



## Exploresearch

Impact Factor (Cosmos: 6.262& I2OR: 3.585)

© Copyright by MGM Publishing House (MGMPH)

www.mgmpublications.com



# From Green Sheen to Genuine Impact: Understanding Insights of Consumer towards Sustainability in Cause Marketing

Dr. Bidisha Lahkar Das<sup>1\*</sup> & Dr. Priya Mahanta Das<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of BBA, Gauhati Commerce College, Guwahati, Assam.

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, NERIM Group of Institutions, Guwahati, Assam.

\*Corresponding author: bidisha\_l@rediffmail.com

*Citation:* Das, B., & Das, P. (2026). From Green Sheen to Genuine Impact: Understanding Insights of Consumer towards Sustainability in Cause Marketing. *Exploresearch*, 03(01), 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.62823/ExRe/2026/03/01.162>

### Article History:

**Received:**14 February 2026

**Revised:**28 February 2026

**Accepted:**03 March 2026

**Published:**08 March 2026

### Keywords:

Cause marketing, Social Responsibility, Green Sheen, Sustainability, Marketing.

**Abstract:** Cause marketing is a marketing strategy initiated by business houses where companies show their social responsibility by contributing towards various causes including environment sustainability. Green sheen also known as greenwashing is an ambiguous marketing strategy where business houses deceitfully depict their goods, services and policies as ecologically sound often utilising uncertain claims without actual sustainable practices. The present study tries to understand if the consumers can differentiate between the false claims made by the companies and the genuine initiatives. It also attempts to find the outcome of genuine sustainability efforts upon consumers' trust, brand loyalty and intention to make future purchases. As communication, transparency and third-party authentication in sustainable claims are very important, the study also tries to find their impact upon shaping consumer perception. A total of 110 respondents participated in the survey which has been conducted to fulfil the objectives laid down. Structured close ended questionnaire has been administered to understand the consumers insights. SPSS software has been used to analyse the collected data using statistical tools like paired t test, correlation and regression. The findings of the study conclude that consumers are able to differentiate between green sheen and genuine sustainability efforts in cause marketing. Certification and third-party authentication play an important role in shaping consumer perception. Although genuine claims of sustainability affect consumers insights but they sceptical to those brands who use vague terms of sustainability. also has an important role to play.

### Introduction

When businesses align themselves with certain relevant issues or beliefs and design their advertising campaign accordingly, it is known as cause marketing. It is a useful tactic to bring not only

awareness to a cause but also show social responsibility of the business. In most of the cases the business organization partners with a non-profit organization to carry out the campaign. During the process both the parties extract benefits from the association. Associating with a relevant social cause enhances the goodwill of the business and helps in building a reputation. For the NGOs, this kind of association helps in bringing awareness.

Cause-related marketing (CRM) initiatives have become an important part of the marketing initiatives of business houses. It has gain support from all the stakeholders of businesses. CRM helps companies to connect with their consumers and acts as an important part of the CSR initiatives of the business forms.

Brown and Dacin (1997) opined that when business houses associate themselves with a cause relevant to the society, it affects consumers perception on products and services offered by the corporation.

Varadarajan and Manon (1998) have defined Cause Related Marketing as, "The process of formulating and implementing marketing activities that are characterized by an offer from the firm to contribute a specified amount to a designated cause when customers engage in revenue producing exchanges that satisfy organizational and individual objectives.

Adkins (2000) added that since the beginning of the CRM, the number of associations between business houses and charitable organizations have increased. Adkin also added that CRM strategy helps in increasing the goodwill, reputation and trust as well as helps in increasing sales and profits of the organization.

