DEVOTION
Journal of Research and Community Service

Volume 6, Number 8, Aufust 2025
e-ISSN: 2797-6068 and p-ISSN: 2777-0915

Sustainability Marketing: Marketing Concepts in the Era of Sustainability

Abdul Somad, Fatmawati Fatmawati, Amang Budhisusetyo, Zuhri
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Widya Darma Surabaya, Indonesia
Email: haji.abdul2601@gmail.com, fatmawati.77055@gmail.com,
amangbudhisusetyo1@gmail.com,piazuhri83@gmail.com

KEYWORDS
Sustainability Marketing; Green Marketing; Discourse Analysis

ABSTRACT
The conceptual issue of sustainable marketing is still a challenge, although this topic is increasingly discussed in the marketing literature. Terms such as sustainability marketing, sustainable marketing, and green marketing are often used interchangeably, causing confusion among academics and practitioners alike. This research aims to clarify the concept of sustainable marketing through discourse analysis of leading articles while identifying various approaches in its application. The research method used discourse analysis on 166 selected articles from the Scopus database which included the most influential publications. The analysis was carried out by categorizing theoretical and practical perspectives based on the framework of Hopwood et al. (2005). The findings of the study reveal three main approaches: Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing (ASM) which focuses on refining conventional marketing practices, Reformative Sustainability Marketing (RSM) which drives sustainable lifestyle changes, and Transformative Sustainability Marketing (TSM) which demands systemic transformation in social and economic institutions. This research makes an important contribution by presenting a clearer conceptual foundation for the development of sustainable marketing theory. For practitioners, the results of the research can be a guide in choosing an approach that is in accordance with the organization's sustainability goals. Going forward, further research is needed to test the effectiveness of each approach in a variety of different business contexts.

INTRODUCTION

Sustainability has become part of the common language in many disciplines, and marketing is no exception (Kemper et al., 2019). However, what is meant by sustainability, both in and outside of marketing, is still a matter of debate (Connelly, 2007; Davidson, 2014; Hopwood, Mellor, & O'Brien, 2005; Lim, 2016; McDonagh & Prothero, 2014). At the forefront of this debate is the contradictory nature of sustainability and marketing; questioning whether marketing, as currently defined, can actually be sustainable when it is based on unrealistic consumption models and ignores the ecological constraints of growth (Jones, Clarke-Hill, Comfort, & Hillier, 2008; Peattie & Peattie, 2009; Sandberg & Polsa, 2015). Marketing is also considered to be the opposite of sustainability (Jones et al., 2008; Lim, 2016; Pereira Heath & Chatzidakis, 2012).

Nonetheless, there is potential in marketing capabilities to influence sustainable lifestyles (Peattie & Peattie, 2009) and produce sustainable products (Charter, Peattie, Ottman, & Polonsky, 2002; Peattie, 2001). Discussions about the relationship between marketing and the environment have been ongoing since the 1960s with the advent of books such as Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" and the Club of Rome's "Limits to Growth" (Peattie, 2001).

The relationship between marketing and sustainability does not seem to be a matter of debate among marketers. However, for those in the field of *macromarketing*, *critical marketing*, and beyond the marketing discipline, issues of (un)sustainability in marketing raise

critical questions about what it means to be sustainable and how this can be achieved in marketing (Alvesson, 1994; Prothero, McDonagh, & Dobscha, 2010; Varey, 2010).

Many people ignore the problem that overconsumption remains a problem and that replacing products with eco-friendly products does not address the problem of limited resources (Varey, 2011). In other words, the answer to sustainable consumption is not more consumption (Peattie & Crane, 2005). Therefore, while a *cradle-to-cradle* (from start to finish) approach as proposed by McDonough & Braungart (2002) is certainly necessary, it needs to be followed by a reduction in consumption and appreciation for life beyond the possession of material objects (Dermody, Hanmer-Lloyd, Koenig-Lewis, & Zhao, 2015; Peattie & Peattie, 2009; Varey, 2010). Indeed, Prothero et al. (2010) discuss the 'green commodity' discourse that has dominated, i.e., encouraging "people to think about consuming less rather than just different ways of consuming" (p. 155).

