



Matias Huhtala

HOW TO FIND COMPANY GREENWASHING

Degree of Bachelor of science in economics and business administration

Oulu Business School

5/2022

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1	Introduction and justification for this subject.....	3
1.2	Objective and research questions	5
1.3	Main concepts	6
1.4	The structure of this thesis	7
2	GREENWASHING.....	8
2.1	Different forms of greenwashing	8
3	RESEARCH METHOD	13
4	PATTERNS AND TRANSGRESSIONS OF GREENWASHING.....	16
5	HOW TO FIND GREENWASHING	20
5.1	Different sins and transgressions of greenwashing found in different forms of greenwashing.	20
5.2	How to find a greenwashing company	22
6	CONCLUSIONS	24
6.1	Answer to research questions	24
6.2	Assessment of the reliability results, restrictions of this thesis	26
6.3	Managerial implications	27
6.4	Possible subjects for future research.....	27
	REFERENCES	29

TABLES

Table 1.	The key literature of the thesis.....	14
----------	---------------------------------------	----

1 INTRODUCTION

This bachelor's thesis goes through different forms of greenwashing, different patterns or 'sins' of greenwashing that has been found with research, different transgressions of greenwashing that have been found with research and ultimately, will introduce ways that greenwashing can be found in companies.

1.1 Introduction and justification for this subject

According to research done by Nielsen media in 2015, 66 percent of consumers worldwide are willing to pay more from a product if its 'green' (De Freitas Netto, Sobral, Ribeiro, and da Luz Soares, 2020). Thus, by making 'green' or ecological products, companies can attract customer to pay more from their 'green' products than their 'regular' products.

According to an article from Telegraph (2015), nearly 50% of green goods are more expensive than the normal goods that is offered in the market. This means that by selling green products and finding the 66 percent of consumers that are willing to pay more for green products, the company that sells the product has a real chance to make profits and gain potential consumers (De Freitas Netto et al., 2020). When these kinds of consumers see a company as socially responsible, they are maybe willing to buy the products at a higher price (Grimmer & Bingham, 2013). So overall, by making green products, companies can increase the price of them and gain the 66 percent of consumers mentioned by De Freitas Netto et al. (2020).

The World Economic Forum has done research in collaboration with PwC (Price water Coopers) and concluded that the prize of nature in the global economy is 44 trillion dollars (World Economic Forum, 2020). According to European Commission (2022), the global market for low carbon environmental goods and services already reached 4.2 trillion in 2012. And due to research done by Fortune Business Insight (2021) only the green technology and sustainability market hit 9.57 billion dollars in 2020. These are both a huge amount of money and when assessing these kinds of amounts, it is hard to assess the size due to the fact of changing prices and different parts that studies

investigate. But taking all this into consideration, this thesis argues that these kinds of amount of capital and volume is something worth studying and assessing.

All of these reasons correlate to some point with the research done by Nielsen Media in 2015 and Telegraph's (2015) article (De Freitas Netto et al., 2020). So, it can be said that it can be profitable to corporations to greenwash their product, but it also comes with a price to pay for everybody else such as the consumers, truly ecological companies, and the planet. By favouring green and sustainable products, companies can make themselves a supporting piece of fighting global warming, the destruction of nature and make sure that their workers have humane working conditions and pay.

The latest definition of global warming is the long-term heating of Earth's climate system observed since the pre-industrial period (between 1850 and 1900) due to human activities, primarily fossil fuel burning, which increases heat-trapping greenhouse gas levels in Earth's atmosphere (National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 2022). According to many numerous sources, such as the European commission (2022), the World Wild Fund for Nature (2022) and United Nations (2022), global warming is considered one of the biggest threats to the Earth's climate. Global warming can do such things as increase drought and floods, make the sea-level rise, and lift the global temperatures (European Union, 2022).

The conditions that every employee works should be very important to every company that buys the product they make. Many countries define the minimum working conditions that are acceptable but making the working conditions the employees can also be green and productive. According to research "Productive employment and working conditions as deterrent of sustainable economic development in Serbia" (Milica & Milica, 2019), to achieve sustainable and high economic development, working and social conditions must be among top priorities. Based on this, this thesis argues that claim to be 'green' and ecological must offer their employees and make sure that their employees get the same kind of treatment that was mentioned by Milica and Milica (2019).

By favouring products that are not green and unethical but claiming to be so (so called greenwashing) companies are directly involved in taking market space from ecological

and green companies that are willing to do so. And by doing this, companies can be seen as being fine with such things as global warming and inhumane working conditions.

The contribution of this thesis is to introduce different forms greenwashing has been found by researchers such as Baum (2012) and De Freitas Netto et al. (2020). Then it will bring out the different transgression and patterns that have been found by researchers such as Scanlan (2017) and the marketing company Terrachoice (2010). The last step is to use the different forms of greenwashing that has been found by researchers with the transgressions and patterns to identify if a company is doing greenwashing.

1.2 Objective and research questions

The objective of this bachelor thesis is to reveal how can greenwashing be found in a company. To help this objective, this thesis will use the perspective of a company or a consumer or anyone who is assessing a company without the inside information of the company.

The ideal result of this bachelor thesis is that the person who reads this, can easily understand different ways that greenwashing can be found in a company if there is greenwashing to be found. What motivates this thesis is the need to help consumers and companies to find companies that are green in modern markets.

The intent is to divide this objective into two main paragraphs and assess their role in helping to achieve the ideal result of this bachelor thesis. By analysing them and using them to assess each other, this research has the potential to create a guide for anyone who wants to find if a company is doing any form of greenwashing.

When comparing this thesis to research done before this thesis, there are a lot of research that focuses on greenwashing as a form and some that focuses on patterns and transgression but none of them completely focus on just finding greenwashing. For example, the research of De Freitas Netto et al. (2020) focused on introducing greenwashing as a phenomenon not to finding it. The only other studies that are close

to finding greenwashing in a different way than my thesis are the studies of Scanlan (2017), Terrachoice (2007), Terrachoice (2010) and Berrone, Fosfuri, and Gelabert (2015). These are all connected to my thesis because they are being used as ways to find greenwashing. This will be gone through later in this thesis. The added value that this thesis brings is the usage of both, the different forms of greenwashing and the patterns and transgressions together to find greenwashing in companies.

