesive assessment of the veracity of the green marketing claims. For that reason, the following hypothesis is reached,

Assumption 1 (A1): Greenwashing has been linked to increased consumers' green uncertainty.

Green Discern Possibility

The discerning possibility is a customer's value judgment of the potential repercussions of poor actions (Peter & Ryan, 1976). While the implications of a transaction are unknown, the customer is taking a chance when buying something (Rao, Truong, Senecal, & Le, 2007). When a client buys the product choice, they consider the potential ramifications of their choice. Because customers' judgment that the advantage acquired from the item is much more significant than the monetary loss of purchasing it drives the

purchasing behavior. Having stated that, while acquiring a product, the buyer is ready to face the responsibility that the product's worth falls short of expectations. The buying choice is influenced by discerning possibility (Aaker, 1995). Since the buyer should view the possibility as an acceptable degree before accepting it. The buyer would not buy the product if the threat were regarded to be quite significant since the negative implications are too obvious (Peter & Ryan, 1976).

Monetary probability, however, may not be the only degree of problem that the customer faces. Monetary, intellectual, physiological, behavioral, and risk perception, are all forms of Discern possibility (Jacoby & Kaplan, 1972). When faced with the awareness, that customers possess four options: "reduce the perceived risk by reducing the probability of purchase, change from one type of perceived loss to another whose tolerance is greater, postpone the purchase, buy the good and accept the unresolved risk" (Roselius, 1971). As a result, risk perception might negatively impact anticipated gain and consumer happiness (Martínez et al., 2020). Green marketing, the writer argues, might have a detrimental impact on the customer's belief when viewed, because the anticipated qualification of purchasing is considered to be belief in the item. That's because when a customer is notified of false advertising, the discernible possibility of making a transaction rise.

Green discern possibility as "the expectation of negative environmental consequences associated with purchase behavior" (Chen & Chang, 2012). The customer understands that the transaction may have a detrimental ecological impact. As a result, while buying an item, the customer takes a chance that the item will not meet their environmental requirements. The larger the threat, the more hesitant the customer is about completing a transaction (Chen & Chang, 2013). As a result, the discernible possibility would reduce the likelihood of making a purchasing choice (Mitchell, 1999). There is a substantial link between potentially adverse feelings and discern possibility as stated by (Chaudhuri, 1997).

As pollution problems including global warming have developed, customers increasingly acknowledged they have to adjust their purchase habits and be more ecologically conscious (Chen & Chang, 2013). The sustainable consumer's goal is to make a purchase that meets the description of green qualities that the customer has established. Based on (Chen & Chang, 2013), as the environmental movement has grown in popularity, customers have such a relatively high discern possibility because they are more aware of the harmful consequences of their purchases. When con-

sumers witness greenwashing, they lose faith in the company's green marketing and its ability to meet their needs and requirements, leading to a rise in environmental risk perception (Wood & Scheer, 1996).

Assumption 2 (A2): Greenwashing is linked to a higher perception of green discern possibility.

Green Trust

Misleading advertising is a risk to the expanding current market since it can erode customers' faith in environmental practices (Chen & Chang, 2013). Deceptive marketing impairs the customer's capacity to understand the influence of their purchase; the customer would be unable to genuinely appreciate the ecological repercussions since greenwashing claims that the consequences are less than they were before (Horiuchi, Schuchard, Shea, & Townsend, 2009). As a result, the buyer who believes the bogus environmental assertions believes the influence of their transaction is greater than it is. Greenwashing involves reducing the customer base of lawful green businesses by flooding the world with false green marketing, slowing the transition to a better economy (Polonsky et al., 2010).

False green marketing causes people to be skeptical of sustainability reports provided by businesses (Self, Self, Bell-Haynes, et al., 2010). Mistrust is also related to the idea of mistrust and poor faith (Nguyen et al., 2019). The essential principle of trusting, is the hopeful expectation of either of the current party action (Hart & Saunders, 1997). Trust is the ability to tolerate the exposure that comes with having great standards of the other party's position (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). Furthermore, when an individual believes another party, they go in with the assumption that the other group is dependable, benign, and capable of acting in a truthful manner (Ganesan, 1994).