Recently it has been found that business houses have started aligning their marketing campaigns with various environmental and social causes giving more importance to sustainability to connect with morally alert consumers. With the growing prevalence, concern and need for sustainability as well as the pressure and competition to meet the sustainability objectives, many business houses have also opted for green sheen also known as green washing. Sajid et al., (2024) forwarded the view that green sheen or greenwashing practices are becoming very common among business houses to establishing themselves as being sustainable. Gatti et al. (2019) suggest that the issue of green sheen can be addressed promptly by initiating steps like establishing industry-wide codes of practice and enforceable CSR standards. Mateo-Márquez et al. (2022) also argued that inescapable environmental declaration would help in averting greenwashing practices. Greenwashing is a marketing tactic where the business houses try to deceive the consumers by making misleading or sometimes false claims by making the consumers believe that their products and services are environment and eco-friendly and they claim that the investment made by the consumers will be utilized for the good of the environment. While some companies adopt sustainability primarily as a branding strategy to gain goodwill and attract consumers whereas others practice sustainability genuinely and implant it into their operations and values. Glavas et al., (2023); Mangini et al., (2020); Yu et al., (2020) opined that unethical practices like greenwashing have short-term benefits and its long-term impact upon the society and environment is harmful. Ghitti et al., (2023) opined that identification of greenwashing practices remains one of the complex problems. The present investigation thus tries to understand the insight of a consumer with regard to sustainability in cause marketing with special attention to green sheen and authentic impact.

### **Literature Review**

Julia Adamkiewicz, Ewa Kochańska, Iwona Adamkiewicz (December 2022) highlighted about the fashion industry's use of green washing. It has been stated that businesses must reassure consumers about their goods by offering clear proof that the company adheres to moral standards. The consumer decision-making process must first be redefined from an emotional model to an analytical one based on the logical assessment of the consumer's demands in order to prevent the negative impacts of drugs utilized by the fashion industry. Achieving this awareness-raising goal is essential, as is tightly regulating the various greenwashing techniques such as green labels and somewhat ambiguous certification schemes used by fashion corporations.

R. Kavitha and N. Senthil Kumar (September 2023) examined about how green perceived risk and green skepticism function as mediators in the relationship between greenwashing and sustainable behaviour, as well as how these mediators influence one another in a sequential manner. Since individuals today rely entirely on technology in their daily life, the study had targeted customers who had bought eco-friendly devices from malls and other electronic retailers. The findings show that green

perceived risk and green skepticism mediated the negative relationship between green washing and sustainable behaviour, and that these mediators had a sequential effect on both green washing and sustainable behaviour. The study has suggested the companies to include transparency into green products without using greenwashing as nowadays, consumers are aware of greenwashing and have begun to look into it. It has been stated that transparency would boost consumer confidence in green products and lower their perceptions of risk and skepticism.

Elena Bausa and Stefanie Fella (May 2024) attempted to determine whether consumers could detect greenwashing in the products they purchased. According to the study, respondents do not identify greenwashed products, despite their preference for both green and non-green products. According to the survey, consumers are only aware of two categories—green and non-green—instead of the three i.e. green, non-green, and greenwashed. Customers' reported ideas about greenwashing indicate that they barely ever consider it when asked about their buying intentions. Therefore, merely shifting customers' attention to a product's greenness doesn't seem to be enough to effectively identify greenwashing.

Sumit Sharma and Anjani Kumar (November 2024), stated in their study that, the majority of customers are concerned about environmental sustainability and are aware of green products, green marketing, and green washing. Nowadays, consumers are well aware of a variety of greenwashing techniques, including packaging eco-friendly products without using sustainable procedures, presenting ambiguous or deceptive environmental claims and concealing or omitting crucial information. In order to prevent greenwashing, the study has suggested that consumers should observe and confirm terms like eco-friendly, organic, carbon neutral, sustainable, etc. as they may be misleading. They should also seek for eco-labels and Third-Party Certifications. Additionally, marketers should analyze a product's life cycle, examining about how each product affects the environment, be ethical and transparent, and convey the relevant information in the appropriate manner. Finally, by punishing offenders and raising awareness, the appropriate authorities should guarantee stringent adherence to and execution of regulations.

Dr. Santosh Kumar Pandey, Prof. (Dr.) Bhagwan Jagwani, Dr. Rita Singh Rathore, Dr. Nirvikar Katiyar, Dr. Alok Kumar Sahu, Mr. Shiv Sagar Vishwakarma (June 2025) stated in their study that businesses who indulge in green washing and those that are genuinely devoted to sustainability have quite different marketing strategies. Green washing, which is characterized by deceptive and vague environmental promises, has been said to pose serious problems for both customers and companies. According to the study, improving consumer education on green sheen can help mitigate its effects and promote better informed decision-making. Furthermore, regulatory actions are also crucial in the fight against green washing. It has been mentioned that, stricter regulations and enforcement procedures can guarantee the validity and significance of sustainability claims. Thus, along with consumer awareness, governments, business executives, and consumer advocacy organizations must work together to create sensible laws and advance sustainable marketing best practices.