This bachelor's main research question is:

How to find greenwashing companies?

To support the main question, there are two sub-questions. One of them focuses on the different forms that greenwashing has been found in the past and the other focuses on the different patterns and transgressions that have been found in 'green' products. The sub-questions are:

What are the different forms that greenwashing has been found in the past?

What are different patterns and transgressions that have been found in greenwashing companies that have done greenwashing?

1.3 Main concepts

The main concepts of this thesis are greenwashing and the 'sins and transgression of greenwashing.

Greenwashing became alive in 1986 from an essay by environmentalist Jay Westervelt. He published an essay on the hospitality industry concerning their practices to promote towel reuse (Guo, Zhang, Wang, Li, and Tao, 2018). After that, the term has developed over time and gained numerous meanings from different researchers.

Before this thesis, the term greenwashing had developed into a broad number of different meanings. The earliest definition of greenwashing that was officially made, was in 1999 when it was added to the Concise Oxford dictionary (De Freitas Netto et al., 2020). It

defined as “Disinformation disseminated by an organization so as to present an environmentally responsible public image; a public image of environmental responsibility promulgated by or for an organization, etc., but perceived as being unfounded or intentionally misleading” (De Freitas Netto et al., 2020: 6). In 2010, Terrachoice marketing firm described greenwashing as “the act of misleading consumer regarding the environmental performance and positive communication”. Delmas and Burbano (2011, p. 84) defined greenwashing as “poor environmental performance and positive communication about environmental performance”. Walker and Wan (2012: 234) defined greenwashing as the difference between symbolic and substantive actions. Baum (2012: 423) described greenwashing in the form of “the act of disseminating disinformation to consumers regarding the environmental practices of a company or the environmental benefits of a product or service”. Tateishi (2018: 372) summarized greenwashing as ‘communication that misleads people regarding environmental performance/benefits by disclosing negative information and disseminating positive information about an organization, service, or product’.

But to make things clear, this thesis will use the definition of greenwashing that was made by Baum (2012) which is the act of disseminating disinformation to consumers regarding the environmental practices of a company or the environmental benefits of a product or service.

The sins of greenwashing are patterns of greenwashing that has been found with research in different products and companies. Overall, there are twelve sins that are mentioned in this thesis.

1.4 The structure of this thesis

This thesis is structured into three paragraphs that contain theoretical framework of the thesis, paragraphs two, three and four. In paragraphs five and six, the research methods and conclusions will be gone through.

The thesis starts with introduction, where the reader will be led to the subject. Then, the main theoretical parts will be introduced in chapters two, three and four. After that the research method will be brought forth in paragraph five and after that, conclusions will be gone through in paragraph six.

2 GREENWASHING

In this paragraph, this thesis will go through different forms of greenwashing. The goal of this chapter is to introduce greenwashing's different forms that have been found through the history.

2.1 Different forms of greenwashing

According to Bruce Watson's (2016) article "Troubling evolution of corporate greenwashing", greenwashing has been happening before the term was discovered in 1986. In the article, he claims that in the 1960's a company named Westinghouse 's nuclear power was introducing nuclear power as 'odorless, neat and safe' and made advertisements that claimed that their clean and safe. Even though some of the claims were true, they did not cover the whole truth.

Early in 1991, Kangun, Carlson and Grove made three categories of greenwashed advertising: One, those employing false claims. Two, those omitting important information that could help with the evaluation of environmental claim sincerity and three, those employing vague or ambiguous term which could be summed up as lying, lying by omission, or lying through lack of clarity. (Parguel, Benoit-Moreau, & Russell, 2015.) These were the earliest descriptions of greenwashing in advertising and was used as a basis for the research done by Parguel et al. (2015) and De Freitas Netto et al. (2020) and used to name 'executional greenwashing'.

One of the first greenwashing forms that were noticed, was greenwashing reflecting the increasing apprehension that at least some corporations creatively manage their reputations with public, financial community and regulators, so to hide deviance, deflect attributions of fault, obscure the nature of the problem or allegation and finally, seek to appear in a leadership position. (Laufer, 2003.) But they wanted to keep doing their business unsustainably while still seemingly were ecological. For a lot of companies, this led to taking the position as the leader in the ecological field of their industry and at the same time is being the main polluter and the most unethical company in their industry (Bruno, 1997). Trying keep their image as a leader when

caught from unecological behavior, some companies started doing one of the first greenwashing levels: confusion, fronting and posturing (Laufer, 2003).

For example, when a study “Global spin: the corporate assault on environmentalism”, Beder (2002) and some other cases came forth, companies like Royal Dutch/Shell, Mobil corporation, Dow Chemical and many other companies started to do complex strategies to shift focus and attention from their firm, create confusion, undermine credibility, criticize viable alternatives, and would deceptively posture their firms’ objectives, commitments, and accomplishments (Laufer, 2003). As can be seen in this example, the ways that these companies influenced public opinion was in the three categories that were mentioned by Laufer (2003). Using these levels, companies could deceit their costumers and change the public opinion in their to be in their favor.

Corporate advertising is defined as paid promotion of services, companies, goods, and ideas by an identified sponsor, seeks to reach company’s ultimate constituencies directly, without the participation of third parties (Ormeno & Berndt, 2007). It is also one of the main channels that companies use to influence the public opinion and greenwash their products. While many corporations have used advertising to communicate sincere attempts to minimize the environmental impact of their services and products, others have used advertising as a tool to exaggerate or even fabricate the environmental features of their offerings (Carlson et al., 1993). With “green advertising,” companies announce the introduction of green products into the market, the modification of existing products, and the sponsorship of or partnership with environmentally vested advocacy organizations (Carlson, Groves, & Kangun, 1996).

When comparing this to the greenwashing form of Laufer (2003) that was mentioned in the chapter before this, this kind of greenwashing is much more misleading and visible than Laufer’s (2003). For example, taking a leadership position and the confusing, posturing and fronting the consumer sand public opinion is much more effective because Carlson et al. (1993) greenwashing only focused on advertising. Advertising can also be used as a tool to of posturing, fronting and confusing but it is just a part of it.