Environmental belief as "willingness to depend on a product or service based on the belief or expectation resulting from its credibility, benevolence, and ability about environmental performance. The customer perceives the corporation's integrity and compassion, as well as its suitable climatic efficiency. According to (Horiuchi et al., 2009), referenced in (Chen & Chang, 2013), if the vast majority of businesses created enough sustainability efforts as well as expressed them honestly and convincingly, customers would assume that the corporations are indeed engaged in sustainable activities, increasing clean trust in organizations and businesses. Corporations, on the other hand, are frequently misrepresenting or inflating the ecological features and benefits, eroding ecological faith in corporations that are making environmental claims. Because

the primary purpose of environmental advertising is to try and retain trusted clients (Lewandowska, Witczak, & Kurczewski, 2017), a loss of faith could be damaging to corporations promoting sustainability efforts. Moreover,(Cherry & Sneirson, 2010) indicated that people are hesitant to create long trusting connections with corporations that greenwash them.

Assumption 3 (A3): Greenwashing has a detrimental impact on "green trust".

The Negative Repercussion of Green Consumer Uncertainty and Green Discern Possibility of Green Trust

Customer uncertainty arising from conflicting information makes it difficult for them to make reasonable purchasing choices (Mitchell & Papavassiliou, 1999). According to the writers, misunderstanding might result in customers discarding their purchases and losing faith in the company. Uncertainty makes purchasing decisions inefficient and stressful for customers since it is related to doubt, worry, puzzlement, and hesitation (Mitchell et al., 2005). As a result, the pessimistic feelings engendered by customer misunderstanding make an effective purchase intention not likely to happen, lowering faith in the organization.

According to Singh and Sirdeshmukh (2000), customer problems caused by deceptive and confusing ads erodes customer confidence and raises mistrust. According to (Walsh, Hennig-Thurau, & Mitchell, 2007), eliminating customer uncertainty will boost people's confidence. The customer seems to be more prepared to support the business if they comprehend the targeted advertising and can determine whether they are real and reliable. People are frequently hesitant to believe an item that causes them to be confused (Mitchell & Papavassiliou, 1999). As a result, customer uncertainty has a detrimental influence on customer trust (Walsh & Mitchell, 2010). People are starting to wonder about corporations' motives for creating advertising too difficult to comprehend, resulting in customer bewilderment (Walsh & Mitchell, 2010). As a response, customers are less likely to support businesses if consumers believe green claims made are misleading (Kalafatis, Pollard, East, & Tsogas, 1999). Environmental consumer uncertainty, according to the writers, is significantly connected with faith in green marketing.

As a result, the less environmental confidence a customer has in the business, the more uncertain they are about green marketing (Chen, 2010). As a result, limiting the transaction threat is much more major to the customer than achieving an ideal projected result. As per Wood and Scheer (1996), lowering the risk perceptions increases the likeli-

hood of a sale.

Assumption 4 (A4): Green consumer uncertainty is linked to a lack of "green trust".

According to Peter and Ryan (1976) , the customer's decision to purchase is influenced by their perception of chance since they are aware of the transaction's potential adverse implications. Users are more willing to mitigate the risk of a transaction than just to optimize the intended result (Mitchell et al., 2005). Chang and Chen (2008) start the debate by suggesting that lowering risk perception will improve customer loyalty. The consumer's choice to recognize or not accept the goods is heavily determined by the discern possibility (Harridge-March, 2006). Consumers are less likely to trust a corporation if they believe their product's performance would have unfavorable and unanticipated implications. According to (Mitchell, 1999), if the consumers recognize a threat, they will not accept the goods or the brands. As a result, a reduction in risk perception may enhance customer confidence (Koehn, 2003). In response, previous research has found that seen threat has a pessimistic influence on trust and that organizations can boost people's trust by lowering the perception of risk (?, ?; Chang & Chen, 2008); As customers search for sustainable goods, the level of risk of ethical goods will erode green confidence. Customers who are exposed to ecological discern possibility can know exactly what they are acquiring may not provide the claimed sustainable benefits for the environment, and hence people are unable to trust sustainable goods. The concept of greenwashing raises the image of environmental risk, lowering green credibility. The green perceived value of sustainability aspects is inversely connected with faith in green promises, according to (Wood & Scheer, 1996).