The concepts of *ecological marketing* and *green marketing*, although similar but significantly different, are less able to address complex needs related to sustainability. Around the 1970s, *ecological marketing* began to emerge (Peattie, 2001; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). This marketing stream is concerned with industries that have clear environmental risks and focuses on purely environmental issues such as pollution, oil spills, and the ecological impact of products such as synthetic pesticides (Peattie, 2001; Sheth & Parvatiyar, 1995). However, at the same time, there were businesses like The Body Shop that instilled environmental and social values in their mission and culture, responding to an entrepreneurial vision rather than consumer demand (Peattie, 2001; Peattie & Crane, 2005).

Green marketing emerged later in the 1980s with the increasing demand from so-called 'green consumers', which led to the emergence of new markets and competitive advantages (Peattie, 2001; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). However, *green marketing* is considered to be related to product orientation, criticized for exaggerating environmental claims and ignoring individual consumer behavior (e.g., the bouncing effect) (Gordon et al., 2011).

As a result of the large number of green marketing claims, the lack of credibility of such claims, and the perception that green products have lower performance, consumer hesitancy remains high (Crane, 2000; Peattie & Crane, 2005). In addition, the attitude-behavior gap is also a major concern in the purchase of green products (Peattie, 2001). The difference between *green marketing* and *ecological marketing* is that the former is subject to consumer pressure, while the latter is based on a certain moral dimension (van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). However, both concepts have a tendency to overestimate consumer demand, desire, and ability to purchase environmentally friendly products (as they are usually sold at a premium), as well as the ability of producers to create such goods (van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996).

To develop *ecological* and *green marketing*, sustainability marketing has been proposed by some to change the scale of marketing (Gordon et al., 2011; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996), and towards "radical changes in the way we live, produce, market, and consume" (Peattie, 2001, p. 144).

As a result, sustainability marketing is the result of the evolution of the sustainability agenda in marketing over the past 30 years. The first introduction of sustainability marketing by Sheth and Parvatiyar (1995) was followed by many different definitions of sustainability (and sustainable) marketing, which range from environmental conceptions (Fuller, 1999; Sheth & Parvatiyar, 1995) to holistic conceptions (e.g., Belz, 2005; Belz & Peattie, 2009; van Dam

& Apeldoorn, 1996), as well as differences of views between European and North American perspectives (Murphy, 2005).

For example, Fuller (1999, p. 4) offers continuous marketing as the process of planning, executing, and controlling the development, pricing, promotion, and distribution of products in a way that meets the following three criteria: (1) meeting customer needs; (2) achieving organizational goals; and (3) the process is in accordance with the ecosystem.

Some scholars see the merging of relational, social, green, and ethical marketing combined to create a new concept of 'sustainable marketing', which in particular goes beyond commercial and product orientation to look at its impact broadly on society and is based on long-term relationships (Belz & Peattie, 2010; Gordon et al., 2011). Therefore, from the macro view, this relationship treats socio-ecological issues from the beginning of the marketing process rather than as externalities, reshaping the marketing mix, and focusing on the transformational potential of marketing in creating institutional changes that support sustainable consumption and production (Belz & Peattie, 2010).

Taking into account the trajectory from environmental marketing to green marketing to sustainability marketing, as outlined by previous scholars (Belz & Peattie, 2010; Gordon et al., 2011; Peattie, 2001), but noting that there is still debate about how scholars differ from each other, the authors chose to focus on sustainability marketing as it can be considered a recent reflection of environmental and social concerns in marketing disciplines (Belz & Peattie, 2009; Peattie, 2001).

Recent attempts at conceptualizing sustainability and sustainable marketing include three dimensions of sustainable development: economic, social, and environmental (Belz & Peattie, 2009; Martin & Schouten, 2012). However, there is confusion regarding the role (what marketing is), the scope (micro and/or macro), and the purpose (what marketing is for) of sustainable marketing (McDonagh & Prothero, 2014), as well as more feasible solutions (e.g., limited to the marketing mix or more than that).

As a result, although interest in sustainable, green, and ethical marketing continues to increase (McEachern & Carrigan, 2012), further clarification is still needed on what it means to be sustainable in marketing (McDonagh & Prothero, 2014). Therefore, a review of how sustainability is articulated in the marketing literature provides a way to understand how marketers view sustainable development and the role of marketing in it. This study analyzes how the construction of sustainable marketing has been conceptualized in the marketing literature and finds three key views or perspectives.

