

UCLA

Electronic Green Journal

Title

An Introduction To Green Marketing

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/49n325b7>

Journal

Electronic Green Journal, 1(2)

Author

Polonsky, Michael Jay

Publication Date

1994

DOI

10.5070/G31210177

Copyright Information

Copyright 1994 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

An Introduction To Green Marketing

Michael Jay Polonsky <mgmjp@cc.newcastle.edu.au>

Department of Management, University of Newcastle, Newcastle NSW 2308, Australia. TEL: 61(49)216-911. Fax:61(49)216-911.

INTRODUCTION

Although environmental issues influence all human activities, few academic disciplines have integrated green issues into their literature. This is especially true of marketing. As society becomes more concerned with the natural environment, businesses have begun to modify their behavior in an attempt to address society's "new" concerns. Some businesses have been quick to accept concepts like environmental management systems and waste minimization, and have integrated environmental issues into all organizational activities. Some evidence of this is the development of journals such as "Business Strategy and the Environment" and "Greener Management International," which are specifically designed to disseminate research relating to business' environmental behavior.

One business area where environmental issues have received a great deal of discussion in the popular and professional press is marketing. Terms like "Green Marketing" and "Environmental Marketing" appear frequently in the popular press. Many governments around the world have become so concerned about green marketing activities that they have attempted to regulate them (Polonsky 1994a). For example, in the United States (US) the Federal Trade Commission and the National Association of Attorneys-General have developed extensive documents examining green marketing issues [FTC 1991, NAAG 1990]. One of the biggest problems with the green marketing area is that there has been little attempt to academically examine environmental or green marketing. While some literature does exist [Carlson, Grove and Kangun 1993, Davis 1992, Davis 1993], it comes from divergent perspectives.

This paper will attempt 1) to introduce the terms and concepts of green marketing; 2) briefly discuss why going green is important; 3) examine some of the reason that organizations are adopting a green marketing philosophy; and 4) mention some of the problems with green marketing.

WHAT IS GREEN MARKETING

Unfortunately, a majority of people believe that green marketing refers solely to the promotion or advertising of products with environmental characteristics. Terms like Phosphate Free, Recyclable, Refillable, Ozone Friendly, and Environmentally Friendly are some of the things consumers most often associate with green marketing. While these terms are green marketing claims, in general green marketing is a much broader concept, one that can be applied to consumer goods, industrial goods and even services. For example, around the world there are resorts that are beginning to promote themselves as "ecotourist" facilities, i.e., facilities that "specialize" in experiencing nature or operating in a fashion that minimizes their environmental impact [May 1991, Ingram and Durst 1989, Troumbis 1991].

Thus green marketing incorporates a broad range of activities, including product modification, changes to the production process, packaging changes, as well as modifying advertising. Yet defining green marketing is not a simple task. Indeed the terminology used in this area has varied, it includes: Green Marketing, Environmental Marketing and Ecological Marketing. While green marketing came into prominence in the late 1980s and early 1990s, it was first discussed much earlier. The American Marketing Association (AMA) held

the first workshop on "Ecological Marketing" in 1975. The proceedings of this workshop resulted in one of the first books on green marketing entitled "Ecological Marketing" [Henion and Kinnear 1976a]. Since that time a number of other books on the topic have been published [Charter 1992, Coddington 1993, Ottman 1993].

The AMA workshop attempted to bring together academics, practitioners, and public policy makers to examine marketing's impact on the natural environment. At this workshop ecological marketing was defined as:

the study of the positive and negative aspects of marketing activities on pollution, energy depletion and nonenergy resource depletion. [Henion and Kinnear 1976b, 1]

This early definition has three key components, 1) it is a subset of the overall marketing activity; 2) it examines both the positive and negative activities; and 3) a narrow range of environmental issues are examined. While this definition is a useful starting point, to be comprehensive green marketing needs to be more broadly defined. Before providing an alternative definition it should be noted that no one definition or terminology has been universally accepted. This lack of consistency is a large part of the problem, for how can an issue be evaluated if all researchers have a different perception of what they are researching. The following definition is much broader than those of other researchers and it encompasses all major components of other definitions. My definition is:

Green or Environmental Marketing consists of all activities designed to generate and facilitate any exchanges intended to satisfy human needs or wants, such that the satisfaction of these needs and wants occurs, with minimal detrimental impact on the natural environment. [Polonsky 1994b, 2]

This definition incorporates much of the traditional components of the marketing definition, that is "All activities designed to generate and facilitate any exchanges intended to satisfy human needs or wants" [Stanton and Futrell 1987]. Therefore it ensures that the interests of the organization and all its consumers are protected, as voluntary exchange will not take place unless both the buyer and seller mutually benefit. The above definition also includes the protection of the natural environment, by attempting to minimize the detrimental impact this exchange has on the environment. This second point is important, for human consumption by its very nature is destructive to the natural environment. (To be accurate products making green claims should state they are "less environmentally harmful" rather than "Environmentally Friendly.") Thus green marketing should look at minimizing environmental harm, not necessarily eliminating it.