Assumption 5 (A5): Green risk perception is inversely proportional to "green trust".

Greenwashing has a variety of implications on consumption patterns, as detailed in earlier segments. Greenwashing, according to past studies, increases green consumption misunderstanding and effort expectancy while decreasing environmental trust (Chen & Chang, 2013).

METHODS

This is review based study, included articles on given topic and tried to provide critical evaluation to develop the knowledge. The major goal of this article was to look into the potential consequences of greenwashing on green consumer misunderstanding, discern possibility, and environmental trust. The study was conducted both from a production and an advertiser's perspective, because boosting

the use of ethical goods benefits both the economy and eco-conscious enterprises that manufacture clean items.Backing the review in the earlier part of this paper, this research seeks to discuss the objectives of the research provided.

Research Objective 1: "To understand the repercussion of greenwashing on green risk, green trust, and green consumer confusion on customers who consume goods that insist to possess an advantage to the environment".

The goal of this research is to learn more about customer habits when it comes to misleading goods. The results could have a big impact on corporations' business strategies if they want to build successful promotion techniques that promote customer happiness and loyalty. Moreover, the goal of this research is to promote and expand transparency advertising, as well as present insights which would make beneficent branding more appealing to businesses.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The conclusions of this study recommend reducing greenwashing to boost consumers' ecological trust. When customers do not consider "greenwashing, green misunderstanding, green risk, or a loss of green trust", "green" advertising is more effective and able to stimulate sustainable consumption. Five assumptions were discussed to determine the relationship and the conclusion revealed that the associations were substantial.

The influence of "greenwashing on green trust, green consumer confusion, and green risk" was the study's initial first objective research. The report's conclusions are unambiguous, and all proposed hypotheses are found to be true. Misleading advertising, according to this study, not just to increases green consumption uncertainty and discern possibility, but also undermines ecological trust. Furthermore, the findings found that environmental consumer misunderstanding and discern possibility are inversely related to green satisfaction. As a result, the study finds that consumers' green misunderstanding and environmental risk involved moderate the negative connection between "greenwashing and green trust" to some extent. This indicates when customers are confused about sustainable products and feel a danger as a result of false advertising, people will be less likely to trust the goods or the distributor. The data are compatible with (Chen et al., 2014)'s research was done, validating prior reports and strengthening the conceptual model.

This research builds upon Chen and Chang (2013)'s research in Southeast Asia by verifying the concept in a respective situation. This strengthens the findings' legitimacy by demonstrating that they're being utilized across nations.

In comparison to prior studies that concentrated on data and electrical goods, the findings suggest that the conceptual foundation may be extended to a variety of ecological market segments. This is significant since it allows the structure to be applied to a variety of environmental projects and promoted businesses. The other goal of the objectives of the research was to see if "greenwashing" affect ecologically sensitive customers more significantly than those that are unconcerned about the planet. There has been no distinction in the impacts of "greenwashing" in the evaluated variables used in this study. Concern for the environment is among the important developmental metrics that explain sustainable purchasing behavior, as per the research study covered in the preceding paragraphs (Jaiswal & Kant, 2018). Because the corporation's interaction is the key source of data for customers, ecologically aware buyers seeking sustainable goods may be more vulnerable to "greenwashing" (Hamann & Kapelus, 2004). As a result, "greenwashing" may have a bigger impact on ecologically aware customers.

Suggestion for Business

This study suggest the fact that would help to encourage honest marketing strategy. Moreover, this study encourages enterprises to develop ethical advertising decisions that help customers, the planet, and, due to the result of this research, the company overall. This is fact that vague and dishonest advertising is harmful to all participants and can impact the company and the entire green brand industry in the coming years. The issue with "greenwashing" is that businesses profess to be eco-friendly even when they're not (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). The outcome of this research is evident: "greenwashing" decrease faith in a corporation and its goods, which can lead to financial loss. It is a significant result in the world of foreign industry, as executives are always seeking ways to develop a loyal, long-term target market. This research recommends two approaches for businesses to minimize the negative effects of "greenwashing": minimizing deceptive ecological advertising ("greenwashing") or modifying the corporation to be ecologically responsible to fit the intended sustainability practices ("green initiatives"). Furthermore, this research recommends that using transparent advertising to build consumer sentiment. The next parts go over these issues.