Himani and Dr. Ravi Kant (August 2025) attempted to determine consumer awareness and perception of green marketing as well as examine the tactics used by Indian businesses to promote green goods and services. According to the study, companies that make investments in real sustainability, open communication, and consumer education have a higher chance of success as the Indian market develops. Even well-meaning attempts might be undermined by skepticism stemming from green washing, affordability concerns, and the green attitude behaviour gap. It has also been said that the shift from traditional to sustainable marketing necessitates both innovation and a cultural change in the way that consumers and companies perceive value. The study concluded that businesses need to see green marketing as a long-term strategic orientation that is in line with India's sustainable development objectives rather than merely a trend. By doing this, they may become stewards of constructive social and environmental change in addition to being market leaders.

#### **Objectives of the Study**

- To explore how consumers recognize and find the difference between green sheen and genuine efforts towards sustainability in cause marketing drive.
- To understand the consequence of perceived genuineness in cause marketing driven by sustainability on consumer trust, brand loyalty and intention to purchase.
- To assess how communication, transparency and third-party authentication helps in moulding the perception of consumers in sustainability driven cause marketing.

### Research Gap

Cause marketing with reference to sustainability is not an unexplored area and enough literature work is available in this aspect. But research to investigate insights on consumers to differentiate between authentic efforts of sustainability in cause marketing and green sheen is limited. Thus, it can be concluded that a research gap exists in apprehending perception of consumers in understanding the authenticity of sustainability claims and their behavioural responses.

### Research Questions

- Whether consumers can understand the difference between green sheen and authentic efforts of sustainability in cause marketing?
- Does perceived genuineness in sustainability claims impact trust, brand loyalty and intention of the consumers?
- What is the impact of communication, transparency and third-party authentication upon the insights of consumers with regard to sustainability in cause marketing?

### Hypothesis

- H<sub>01</sub>:** Consumers do not recognize any significant difference between green sheen and genuine efforts towards sustainability in cause marketing drive.
- H<sub>02</sub>:** Perceived genuineness in cause marketing driven by sustainability has no significant consequence on consumer trust, brand loyalty and intention to purchase.
- H<sub>03</sub>:** Communication, transparency and third-party authentication has no significant effect in shaping the perception of consumers in sustainability driven cause marketing

### Importance of the Study

The present investigation is significant due to the following reasons.

- It helps in differentiating between green sheen and authentic sustainability in cause marketing thus filling the research gap.
- It will add to the existing knowledge and literature available in understanding psychology of consumers towards sustainability efforts of business houses in cause marketing.
- The investigation will guide the business houses in avoiding such kind of campaigns which misguide the consumers and can damage their goodwill.
- The study will guide the consumers in evaluating the sustainability claims.
- The research will play a role in protecting the environment by making the consumers more alert and will also contribute towards ethical marketing.

### Research Methodology

The research investigation is quantitative and exploratory in nature where the researchers tried to understand the insights of consumers with regard to sustainability initiatives in cause marketing with particular focus on green sheen versus genuine efforts. Convenience sampling technique has been adopted to reach respondents who are available and willing to participate in the investigation. This sampling technique has been adopted as the researchers tried to find the initial insights to understand the trends and associations. Primary data has been collected with the help of a structured questionnaire consisting of only close ended questions. The insights of consumers towards sustainability in cause marketing with focus on green sheen versus genuine efforts has been assessed utilizing the questionnaire which consisted of certain statements related to it focussing on the objectives of the study. These statements were designed to capture various dimensions of investigation in focus. The questionnaire has been framed based on the principles of simplicity and understandability. Five-point Likert scale was used for the study, in which 1 = "strongly disagree", 2 = "disagree", 3 = "neutral", 4 = "agree", 5 = "strongly agree". The sample size for the study is 110 respondents. The primary data collected have been analysed with the help of the SPSS software and statistical tools such as mean, coefficient of correlation, regression analysis, paired sample t test have been used. Secondary data have been collected from research journal, books and various internet sources. A reliability test has been conducted to examine the consistency, accuracy and predictability of the scales in the questionnaire. The reliability of the scales of the questionnaire is Cronbach's Alpha = 0.937.

