GREENWASHING AND CONSUMER TRUST: THE ROLE OF HR POLICIES, COMPLIANCE TRAINING, AND ETHICAL CULTURE

Bushra S. P. Singh[1]
Swati Bhatia[2]

Abstract

Greenwashing, the practice of making misleading or unverified environmental claims, has become a significant ethical and strategic issue in contemporary business. Although such claims may enhance brand perception in the short term, they ultimately weaken consumer trust, damage credibility, and hinder genuine sustainability efforts. As stakeholders increasingly demand transparency and accountability, trust in environmental communication has emerged as a critical factor influencing consumer behaviour and brand loyalty.

This study examines the role of human resource (HR) management in addressing green washing through organizational policies, compliance training, and ethical culture-building. The research is based on secondary sources, integrating insights from existing literature, regulatory frameworks, and selected case studies of corporate conduct.

The analysis indicates that HR can play a preventive role by promoting sustainability awareness during recruitment and onboarding, aligning employee evaluation systems with environmental performance, and supporting secure mechanisms for reporting unethical practices. In addition, collaboration between HR, marketing, and legal teams helps ensure the accuracy of sustainability claims.

The study concludes that HR-driven ethical practices are essential for reducing greenwashing risks and strengthening long-term consumer trust.

Keywords: Greenwashing, Human Resource Management, Sustainability Communication, Consumer Trust, Ethical Culture, ESG Compliance

INTRODUCTION

Background on Sustainability as a Corporate Value Proposition

In recent decades, sustainability has emerged as a central pillar of strategic management rather than a peripheral corporate concern. In an increasingly volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) business environment, organizations are not only responding to market fluctuations but also to rapid technological advancements that are reshaping how sustainability is communicated and evaluated. Digital disruption has intensified this environment by accelerating information flows, expanding access to corporate disclosures, and increasing scrutiny from stakeholders. While digital technologies generate vast amounts of sustainability-related data—often leading to information overload and complexity—they also provide powerful tools such as artificial intelligence and data analytics to monitor, verify, and communicate environmental performance.

As a result, businesses are increasingly judged not only by the quality of their products or services but also by their environmental footprint, ethical supply chains, and contributions to social welfare (Porter & Kramer, 2011). This shift is driven by heightened expectations from investors, regulators, employees, and consumers, all of whom now demand transparent, verifiable, and digitally accessible evidence of sustainable practices (Eccles et al., 2020).

[1] Associate Professor, Gian Jyoti Institute of Management and Technology, Mohali, Punjab
[2] Professor, Asian Business School, Noida, Uttar Pradesh

The Rise of Green Consumerism and Corresponding Corporate Responses

The emergence of green consumerism—where purchase decisions are shaped by environmental and ethical considerations—has further amplified the importance of sustainability. Digital platforms and social media have empowered consumers with greater access to information, enabling them to evaluate and compare corporate sustainability claims more critically. According to NielsenIQ (2023), more than 70% of global consumers are willing to pay a premium for sustainable products.

In response, organizations have increasingly integrated sustainability into their branding, product design, and supply chain strategies. However, the same digital environment that enables transparency also creates pressures for rapid communication and competitive positioning. This has, in some cases, encouraged superficial or exaggerated sustainability claims, as firms attempt to capture consumer attention in an information-saturated marketplace.

Definition of Greenwashing

Greenwashing is broadly defined as the deliberate misrepresentation of a company's environmental practices or the benefits of its products and services (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). From a regulatory perspective, the U.S. Federal Trade Commission (FTC, 2012) identifies it as the use of deceptive or unsubstantiated environmental claims, while the European Commission (2023) describes it as providing false or misleading sustainability information.

In the context of digital disruption, greenwashing has become more complex. The rapid dissemination of information through digital channels allows misleading claims to spread quickly, but it also increases the likelihood of detection through data verification tools, watchdog organizations, and informed consumers. Thus, digitalization simultaneously amplifies the risks and consequences of greenwashing.

The Trust Gap: Why Greenwashing Damages Brand Equity and Long-Term Business Viability

Trust has become a critical asset in contemporary markets, particularly for organizations positioning themselves as sustainability-driven. Digital transparency has heightened stakeholder awareness, making it easier to identify inconsistencies between corporate claims and actual practices. When greenwashing is exposed, it leads to reputational damage, erosion of consumer trust, and potential regulatory penalties (Parguel et al., 2011).

Unlike traditional forms of misleading advertising, greenwashing carries broader ethical implications, as it undermines collective environmental goals and weakens confidence in legitimate sustainability initiatives. Over time, this erosion of trust can negatively affect brand equity, employee engagement, and stakeholder relationships, creating long-term strategic risks.