Using discourse analysis, the authors categorize various views on sustainability and provide an understanding of the various conceptualizations that exist about sustainability marketing. In particular, the authors develop a conceptualization of why and how to participate in sustainability marketing, and in connection with that, the key assumptions that exist about consumers, businesses, and the environment regarding their roles, responsibilities, and limitations.

In doing so, the authors hope to examine the current views of marketing academics on sustainability, and furthermore, for professional marketers to provide clear marketing concepts and advice in the implementation of sustainability marketing. Building on Lim’s (2017) conceptual work on sustainable consumption, the journal makes a major contribution by offering conceptual limitations of sustainability marketing and providing a critical evaluation

of the three theoretical perspectives found in the literature. The authors conclude by offering theoretical, managerial, and policy implications for each of the three conceptualizations.

The Brundtland Commission provides the most commonly used definition of sustainable development, which is "development that meets current needs without sacrificing the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Brundtland, 1987, p. 43). Sustainable development is usually described as involving three dimensions: economic (the ability of companies and activities to be sustainable in the long term), social (equitable distribution of benefits and poverty reduction), and environmental (conservation of natural resources). Although sustainability and sustainable development are sometimes used interchangeably (Hugé, Waas, Dahdouh-Guebas, Koedam, & Block, 2013), here sustainable development is conceptualized as a process towards achieving sustainability (Sidiropoulos, 2014).

Debates around sustainability allow for a variety of interpretations and discourses to emerge, and these views tend to differ in the emphasis placed on the environmental, social, and economic aspects of society, as well as how societies can achieve sustainable development (Connelly, 2007; Davidson, 2014; Hopwood et al., 2005). As a result, views and frameworks on sustainability have been created to identify different views, beliefs, and opinions about sustainability. Common frameworks include *weak* and *strong sustainability* (Neumayer, 1999), anthropocentric and ecocentric views or epistemologies (Thompson & Barton, 1994), and Hopwood et al.'s (2005) mapping approach. Neumayer (1999) introduces the concept of *weak* and *strong* sustainability in economic theory. *Weak sustainability* is a substitution paradigm in which natural capital "can be substituted in the production or consumption of goods and as a direct provider of utilities" (p. 1); therefore, it does not matter if natural resources are not available to future generations as long as other resources such as roads, ports, and machinery are "built in their place" (p. 1). *Strong sustainability* is not clearly defined as *weak sustainability*, but there is a common belief that natural capital must be preserved for future generations and that natural capital cannot be replaced (Neumayer, 1999). Although the *weak* and *strong sustainability* dimension is the most well-known typology, the problem has been criticized for lacking diversity in the sustainability debate (Davidson, 2014).

Expressions of concern for the environment can also differ in terms of personal motives (Thompson & Barton, 1994). Anthropocentric and ecocentric views or epistemologies classify individuals based on the reasons why they should respect nature. Anthropocentric individuals value nature because nature sustains human life, while ecocentric individuals value nature because it has intrinsic value and therefore deserves to be protected as its own right (Thompson & Barton, 1994).

Borland and Lindgreen (2013) conceptualize anthropocentric epistemology as a view that justifies humans from the limits of nature and links this view to the *Dominant Social Paradigm (DSP)*. In contrast, ecocentric epistemology believes in the need for responsibility and management of nature and sees the anthropocentric epistemological view (or DSP) as the root of ecological problems; this links ecocentric epistemology with the *New Environmental Paradigm* (Borland & Lindgreen, 2013; Dunlap, 2008). Critical reflection on DSP is also reviewed from the perspective of the transformation framework of Hopwood et al. (2005).

Hopwood et al. (2005) map three different views (*status quo*, *reform*, and *transformation*) on sustainability. The *status quo* view sees sustainable development as possible within existing structures or arrangements. Strong support for the free market exists,

but some forms of government intervention are also tolerated. Proponents of this view have a weak view of sustainability and see natural capital as replaceable with human capital. The *reform* view perceives the root of the problem of sustainability as an imbalance of information and knowledge, and sees changes in economic and political structures as necessary, but without fundamental transformation. The reform view recognizes that major shifts must occur in policies and lifestyles, and therefore supports market reform, but remains within existing social and economic structures; this view is held by most academics and non-governmental organizations.