The Reduction of Greenwashing

The key difficulty for businesses is to build sustainable trust in an era where "greenwashing" is common, and customers are highly likely to detect and respond poorly to it. The primary purpose of environmental marketing, as described in the review of the literature, is to attract and retain consumer loyalty (Lewandowska et al., 2017). According to the findings of this study, reducing "greenwashing" could boost environmental credibility, which then would enhance buying behavior. Customers are hesitant to form long-term trust connections with organizations that mislead their customers (Cherry & Sneirson, 2010), hence eliminating "greenwashing" would help retain customers. Consumers are more concerned and eager to build long-term customer connections when they can verify the goods, corporation, and campaign. Reduction of green consumption uncertainty and perceived threat, as well as elevated numbers of green satisfaction, could result from decreasing "greenwashing". Reduced "greenwashing" would reduce environmental potential risk by allowing the goods to improve the needs of the customers.

"Green" Capabilities

Corporations can promote sustainable claims and engage in "green marketing" without indulging in "greenwashing" by implementing ecologically favorable projects. Customer loyalty is harmed by "greenwashing", according to the result of this research. Nevertheless, offering precise, true, and substantial evidence of environmental claims promotes credibility in the goods because the customer may verify the facts. Corporations can transform overall economic trends towards a more sustainable future while retaining customer happiness and accessing the environmental market by developing green activities. Eco-friendly risk perception is reduced by implementing environmental policies because the customer does not see unfavorable repercussions from the transaction. This allows businesses to meet their consumers' environmental requirements, leading to increased customer loyalty. "Greenwashing" may be reduced by taking steps to sustainability and speaking about them with actual proof.

Transparency Advertising

Greenwashing is jeopardizing the entire environmental industry, as customers believe corporations are lying about their environmental promises (Polonsky et al., 2010). Customers would be much more willing to trust corporations' corporate environmental statements when more major corporations adopted truthful and accountable advertising. Transparency advertising could reduce environmental risk perceptions since customers would've been able to believe that the brand provides the requirement of environmental

responsibility and, as a result, the transaction seems to have no adverse implications. Accurate and realistic advertising statements lessen favorable customer uncertainty since the customer can comprehend and trust the promises. As a result, green trust in enterprises and the green sector would mostly increase.

REFERENCES

Aaker, D. A. (1995). *Building strong brands*. Florence, MA: Free Press.

Aji, H. M., & Sutikno, B. (2015). The extended consequence of greenwashing: Perceived consumer skepticism. *International Journal of Business and Information*, *10*(4), 433-468.

Chang, H. H., & Chen, S. W. (2008). The impact of online store environment cues on purchase intention: Trust and perceived risk as a mediator. *Online Information Review*, *32*(6), 818-841. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/14684520810923953

Chaudhuri, A. (1997). Consumption emotion and perceived risk: A macro-analytic approach. *Journal of Business Research*, *39*(2), 81-92. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(96)00144-0

Chekima, B., Wafa, S. A. W. S. K., Igau, O. A., Chekima, S., & Sondoh Jr, S. L. (2016). Examining green consumerism motivational drivers: Does premium price and demographics matter to green purchasing? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *112*(4), 3436-3450. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.102

Chen, Y.-S. (2010). The drivers of green brand equity: Green brand image, green satisfaction, and green trust. *Journal of Business ethics*, *93*(2), 307-319. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0223-9

Chen, Y.-S., & Chang, C.-H. (2012). Enhance green purchase intentions: The roles of green perceived value, green perceived risk, and green trust. *Management Decision*, *50*(2), 502-520. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741211216250

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*(3), 489-500. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1360-0

Chen, Y.-S., Lin, C.-L., & Chang, C.-H. (2014). The influence of greenwash on green word-of-mouth (green wom): The mediation effects of green perceived quality and green satisfaction. *Quality & Quantity*, *48*(5), 2411-2425. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9898-1

Cherry, M. A., & Sneirson, J. F. (2010). Beyond profit: Rethinking corporate social responsibility and greenwashing after the bp oil disaster. *Tul. L. Rev.*, *85*, 984-1038.