According Parguel et al. (2015) executional greenwashing is defined as ‘the use of nature evoking elements in advertisement to artificially enhance brands ecological image’. De Freitas Netto et al. (2020) described it as a strategy that does not use any type of claim that was described before, but it suggests nature-evoking elements such as sounds and images that are correlated with nature. With research done by Parguel et al. (2015), they proved that the presence of executional nature-evoking advertisement generated a higher perception of brand’s greenness among consumers who are not experts of the brand but did not have significant influence on expert consumers. By doing research towards different papers and studies, De Freitas Netto et al. (2020) argued that this kind of greenwashing is one of the most common in modern markets.

One form of greenwashing is using different terms to describe your products. For example, use of the term “organic,” for instance, is regulated on food products, yet not on personal care products. This allows different corporations and retailers to make false claims on synthetic goods. For example, words like “all natural, “eco-friendly” and “carbon neutral,” all lack accepted, universal definitions and have therefore managed to go largely unregulated (Baum, 2012). This lack of clarity makes proving and quantifying greenwashing difficult (Benz, 2000). One of the examples of this is the food industry. The increase of ‘organic’ food has grown seven times faster than the average food category, almost tripling between 1997 and 2012. (Baum, 2012.)

The type of greenwashing that was presented by Baum (2012) was recently analyzed and assessed by De Freitas Netto et al. (2020). By assessing Baum’s (2012) and new research done by Tateishi (2018) and taking into consideration the research done by Carlson et al. (1993), the greenwashing was named as claim greenwashing and divided into two categories: claim type and claim deceptiveness.

Claim type was divided into five categories: First, the product orientation claim, claims centering on the ecological attribute of the product. Second, process orientation claim, claims centering on the ecological high performance of a production process technique, or/and an ecological disposal method. Third, image orientation claim, claims centering on enhancing the eco-friendly image of the organization, like claims that associate an organization with an environmental cause or activity which there is

elevated public support. Fourth, environmental fact claim, claims that involves an independent statement that is ostensibly factual in nature from an organization about the environmental at large or its condition. And the last claim, combination of these claims, claims having two or more of the categories mentioned above. (De Freitas Netto et al., 2020.)

When putting together the three studies done by Baum (2012), Tateishi (2018) and their basis, Carlson et al. (1993), the second claim type: claim deceptiveness was also divided into five categories by De Freitas Netto et al. (2020). The first claim was the vague/ambiguous claims. These claims are described as too broad, or/and lacking clear definition claims. Second, omission claims, claims missing the necessary information to evaluate its validity. Third, false/outright lie claims, claims that are inaccurate or a fabrication. Fourth, combination of these claims, claims having two or more of the categories mentioned before this. Fifth, acceptable claim, claims that do not contain deceptive feature. (De Freitas Netto et al., 2020.)

All the things that were found through analyzing the claim and claim deceptiveness greenwashing, there is a lot of common with the ‘sins’ of greenwashing that was introduced by Terrachoice (2010). This will be gone through later in this thesis.

According to Pizzetti, Gatti, and Seele (2019), there has been three forms of greenwashing, direct greenwashing, indirect greenwashing, and the newest one found, vicarious greenwashing. Direct greenwashing is defined as greenwashing that happens in the company level, indirect greenwashing is defined as misbehaviour perpetrated by a supplier who claims to be sustainable, and which results creates less negative impact on a supplied company and vicarious greenwashing is defined as the behaviour of a supplier is in breach of a company’s claims of sustainability (Pizzetti et al., 2019). So, some companies choose to instead of taking responsibility of their shortcomings, some of the companies use suppliers as their scapegoats (Carvalho, Muralidharan, and Bapuji, 2015). By doing this, companies can easily use the blame game to escape the greenwashing accusations.

All the different ways that greenwashing has been discovered through the years gives a good example of how greenwashing has developed over the years. The first form of

greenwashing that was mentioned by Watson (2016) is a lot of different than Pizzetti et al. (2019) form of greenwashing. Their discoveries have more than 55 years of difference and it can be seen measures that was made to assure the 'greenness'. In the 1960's, the Westinghouse nuclear power plant offered their own truth about their nuclear power plant and informed that, it was the truth. (Watson, 2016) But as mentioned in chapter 1 of this thesis, companies have the urge to please consumers who want 'green' products and are willing to pay more from them. This can easily lead to the blame game that was described by Pizzetti et al. (2019) and lead to the usage of suppliers as escape goats to avoid the prosecutions of unethical and not 'green' behavior.

Green marketing, advertisement and adjectives that was described by Parguel et al. (2015), Baum (2012) and Laufer (2003) are all in the same field with each other. All of them focus on influencing consumers opinions of the product with different kind of methods, such as words, images, and sounds. For example, green marketing (Parguel et al., 2015), advertisement (Baum, 2012) and adjectives (Laufer, 2003) are opinions and description of something, not in the same category as the greenwashing described by Pizzetti et al. (2019) and Watson (2016). All of them have something to do with marketing and that is the things that unites them. According to De Freitas Netto et al. (2020) the most common greenwashing that is found is claim greenwashing that is mentioned by Baum, (2012) and Tateishi, (2018) and executional greenwashing that is mentioned by Parguel et al. (2015).

As an overall, greenwashing has come a long way within 60 years. Consumers have made huge impact to it by being more interested in being more ecological products and with that, making companies invest into being actually green, or worse improve their greenwashing efforts (Horiuchi et al., 2009).

One of the reasons were mentioned in chapter one, as the correlation with Horiuchi et al. (2009) and the correlation between the articles of Nielsen media (2015) and Telegraphs (2015). In that part of the chapter 1, this thesis argued that it was profitable for corporations to greenwash their products, but it had price to pay for everybody else.

3 RESEARCH METHOD

This paragraph will go through the research methodology that has been used in this research to create it and answer the research questions. The paragraph will also address the research process that has been done while making this thesis by going through the phrases and words used to find the literature used in this thesis, introduce the database that have been used and the most important studies that were used in the creation of this thesis.

The objective of this thesis is to reveal how greenwashing can be found in a company. This objective will be achieved through a literature review. With the usage of literature review, this thesis can be based on a solid background and by comparing, assessing, and finding similarities in the past literature, an adequately accurate deduction of a result can be created based on previous studies. This is an appropriate methodology to use in this thesis because there is a huge amount of literature towards greenwashing in its different forms and to the transgression and patterns of greenwashing can already be found in past literature.