Purpose of the Study

Against this backdrop of VUCA conditions and digital disruption, this study examines the impact of greenwashing on consumer trust and corporate reputation, with a specific focus on the role of human resource (HR) policies and organizational culture in preventing such practices. It also explores how evolving global regulatory frameworks and digital accountability mechanisms are shaping corporate behaviour and sustainability communication.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study aims to achieve the following objectives:

a) To examine the impact of greenwashing on consumer trust and corporate reputation.

b) To analyze the role of human resource (HR) policies, compliance training, and ethical culture in preventing greenwashing practices.

c) To evaluate the influence of global regulatory frameworks on corporate sustainability communication and accountability.

d) To explore how HR-driven interventions can align organizational practices with authentic sustainability commitments.

Research Questions

a) How does greenwashing impact consumer trust and corporate reputation?

b) What role can HR play in preventing greenwashing?

c) How are global regulations shaping corporate practices in a digitally transparent environment?

Scope and Limitations

This research is based on secondary data, including academic literature, industry reports, regulatory documents, and case studies. While the absence of primary data limits empirical generalization, the use of diverse and credible sources enables a comprehensive and well-rounded analysis. The study adopts a global perspective, with illustrative examples primarily drawn from regions where greenwashing has been extensively documented, including North America, Europe, and Asia-Pacific.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Framework: Greenwashing Typologies

Greenwashing is a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing a range of deceptive practices that mislead stakeholders about environmental performance. Existing literature categorizes these practices into distinct typologies, including selective disclosure, misleading labels, irrelevant claims, and false certifications (Delmas & Burbano, 2011; Lyon & Montgomery, 2015; TerraChoice, 2010). While these typologies help identify the forms greenwashing may take, their significance extends beyond classification. They highlight critical intervention points within organizations, particularly in areas such as internal communication, employee training, and compliance monitoring.

From an HR perspective, these typologies underscore the need for structured policies and training programs that equip employees—especially in marketing and communications—with the ability to distinguish between substantiated and misleading claims. By embedding awareness of these practices into organizational processes, HR can play a preventive role in reducing the likelihood of misrepresentation.

Theoretical Lenses

a) Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory emphasizes that organizations must balance the expectations of diverse stakeholder groups, including consumers, investors, employees, and regulators (Freeman, 1984). In the context of greenwashing, this creates inherent tensions between sustainability commitments and profit-driven objectives. Misleading claims may offer short-term reputational gains but risk long-term damage across stakeholder groups (Furlow, 2010).

HR plays a crucial role in mediating these tensions by aligning employee incentives and performance metrics with ethical sustainability goals. By integrating stakeholder-oriented values into recruitment, appraisal, and reward systems, HR can ensure that organizational behaviour reflects broader accountability rather than narrow financial interests.

b) Legitimacy Theory

Legitimacy theory explains corporate behaviour as an effort to maintain alignment with societal norms and expectations (Suchman, 1995). Greenwashing can thus be interpreted as a symbolic strategy to project legitimacy without substantive action. However, such strategies are inherently unstable, as exposure can lead to rapid loss of credibility (Berrone et al., 2017).

This highlights the importance of internal governance mechanisms. HR contributes by fostering transparency, embedding ethical standards in organizational culture, and ensuring that employees are trained to prioritize authenticity over symbolic compliance. In this sense, HR functions as a gatekeeper of legitimacy by translating external expectations into internal practices.

c) Ethical Climate Theory

Ethical climate theory focuses on how shared organizational values influence employee decision-making (Victor & Cullen, 1988). A strong ethical climate encourages scrutiny of sustainability claims and empowers employees to question misleading practices, whereas a weak climate may normalize exaggeration or omission (Mayer et al., 2010).

HR is central to shaping this climate through leadership development, ethics training, and the establishment of safe reporting mechanisms. By promoting openness and accountability, HR can create an environment where employees actively contribute to preventing greenwashing rather than passively enabling it.

Historical Evolution of Greenwashing in Marketing and Corporate Sustainability Reporting

The evolution of greenwashing reflects broader changes in corporate communication and stakeholder expectations. Initially associated with isolated marketing practices in the 1980s, greenwashing expanded alongside the rise of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and sustainability reporting in the 1990s and early 2000s (Laufer, 2003). The proliferation of ESG frameworks in the 2010s increased both the scope of sustainability disclosures and the scrutiny surrounding them (Marquis et al., 2016).

Importantly, this evolution has implications for HR functions. As sustainability reporting becomes more integrated into organizational strategy, employees across departments—not just marketing—are involved in generating and validating ESG data. This increases the need for cross-functional training, ethical oversight, and coordination, reinforcing HR’s role in ensuring consistency and accuracy in sustainability communication.

Review of Global Regulatory Landscape

Regulatory frameworks play a critical role in shaping corporate behaviour and reducing greenwashing.

The EU Green Claims Directive mandates that environmental claims be substantiated, verifiable, and supported by life-cycle assessments (European Commission, 2023). Similarly, the FTC's Green Guides provide detailed guidance on avoiding deceptive claims, while ISO standards establish principles for credible environmental labeling (FTC, 2012; ISO, 2016).