WHY IS GREEN MARKETING IMPORTANT

The question of why green marketing has increased in importance is quite simple and relies on the basic definition of Economics:

Economics is the study of how people use their limited resources to try to satisfy unlimited wants. [McTaggart, Findlay and Parkin 1992, 24]

Thus mankind has limited resources on the earth, with which she/he must attempt to provide for the worlds' unlimited wants. (There is extensive debate as to whether the earth is a resource at man's disposal, for example, see Gore 1993.) While the question of whether these wants are reasonable or achievable is

important, this issue will not be addressed in this paper. In market societies where there is "freedom of choice", it has generally been accepted that individuals and organizations have the right to attempt to have their wants satisfied. As firms face limited natural resources, they must develop new or alternative ways of satisfying these unlimited wants. Ultimately green marketing looks at how marketing activities utilize these limited resources, while satisfying consumers wants, both of individuals and industry, as well as achieving the selling organization's objectives.

WHY ARE FIRMS USING GREEN MARKETING?

When looking through the literature there are several suggested reasons for firms increased use of Green Marketing. Five possible reasons cited are:

1. Organizations perceive environmental marketing to be an opportunity that can be used to achieve its objectives [Keller 1987, Shearer 1990];
2. Organizations believe they have a moral obligation to be more socially responsible [Davis 1992, Freeman and Liedtka 1991, Keller 1987, McIntosh 1990, Shearer 1990];
3. Governmental bodies are forcing firms to become more responsible [NAAG 1990];
4. Competitors' environmental activities pressure firms to change their environmental marketing activities [NAAG 1990]; and
5. Cost factors associated with waste disposal, or reductions in material usage forces firms to modify their behavior [Azzone and Manzini 1994].

OPPORTUNITIES

It appears that all types of consumers, both individual and industrial are becoming more concerned and aware about the natural environment. In a 1992 study of 16 countries, more than 50% of consumers in each country, other than Singapore, indicated they were concerned about the environment [Ottman 1993]. A 1994 study in Australia found that 84.6% of the sample believed all individuals had a responsibility to care for the environment. A further 80% of this sample indicated that they had modified their behavior, including their purchasing behavior, due to environmental reasons [EPA-NSW 1994]. As demands change, many firms see these changes as an opportunity to be exploited.

Given these figures, it can be assumed that firms marketing goods with environmental characteristics will have a competitive advantage over firms marketing non-environmentally responsible alternatives. There are numerous example of firms who have strived to become more environmentally responsible, in an attempt to better satisfy their consumer needs.

- McDonald's replaced its clam shell packaging with waxed paper because of increased consumer concern relating to polystyrene production and Ozone depletion [Gifford 1991, Hume 1991].
- Tuna manufacturers modified their fishing techniques because of the increased concern over driftnet fishing, and the resulting death of dolphins [Advertising Age 1991].
- Xerox introduced a "high quality" recycled photocopier paper in an attempt to satisfy the demands of firms for less environmentally harmful products.

This is not to imply that all firms who have undertaken environmental marketing activities actually improve their behavior. In some cases firms have misled consumers in an attempt to gain market share. In other

cases firms have jumped on the green bandwagon without considering the accuracy of their behavior, their claims, or the effectiveness of their products. This lack of consideration of the true "greenness" of activities may result in firms making false or misleading green marketing claims.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Many firms are beginning to realize that they are members of the wider community and therefore must behave in an environmentally responsible fashion. This translates into firms that believe they must achieve environmental objectives as well as profit related objectives. This results in environmental issues being integrated into the firm's corporate culture. Firms in this situation can take two perspectives; 1) they can use the fact that they are environmentally responsible as a marketing tool; or 2) they can become responsible without promoting this fact.

There are examples of firms adopting both strategies. Organizations like the Body Shop heavily promote the fact that they are environmentally responsible. While this behavior is a competitive advantage, the firm was established specifically to offer consumers environmentally responsible alternatives to conventional cosmetic products. This philosophy is directly tied to the overall corporate culture, rather than simply being a competitive tool.