A lot of different databases were used to research this thesis. Mostly, the used databases were EBSCO Business Source, Oulu-Finna, ProQuest, and Google Scholar. Most of the literature that were found in this thesis were easily found using these databases. Most of the literature used in this thesis were found from these databases that were mentioned before because they were easy to use, there were a lot of data in each of them, the diversity of their use opened the chance of comparing their results and by using them together, it usually gave a good chance to find the article. The usage of Google Scholar was tricky, because most of the articles required a certain level permission to access them. Sometimes, if required, the usage of Google was required because with it could be accessed the websites of some sources. There, the result could be found and assessed.

Search terms that were used in the research of the literature of this thesis in all the databases were the following ones: *green, greenwash, greenwashing, greenwashed, ecological, sustainable, natural, finding greenwashing, forms of greenwashing, eco-*

friendly, unecological, green company, sustainability, climate friendly, global warming, working conditions, misleading consumers, climate friendly, nature.

When searching for the literature for this thesis, there were troubles on finding a same kind of example. For example, when searching for “how to find company greenwashing”, most sources just use the Terrachoice (2010) as an example and nothing else. Finding information on the forms of greenwashing was relatively easy by just using a search word *greenwash* and did not cause any troubles.

The quality of the literature that were found was good. Most of it was found in the databases that were mentioned before and were “peer-reviewed”. I did not use a specific filter when acquiring literature from the databases that were mentioned before, but sometimes there were time of time filter to search for different literature that was suitable for the part of the thesis. Some of the data that was collected was from trustworthy journals such as The Telegraph and The Guardian and some were even from the websites of reliable institutions such as the European Commission.

Table 1. The literature that is used most often in this thesis

Author(s)	Article Name	Publishing year	Journal
De Freitas Netto, S Sobral, M Ribeiro, A da Luz Soares, G	Concepts and forms of greenwashing: a systematic review	2020	Environmental sciences Europe
Pizzetti, M Gatti, L Seele, P	Firms Talk, Suppliers Walk: Analyzing the Locus of Greenwashing in the Blame Game and Introducing ‘Vicarious Greenwashing’	2019	Journal of Business Ethics
Scanlan, S	Framing fracking: scale-shifting and greenwashing risk in the oil and gas industry	2017	Local Environment
Terrachoice marketing firm	The Sins of Greenwashing home and family edition	2010	Terrachoice’s own research
Berrone, P Fosfuri, A Gelabert, L	Does Greenwashing Pay Off? Understanding the Relationship Between Environmental Actions and Environmental Legitimacy	2015	Journal of Business Ethics

Bruno, K	The Greenpeace Book of Greenwash	1992	-
----------	-------------------------------------	------	---

4 PATTERNS AND TRANSGRESSIONS OF GREENWASHING

This paragraph will introduce different patterns and transgressions that have been found in greenwashed companies or products through analyzing them. The goal of this paragraph is to bring forth different kinds of patterns and transgressions that can help identifying greenwashing.

The methodology that is used in this paragraph are based on research done by two researchers and an institution. The text will go through the Terrachoice environmental marketing company's "six sins of greenwashing" that was published in 2007, Terrachoice UL's "the sins of greenwashing home and family edition" that was published in 2010, the six 'sins' from Stephen Scanlan (2017) from his investigation in the oil and gas industry (OGI) and the firm level greenwashing by Berrone et al. (2015).

The patterns or sins of greenwashing and transgressions of greenwashing were found by Terrachoice in two occasions, in 2007 and 2010, Scanlan in 2017 and Berrone et al. in 2015. All of them focused on different areas of different industries.

The first six sins of greenwashing were determined by Terrachoice in 2007 with a survey towards six category-leading big box stores. During this survey they recognized six patterns that they called 'sins' that happened in products that claimed to be 'green' but the claims were demonstrably false or misleading (Terrachoice, 2007). In 2010, Terrachoice conducted another survey with the same concept, but this time, they increased the number of stores that they visited to 34 large stores in Canada and USA. During this survey they discovered one more pattern or a 'sin', the sin of worshipping false labels (Terrachoice, 2010). As mentioned before, these sins were found through analyzing products. But this opens an opportunity to use these product-based sins to analyze the company behind them and with that, may also help to find greenwashing on company-level. Markham, Khare, and Beckam (2014) also mentioned that these can be used as detecting instances of firm-based greenwashing.

Terrachoice found the first six sins in 2007 and the last sin, sin of worshipping false labels, in 2010. So, the here are the sins that they found: The first sin is the sin hidden

trade-off, a claim suggesting that a product is 'green' on a narrow set of attributes without attention to other important environmental issues. Second, the sin of hidden proof, an environmental claim that cannot be backed with easily accessible supporting information or by reliable third-party certification. Third, the sin of vagueness, a claim that is poorly defined or too broad, a claim lacking in detail that its real meaning is inclined to be misunderstood by consumers. Fourth, the sin of irrelevance, a claim that is environmentally truthful but is not important or helpful for consumers seeking 'green' products. Fifth, the sin of lesser two evils, a claim that may be true within the product, but may distract the consumer from greater environmental harm that the category does as a whole. Sixth, the sin of fibbing, the environmental claims that are simply false. The newest and the seventh sin of worshipping false labels, a product that through false suggestions or certification-like image misleads consumers into thinking that it has been through a legitimate ecological certification process. (Terrachoice, 2010).

There has been a lot of talk around these 'sins' of greenwashing. According to Baum (2012) the seven sins of greenwashing by Terrachoice (2010) are the main indication ways that a company can mislead their consumer with environmental claims and uses the seven sins as their framework for their advertising analysis.

Firm-level greenwashing transgressions were brought forth by Bruno (1992) in the book: "The Greenpeace Book on Greenwash". This was examined and complemented by Berrone et al. (2015) in the research "Green Lies: How Greenwashing can destroy a company (and how to go green without the wash)". In the Greenpeace Book of Greenwash, they cited four different transgressions concerning firm-level (Berrone et al., 2015). These regressions were examined and analyzed by Berrone et al. in 2015 and with this research there were added a fifth transgression, the transgression of fuzzy reporting. The five transgressions that are mentioned here are all introduced by Berrone et al. (2015).