## Results and Discussion

**Table 1(a): Case Processing**  
**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	110	100.0
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	0	.0
	Total	110	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Source: SPSS Compilation

**Table 1(b): Reliability Statistics**

### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.937	27

Source: SPSS Compilation

To assess the internal consistency reliability of the scale Cronbach's Alpha has been used. The value of Cronbach's Alpha is 0.937 which is considered a highly reliable score and is considered to have a very good reliability.

**Table 2: Age**

Age					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-20 years	53	48.2	48.2	48.2
	21-30 years	41	37.3	37.3	85.5
	31-40 years	11	10.0	10.0	95.5
	41-50 years	4	3.6	3.6	99.1
	Above 50 years	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	110	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Compilation

The above table reveals the age of the participants in the survey. 48.2% respondents are in the age group of 18-20 years, 37.3% belong to the category of 21-30 years age group and 10% of them belong to the age group of 31-40 years.

**Table 3: Gender**

### Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	48	43.6	43.6	43.6
	Female	61	55.5	55.5	99.1
	Prefer not to say	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	110	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Compilation

Out of 110 respondents, 48 are male and 61 are female.

**Table 4: Qualification****Qualification**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High school or below	8	7.3	7.3	7.3
	Undergraduate degree	62	56.4	56.4	63.6
	Postgraduate degree	31	28.2	28.2	91.8
	Doctoral degree	8	7.3	7.3	99.1
	Other	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	110	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Compilation

Table reveals the qualification of the respondents. 56.4% of the respondents are Bachelor's degree holder whereas 28.2% of the respondents are Master degree holders.

**Table 5: Occupation****Occupation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Student	78	70.9	70.9	70.9
	Service	21	19.1	19.1	90.0
	Business	5	4.5	4.5	94.5
	Homemaker	1	.9	.9	95.5
	Other	5	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	110	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Compilation

The above table shows the occupation of the respondents. 70.9% of the participants in the survey are students, 19.1% of the respondents are service holders and 4.5% of the respondents are either doing business or entrepreneurs.

**Table 6: Income****Income**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than Rs 25000	21	19.1	19.1	19.1
	Rs 25000-Rs 50,000	28	25.5	25.5	44.5
	Rs 50,001- Rs 1,00,000	20	18.2	18.2	62.7
	Above Rs 1,00,000	41	37.3	37.3	100.0
	Total	110	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Compilation

37.3% of the respondents have a monthly household income of above Rs.1,00,000, 25.5% of the respondents have an income of Rs.25,000 to Rs. 50,000 and 18.2% of the respondents fall in the income group of Rs. 50,001 to Rs. 1,00,000.

**Objective**

To explore how consumers recognize and find the difference between green sheen and genuine efforts towards sustainability in cause marketing drive.

**H<sub>01</sub>:** Consumers do not recognize any significant difference between green sheen and genuine efforts towards sustainability in cause marketing drive.

**Table 7(a): Paired Sample t-test**

**Paired Samples Statistics**

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 Exaggerating_sustainability	3.40	110	.859	.082
Evidence_trustworthy	3.70	110	.914	.087
Pair 2 Skeptical	3.76	110	.957	.091
Claims_measurable_actions	3.55	110	.935	.089

Source: SPSS Compilation

**Table 7(b): Paired sample Correlations**

**Paired Samples Correlations**

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 Exaggerating_sustainability & Evidence_trustworthy	110	.365	.000
Pair 2 Skeptical & Claims_measurable_actions	110	.576	.000

**Paired Samples Test**

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	Exaggerating_sustainability - Evidence_trustworthy	-.300	1.000	.095	-489	-.111	-3.145	109	.002
Pair 2	Skeptical - Claims_measurable_actions	.218	.871	.083	.054	.383	2.626	109	.010

Source: SPSS Compilation

To achieve the first objective of the research study, where the investigators tried to find if the consumers can differentiate between consumers perception towards green sheen and genuine efforts of sustainability in cause marketing drive, a paired comparison t- test has been conducted among the identified variables with respect to the above. The first table reveals that respondents gave higher weightage to brands providing clear evidence of sustainability than those exaggerating their sustainability claims (green sheen) as the mean evidence\_trustworthy (3.74) >exaggerating\_sustainability (3.40). But the respondents also revealed that they are sceptical to those brands who use vague terms like “eco-friendly (3.76) even after paying attention to sustainability claims backed by measurable actions (3.55).