Finally, those who believe that a *transformation* approach is necessary, believe that the relationship between humans and the environment, existing economic and power structures, is the root of the problem of unsustainability and that radical transformation is necessary. This group tends to see injustice as the main source of environmental and social problems. In addition, they usually see the current model of capitalism as the exploitation of nature and man, and see this as the main cause of environmental and social problems.

Discourses help maintain power and hegemony, and as a result, the struggle for sustainable development discourse highlights the ongoing negotiations about what it means to be sustainable, how to achieve it and by whom, and which voices are most heard in this regard (Springett, 2003; Tregidga, Milne, & Kearins, 2015). Academic research, whether acknowledged or not, contributes to the struggle of this discourse. As a result, research should reflect on how the concept of sustainability is used in marketing academia to truly understand how stakeholders define sustainability in the context of marketing.

Sustainable marketing is still very under-researched (McDonagh & Prothero, 2014; Purani, Sahadev, & Kumar, 2014). In fact, Purani et al. (2014) found that only 2% of the articles in the 10 highest-ranked marketing journals specifically addressed sustainability. However, there have been few reviews of the field of sustainable marketing, or more specifically, sustainability research in the marketing literature due to its broad scope (Chabowski, Mena, & Gonzalez-Padron, 2011; Kilbourne & Beckmann, 1998; Kumar, Rahman, & Kazmi, 2013; Leonidou & Leonidou, 2011; McDonagh & Prothero, 2014).

A literature review on sustainability has focused on categorizing findings using a review and analysis of connections as well as a bibliograph. The review shows that although sustainability topics are growing in popularity, they mostly focus on managerial aspects (Kilbourne & Beckmann, 1998) and a wide variety of topics are raised (e.g., regulation, consumer and organizational practices) (McDonagh & Prothero, 2014), dominated by American and European perspectives (Leonidou & Leonidou, 2011).

Although there has been research for 20 years, McDonagh and Prothero (2014) urge future research to engage in the question of 'what is sustainability marketing'. The fact that many definitions of sustainability marketing exist (Andreea, 2015) suggests that this concept is still a matter of debate. This divergence is likely to reflect a complex and debated definition of sustainability (Hopwood et al., 2005; Sidiropoulos, 2014). Most of the articles have focused on the consumer market; however, some have also studied business-to-business markets (e.g., Sharma, Iyer, Mehrotra, & Krishnan, 2010). However, attempts to conceptualize and theorize sustainability marketing still remain problematic. For example, a recent effort by Lim (2016) presents sustainability marketing as covering economic, environmental, social, ethical, and technological aspects in sustainability; however, this conceptualization remains inadequate to

define the ideas, limitations, and practical implications of sustainability marketing. In addition, few articles aim to establish theories about the concept of sustainability marketing (e.g., Belz, 2005; Gordon et al., 2011; Peattie, 2001; Sheth & Parvatiyar, 1995); instead, most articles in the field of sustainability use it as context and rarely discuss in depth the conceptualization and implications of sustainability marketing.

Indeed, there is still confusion about the interchangeable nature between sustainability, sustainable marketing, and green marketing. Some argue that sustainability and sustainable marketing are two different concepts (e.g., Belz, 2005; Kumar et al., 2013), while others use them interchangeably. The same can be seen for *green marketing* used interchangeably with sustainability and sustainable marketing (e.g., Abzari, Shad, Sharbiyani, & Morad, 2013; Garg, 2015).

This research offers fresh perspectives and new insights in the field of sustainable marketing by using academic research to understand the current conceptualization of sustainable marketing, and by using a different methodology than previous sustainable marketing reviews. Specifically, the authors use discourse analysis to emphasize the impact areas of sustainable marketing to advance author knowledge in this rapidly evolving space. The authors offer a key conceptualization of sustainable marketing, articulating the objectives, assumptions, and underlying practical and theoretical implications. The study also addresses the sometimes vague theorizations offered by previous research (e.g., Lim, 2016; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996), and aims to provide a clear and practical conceptualization, as well as implications, of sustainable marketing for both marketing academics and practitioners.