These frameworks not only impose external accountability but also create internal organizational demands. HR must translate regulatory requirements into employee training, compliance systems, and performance expectations. This includes equipping employees with knowledge of relevant standards and ensuring that sustainability-related roles are clearly defined and monitored.

Secondary Evidence on Consumer Reactions to Greenwashing

Empirical studies consistently show that greenwashing erodes consumer trust and negatively influences purchasing behaviour (Parguel et al., 2011). It also contributes to broader scepticism toward sustainability claims, affecting even organizations with genuine environmental commitments (Nyilasy et al., 2014). In extreme cases, consumers may engage in boycotts or advocacy campaigns (Walker & Wan, 2012).

Beyond external stakeholders, greenwashing has significant internal consequences. Research indicates that employees exposed to unethical sustainability practices experience reduced morale, lower engagement, and increased turnover intentions (Hafner et al., 2021). This reinforces the importance of HR-led interventions, as maintaining employee trust and alignment is essential for sustaining authentic organizational behaviour.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative, exploratory research design based on secondary data. Given the conceptual and interpretive nature of the research problem, the study integrates a structured literature review with qualitative case analysis to examine the relationship between greenwashing, consumer trust, and the role of human resource (HR) practices.

Systematic Literature Review Approach

To ensure rigor and transparency, a structured literature review approach was followed. Relevant academic articles, reports, and regulatory documents were identified using databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Keywords including *greenwashing*, *consumer trust*, *HR practices*, *ESG compliance*, and *sustainability communication* were used to retrieve relevant studies.

Inclusion criteria comprised:

a) Peer-reviewed journal articles and credible institutional reports
b) Studies published primarily in the last two decades
c) Literature addressing greenwashing, sustainability reporting, or HR's role in ethical governance

Exclusion criteria included**:**

a) Non-scholarly sources lacking empirical or theoretical grounding
b) Studies not directly related to sustainability communication or organizational practices

The selected literature was then thematically analyzed to identify recurring patterns, theoretical linkages, and research gaps.

Qualitative Case Study Method

The study incorporates multiple case study analysis to provide contextual insights into organizational practices. Two contrasting cases were selected using purposive sampling:

a) A positive case demonstrating ethical sustainability practices (e.g., Patagonia)
b) A negative case illustrating greenwashing and governance failure (e.g., Volkswagen Dieselgate)

Case Analysis Framework

Each case was analyzed using the following dimensions:

a) Nature of sustainability claims
b) Role of HR policies and ethical culture
c) Presence or absence of compliance training and whistleblower mechanisms
d) Alignment between stated and actual practices
e) Impact on consumer trust and corporate reputation

This structured approach ensures analytical consistency and enables cross-case comparison.

Analytical Technique

A thematic analysis was employed to synthesize findings from both literature and case studies. Key themes included:

a) Typologies of greenwashing
b) HR interventions and ethical climate
c) Regulatory influence on corporate behaviour
d) Consumer and employee responses

The integration of theoretical insights with case-based evidence allowed for a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

THE HR DIMENSION OF GREENWASHING

Internal Ethics Policies

a) Codes of Conduct Related to Sustainability

Human Resource (HR) departments play instrumental role in embedding sustainability principles into the ethical framework of organizations. A well-developed code of conduct serves as the foundation for preventing greenwashing by explicitly stating acceptable practices regarding environmental communication and marketing. These codes often include clear guidelines on the accuracy of sustainability claims, the need for evidence-based communication, and the avoidance of misleading terminology (Kaptein, 2011). Incorporating sustainability into the organizational code of conduct ensures that employees at all levels understand the boundaries of ethical environmental communication. Furthermore, when these codes are widely disseminated and reinforced through onboarding and internal communications, they serve as a daily reminder of the company’s commitment to integrity in sustainability reporting (Weaver et al., 1999).

b) Integration into Performance Metrics and KPIs

Beyond policy statements, sustainability ethics must be operationalized through measurable performance indicators. HR can work with sustainability and marketing teams to integrate environmental integrity metrics into performance appraisals and key performance indicators (KPIs). For example, managers may be evaluated on their adherence to verified sustainability reporting standards or their ability to meet environmental targets without exaggeration in public claims (Epstein & Buhovac, 2014). Such integration ensures that employees' career progression is linked to both environmental performance and truthfulness, reducing incentives for misrepresentation.

Compliance Training

a) Employee Awareness Programs to Detect and Prevent Misleading Claims

Greenwashing prevention requires employees to be both informed and vigilant. HR-led compliance training can equip staff—especially those in marketing, sales, and public relations—with the skills to identify potentially misleading environmental claims before they reach the public domain (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). These initiatives include case studies of greenwashing scandals, practical exercises in claim verification, and guidance on consulting legal or sustainability experts when in doubt. Regular refresher training reinforces knowledge and secures that employees remain aware of evolving regulatory and industry standards.

b) Training in ESG Reporting Standards

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) reporting is increasingly recognized as a crucial area where greenwashing can occur if claims are not supported by verifiable data (Ioannou & Serafeim, 2017). HR departments can collaborate with sustainability officers to ensure employees responsible for data collection and reporting receive targeted training on relevant frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), and ISO environmental labeling standards. Familiarity with these standards helps staff produce transparent, comparable, and credible sustainability disclosures, mitigating the risk of unintentional misrepresentation.