Correa, C., Junior, S., & Da Silva, D. (2017). The social control exerted by advertising: A study on the perception of greenwashing in green products at retail. *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, *19*(2), 1-9. doi:DOI:10.9734/BJESBS/2017/29819

De Jong, M. D., Harkink, K. M., & Barth, S. (2018). Making green stuff? effects of corporate greenwashing on consumers. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, *32*(1), 77-112. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651917729863

Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review*, *54*(1), 64-87. doi: https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64

Fliegelman, J. E. (2010). The next generation of greenwash: Diminishing consumer confusion through a national eco-labeling program. *Fordham Urb. LJ*, *237*(2), 1001-1056.

Furlow, N. E. (2010). Greenwashing in the new millennium. *The Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, *10*(6), 22.

Ganesan, S. (1994). Determinants of long-term orientation in buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, *58*(2), 1-19. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800201

Gleim, M., & Lawson, S. J. (2014). Spanning the gap: An examination of the factors leading to the green gap. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *31*(6/7), 503-514. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-05-2014-0988

Guyader, H., Ottosson, M., & Witell, L. (2017). You can't buy what you can't see: Retailer practices to increase the green premium. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *34*, 319-325. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.07.008

Hamann, R., & Kapelus, P. (2004). Corporate social responsibility in mining in Southern Africa: Fair accountability or just greenwash? *Development*, *47*(3), 85-92. doi:https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.development.1100056

Harridge-March, S. (2006). Can the building of trust overcome consumer perceived risk online? *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *24*(7), 746-761. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500610711897

Hart, P., & Saunders, C. (1997). Power and trust: Critical factors in the adoption and use of electronic data interchange. *Organization Science*, *8*(1), 23-42. doi:https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.8.1.23

Hoedeman, O. (2002). Rio+ 10 and the greenwash of corporate globalization. *Development*, *45*(3), 39-42. doi:https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.development.1110376

Horiuchi, R., Schuchard, R., Shea, L., & Townsend, S. (2009). *Understanding and preventing greenwash: A business guide* (Tech. Rep.). New York, NY: BSR.

Jacoby, J., & Kaplan, L. B. (1972). The components of perceived risk. In *Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference of the Association for Consumer Research,* Chicago, IL.

Jahdi, K. S., & Acikdilli, G. (2009). Marketing communications and corporate social responsibility (csr): Marriage of convenience or shotgun wedding? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *88*(1), 103-113. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0113-1

Jaiswal, D., & Kant, R. (2018). Green purchasing behaviour: A conceptual framework and empirical investigation of indian consumers. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *41*, 60-69. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.11.008

Kalafatis, S. P., Pollard, M., East, R., & Tsogas, M. H. (1999). Green marketing and ajzen's theory of planned behaviour: A cross-market examination. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *16*(5), 441-460. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/07363769910289550

Koehn, D. (2003). The nature of and conditions for online trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *43*(1), 3-19. doi:https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022950813386

Langer, A., Eisend, M., et al. (2007). The impact of eco-labels on consumers: Less information, more confusion? *ACR European Advances*, *8*, 338-339.

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

Leal Filho, W., Finisterra Do Paco, A., & Raposo, M. (2009). Identifying the green consumer: A segmentation study. *Marketing*, *17*(1), 17-25. doi:https://doi.org/10.1057/jt.2008.28

Lewandowska, A., Witczak, J., & Kurczewski, P. (2017). Green marketing today-a mix of trust, consumer participation and life cycle thinking. *Management*, *21*(2), 28-48. doi:10.1515/manment-2017-0003

Lu, L., Bock, D., & Joseph, M. (2013). Green marketing: What the millennials buy. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *34*(6), 3-10. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-05-2013-0036

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

Lyon, T. P., & Montgomery, A. W. (2015). The means and end of greenwash. *Organization & Environment*, *28*(2), 223-249. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575332

Martínez, M. P., Cremasco, C. P., Gabriel Filho, L. R. A., Junior, S. S. B., Bednaski, A. V., Quevedo-Silva, F., ... Padgett, R. C. M.-L. (2020). Fuzzy inference system to study the behavior of the green consumer facing the perception of greenwashing. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *242*, 1-43. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.03.060

Mitchell, L., & Ramey, W. (2011). Look how green i am! an individual-level explanation for greenwashing. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, *12*(6), 40-45.