METHOD

The author's goal is to understand the discourse of sustainable marketing. Detailed meta-analysis is not the purpose of this study, nor do the authors intend to repeat the previously mentioned studies. Therefore, the purpose of the analysis is not to classify or categorize articles, as this has been done by many studies (e.g., Kumar et al., 2013). Instead, the author wants to classify or categorize the views of sustainable marketing. Therefore, this study uses *discourse analysis*.

Discourse is embedded in social and cultural practices, and as a result, discourse is shaped by the world and shapes the world (Paltridge, 2012). Discourse is "a particular set of ideas, concepts, and categorizations that are generated, reproduced, and altered in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social reality" (Hajer, 1995, p. 44). Therefore, *discourse analysis* considers how the use of language presents different views of the world (Paltridge, 2012). Discourse-based analysis provides an approach to reflecting on marketing thinking, especially "among opposing discourses" about sustainable consumption, the environment, and justice, for example (Fitchett & Caruana, 2015, p. 2). *Discourse analysis* is helpful in understanding interpretations of sustainability and sustainable development (Hugé et al., 2013). In addition, discourse analysis allows for the reflection and identification of broader political and economic assumptions in marketing thinking (Fitchett & Caruana, 2015).

To conduct this research, a search was conducted on the Scopus database using the term 'sustainability marketing' or 'sustainable marketing', as well as a separate search for 'green marketing' in titles, abstracts, and keywords. Scopus is the only database that allows ranking

by citations, so it is used to sort the literature based on total citations. However, the authors realize that by using Scopus, some journals may be missed, and some widely cited articles may not be covered. Also, by leaving out monographs and edited books, some more critical insights may be missed. Nonetheless, with this approach, we can focus our analysis on the articles that have had the greatest impact on the sustainable marketing discourse to date.

The words 'sustainability' and 'sustainable marketing' were combined in a single search on Scopus ('sustainability marketing' OR 'sustainable marketing') due to the lack of articles that use these phrases. Overall, the search revealed 89 papers with citations for sustainability/sustainable marketing, and 393 papers with citations for green marketing. The database search was conducted on February 18, 2018, and the articles searched were not limited by a specific time period.

In this study, the author analyzed the 100 most cited papers from the search for sustainability/sustainable marketing and green marketing. Citations for sustainability/sustainable marketing range from 132 to 1, while green marketing ranges from 738 to 31 citations and covers about 80% of all citations. Only four articles overlapped between the two lists, so the other four papers (up to 104) from the green marketing search list were also included in the analysis. This helps narrow the focus of the search, while still providing a large number of papers to analyze.

Due to the lack of 100 articles for sustainability/sustainable marketing, a reference list of 89 articles was consulted to identify whether any important sources were missing from the search on Scopus. By focusing only on articles that discuss sustainability/sustainable marketing, eight other sources are included (Belz, 2005, 2006; Belz & Peattie, 2010; Charter et al., 2002; Kotler, 2011; Martin & Schouten, 2014; Murphy, 2005; Pereira Heath & Chatzidakis, 2012). Although the primary search focus is on journal articles in English, there are exceptions for two non-journal papers (Belz, 2005; Charter et al., 2002), both of which are frequently cited in articles identified by early searches. A total of 166 articles remained after 31 papers were deleted that only referred to sustainability, sustainable, or green marketing, but did not discuss them.

The author's analysis is considered the *Grand Discourse* approach. Foucauldian-style long-term discourse studies may involve the *Grand Discourse* approach, in which "a group of discourses is structured and presented as an integrated framework," or in other words, an aggregated discourse pattern (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000, p. 1133), which is considered to reflect social realities (in this case, continuous marketing research). This approach seeks to find a dominant language or discourse that is universal and standardized, as in the concept of immigration (Lim & Moufahim, 2011). This analysis examines the relationship between words, frequency, and semantic associations (Lim & Moufahim, 2011). Since texts are "material manifestations of discourse" (Chalaby, 1996, p. 688), they are analyzed for the "meanings" and inferences associated with and drawn from the broader social context (Lim & Moufahim, 2011). Overall, the text was analyzed thematically to understand the dominant discourse on sustainability and marketing, and ultimately to understand the *Grand Discourse* concept of sustainable marketing.