Here are all of the transgressions that Bruno (1992) and Berrone et al. (2015) mentioned. The first four are from Bruno (1992) and the fifth is from Berrone et al. (2015). First, the transgression of dirty business. It means that a company is being an inherently unsustainable business, but at the same time promoting sustainable practices

or products that do not represent the business or society. The second transgression is ad bluster. It means that a company is diverting attention from sustainable problems through advertising. Third transgression is political spin. The meaning of it is that a company is influencing regulations or governments in order to obtain benefits that affect sustainability. Fourth transgression is the It's the law, stupid, transgression. It means that a company is proclaiming sustainability commitments and accomplishments that are already required by existing regulations or laws. (Bruno, 1992.) The last and fifth transgression is fuzzy reporting. By doing it, a company is taking advantage of sustainability reports and their nature of one-way communication channel. (Berrone et al., 2015).

Contreas-Pacheco and Claassen (2017) published research named "Fuzzy reporting as a way for a company to greenwash: perspectives from the Colombian reality" towards the transgression "Fuzzy reporting" of Berrone et al. (2015). The research claimed that there are three dimensions to take into consideration when assessing Fuzzy reporting: 1. define a specific variable to focus on; 2. focus on a single social or environmental incident; and 3. analyze and track official mentions of that same variable through several public sources (SRs).

The latest sins were found in the research done by Scanlan (2017) concerning the oil gas industry (OIG). In this research, he used to follow different advertisements that were made by the oil gas industry during the time frame 2000-2015 in the magazines: *The Atlantic Monthly*, *Harper's Magazine* and *The Economist* (Scanlan, 2017). The 'sins' of Scanlan (2017) were built on top of the Terrachoice's (2010) 'sins' according to De Freitas Netto et al. (2020). These 'sins' are noticed on a quite long time period (15 years) so the evidence against has been done in a long perspective and taking a lot of their actions into consideration (Scanlan, 2017).

There were six sins that were found by Scanlan (2017). Here is all of them and a short explanation of them. First, the sin of false hopes, a claim that reinforces a false hope. Second, the sin of fearmongering, claims that fabricate insecurity concerning not "buying in" into an organized practice. Third, the sin of broken promises, claims promising that the fracking will lift up the poor, rural communities with riches from the mineral rights and economic development. Fourth, the sin of injustice,

environmental communication that is used with fracking does not speak directly to the communities that are most affected by it and focuses on the population that gets the most out of it. Fifth, the sin of hazardous consequences, greenwashing that hides the reality of distract and inequality the public from dangers of risk other experiences. Sixth, the sin of profits over people and environment. Scanlan (2017) describes this as the greatest sin of all. (Scanlan, 2017.)

These 'sins' were found in research done in 2017, seven years after the Terrachoice's (2010) research. Also, the focus was on a different industry (OGI), when Terrachoice focused on products that were found in products that were found in large stores in the USA and Canada. So, the different 'sins' were found in a completely different situations and fields so that the usage of them together to found greenwashing form a target has a lot to do with the target that is examined.

These four surveys gave a good look at different patterns that companies use to greenwash their product and company. The 'sins' are quite accurate, but some of them do not represent modern point of view of greenwashing. Some companies have started to give their own view on ecological product and go extremely far to protect their green image which makes it even harder to consumers recognize greenwashing. As seen in the study: "Framing and fracking: scale-shifting and greenwashing risk in the oil gas industry" by Scanlan (2017), the oil giant ExxonMobil funded organizations that supported their own agenda, questioned the science behind the research and financed their own studies concerning the claims that were made against them.

5 HOW TO FIND GREENWASHING

The meaning of this paragraph is to introduce the different ways that the sins of Scanlan (2017), the sins of Terrachoice (2010) and the transgressions of Bruno (1992) and Berrone et al. (2015) appear in the different forms of greenwashing that was mentioned in chapter 2.1 of this thesis. It will also bring out how to find if a company is doing greenwashing.

5.1 Different sins and transgressions of greenwashing found in different forms of greenwashing.

Greenwashing has surfaced in multiple ways since it was created as a term in 1986 by Jay Westervelt. The different ways that it has surfaced and the different ways the term has evolved through decades was gone through in chapter 2 of this thesis. In this part of chapter 4, it will be introduced how to find the transgression of Bruno (1992) and Berrone et al. (2015) and sins of Scanlan (2017) and Terrachoice (2010) in different forms of greenwashing.

The greenwashing that was assessed in the article of Watson (2016), where the Westinghouse nuclear power plant was accused of introducing nuclear power as ‘neat, odorless, neat and safe’ and also at the same time, it was not all those things. In this form of greenwashing, there can be seen multiple forms of greenwashing sins and transgressions. Terrachoice’s (2010) sins of hidden trade-off, hidden proof and vagueness can be seen in this kind of greenwashing. Bruno’s (1992) transgressions of dirty business and ad bluster can also be seen in this form of greenwashing. Scanlan’s (2017) sin of hazardous consequences can be seen in this form of greenwashing. So, as an overall, if a company makes such claims about something being completely safe, neat and in other just positive adjectives, that should raise the attention of consumers and other focus groups.

According to Parguel et al. (2015) and De Freitas Netto et al. (2020), whom both described executional greenwashing as using nature evoking elements in advertising to enhance the brands ecological image, but it is not a strategy. By assessing it with the sins of Terrachoice (2010), the sins of Scanlan (2017) and the transgressions of

Bruno (1992) and Berrone et al. (2015), it is easily to notice that it has perpetrated into the sin of worshipping of false labels of Terrachoice (2010), the sin of false hopes of Scanlan (2017), the transgression of ad bluster of Bruno (1992). Both of the sins and the transgression correlate with executional greenwashing. Overall, if consumer has any suspicions about seeing executional greenwashing, these are the sins and transgression that can be blamed on the companies and should be look into before purchasing this kind of product or associating with the company, if they want to stay away from greenwashing.

Baum (2012) and Tateishi (2018) description of greenwashing is based on using adjectives such as organic, green, earth-friendly, or other adjectives that do not have a proper meaning to describe products. This kind of greenwashing was divided into two main categories and these two categories by De Freitas Netto et al. (2020) (claim type and claim deceptiveness) were divided into five more categories. This kind of greenwashing is guilty of the sins of hidden trade-off, hidden proof, vagueness, irrelevance, and fibbing of Terrachoice (2010). The sin of Scanlan (2017) that can be seen in this form of greenwashing is the sin of false hopes, from the transgressions of Bruno (1992) would be the transgression of ad bluster.