**For pair 1:** Exaggerating Sustainability vs. Trustworthy Evidence, as the  $p= 0.002$  reveals that it is statistically significant and consumers can identify the difference between green washing and genuine sustainability and give more value/weightage to brands providing clear evidence of sustainability than those exaggerating their sustainability claims (green sheen).

**For pair 2:** Sceptical to those brands who use vague terms vs. Claims backed by measurable action, the paired t test is significant with p value 0.002 which shows that consumers can apprehend the difference between green sheen and genuine sustainability. But here scepticism remains a stronger variable even when sustainable claims are backed by measurable actions and evidence. Ginder and Byun (2022) concluded that consumer doubts and skepticism can be reduced only when the environmental claims can be properly verified and transparency in communication prevails.

Thus, we reject the null hypothesis  $H_{01}$ . The results clearly reveal that consumers can easily identify and differentiate between green sheen and genuine efforts towards sustainability in cause marketing drive.

### Objective

To understand the consequence of perceived genuineness in cause marketing driven by sustainability on consumer trust, brand loyalty and intention to purchase.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** Perceived genuineness in cause marketing driven by sustainability has no significant consequence on consumer trust, brand loyalty and intention to purchase.

**Table 8(a): Correlations**

		Correlations					
		Confident_evaluating	Genuine_sustainability_trust	Genuine_sustainabilit_trust	Purchase_authentic_sustainable_products	Dishonest_reduces_trust	Recommend_genuine_sustainable_brands
Confident_evaluating	Pearson Correlation	1	.444**	.419**	.499**	.437**	.335**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110
Genuine_sustainability_trust	Pearson Correlation	.444**	1	.697**	.629**	.606**	.532**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110
Genuine_sustainabilit_trust	Pearson Correlation	.419**	.697**	1	.743**	.637**	.608**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110
Purchase_authentic_sustainable_products	Pearson Correlation	.499**	.629**	.743**	1	.632**	.600**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110
Dishonest_reduces_trust	Pearson Correlation	.437**	.606**	.637**	.632**	1	.634**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110
Recommend_genuine_sustainable_brands	Pearson Correlation	.335**	.532**	.608**	.600**	.634**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS Compilation

\*Confident\_evaluating: Consumers feel confident in evaluating whether a brand's cause marketing efforts is genuinely sustainable.

\*\*Genuine\_sustainability\_trust: A brand's genuine sustainability efforts increases brand trust.

\*\*\*Genuine\_sustainability\_loyalty: A brand's genuine sustainability efforts increases brand loyalty.

\*\*\*\*Purchase\_authentic\_sustainable\_products: Authentic sustainable practices increase willingness to purchase the brand.

\*\*\*\*\*Dishonest\_reduces\_trust: Dishonesty in sustainability claims reduces trust towards brands.

\*\*\*\*\*Recommend\_genuine\_sustainable\_brands: Genuine sustainable brands can be recommended.

**Table 8(b): Model Summary****Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.538 <sup>a</sup>	.290	.255	.795

a. Predictors: (Constant), Recommend\_genuine\_sustainable\_brands, Genuine\_sustainability\_trust, Purchase\_authentic\_sustainable\_products, Dishonest\_reduces\_trust, Genuine\_sustainabilit\_trust

Source: SPSS Compilation

**Table 8(c): ANOVA****ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	26.814	5	5.363	8.479	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	65.777	104	.632		
	Total	92.591	109			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Recommend\_genuine\_sustainable\_brands, Genuine\_sustainability\_trust, Purchase\_authentic\_sustainable\_products, Dishonest\_reduces\_trust, Genuine\_sustainabilit\_trust

b. Dependent Variable: Confident\_evaluating

Source: SPSS Compilation

**Table 8(d): Coefficients****Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.152	.399		2.889	.005
	Genuine_sustainability_trust	.192	.131	.179	1.469	.145
	Genuine_sustainabilit_trust	-.029	.145	-.029	-.201	.841
	Purchase_authentic_sustainable_products	.354	.143	.329	2.474	.015
	Dishonest_reduces_trust	.170	.124	.168	1.368	.174
	Recommend_genuine_sustainable_brands	-.047	.115	-.047	-.406	.686