First of all, the definitions of sustainability, sustainable, and green marketing are found using the search function in each text. Furthermore, other sentences were chosen to be analyzed because they were related to the concepts of sustainability, marketing, and/or

sustainability/sustainable/green marketing; the framework of Hopwood et al. (2005) helps in the selection of texts. Although other sustainability frameworks have been created, as discussed earlier, the Hopwood et al. (2005) framework is the most frequently cited and most comprehensive type that emphasizes a broader and more specific range of aspects of sustainability, including environmental, social (*inequality*, *injustice*), and economics (economic models, responsibility). For example, Neumayer's (1999) framework on *weak* and *strong sustainability* focuses only on the economic aspects of sustainability, while the anthropocentric and ecocentric views are more concerned with the environmental dimension (Thompson & Barton, 1994).

The first part of the analysis includes identifying sentences that address sustainability issues as discussed in the framework of Hopwood et al. (2005) (e.g., views on growth, the role of government, business, and individuals, and ideas for sustainable solutions). The authors also extend the analysis to other content related to sustainability, as this is necessary to understand why and how businesses engage in sustainable marketing. This includes (a) consumer, business, and/or government responsibility for sustainability; (b) why the business is involved in sustainability (e.g., morals, profits, and/or competitive advantage); and (c) how sustainable marketing is implemented (e.g., green products and sustainable lifestyle promotions). In the coding process, there are variations in the length and number of sentences in the articles; this is understandable because some articles focus heavily on sustainable marketing, while for others, the topic becomes secondary in the article.

The extended analysis provides a classification that is very similar to the framework of Hopwood et al. (2005), and therefore, comparable terms are used. Three conceptualizations are identified: one that addresses minor changes or adjustments to business/marketing activities and responsibilities (*supporting conceptualization*), another that reforms some of the key premises in business/marketing practice (*conceptualization reform*), and the last one that argues for institutional transformation and business/marketing practices (*transformative conceptualization*).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Findings: Three Conceptualizations of Sustainability Marketing

The decision has been taken to use sustainability marketing, sustainable marketing, and green marketing under one term – sustainability marketing. This is because both the terms "sustainable" and "sustainability" are indistinguishable from each other in the text, in contrast to the observation of Belz (2005) who states that the two terms are different. Although green marketing is still used in terminology, many scholars see sustainability marketing as a broader holistic construct (e.g., Gordon et al., 2011; McEachern & Carrigan, 2012; Peattie, 2001; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). Discourse analysis reveals differences in conceptualization of how to implement or practice sustainability marketing, and more importantly, why and how marketers and companies should practice sustainability marketing.

2. Additional Sustainability Marketing (Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing)

The Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing (ASM) perspective includes the integration of sustainability across the marketing mix, focusing on the environmental, social, and economic dimensions of production and consumption. ASM encompasses most sustainability marketing perspectives as it focuses on changes in existing structures or arrangements (e.g. free markets,

government interventions, and business models). The watchword for this perspective might be 'Do what the company does, better'; The better in this regard involves the incorporation of the ecological and social impacts of production and part of consumption.

First of all, focusing on the product, the properties of sustainability can be divided into three attributes: production conditions (how the product is made, e.g. child labor, harsh working conditions, CO2 emissions from production, water use); characteristics and performance of the product (what is contained in the product and what functions it produces, e.g. CO2 emissions from use, chemicals); and exposure and risk (exposure of people to risks through the consumption of products, e.g. non-toxic paints) (Iles, 2008). Sustainable products will reuse materials and are recyclable, and in the best case, products are designed as cradle-to-cradle (Peattie, 2001). Planned destruction must not exist (Achrol & Kotler, 2012; Polonsky, 2011), replaced with products that are easy to repair (Charter et al., 2002) and can be improved (Polonsky, 2011). Packaging should also be considered (e.g. safety, recyclable, and biodegradable) and minimized (e.g. single serving size) (Charter et al., 2002; Fuller & Ottman, 2004; Kotler, 2011; Murphy, 2005). As a consequence of sustainable product production, many are aware of the need for a balance between price and performance (Grimmer & Bingham, 2013; Kammerer, 2009; Michaud & Llerena, 2011).