The form of greenwashing that Laufer (2003) described was that a company would creatively manage their reputation with public, financial community and regulators and hide their deviance and to deflect their attributes of fault, and finally, become seek to appear in a leadership position. This kind of greenwashing is one of the worst kinds, due to the fact that the consumers can misunderstood companies with this kind of greenwash and just be satisfied with the truth that the company offers. When assessing this kind of greenwashing, there can be seen multiple sins of Scanlan (2017), Terrachoice (2010) and even some transgression of Bruno (1992). The sins that can be seen form Terrachoice (2010) are the sin of fibbing, the sin of irrelevance and the sin of hidden trade-off. Scanlan's (2017) sins that can be seen here are the sin of false hopes and the sin of hazardous consequences. The transgression of Bruno (1992) that can be seen here are dirty business and ad bluster. Considering the number of sins by Terrachoice (2010) and Scanlan (2017) transgression Bruno (1995) that is spotted in this kind of greenwashing, it can be argued that this should be one of the most noticeable forms of greenwashing.

The newest form of greenwashing is the one defined as vicarious greenwashing by Pizzetti et al. (2019), by being somewhat the combination of direct and indirect greenwashing. To look for the sins of Scanlan (2017) and Terrachoice (2010) and even the transgressions of Bruno (1992) and Berrone et al. (2015). The sins of Terrachoice (2010) and Scanlan (2017) cannot be seen in this kind of greenwashing and only the dirty business transgressions of Bruno (1992) can be found. This kind of greenwashing is hard to find and by using escape goats can make the greenwashing even harder to find.

These were the different transgressions of Bruno (1992) and Berrone et al. (2015) and sins of Terrachoice (2010) and Scanlan (2017) that were found in the different forms of greenwashing that has been mentioned in chapter 2 of this thesis.

5.2 How to find a greenwashing company

The aim on this chapter is to introduce a way that a company can be exposed if they are doing greenwashing. It is divided into three steps that go through the process of finding greenwashing companies.

The first thing to do if a company is being under the suspicion of doing greenwashing is to assess if any of the drivers that have been found with research can influence the companies actions.

According to Delmas and Burbano (2011), there are three different driver groups that drive poorly performing companies to greenwashing. All of them are driven from the pressure of lax and uncertain regulatory environment and by activists, NGO's, and media monitoring. Here are the drivers that drive poorly performing ecological companies to greenwash: Market external drivers such as consumer demand, investor demand and competitive pressure, organizational drivers, such as firm characteristics incentive structure and culture, organizational inertia, and effectiveness of infra-firm communication and nonmarket external drivers, such as optimistic bias, narrow

decision framing and hyperbolic intertemporal discounting. (Delmas & Burbano, 2011.)

According to Horiuchi, Schuchard, Shea, and Townsend, (2009), there are four different reasons that drive the increase of greenwashing. First, an increased consumer demand for environmentally responsible products, despite the economic downturn. Second increased sales of green products. Third, regulation and government action supporting environmental objectives. And the last one is the lack of federal law(s) and/or industry-wide standards governing environmental marketing claims. (Horiuchi et al., 2009.)

After assessing if the company is affected by the drivers of Horiuchi et al. (2009) and Delmas and Burbano (2011) but if none of them can be found, but the suspicion of greenwashing still remains, then the part two of this search process starts.

Second part to find greenwashing in companies is to compare the different forms of greenwashing that has been found in the past and mentioned in chapter 2.1 of this thesis to the company's attributes and different information that can be found. After that, use the different transgressions of Bruno (1992) and Berrone et al. (2015) and sins of Terrachoice (2010) and Scanlan (2017) that have been found in the different forms of greenwashing and mentioned in the chapter 4.1 of this thesis to clarify what kind of greenwashing can be found if there is any greenwashing to be found.

The third and final step is to look for the different sins of Terrachoice (2010) and Scanlan (2017) and transgressions of Bruno (1992) and Berrone et al. (2015) in a company if they have not already been found.

Overall, finding a greenwashing in a company is hard. There is always a lot of different information from different sources and there can be the usage of 'escape goats' as seen in vicarious greenwashing in the forms of suppliers (Pizzetti et al, 2019). But assessing the company's information, finding different sources where to find as much information that can be found and using the method that have been mentioned in this chapter, there is a chance to find if the company that is assessed is doing greenwashing

6 CONCLUSIONS

This is the last subject chapter of this thesis. It will go through the conclusions that can be made from the discoveries that have been found during this thesis and answers the research questions that were mentioned in chapter 1 of this thesis. It will also introduce the last subject of this thesis.

6.1 Answer to research questions

The object of this thesis was to discover ways to find company greenwashing. To achieve this object, one main research question was determined, and two sub-questions were determined.

To support the main question, there is two sub-questions. The sub-questions are:

Sub-question 1: What are the different forms that greenwashing has been found in the past?

To answer sub question 1, *What are the different forms that greenwashing has been found in the past?* there has been multiple forms of greenwashing that has been found by different researchers. The first form of greenwashing was the Watson's (2016) form. In that form, Westinghouse 's nuclear power was introducing nuclear power as 'neat, odourless, and safe' and made advertisements that claimed that their clean and safe. Even though some of the claims were true, they did not cover the whole truth. (Watson, 2018). So, the company was straight out lying to consumers.

The second form of greenwashing that was found was Laufer's (2003). This form of greenwashing was that a company, which was a greenwashing form where corporations were doing unecological things but did not want to be seen in that light and used strategies to influence the public opinions. (Laufer, 2003) So, they made themselves to be seen in leadership position and used confusion, posturing and fronting. (Laufer, 2003)

The usage of corporate advertising is linked to almost all of these, but it can be also considered one of the forms of greenwashing. These were found by Carlson et al. in 1996. This was used as the basis for Parguel et al. (2015). There is Parguel et al.'s (2015) executional greenwashing form. This means the usage of nature-evoking elements in advertisement to artificially enhance the company's brands ecological image.