a. Dependent Variable: Confident\_evaluating

Source: SPSS Compilation

The above tables try to find the consequence of perceived genuineness in sustainability in cause marketing on consumer trust, brand loyalty and intention to purchase. If we observe the overall model (F-test,  $p < 0.001$ ) which concludes that it is significant and authentic sustainable practices is the only significant predictor,  $p = 0.015$ , whereas the other variables, i.e., a brand's genuine sustainability efforts increase brand trust, a brand's genuine sustainability efforts increase brand loyalty, dishonesty in sustainability claims reduces trust towards brands and genuine sustainable brands can be recommended are not significant statistically. Ginder and Byun (2022) concluded that consumer doubts and scepticism

can be reduced only when the environmental claims can be properly verified and transparency in communication prevails. Thus, it can be concluded that if consumers are confident in assessing the claims of sustainability in cause marketing, then they are willing to purchase authentic sustainable products. Their intention to purchase or purchase behaviour is not influenced by trust, dishonesty or recommendation tendencies. Thus, we based on the overall model of regression and its results we reject  $H_{02}$ .

### Objective

To assess how communication, transparency and third-party authentication helps in shaping the perception of consumers in sustainability driven cause marketing.

$H_{03}$ : Communication, transparency and third-party authentication has no significant effect in shaping the perception of consumers in sustainability driven cause marketing.

**Table 9(a): Correlations**

		Correlations								
		Confident_evaluating	Communication_helps_undestand_efforts	Transparency_increases_confidence	Thirdparty_certification_increases_believes	Support_brands_collaborate_independent_agencies	Sustainability_reports_convincing_than_ads	Thirdparty_certification_more_credible	Value_brands_discloses_successes_challenges	Value_brands_transparency_reports
Confident_evaluating	Pearson Correlation	1	.445**	.437**	.392**	.458**	.421**	.459**	.428**	.465**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Communication_helps_undestand_efforts	Pearson Correlation	.445**	1	.763**	.544**	.715**	.627**	.558**	.557**	.643**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Transparency_increases_confidence	Pearson Correlation	.437**	.763**	1	.500**	.754**	.636**	.463**	.558**	.649**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Thirdparty_certification_increases_believes	Pearson Correlation	.392**	.544**	.500**	1	.564**	.593**	.562**	.574**	.550**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Support_brands_collaborate_independent_agencies	Pearson Correlation	.458**	.715**	.754**	.564**	1	.645**	.572**	.658**	.656**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Sustainability_reports_convincing_than_ads	Pearson Correlation	.421**	.627**	.636**	.593**	.645**	1	.508**	.678**	.666**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Thirdparty_certification_more_credible	Pearson Correlation	.459**	.558**	.463**	.562**	.572**	.508**	1	.537**	.515**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Value_brands_discloses_successes_challenges	Pearson Correlation	.428**	.557**	.558**	.574**	.658**	.678**	.537**	1	.602**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Value_brands_transparency_reports	Pearson Correlation	.465**	.643**	.649**	.550**	.656**	.666**	.515**	.602**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS Compilation

**Table 9(b): Model Summary****Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.555 <sup>a</sup>	.308	.253	.796

a. Predictors: (Constant), Value\_brands\_transperancy\_certification\_reports, Thirdparty\_certification\_more\_credible, Thirdparty\_certification\_increases\_believes, Transperancy\_increases\_confidence, Value\_brands\_discloses\_successes\_challenges, Sustainability\_reports\_convincing\_than\_ads, Communication\_helps\_undestand\_efforts, Support\_brands\_collaborate\_independent\_agencies

\*Value\_brands\_transperancy: Transparency in reporting sustainability practices increases my confidence in the brand.

\*\*Thirdparty\_certification\_credible: I believe third-party certifications make sustainability claims more credible.

\*\*\*Thirdparty\_certification\_believes: Third-party certifications (e.g., Fair Trade, FSC, Organic) make me believe sustainability claims more strongly.