Mitchell, V., & Papavassiliou, V. (1999). Marketing causes and implications of consumer confusion. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *8*(4), 319-342. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/10610429910284300

Mitchell, V.-W. (1999). Consumer perceived risk: Conceptualisations and models. *European Journal of Marketing*, *33*(1/2), 163-195. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/03090569910249229

Mitchell, V.-W., Walsh, G., & Yamin, M. (2005). Towards a conceptual model of consumer confusion. *ACR North American Advances*, *32*, 143-150.

Moravcikova, D., Krizanova, A., Kliestikova, J., & Rypakova, M. (2017). Green marketing as the source of the competitive advantage of the business. *Sustainability*, *9*(12), 1-13. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/su9122218

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), 1-16. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/su11092653

Nyilasy, G., Gangadharbatla, H., & Paladino, A. (2014). Perceived greenwashing: The interactive effects of green advertising and corporate environmental performance on consumer reactions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *125*(4), 693-707. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1944-3

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

Parguel, B., Benoit-Moreau, F., & Russell, C. A. (2015). Can evoking nature in advertising mislead consumers? the power of 'executional greenwashing'. *International Journal of Advertising*, *34*(1), 107-134. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2014.996116

Peattie, K., Peattie, S., & Ponting, C. (2009). Climate change: A social and commercial marketing communications challenge. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, *4*(3), 270-286. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/14502190910992693

Perera, C., Auger, P., & Klein, J. (2018). Green consumption practices among young environmentalists: A practice theory perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *152*(3), 843-864. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3376-3

Peter, J. P., & Ryan, M. J. (1976). An investigation of perceived risk at the brand level. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *13*(2), 184-188. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/002224377601300210

Polonsky, M. J. (2011). Transformative green marketing: Impediments and opportunities. *Journal of Business Research*, *64*(12), 1311-1319. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.01.016

Polonsky, M. J., Grau, S. L., & Garma, R. (2010). The new greenwash?: Potential marketing problems with carbon offsets. *International Journal of Business Studies: A Publication of the Faculty of Business Administration, Edith Cowan University*, *18*(1), 49-54.

Rao, S. S., Truong, D., Senecal, S., & Le, T. T. (2007). How buyers' expected benefits, perceived risks, and e-business readiness influence their e-marketplace usage. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *36*(8), 1035-1045. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2006.08.001

Roselius, T. (1971). Consumer rankings of risk reduction methods. *Journal of marketing*, *35*(1), 56-61. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/002224297103500110

Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 393-404. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.926617

Self, R. M., Self, D. R., Bell-Haynes, J., et al. (2010). Marketing tourism in the galapagos islands: Ecotourism or greenwashing? *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, *9*(6), 111-126. doi:https://doi.org/10.19030/iber.v9i6.590

Singh, J., & Sirdeshmukh, D. (2000). Agency and trust mechanisms in consumer satisfaction and loyalty judgments. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *28*(1), 150-167. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070300281014

Skarmeas, D., & Leonidou, C. N. (2013). When consumers doubt, watch out! the role of csr skepticism. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(10), 1831-1838. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.02.004

Spack, J. A., Board, V. E., Crighton, L. M., Kostka, P. M., & Ivory, J. D. (2012). It's easy being green: The effects of argument and imagery on consumer responses to green product packaging. *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture*, *6*(4), 441-458. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2012.706231

Turnbull, P. W., Leek, S., & Ying, G. (2000). Customer confusion: The mobile phone market. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *16*(1-3), 143-163. doi:https://doi.org/10.1362/026725700785100523

Walsh, G., Hennig-Thurau, T., & Mitchell, V.-W. (2007). Consumer confusion proneness: Scale development, validation, and application. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *23*(7-8), 697-721. doi:https://doi.org/10.1362/026725707X230009

Walsh, G., & Mitchell, V.-W. (2010). The effect of consumer confusion proneness on word of mouth, trust, and customer satisfaction. *European Journal of Marketing*, *44*(6), 838-859. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561011032739

Wood, C. M., & Scheer, L. K. (1996). Incorporating perceived risk into models of consumer deal assessment and purchase intent. *ACR North American Advances*, *23*, 399-404.