The form of greenwashing that Baum (2012) and Tateishi (2017) described, the usage of words that are linked in ecologic descriptions without opening them or using them in a context that does not have description of them. De Freitas Netto et al. (2020) divided this into two segments, both with five different categories.

One of the newest forms of greenwashing that were found was vicarious greenwashing, direct greenwashing, and indirect greenwashing by Pizzetti et al. (2019). Direct greenwashing is greenwashing that happens in the company level, indirect greenwashing is misbehaviour perpetrated by a supplier who claims to be sustainable, and which results in a less negative impact on a supplied company and vicarious greenwashing is the behaviour of a supplier is in breach of a company's claims of sustainability. (Pizzetti et al., 2019)

The second sub-question is: *What are different patterns and transgressions that have found in greenwashing companies that have done greenwashing?*

The different transgression and sins or patterns were found by Terrachoice in two separate investigations, one in 2007 and one in 2010 (Terrachoice, 2007; Terrachoice, 2010). Another set of sins were found by Scanlan in 2017. The transgressions were found by Bruno in 1992, then analysed by Berrone et al. in a study published in 2015, and they also added the fifth transgression. These were all gone through in paragraph 3 of this thesis.

The transgression of Bruno (1992), Berrone et al. (2015) and sins of Scanlan (2017) were all found by assessing different attributes of companies. So, these two studies are completely focused on companies. The sins of Terrachoice (2010) were made by analysing products, but they can be also useful in finding a company greenwashing

since if product level greenwashing is to be seen, then company greenwashing can be also seen because they make the products. The main research question is:

How to find greenwashing companies?

To answer this question, this thesis determined three steps that is based on the literature that is mentioned in this thesis. This thesis argues that these steps can recognize company greenwashing.

- (1) Assesses if the drivers of greenwashing mentioned by Horiuchi et al. (2009) and Delmas and Burbano (2011) can influence the company. If none of these can be found and the suspicion of greenwashing still remains, then it should go to step 2.
- (2) Compare the different attributes and information gathered from the different forms of greenwashing that has been found by researchers for such as Laufer (2003), Baum (2012), Parguel et al. (2015). Watson (2016), Pizzetti et al. (2019), and De Freitas Netto et al. (2020), After looking though these, it can be compared to the attributes of the company. If not, any of these are found and/or some of them are, then move to step three.
- (3) After this, use the transgressions of Bruno (1992) and Berrone et al. (2015), the sins of Terrachoice (2010) and Scanlan (2017) to find the sins that have not been yet found in step 2. The different sins of Scanlan (2017) and Terrachoice (2010) and transgressions of Berrone et al. (2015) can be seen in paragraph four of this thesis.

6.2 Assessment of the reliability results, restrictions of this thesis

The research that has been done here has been done by using resources that are available to almost every student that goes to Oulu University Business School. Most of them were found by using databases that are kept by institutions that are reliable such as Oulu University. This thesis argues that the reliability of this thesis is good but not perfect due to the fact that the literature has come from a reliable source. Of course, there has to be considered if the person who has done this thesis is misinterpreted some

things. Misinterpretation can happen, because this was done by a student who has not done any academically research before this.

The result of this thesis is based on reliable sources and can be useful for companies and consumers who are suspecting if the company is doing greenwashing. The boundaries that this thesis has was the absent of access to more information due to the fact that this thesis was as a literature review as a student at Oulu University Business school. By accessing more literature, there could be more results and more diverse forms of greenwashing and possibly, even more patterns and transgressions of greenwashing.

6.3 Managerial implications

In this part of this paragraph, the managerial implications will be gone through. The managerial implications of this thesis are for the companies and consumers who suspect that companies or a company is doing greenwashing.

If they want to find greenwashing, this thesis recommends using the three steps that are mentioned before and analyse with them all the information of the company that are under the suspicion of doing greenwashing.

The findings of this thesis can also be used as a tool for companies to analyse any company that they are doing business with. It can be also by companies as a kind of certification process when starting a new business with another company.

Consumers can use the findings of this thesis to analyse any company that they are buying products from. This is also a certain kind of certification process that can be used to analyse companies.

6.4 Possible subjects for future research

This thesis argues that in because of everything that has been found in this thesis, in the future, the most common form of greenwashing is the vicarious greenwashing, executional greenwashing and the form of greenwashing that does not have a name

yet. By using the advertising greenwashing that can be seen the forms of greenwashing found by Baum (2012), De Freitas Netto et al. (2020), Carlson et al. (1996), Parguel et al. (2015) and Tateishi (2018) to influence the consumers and even take the leadership position as can be seen in the greenwashing form of Laufer (2003) but at the same time, give the consumers their own truth about the company and about their products. By doing this, companies can please the consumers who are willing to pay more for ecological products (Nielsen media, 2016) still stay ecological to themselves and charge more from their products on the basis that they are ecological (Telegraph, 2015).

This kind of greenwashing should be studied and find ways to impose company greenwashing completely. By studying different ways that companies use these greenwashing forms together, there is a chance to find new companies that have done greenwashing or are doing it.

REFERENCES

- Baum, L. M. (2012). It's not easy being green...or is it? a content analysis of environmental claims in magazine advertisements from the United States and United Kingdom. *Environmental Communication*, 6(4), 423–440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2012.724022>
- Beder, S. (2002). *Global spin: the corporate assault on environmentalism* (2nd edition). Hartford: Chelsea Green Publishing Company.
- Benz, B. (2000). Let it green: The ecoization of the lexicon. *American Speech*, 75(2), 215–221. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-75-2-215>
- Berrone, P., Fosfuri, A., & Gelabert, L. (2015). Does Greenwashing Pay Off? Understanding the Relationship Between Environmental Actions and Environmental Legitimacy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 144(2), 363–379. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2816-9>
- Bruno, K. (1997). *The World of Greenwash* (1st edition). San Francisco: CorpWatch.
- Bruno, K. (1992). *The Greenpeace Book on Greenwash* (1st edition). Amsterdam: Greenpeace.
- Carlson, L., Groves, S. T., & Kangun, N. (1996). An international comparison of environmental advertising: Substantive versus associative claims. *Journal of macromarketing*, 16, 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/027614679601600205>
- Carlson, L., Grove, S. J. & Kangun, N. (1993). A Content Analysis of Environmental Advertising Claims: A Matrix Method Approach. *Journal of advertising*, 22(3), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1993.10673409>
- Carvalho, S. W., Muralidharan, E., & Bapuji, H. (2015). Corporate Social ‘Irresponsibility’: Are Consumers’ Biases in Attribution of Blame Helping Companies in Product–Harm Crises Involving Hybrid Products? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(3), 651–663. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2258-9>
- Changing Markets foundation. (2021). Synthetics Anonymous: fashion brands’ addiction to fossil fuels. Available at: http://changingmarkets.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/SyntheticsAnonymous_FinalWeb.pdf
- Contreras-Pacheco, O. E. & Claasen, C. (2017). Fuzzy reporting as a way for a company to greenwash: Perspectives from the Colombian reality. *Problems and perspectives in management*, 15(2(c.3)), 525–535. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.15\(si\).2017.06](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.15(si).2017.06)