An example of a firm that does not promote its environmental initiatives is Coca-Cola. They have invested large sums of money in various recycling activities, as well as having modified their packaging to minimize its environmental impact. While being concerned about the environment, Coke has not used this concern as a marketing tool. Thus many consumers may not realize that Coke is a very environmentally committed organization. Another firm who is very environmentally responsible but does not promote this fact, at least outside the organization, is Walt Disney World (WDW). WDW has an extensive waste management program and infrastructure in place, yet these facilities are not highlighted in their general tourist promotional activities (Murphy 1985).

GOVERNMENTAL PRESSURE

As with all marketing related activities, governments want to "protect" consumers and society; this protection has significant green marketing implications. Governmental regulations relating to environmental marketing are designed to protect consumers in several ways, 1) reduce production of harmful goods or by-products; 2) modify consumer and industry's use and/or consumption of harmful goods; or 3) ensure that all types of consumers have the ability to evaluate the environmental composition of goods.

Governments establish regulations designed to control the amount of hazardous wastes produced by firms. Many by-products of production are controlled through the issuing of various environmental licenses, thus modifying organizational behavior. In some cases governments try to "induce" final consumers to become more responsible. For example, some governments have introduced voluntary curb-side recycling programs, making it easier for consumers to act responsibly. In other cases governments tax individuals who act in an irresponsible fashion. For example in Australia there is a higher gas tax associated with leaded petrol.

One of the more recent publicized environmental regulations undertaken by governments has been the establishment of guidelines designed to "control" green marketing claims [Polonsky 1994a]. These regulations include the Australian Trade Practices Commission's (TPC) "Environmental Claims in Marketing - A Guideline [TPC 1992], the US Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) "Guides for the Use of Environmental

Marketing Claims" [FTC 1991 and 1992] and the regulations suggested by the National Association of Attorneys-General [NAAG 1990]. These regulations are all designed to ensure consumers have the appropriate information which would enable them to evaluate firm's environmental claims. In addition to these guidelines many States in the US have introduced legislation to control various environmental marketing activities [Kangun and Polonsky 1994]. In most cases these State laws are more stringent than the FTC's guidelines. To date the majority of prosecutions of firms using misleading green marketing has occurred in State rather than Federal courts.

Thus governmental attempts to protect consumers from false or misleading claims should theoretically provide consumers with the ability to make more informed decisions. In Australia where regulations have affected many companies, one unintended casualty was an advertisement for the Federal Government's environmental labeling program "Environmental Choice." This ad was deemed to breach the TPC's guidelines, as it implied that only products with the logo were environmentally responsible.

COMPETITIVE PRESSURE

Another major force in the environmental marketing area has been firms' desire to maintain their competitive position. In many cases firms observe competitors promoting their environmental behaviors and attempt to emulate this behavior. In some instances this competitive pressure has caused an entire industry to modify and thus reduce its detrimental environmental behavior. For example, it could be argued that Xerox's "Revive 100% Recycled paper" was introduced a few years ago in an attempt to address the introduction of recycled photocopier paper by other manufacturers. In another example when one tuna manufacture stopped using driftnets the others followed suit [Advertising Age 1991].

COST OR PROFIT ISSUES

Firms may also use green marketing in an attempt to address cost or profit related issues. Disposing of environmentally harmful by-products, such as polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) contaminated oil are becoming increasingly costly and in some cases difficult. Therefore firms that can reduce harmful wastes may incur substantial cost savings. When attempting to minimize waste, firms are often forced to re-examine their production processes. In these cases they often develop more effective production processes that not only reduce waste, but reduce the need for some raw materials. This serves as a double cost savings, since both waste and raw material are reduced.

In other cases firms attempt to find end-of-pipe solutions, instead of minimizing waste. In these situations firms try to find markets or uses for their waste materials, where one firm's waste becomes another firm's input of production. One Australian example of this is a firm who produces acidic waste water as a by-product of production and sells it to a firm involved in neutralizing base materials.

The last way in which cost or profit issues may affect firms' environmental marketing activities is that new industries may be developed. This can occur in two ways: 1) a firm develops a technology for reducing waste and sells it to other firms; or 2) a waste recycling or removal industry develops [Yurman 1994]. For example, firms that clean the oil in large industrial condensers increase the life of those condensers, removing the need for replacing the oil, as well as the need to dispose of the waste oil. This reduces operating costs for those owning the condensers and generates revenue for those firms cleaning the oil.

SOME PROBLEMS WITH GOING GREEN

No matter why a firm uses green marketing there are a number of potential problems that they must overcome. One of the main problems is that firms using green marketing must ensure that their activities are not misleading to consumers or industry, and do not breach any of the regulations or laws dealing with environmental marketing. For example marketers in the US must ensure their green marketing claims can meet the following set of criteria, in order to comply with the FTC's guidelines. Green marketing claims must;

- Clearly state environmental benefits;
- Explain environmental characteristics;
- Explain how benefits are achieved;
- Ensure comparative differences are justified;
- Ensure negative factors are taken into consideration; and
- Only use meaningful terms and pictures.