In this discourse, both the life cycle of socioecological products and/or the life cycle of ecological products can be considered. The socioecological product life cycle includes examining who produces the product and the impact of production on humans and non-human beings, such as the elimination of child labor, harsh working conditions, and cruelty to animals, as well as implementing living wages and other employee benefits (e.g., flexible working hours) (Charter et al., 2002; Ingenbleek, Meulenberg, & Van Trijp, 2015; Nkamnebe, 2011; Strong, 1996).

In contrast, the life cycle of ecological products considers the environmental impact of the product during production and consumption, as well as in disposal (Lähtinen, Vivanco, & Toppinen, 2014; Lampe & Gazda, 1995; Prakash, 2002; Zeriti, Robson, Spyropoulou, & Leonidou, 2014), which is usually achieved through life cycle assessment (Belz, 2006).

Previous green marketing research focused more purely on products (Langerak, Peelen, & van der Veen, 1998), but marketing responsibilities have now expanded to include distribution, pricing, and promotion (Chamorro & Bañegil, 2006; Jain & Kaur, 2004). Distribution includes product disposal, so issues such as the use of recycled materials (pollution prevention) and disposal/collection projects (resource recovery) become part of the marketer's role; This 'resource loop', i.e. recovering and reusing materials, is essential for sustainable product systems (Charter et al., 2002; Crane, 2000; Fuller & Ottman, 2004; Murphy, 2005; Prakash, 2002). The resource circle for recovering materials from consumers must be easily accessible to customers (Charter et al., 2002). In addition, products, whenever possible, should be produced locally to reduce transport emissions and provide employment for local communities (Charter et al., 2002; Kotler, 2011).

Reducing carbon emissions is important in the distribution of Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing (ASM). Reduced storage requirements and product sizes (e.g., flat packaging) can reduce transportation requirements (Charter et al., 2002). Reducing the impact of transportation can include checking the company's own location, finding a closer supplier, and using other forms of transportation that result in lower carbon emissions (Charter et al., 2002). In addition,

pressure can be placed on existing suppliers to adopt sustainable practices or suppliers can be replaced in an effort to work with sustainable partners (Iles, 2008). Therefore, the working conditions of suppliers and their waste management practices should be audited (Charter et al., 2002; Kirchoff, Koch, & Satinover Nichols, 2011; Zhu, Dou, & Sarkis, 2010).

Product pricing now includes environmental and social costs, and addresses and communicates total cost of products (Peattie, 2001; Polonsky, 2011; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). Join environmental costs and social is not an easy task because production and consumption are largely supported by the environment (Peattie, 1999, 2001) and when taken into account, these costs are inevitable and ultimately passed on to consumers. Therefore, the government has a strong role in regulating the field of full cost accounting (Charter et al., 2002; Kotler, 2011; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). In addition, the marketer's job is to make customers aware of the lifetime cost of the product, taking into account durability, repairability, water/energy usage, etc. (Belz & Peattie, 2010; Kaenzig & Wüstenhagen, 2010; Polonsky, 2011). There is a wide range of research and opinions on the application of premium prices for green products and this is still a matter of debate (Michaud & Llerena, 2011). Some scholars believe that premium prices are feasible and consumers are willing to pay for them (Chen, 2010; Hamzaoui Essoussi & Linton, 2010), while other research shows that (most) consumers are reluctant to pay more for the environmental dimension (Kammerer, 2009; Manaktola & Jauhari, 2007; Rex & Baumann, 2007). Similarly, some scholars also believe that sustainable products must compete with non-sustainable products, and therefore require similar availability and pricing (Fuller & Ottman, 2004; McDaniel & Rylander, 1993), while others see the benefit of green products as the ability to charge a premium price and thus increase the company's profits (Langerak et al., 1998).

Other green pricing strategies include philanthropy and targeting lower-income populations. Donations and other charitable giving can also be integrated into pricing, usually emphasizing a percentage of income donated to charity (e.g., cause-related marketing) (Charter et al., 2002). Regarding the social aspects of pricing, scholars have also advocated shifting the focus to the bottom of the pyramid (Achrol & Kotler, 2012; Hunt, 2011; Kirchgeorg & Winn, 2006; Murphy, 2005).