de Freitas Netto, S. V., Sobral, M. F. F., Ribeiro, A. R. B., & da Luz Soares, G. R. (2020). Concepts and forms of greenwashing: a systematic review. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12302-020-0300-3>

Delmas, M. A. & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The Drivers of Greenwashing. *California management review*, 54(1), 64-87. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64>

European Commission. (2022). *Climate action*. Available at https://ec.europa.eu/clima/eu-action/adaptation-climate-change/how-will-we-be-affected_en

European Commission. (2022). *Single Market for Green Products*. Available at https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/smgp/facts_and_figures_en.htm

Fortune Business Insight. (2021). *Green Technology and Sustainability Market to Hit USD 41.62 Billion by 2028; Increasing Investment to Promote Sustainable Energy Worldwide to Augment Growth: Fortune Business Insights™*. Available at: <https://www.globenewswire.com/en/news-release/2021/07/28/2270030/0/en/Green-Technology-and-Sustainability-Market-to-Hit-USD-41-62-Billion-by-2028-Increasing-Investment-to-Promote-Sustainable-Energy-Worldwide-to-Augment-Growth-Fortune-Business-Insight.html>

Grimmer, M., & Bingham, T. (2013). Company environmental performance and consumer purchase intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 1945–1953. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.02.017>

Guo, R., Zhang, W., Wang, T., Li, C. B., & Tao, L. (2018). Timely or considered? Brand trust repair strategies and mechanism after greenwashing in China—from a legitimacy perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 72, 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2018.04.001>

Horiuchi, R., Schuchard, R., Shea, L., & Townsend, S. (2009). Understanding and preventing greenwash. *Futerra sustainability communications and BSR*. Available at: https://www.bsr.org/reports/Understanding%20_Preventing_Greenwash.pdf

Laufer, W. (2003). Social Accountability and Corporate Greenwashing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 43(3), 253–261. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022962719299>

Laufer, William. S. (2002). Corporate Prosecution, cooperation, and the trading of favors. *Iowa Law Review*, 87(2), 643.

Markham, D., Khare, A. & Beckman, T. (2014). Greenwashing: A proposal to restrict its spread. *Journal of environmental assessment policy and management*, 16(4), 1-16.

Milica, Đ. & Milica, J. (2019). Productive Employment and Working Conditions as Determinants of Sustainable Economic Development in Serbia. *Studies in business and economics (Romania)*, 14(3), 84-96. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sbe-2019-0045>

National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (2022). *Overview: Weather, Global Warming and Climate Change*. Available at: <https://climate.nasa.gov/resources/global-warming-vs-climate-change/>

Ormeno, M., & Berndt, P. R. (2007). *Managing corporate brands: A new approach to corporate communications*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-8350-9599-1>

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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2014.996116>

Pizzetti, M., Gatti, L., & Seele, P. (2019). Firms Talk, Suppliers Walk: Analyzing the Locus of Greenwashing in the Blame Game and Introducing ‘Vicarious Greenwashing.’ *Journal of Business Ethics*, 170(1), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04406-2>

Porter, M. E. & Linde, C. v. d. (1995). Toward a New Conception of the Environment-Competitiveness Relationship. *The Journal of economic perspectives*, 9(4), 97-118. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.9.4.97>

Scanlan, S. J. (2017). Framing fracking: Scale-shifting and greenwashing risk in the oil and gas industry. *Local environment*, 22(11), 1311-1337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2017.1345877>

Schumck, D., Matthes, J., & Naderer, B. (2018). Misleading Consumers with Green Advertising? An Affect–Reason–Involvement Account of Greenwashing Effects in Environmental Advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 47(2), 127–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2018.1452652>

Tateishi, E. (2018). Craving gains and claiming “green” by cutting greens? An exploratory analysis of greenfield housing developments in Iskandar Malaysia. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40(3), 370–393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1355667>

Terrachoice. (2007). *The "Six Sins of Greenwashing TM " A Study of Environmental Claims in North American Consumer Markets*. Available at: https://sustainability.usask.ca/documents/Six_Sins_of_Greenwashing_nov2007.pdf

Terrachoice. (2010). *The Sins of Greenwashing home and family edition*. Available at: <http://faculty.wvu.edu/dunnc3/rprnts.TheSinsofGreenwashing2010.pdf>

The Telegraph. (2010). Green goods cost nearly 50% more. *The Telegraph* 30.5.2010

United Nations. (2022). *Climate Adaptation*. Available at: https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/climate-adaptation?gclid=CjwKCAjwo8-SBhAIEiwAopc9W4hOHipeapEOKK9NZvHEZ7OEx1vsAyYmUIONf9cse4TJ6mJqmvbFWhoCIM8QAvD_BwE

Walker, K., & Wan, F. (2012). The Harm of Symbolic Actions and Green-Washing: Corporate Actions and Communications on Environmental Performance and Their Financial Implications. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(2), 227–242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1122-4>

Watson, B. (2016). The troubling evolution of corporate greenwashing. *The Guardian*. 20.8.2016

World Economic Forum. (2020). *Nature Risk Rising: Why the Crisis Engulfing Nature Matters for Business and the Economy*. Available at: https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_New_Nature_Economy_Report_2020.pdf

World Wildlife Fund, I. (2022). *CLIMATE Create a climate-resilient and zero-carbon world, powered by renewable energy*. Available at: <https://www.worldwildlife.org/initiatives/climate>