Another problem firms face is that those who modify their products due to increased consumer concern must contend with the fact that consumers' perceptions are sometimes not correct. Take for example the McDonald's case where it has replaced its clam shells with plastic coated paper. There is ongoing scientific debate which is more environmentally friendly. Some scientific evidence suggests that when taking a cradle-to-grave approach, polystyrene is less environmentally harmful. If this is the case McDonald's bowed to consumer pressure, yet has chosen the more environmentally harmful option.

When firms attempt to become socially responsible, they may face the risk that the environmentally responsible action of today will be found to be harmful in the future. Take for example the aerosol industry which has switched from CFCs (chlorofluorocarbons) to HFCs (hydrofluorocarbons) only to be told HFCs are also a greenhouse gas. Some firms now use DME (dimethyl ether) as an aerosol propellant, which may also harm the ozone layer [Debets 1989]. Given the limited scientific knowledge at any point in time, it may be impossible for a firm to be certain they have made the correct environmental decision. This may explain why some firms, like Coca-Cola and Walt Disney World, are becoming socially responsible without publicizing the point. They may be protecting themselves from potential future negative backlash, if it is determined they made the wrong decision in the past.

While governmental regulation is designed to give consumers the opportunity to make better decisions or to motivate them to be more environmentally responsible, there is difficulty in establishing policies that will address all environmental issues. For example, guidelines developed to control environmental marketing address only a very narrow set of issues, i.e., the truthfulness of environmental marketing claims [Schlossberg 1993]. If governments want to modify consumer behavior they need to establish a different set of regulations. Thus governmental attempts to protect the environment may result in a proliferation of regulations and guidelines, with no one central controlling body.

Reacting to competitive pressures can cause all "followers" to make the same mistake as the "leader." A costly example of this was the Mobil Corporation who followed the competition and introduced "biodegradable" plastic garbage bags. While technically these bags were biodegradable, the conditions under which they were disposed did not allow biodegradation to occur. Mobil was sued by several US states for using misleading advertising claims [Lawrence 1991]. Thus blindly following the competition can have costly ramifications.

The push to reduce costs or increase profits may not force firms to address the important issue of environmental degradation. End-of-pipe solutions may not actually reduce the waste but rather shift it around. While this may be beneficial, it does not necessarily address the larger environmental problem, though it may minimize its short term affects. Ultimately most waste produced will enter the waste stream, therefore to be environmentally responsible organizations should attempt to minimize their waste, rather than find "appropriate" uses for it.

CONCLUSION

Green marketing covers more than a firm's marketing claims. While firms must bear much of the responsibility for environmental degradation, ultimately it is consumers who demand goods, and thus create environmental problems. One example of this is where McDonald's is often blamed for polluting the environment because much of their packaging finishes up as roadside waste. It must be remembered that it is the uncaring consumer who chooses to dispose of their waste in an inappropriate fashion. While firms can have a great impact on the natural environment, the responsibility should not be theirs alone. In the EPA's 1994 study consumers gave the following reasons for why they damage the environment.




Figure 1.

Figure 1

It appears that consumers are not overly committed to improving their environment and may be looking to lay too much responsibility on industry and government. Ultimately green marketing requires that consumers want a cleaner environment and are willing to "pay" for it, possibly through higher priced goods, modified individual lifestyles, or even governmental intervention. Until this occurs it will be difficult for firms alone to lead the green marketing revolution.

Having said this, it must not be forgotten that the industrial buyer also has the ability to pressure suppliers to modify their activities. Thus an environmental committed organization may not only produce goods that have reduced their detrimental impact on the environment, they may also be able to pressure their suppliers to behave in a more environmentally "responsible" fashion. Final consumers and industrial buyers also have the ability to pressure organizations to integrate the environment into their corporate culture and thus ensure all organizations minimize the detrimental environmental impact of their activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Advertising Age. 1991. "Spurts and Starts: Corporate Role in '90s Environmentalism Hardly Consistent." Advertising Age 62 (46): GR14-GR16.

Azzone, Giovanni and Raffaella Manzini. 1994. "Measuring Strategic Environmental Performance." Business Strategy and the Environment 3 (1): 1-14.

Carlson, Les, Stephen Grove, and Norman Kangun. 1993. "A Content Analysis of Environmental Advertising." Journal of Advertising 22 (3): 27-38.