Corporate Culture Development

a) Encouraging a Culture of Transparency and Accountability

Corporate culture serves as a safeguard against unethical practices, including greenwashing. A culture that prioritizes transparency encourages employees to raise concerns about misleading claims without threat of retribution (Treviño et al., 1998). HR can facilitate this by establishing confidential reporting channels, whistleblower protections, and recognition programs for employees who identify and prevent unethical practices. Transparency in decision-making—particularly in sustainability-related communications—signals to employees that the organization values honesty over short-term reputational gains.

b) Leadership's Role in Role-Modelling Ethical Behaviour

Leadership behaviour sets the tone for the entire organization. When senior leaders visibly commit to accurate and substantiated sustainability claims, they model the behavioural standards applicable to all employees (Brown et al., 2005). HR can support leaders by integrating ethics-based leadership development programs, emphasizing the long-term reputational benefits of integrity in sustainability communication. Leaders who actively engage in sustainability initiatives, verify public claims, and encourage open dialogue about environmental performance contribute to a culture that resists the pressures leading to greenwashing.

c) Link between Employee Engagement and Authentic Sustainability Practices

Authentic sustainability practices not only prevent greenwashing but also enhance employee engagement. Research indicates that employees are more motivated and committed when they perceive their organization as genuinely aligned with their environmental values (Glavas &Piderit, 2009). Conversely, the discovery of deceptive sustainability claims can demoralize staff, erode trust in leadership, and increase turnover intentions (Hafner et al., 2021). HR's role is therefore twofold: ensuring the authenticity of sustainability initiatives and communicating these efforts internally so that employees feel proud to be associated with their organization's environmental performance. By aligning employee values with corporate sustainability actions, HR can foster a workforce that serves as an authentic ambassador of the brand's environmental commitments.

CASE STUDIES AND SECONDARY DATA ANALYSIS

Positive Example: Patagonia – HR-Led Ethical Culture to Prevent Greenwashing

Patagonia, the outdoor apparel company, has long been cited as an exemplar of sustainability-driven corporate culture. Rather than relying solely on marketing claims, Patagonia embeds environmental ethics into its organizational DNA through HR policies, recruitment strategies, and employee training. From the outset, new hires are introduced to the company's "Don't Buy This Jacket" campaign, which openly encourages consumers to purchase only what they need—an unconventional message that underscores authenticity in sustainability (Chouinard & Stanley, 2012).

HR plays a central role by integrating sustainability performance into annual appraisals and through hiring individuals whose personal values reflect the company's purpose. Patagonia's training programs include environmental impact literacy, product lifecycle awareness, and guidance on truthful sustainability communication (B Corps, 2023). These measures ensure that all departments, from product design to marketing, speak a consistent and evidence-backed sustainability language. Importantly, Patagonia invests in transparency by publishing its supply chain data through the "Footprint Chronicles," enabling public scrutiny and reinforcing trust (Patagonia, 2023).

The result is a high degree of consumer trust and loyalty, supported by employees who act as authentic ambassadors for the brand. By embedding sustainability ethics into corporate culture via HR, Patagonia avoids the reputational risks associated with greenwashing.

Negative Example: Volkswagen Dieselgate – HR and Ethical Oversight Failures

The Volkswagen (VW) Dieselgate scandal, revealed in 2015, remains one of the leading examples of corporate greenwashing. VW falsely marketed its diesel vehicles as "clean" and environmentally friendly, when in reality, the cars were fitted with defeat devices to cheat emissions tests (Hotten, 2015). This deception not only violated environmental regulations but also shattered consumer trust globally.

From an HR perspective, Dieselgate reflects a failure in fostering a culture of ethical accountability. Investigations revealed that while some employees were aware of the defeat devices, internal reporting mechanisms were ineffective, and fear of reprisal discouraged whistleblowing (Rhodes, 2016). HR had not implemented robust ethics training on environmental compliance, nor were sustainability KPIs embedded in performance evaluations. Furthermore, the lack of cross-departmental oversight between engineering, compliance, and HR created gaps in accountability, allowing deceptive practices to continue for years.

The repercussions were grave: VW was subjected to fines totalling billions, senior executive resignations, and long-term reputational damage. Employee morale also suffered, particularly among those who joined the company because of its claimed commitment to innovation and environmental stewardship (Ewing, 2017).

Lessons Learned from Each Case in Relation to HR Interventions

From Patagonia:

a) Align recruitment with corporate sustainability values to ensure cultural fit.

b) Integrate sustainability ethics into job descriptions, KPIs, and appraisals.

c) Offer regular training on truthful communication of sustainability practices.

d) Promote transparency through publicly accessible supply chain and impact data.