\*\*\*\*Transperancy\_increases\_confidence: Transparency in reporting sustainability practices increases my confidence in the brand.

\*\*\*\*\*Value\_brands\_discloses: I value brands that disclose both successes and challenges in their sustainability journey.

\*\*\*\*\*Sustainability\_reports\_convincing: I find sustainability reports more convincing than advertisements.

\*\*\*\*\*Communication\_helps\_efforts: I value brands that use transparent communication channels (e.g., detailed reports, disclosures)

\*\*\*\*\*Support\_brands\_collaborate: I am more likely to support brands that collaborate with independent organizations to validate their sustainability claims.

**Table 9 (c): ANOVA****ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	28.518	8	3.565	5.619	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	64.073	101	.634		
	Total	92.591	109			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Value\_brands\_transperancy\_certification\_reports, Thirdparty\_certification\_more\_credible, Thirdparty\_certification\_increases\_believes, Transperancy\_increases\_confidence, Value\_brands\_discloses\_successes\_challenges, Sustainability\_reports\_convincing\_than\_ads, Communication\_helps\_undestand\_efforts, Support\_brands\_collaborate\_independent\_agencies

b. Dependent Variable: Confident\_evaluating

Source: SPSS Compilation

**Table 9(d): Coefficients****Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.054	.409		2.577	.011
	Communication_helps_undestand_efforts	.050	.152	.047	.327	.745
	Transperancy_increases_confidence	.097	.152	.095	.638	.525
	Thirdparty_certification_increases_believes	.033	.126	.031	.266	.791
	Value_brands_discloses_successes_challenges	.083	.131	.081	.637	.526
	Support_brands_collaborate_independent_agencies	.049	.149	.049	.328	.744
	Sustainability_reports_convincing_than_ads	.014	.141	.013	.099	.922
	Thirdparty_certification_more_credible	.214	.113	.213	1.899	.060
	Value_brands_transperancy_certification_reports	.149	.121	.157	1.229	.222

a. Dependent Variable: Confident\_evaluating

Source: SPSS Compilation

To understand the role of communication, transparency and third-party authentication in shaping the perception of consumers in sustainability driven cause marketing the researchers tried to find the correlation between the dependent variable and the identified independent variables relating to communication, transparency and third-party authentication. The correlation table shows a positive correlation of all independent variables with the dependent variable, but due to multicollinearity among the predictors, i.e., the independent variables, the individual regression of the predictors are not significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). The only predictor, i.e., third party authentication has marginal significance (0.060). Thus, these variables cannot be regarded as separate drivers in consumers perception but all these variables are interconnected and play a role in consumers perception. Since the overall regression model is significant, we reject the null hypothesis  $H_{03}$ .

### Conclusion

Cause marketing acts as an important strategy for the companies to meet their social objective of environment sustainability. Green sheen also known as greenwashing is a major problem which the consumers must be aware of and need to identify so that the resources or the investments made by them in the products and services actually reach for the cause of sustainability. Findings of the study confirms that consumers are well aware and can differentiate between the green sheen and genuine sustainability efforts. Authentic sustainable practices influence consumers sustainable purchasing practices but trust, loyalty and recommendations are not significant variables. The investigation also concludes that proper communication, transparency and third-party authentication collectively plays an important role in shaping the perception of consumers in making sustainable purchases. But third party authentication is crucial for the consumers in making the sustainable purchase decision. It is important that government take appropriate measures to prevent these unethical practices. Establishment of standards and transparent verification whether the standards have been met is important. Disclosure of information relating to sustainability should be made mandatory and transparency in reporting and communication should be given prime importance.