Charter, Martin (ed). 1992. Greener Marketing. Sheffield, England: Greenleaf Publishing.

Coddington, Walter. 1993. Environmental Marketing: Positive Strategies for Reaching the Green Consumer. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Davis, Joel J. 1992. "Ethics and Green Marketing." Journal of Business Ethics 11 (2): 81-87.

Davis, Joel J. 1993. "Strategies for Environmental Advertising." Journal of Consumer Marketing 10 (2): 19-36.

Debets, Felix M. H. 1989. "Health and Environmental Safety Aspects of DME as an Aerosol Propellant." Aerosol Age 34 (12): 39-42.

Federal Trade Commission (FTC). 1991. Hearings on Environmental Marketing Issues, (July 17-18), Washington, D.C.: FTC.

Federal Trade Commission(FTC). 1992. Guides for the Use of Environmental Marketing Claims: The Application of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to Environmental Advertising and Marketing Practices. Washington, D.C.: FTC.

EPA-NSW. 1994. Who Cares about the Environment. Sydney, Australia: Environmental Protection Authority.

Freeman, R. E. and J. Liedtka. 1991. "Corporate Social Responsibility: A Critical Approach." Business Horizons 34 (4): 92-98.

Gifford B. 1991. "The Greening of the Golden Arches-McDonald's Teams With Environmental Group to Cut Waste." The San Diego Union, August 19: C1,C4.

- Gore, Al. 1993. Earth in the Balance: Ecology and Human Spirit. New York: Plume.
- Henion, Karl E., and Thomas C. Kinnear. 1976a. Ecological Marketing. Columbus, Ohio: American Marketing Association.
- Henion, Karl E., and Thomas C. Kinnear. 1976b. "A Guide to Ecological Marketing." in Karl E. Henion and Thomas C. Kinnear (Eds). Ecological Marketing. Columbus, Ohio: American Marketing Association.
- Hume, Scott. 1991. "McDonald's: Case Study." Advertising Age 62 (5): 32.
- Ingram, C. Denise and Patrick B. Durst. 1989. "Nature-Oriented Tour Operators: Travel to Developing Countries." Journal of Travel Research 28 (2): 11-18
- Kangun, Norman and Michael Polonsky. 1994 "Regulation of Environmental Marketing Claims: A Comparative Perspective." International Journal of Advertising 13 (4): Forthcoming.
- Keller, G. M. 1987. "Industry and the Environment: Toward a New Philosophy." Vital Speeches 54 (5): 154-157.
- Lawrence, Jennifer. 1991. "The Green Revolution: Mobil." Advertising Age 62 (5): 12-13.
- May, V. 1991. "Tourism, Environment and Development: Values, Sustainability and Stewardship." Tourism Management 12 (2): 112-118.
- McIntosh, Andrew. 1990. "The Impact of Environmental Issues on Marketing and Politics in the 1990s." Journal of the Marketing Research Society 33 (3): 205-217.
- Murphy, P. 1985. Tourism: A Community Approach. New York: Methuen Inc.
- National Association of Attorneys-General (NAAG). 1990. The Green Report: Findings and Preliminary Recommendations for Responsible Advertising. [San Francisco?], USA: National Association of Attorneys-General.
- Ottman, Jacquelyn. 1993. Green Marketing: Challenges and Opportunities for the New Marketing Age. Lincolnwood, Illinois: NTC Business Books.
- Polonsky, Michael Jay. 1994a. "Green Marketing Regulation in the US and Australia: The Australian Checklist." Greener Management International 5: 44-53.
- Polonsky, Michael Jay. 1994b. "A Stakeholder Theory Approach to Designing Environmental Marketing Strategy." Unpublished Working Paper.
- Schlossberg, Howard. 1993. "Effect of FTC Green Guidelines Still Doubtful for Some Marketers." Marketing News 27: 1, 6.

Shearer, Jeffery W. 1990. "Business and the New Environmental Imperative." Business Quarterly 54 (3): 48-52.

Stanton, William J. and Charles Futrell. 1987. Fundamentals of Marketing. 8th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Trade Practices Commission (TPC). 1992. Environmental Claims in Marketing - A Guideline. Canberra: TPC.

Troumbis, A. Y. 1991. "Environmental Labelling on Services: The Case of Tourism." Ekistics (348/349): 167-173.

Yurman, Dan. 1994. "Markets for Green Technologies; Working Paper, Current Literature Review and Bibliography." [EcoNet Western Lands Gopher](#), June. Superseded by "Green Technology: Markets, Competition and Barriers; New Paradigms for Natural Resources." September 13, 1994.