From Volkswagen:

a) Develop and enforce stringent whistleblower protections to encourage reporting of unethical practices.

b) Incorporate sustainability compliance into mandatory training for all employees, including technical staff.

c) Embed environmental ethics into leadership performance metrics to ensure top-level accountability.

d) Strengthen cross-functional collaboration between HR, compliance, and operational departments to detect and address unethical practices early.

Table 1: Cross-Case Comparison of HR Interventions and Greenwashing Outcomes

Aspect	Patagonia (Positive)	Volkswagen Dieselgate (Negative)
HR Integration of Sustainability	Fully embedded in recruitment, onboarding, and KPIs.	Minimal integration; no sustainability-linked KPIs.
Ethics Training	Regular, mandatory training on environmental claims and impact literacy.	Inadequate; limited focus on environmental compliance ethics.
Transparency Mechanisms	Public disclosure of supply chain and impact data via “Footprint Chronicles.”	Secrecy surrounding emissions practices; no proactive transparency.
Whistleblower Protections	Encouraged through supportive culture and confidential channels.	Weak protections; fear of retaliation discouraged reporting.
Leadership Commitment	Senior leaders actively promote sustainability authenticity.	Leadership implicated in misleading environmental claims.
Outcome	High consumer trust, strong brand loyalty, and enhanced reputation.	Severe reputational damage, financial penalties, and loss of consumer trust.

The contrast between Patagonia and Volkswagen shown in table 1 underscores the decisive role HR can play in preventing greenwashing. When HR actively promotes ethical culture, integrates sustainability into employee evaluation, and ensures transparency, the organization avoids regulatory penalties as well as builds deep-rooted trust. Conversely, neglecting these HR-driven safeguards can allow deceptive practices to flourish, with devastating consequences for brand equity and employee engagement.

GLOBAL REGULATORY AND INDUSTRY RESPONSES

Overview of Penalties and Enforcement Actions against Greenwashing

In recent years, regulatory bodies worldwide have intensified scrutiny of greenwashing, resulting in substantial financial penalties and reputational consequences for offending companies. In the European Union (EU), the proposed *Green Claims Directive* decrees that any environmental claim be substantiated by evidence, such as life-cycle analyses, and verified by independent auditors (European Commission, 2023). Under this framework, companies making unverified claims could incur fines of up to 4% of annual turnover in the relevant member state, alongside potential bans on the products in question.

In the United States, enforcement actions under the *Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) Green Guides* have led to multiple settlements. For example, several retailers were fined for falsely marketing textiles as bamboo when they were actually rayon, a violation that misled consumers about the product's environmental attributes (FTC, 2022). Australia's Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) has also pursued enforcement actions, recently initiating investigations into major fashion brands suspected of overstating sustainability credentials (ACCC, 2023). These enforcement examples highlight that regulators are increasingly prepared to impose sanctions, not merely issue warnings.

The reputational damage often exceeds the financial penalties. Once a greenwashing claim is exposed, media coverage, public backlash, and social media activism can cause lasting harm, eroding consumer trust and diminishing brand value (Walker & Wan, 2012).

Role of Industry Bodies

Beyond formal regulation, several global industry bodies play a proactive role in promoting authentic sustainability communication and discouraging greenwashing.

a) United Nations Global Compact (UNGC)

The UNGC encourages companies to align their strategies with ten universally accepted principles in the areas of human rights, labor, environment, and anti-corruption (UN Global Compact, 2022). While participation is voluntary, companies must submit annual *Communication on Progress* reports, which include environmental performance disclosures. Non-compliance or repeated failure to submit credible reports can result in delisting.

b) World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

The WBCSD provides a framework for companies to collaborate on sustainability initiatives and develop industry-specific guidelines for credible environmental claims (WBCSD, 2021). Through its *Reporting Exchange*, the WBCSD offers a global database of ESG disclosure requirements, assisting companies in aligning their reporting with regulatory expectations and best practices.

c) Other Voluntary Standards

Standards such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) also function as soft-regulatory mechanisms, encouraging transparency and providing frameworks that reduce the risk of unsubstantiated claims. Although not legally enforceable, adherence to these standards is increasingly expected by investors, NGOs, and consumers.

d) Corporate Self-Regulation vs. Government Oversight

Corporate self-regulation offers flexibility and can drive innovation in sustainability reporting, but it has inherent limitations. Self-regulatory codes—such as corporate sustainability charters—rely on voluntary compliance, which can be undermined by competitive pressures or short-term profit motives (Berrone et al., 2017). Without independent verification, these self-imposed standards carry the danger of appearing more ceremonial than substantive.

Government oversight, on the other hand, provides enforceable rules and legal consequences for non-compliance, creating a deterrent effect. However, excessive regulation can be resource-intensive for both companies and regulators, and may lead to a compliance-focused rather than innovation-driven approach to sustainability (Lyon & Montgomery, 2015).