## References

1. Mateo-Márquez, A. J., J. M. González-González, and C. Zamora-Ramírez. "An International Empirical Study of Greenwashing and Voluntary Carbon Disclosure." *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 363, 2022, Article 132567. Elsevier, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.132567> (doi.org in Bing).
2. Adamkiewicz, Julia, Ewa Kocharńska, Iwona Adamkiewicz, and Rafal M. Lukasiak. "Greenwashing and Sustainable Fashion Industry." *Current Opinion in Green and Sustainable Chemistry*, vol. 38, Dec. 2022, Article 100710. Elsevier.
3. Glavas, D., G. Grolleau, and N. Mzoughi. "Greening the Green Washers – How to Push Green Washers towards More Sustainable Trajectories." *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 382, 2023, Article 135301. Elsevier, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.135301> (doi.org in Bing)
4. Delmas, Magali A., and Vanessa C. Burbano. "The Drivers of Greenwashing." *California Management Review*, vol. 54, no. 1, 2011, pp. 64–87. University of California Press, <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64>(Bing).
5. Eze, M. "Digital Greenwashing in the Age of Sustainability Marketing: A Meta-Analysis of Consumer Perception, Detection, and Backlash." *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2025, pp. 32–48. Canadian Center of Science and Education, <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v17n2p32>.
6. Mangini, E., L. Amaral, M. A. Conejero, and C. Pires. "Greenwashing Study and Consumers' Behavioral Intentions." *Consumer Behavior Review*, vol. 4, 2020, p. 229. <https://doi.org/10.51359/2526-7884.2020.244488> (doi.org in Bing).
7. Yu, E. P.-y., B. V. Luu, and C. H. Chen. "Greenwashing in Environmental, Social and Governance Disclosures." *Research in International Business and Finance*, vol. 52, 2020, Article 101192. Elsevier, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2020.101192> (doi.org in Bing).
8. Bausa, Elena, and Stefanie Fella. "Green or Greenwashed? Examining Consumers' Ability to Identify Greenwashing." *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, vol. 95, May 2024. Elsevier.
9. Himani, and Dr. Ravi vi Kant. "Green Marketing Strategies and Consumer Behavior: A Contemporary Analysis in the Indian Context." *Environment*, Aug. 2025, <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2025.907000320>.
10. Kavitha, R., and Senthil N. Kumar. "The Influence of Greenwashing on Sustainable Behavior: The Mediators of Green Perceived Risk and Green Skepticism." *Journal of Environmental Biology*, vol. 44, Sept. 2023.
11. Lyon, Thomas P., and A. Wren Montgomery. "The Means and End of Greenwash." *Organization & Environment*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2015, pp. 223–49. SAGE, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575332>.
12. Sajid, M., K. A. Zakkariya, N. M. Suki, and J. U. Islam. "When Going Green Goes Wrong: The Effects of Greenwashing on Brand Avoidance and Negative Word-of-Mouth." *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, vol. 78, 2024, Article 103773. Elsevier.
13. Ghitti, M., G. Gianfrate, and L. Palma. "The Agency of Greenwashing." *Journal of Management and Governance*, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-023-09683-8> (doi.org in Bing).
14. Pandey, S. K., B. Jagwani, R. S. Rathore, N. Katiyar, A. K. Sahu, and S. S. Vishwakarma. "Comparative Analysis of Marketing Strategies: Greenwashing vs. Genuine Sustainability." *Journal of Marketing & Social Research*, vol. 2, no. 4, 2025. JMSR, <https://www.jmsr-online.com/article/download/pdf/227/>.
15. Persakis, A., T. Nikolopoulos, I. C. Negkakis, and A. Pavlopoulos. "Greenwashing in Marketing: A Systematic Literature Review and Bibliometric Analysis." *International Review on Public and Non-profit Marketing*, vol. 22, no. 4, 2025, pp. 957–92. Springer, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-025-00452-x>.
16. Satyanand. "Greenwashing vs. Genuine Sustainability: Measuring Consumer Trust in Eco-Marketing." *Journal of Marketing & Social Research*, vol. 2, no. 8, 2025, pp. 116–28. JMSR, <https://www.jmsr-online.com/article/download/pdf/404/> (jmsr-online.com in Bing).

17. Srivastava, P. "Greenwashing vs. Green Trust: A Review Study of Consumer Perceptions and Responses to Sustainability Claims in Marketing." *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)*, 2025. IJFMR, <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/4/52697.pdf>.
18. Sharma, Sumit, and Anjani Kumar. "A Study on Consumer's Awareness towards Greenwashing." *International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods (IJARESM)*, vol. 12, no. 11, Nov. 2024.
19. Walker, Kent, and F. Wan. "The Harm of Symbolic Actions and Green-Washing: Corporate Actions and Communications on Environmental Performance and Their Financial Implications." *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 109, no. 2, 2012, pp. 227–42. Springer, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1122-4>.