An emerging hybrid model blends these approaches. For example, in the EU, regulators require adherence to certain environmental marketing standards but encourage companies to adopt recognized voluntary frameworks like GRI to exceed minimum compliance. This balance between flexibility and enforceability is critical for preventing greenwashing while promoting continuous improvement in sustainability practices.

Impact of Regulations on HR Policies and Compliance Training Requirements

Regulatory tightening carries immediate consequences for human resource operations, notably in relation to compliance training and ethical culture development.

First, HR departments must incorporate regulatory awareness into employee onboarding and ongoing training. For instance, marketing teams should be trained in the specifics of the FTC Green Guides, the EU Green Claims Directive, or local consumer protection laws applicable to environmental claims (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). This provides assurance that all employees involved in product development, branding, and communication understand both the legal and ethical boundaries.

Second, HR must integrate sustainability compliance into job descriptions and performance evaluations. Employees whose roles involve ESG data collection, analysis, and disclosure—such as sustainability officers or communications managers—should have clear accountability for accuracy and transparency. These expectations can be reinforced through KPIs linked to verified sustainability outcomes rather than marketing reach or campaign success alone (Epstein & Buhovac, 2014).

Third, regulations necessitate stronger whistleblower protection frameworks. Employees need safe channels to report suspected greenwashing without fear of retaliation, aligning with both legal requirements and ethical standards (Treviño et al., 1998). This is particularly important in preventing the type of internal culture failures seen in cases such as Volkswagen's Dieselgate, where a lack of safe reporting mechanisms allowed unethical practices to persist.

Lastly, regulatory compliance often requires cross-functional collaboration, with HR serving as the coordinator between legal, marketing, operations, and sustainability teams. By fostering a shared understanding of regulatory requirements, HR helps verify that environmental claims are consistent across all corporate communications, reducing the likelihood of inadvertent greenwashing.

STRATEGIES FOR HR TO PREVENT GREENWASHING

Integrating Sustainability Literacy into Recruitment and Onboarding

The prevention of greenwashing begins with engaging personnel who not only possess the technical skills required for their roles but also illustrate a strong commitment to sustainability values. HR departments can integrate sustainability literacy assessments into recruitment processes by including interview questions or scenario-based exercises that test a candidate's understanding of environmental ethics and regulatory standards (Renwick et al., 2013). This approach ensures cultural alignment from the outset, reducing the risk of misaligned values that could lead to unethical practices.

During onboarding, sustainability literacy can be embedded through structured training sessions that outline the organization's sustainability policies, relevant regulations (such as the EU Green Claims Directive or FTC Green Guides), and examples of both ethical and unethical environmental communication (Epstein & Buhovac, 2014). By introducing these topics early, HR sets the obligation that all employees are custodians of the company's environmental integrity, not just those in sustainability or marketing roles.

Linking ESG Performance to Employee Rewards and Appraisals

To translate sustainability goals into everyday practices, HR may incorporate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) performance metrics into employee evaluation and reward systems. For example, marketing staff could be evaluated on their ability to produce substantiated sustainability claims, while product teams might be assessed on their success in meeting eco-design targets without exaggeration in promotional materials (Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017).

Incentives such as bonuses, promotions, and public recognition tied to verified ESG outcomes reinforce the message that ethical sustainability communication is a valued organizational objective (Kiron et al., 2013). Linking compensation to ESG performance re-orients priorities from strictly financial outcomes toward a more balanced scorecard that values trust-building and reputational capital alongside profitability.

Encouraging Whistle blowing and Safe Reporting Channels

Whistleblower protection is a cornerstone of ethical governance, particularly in preventing greenwashing. HR can implement confidential reporting mechanisms—such as anonymous hotlines or secure digital platforms—where employees can raise concerns about misleading environmental claims without fear of retaliation (Kaptein, 2011).

To make these channels effective, HR must actively promote them, train employees on how to use them, and ensure timely investigation of reported issues. This aligns with ethical climate theory, implying that employees are more likely to report unethical practices in organizations where ethical behaviour is consistently reinforced by leadership and supported by institutional safeguards (Victor & Cullen, 1988).

Strong whistleblower systems not only detect potential greenwashing before it becomes a public scandal but also foster a climate of accountability and trust internally, signaling that management values transparency over image management.

Partnering with Marketing and Legal Departments to Validate Claims

Greenwashing often arises from a disconnect between marketing ambitions and factual sustainability performance. HR can mitigate this risk by facilitating cross-departmental collaboration between marketing, legal, compliance, and sustainability teams. Regular interdepartmental review sessions can be instituted where all sustainability claims—whether in advertising, product labeling, or corporate reports—are vetted for accuracy and compliance with relevant laws and standards (Delmas & Burbano, 2011).

By positioning HR as the coordinator of these processes, the organization guarantees that employees are held to a consistent standard of truthfulness. Moreover, HR can include cross-functional sustainability workshops that convene professionals from different departments to build shared understanding and mutual accountability (Benn et al., 2015).

Building Cross-Functional Sustainability Committees

Creating sustainability committees with cross-departmental representation can institutionalize the prevention of greenwashing. These committees, composed of representatives from HR, marketing, legal, operations, and sustainability departments, act as governance bodies that oversee environmental claims, track performance metrics, and review compliance risks (Lozano, 2013).

HR's role is critical in selecting members with the appropriate expertise, facilitating committee meetings, and ensuring decisions are communicated organization-wide. These committees may also play the role of a forum for discussing emerging sustainability trends, regulatory changes, and stakeholder expectations, allowing the company to proactively adapt its communication strategies.

Furthermore, the committee model aligns with stakeholder theory by ensuring that multiple perspectives—internal and external—are considered before environmental claims are made public (Freeman, 1984). This collaborative structure not only reduces the risk of greenwashing but also enhances the credibility and depth of sustainability messaging.

By embedding sustainability literacy into recruitment, linking ESG metrics to rewards, safeguarding whistleblowers, fostering cross-departmental collaboration, and institutionalizing oversight through sustainability committees, HR can play a transformative role in preventing greenwashing. Collectively, these strategies guarantee that sustainability commitments are not merely authentic but also consistently reinforced through organizational systems and culture.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Brief of Core Findings

This paper examined greenwashing as both an ethical and strategic challenge, with special emphasis on the role of human resource (HR) management in its prevention. The literature review revealed that greenwashing manifests in multiple forms—such as selective disclosure, misleading labels, irrelevant claims, and false certifications—which undermine consumer trust and corporate legitimacy (Delmas & Burbano, 2011; TerraChoice, 2010). Theoretical perspectives, including stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, and ethical climate theory, provided frameworks for understanding how and why organizations engage in misleading sustainability communication.

Case studies highlighted the stark contrast between companies like Patagonia, which integrates sustainability into its HR policies and culture to maintain authenticity, and Volkswagen, where the absence of strong ethical safeguards and reporting mechanisms contributed to a large-scale greenwashing scandal (Chouinard & Stanley, 2012; Rhodes, 2016). Regulatory developments such as the EU Green Claims Directive, FTC Green Guides, and ISO environmental labeling standards have increased pressure on companies to substantiate environmental claims, with industry bodies like the UN Global Compact and WBCSD offering voluntary frameworks to guide compliance.

HR's Central Role in Ethical Sustainability Communication

Findings consistently underscore HR's pivotal role in preventing greenwashing. HR departments shape recruitment, training, performance management, and corporate culture—all of which influence the accuracy and integrity of sustainability communication (Renwick et al., 2013). By integrating sustainability literacy into hiring, linking ESG performance to appraisals, protecting whistleblowers, and fostering cross-functional collaboration, HR can ensure that sustainability commitments are authentic and consistent across the organization.

Policy Recommendations for Companies and HR Departments

a) Embed Sustainability into HR Systems – Align job descriptions, recruitment criteria, and performance metrics with environmental ethics and verified sustainability goals.

b) Mandatory Compliance Training – Implement regular, role-specific training on environmental regulations, ESG reporting standards, and ethical communication.

c) Whistleblower Protections – Establish confidential reporting channels and guarantee protection from retaliation to encourage early reporting of unethical practices.

d) Cross-Functional Oversight – Create sustainability committees involving HR, marketing, legal, and operations to review and validate all public environmental claims.

e) Transparent Reporting – Publicly disclose verifiable environmental performance data, and ensure that employees understand the value of transparency in building trust.

Directions for Future Research

While this study relied exclusively on secondary data, future research could investigate how emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence (AI), can assist in detecting greenwashing. AI tools capable of scanning sustainability reports, marketing materials, and supply chain data for inconsistencies could provide an additional layer of oversight (Lyon & Montgomery, 2015). Subsequent studies could also examine employee perceptions of corporate sustainability communication and how these perceptions influence engagement, retention, and advocacy. Longitudinal studies comparing organizations with robust HR-led sustainability cultures to those without may generate a deeper understanding of the long-term reputational and financial impacts of greenwashing prevention strategies.

Final Reflection

Preventing greenwashing is not solely the responsibility of marketing or compliance teams; it is a cross-organizational effort in which HR occupies a strategic position. By weaving in crucial ethical sustainability practices into the fabric of the organization—through policies, culture, and performance systems—HR can help ensure that environmental claims are accurate, verifiable, and trusted. In doing so, companies not only safeguard their reputations but also contribute meaningfully to worldwide sustainability objectives.

REFERENCES

1. Australian Competition and Consumer Commission. (2023). *ACCC to investigate greenwashing in fashion industry*. https://www.accc.gov.au
2. B Corps. (2023). *Case study: Patagonia*. Certified B Corporation. https://bcorporation.net
3. Baumgartner, R. J., & Rauter, R. (2017). Strategic perspectives of corporate sustainability management to develop a sustainable organization. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 140*(1), 81–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.04.146
4. Benn, S., Edwards, M., & Williams, T. (2015). *Organizational change for corporate sustainability* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
5. Berrone, P., Fosfuri, A., & Gelabert, L. (2017). 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
6. Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 97*(2), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002
7. 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
8. Cherry, M. A., &Sneirson, J. F. (2011). Beyond profit: Rethinking corporate social responsibility and greenwashing after the BP oil disaster. *Tulane Law Review, 85*(4), 983–1038.
9. Chouinard, Y., & Stanley, V. (2012). *The responsible company: What we've learned from Patagonia's first 40 years*. Patagonia Books.
10. 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
11. Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2020). The impact of a corporate culture of sustainability on corporate behaviour and performance. *Harvard Business School Research Working Paper*, (12-035). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1964011
12. Epstein, M. J., &Buhovac, A. R. (2014). *Making sustainability work: Best practices in managing and measuring corporate social, environmental and economic impacts* (2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
13. European Commission. (2023). Proposal for a Directive on substantiation and communication of explicit environmental claims. https://environment.ec.europa.eu
14. Ewing, J. (2017). *Faster, higher, farther: The Volkswagen scandal*. W. W. Norton & Company.
15. Federal Trade Commission. (2012). *FTC green guides*. https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/media-resources/truth-advertising/green-guides
16. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
17. Furlow, N. E. (2010). Greenwashing in the new millennium. *The Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, *10*(6), 22–25.
18. Glavas, A., &Piderit, S. K. (2009). How does doing good matter? Effects of corporate citizenship on employees. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship, 2009*(36), 51–70. https://doi.org/10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2009.wi.00008
19. Hafner, S., Jones, A., Anger-Kraavi, A., & Paim, M. A. (2021). The impact of greenwashing on employees: A systematic review. *Journal of Business Ethics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-05019-0
20. Hotten, R. (2015, December 10). Volkswagen: The scandal explained. *BBC News*. https://www.bbc.com/news/business-34324772
21. International Organization for Standardization. (2016). *ISO 14020: Environmental labels and declarations – General principles*. ISO.
22. Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2017). The consequences of mandatory corporate sustainability reporting: Evidence from four countries. *Harvard Business School Research Working Paper*, (11-100). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1799589

23. Kaptein, M. (2011). Toward effective codes: Testing the relationship with unethical behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics, 99*(2), 233–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0652-5

24. Kiron, D., Kruschwitz, N., Haanaes, K., &Velken, I. (2013). Sustainability's next frontier: Walking the talk on sustainability issues. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 54*(4), 69–76.

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

26. Lozano, R. (2013). A holistic perspective on corporate sustainability drivers. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 20*(2), 82–106. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1296

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

28. Marquis, C., Toffel, M. W., & Zhou, Y. (2016). Scrutiny, norms, and selective disclosure: A global study of greenwashing. *Organization Science, 27*(2), 483–504. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.1039

29. Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., & Greenbaum, R. L. (2010). Examining the link between ethical leadership and employee misconduct: The mediating role of ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0794-0

30. NielsenIQ. (2023). *The rise of sustainable consumers*. https://nielseniq.com

31. Nyilasy, G., Gangadharbatla, H., & Paladino, A. (2014). Greenwashing: A consumer perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 125*(4), 693–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1944-3

32. Parguel, B., Benoît-Moreau, F., &Larceneux, F. (2011). How sustainability ratings might deter 'greenwashing': A closer look at ethical corporate communication. *Journal of Business Ethics, 102*(1), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0901-2

33. Patagonia. (2023). *The footprint chronicles*. https://www.patagonia.com/our-footprint

34. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review, 89*(1/2), 62–77.

35. Renwick, D. W. S., Redman, T., & Maguire, S. (2013). Green human resource management: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 15*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00328.x

36. Rhodes, C. (2016). Democratic business ethics: Volkswagen's emissions scandal and the disruption of corporate sovereignty. *Organization Studies, 37*(10), 1501–1518. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616655499

37. Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331

38. TerraChoice. (2010). *The sins of greenwashing: Home and family edition*. https://sinsofgreenwashing.com

39. Treviño, L. K., Butterfield, K. D., & McCabe, D. L. (1998). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behaviours. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 8*(3), 447–476. https://doi.org/10.2307/3857431

40. UN Global Compact. (2022). *The ten principles of the UN Global Compact*. https://www.unglobalcompact.org

41. Victor, B., & Cullen, J. B. (1988). The organizational bases of ethical work climates. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33*(1), 101–125. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392857

42. Walker, K., & Wan, F. (2012). The harm of symbolic actions and greenwashing: 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

43. Weaver, G. R., Treviño, L. K., & Cochran, P. L. (1999). Corporate ethics programs as control systems: Influences of executive commitment and environmental factors. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(1), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.5465/256873

44. World Business Council for Sustainable Development. (2021). *Reporting exchange: A global resource for ESG disclosure*. https://www.wbcsd.org