This "bottom of the pyramid" approach Includes considering the market and consumers of economic group and medium, as well as understanding consumer needs and preferences. By recognizing the potential of the market that This neglected company can create products and services that are in accordance with the social and economic conditions of the market, thus helping to Increase quality of life and provide benefits to the wider community. Promotion Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing (ASM) focuses on two key elements: the materials used in the promotion (how to promote) and the message promoted (what is promoted). First, advertising and other marketing activities are carried out through the following Sustainable (e.g., internet, recycled paper) (Kotler, 2011; Murphy, 2005). Second, the promotion is focused on the communication of corporate and product sustainability initiatives (Mostafa, 2006) as well as charitable activities (Jones et al., 2008). These kinds of promotional efforts usually focus on issues related to consumption rather than production (Leonidou, Leonidou, Palihawadana, & Hultman, 2011). Dee this, the company strives to communicate a commitment to sustainability practices, charitable efforts, and environmental initiatives in the company's advertising and marketing messages. This approach aims to attract consumers who

have awareness tall environmental and social issues, and at the same time improve sustainable corporate image.

The goal of Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing (ASM) is to provide a "green" or "sustainable" image for a company (or brand) (Ko, Hwang, & Kim, 2013; Lampe & Gazda, 1995; Pujari, Wright, & Peattie, 2003), so that the advantage of being a first mover advantage becomes very important (McDaniel & Rylander, 1993). Green imagery is expected to improve the reputation of a company or brand and customer loyalty (Phau & Ong, 2007). Providing credible and transparent information is aimed at overcoming consumer skepticism about green products and the claims that occur (Chen & Chang, 2013; Vlosky, Ozanne, & Fontenot, 1999).

Therefore, eco-marks or certifications can be adopted to provide customers with easy-to-understand and credible information (Borin, Cerf, & Krishnan, 2011; Mendleson & Polonsky, 1995; Mostafa, 2006; Murphy, 2005; Nair & Menon, 2008). However, education and awareness campaigns may need to be run by the government to educate consumers about green labels (Zorić & Hrovatin, 2012). The main assumption is that any environmental information provided will be useful to "green" consumers and will be used in decision-making (Rex & Baumann, 2007).

The implementation of Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing (ASM) is focused on creating competitive advantage, reducing costs, differentiating, obtaining/maintaining a good reputation, and anticipating regulations (Calu, Negrei, Calu, & Avram, 2015; Nkamnebe, 2011; Rountree & Koernig, 2015; Zeriti et al., 2014). This financial and reputational success is usually achieved through offering new value propositions to customers (Patala et al., 2016) and maintaining good relationships with stakeholders (Biloslavo & Trnavčevič, 2009).

Extracting value from environmentally conscious consumers is a top priority, which is why profits remain more important than marketing's impact on the natural or social environment (Nair & Menon, 2008; Polonsky, 2011). In this case, green consumption and materialism are something compatible (Strizhakova & Coulter, 2013). This means that companies that implement additional sustainability marketing seek to achieve better profits and reputations through continuous efforts, while still prioritizing the business and profit aspects. Green consumption is integrated with materialistic values, where sustainable products or services are offered as a form of added value for consumers who care about environmental issues.

Traditionally, Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing (ASM) segments and targets markets based on attitudes towards sustainability (Akehurst, Afonso, & Martins Gonçalves, 2012; Kumar, Rahman, & Kazmi, 2016; Tinnish & Mangal, 2012). Specifically, previous research has focused on descriptions of "green" consumers (Shrum, McCarty, & Lowrey, 1995), but recent research has also used demographic and other characteristics to identify and thus segment "green" consumers. Positioning strategies are created after evaluating "green" or responsible consumer segments (Akehurst et al., 2012; Ingenbleek et al., 2015).

Overall, ASM relies on the sustainable attitude of consumers; Without these "green" consumers, businesses will not implement sustainable marketing activities (Cherian & Jacob, 2012; Peattie & Crane, 2005). In other words, it is a demand-pull strategy for green products (Chen, 2001). This means that ASM directs its efforts at consumers who have a sustainable attitude, because without demand from consumers who care about environmental issues, businesses will not implement sustainable marketing activities. With a focus on "green"

consumers, ASM strives to create demand for green products and aims to position their products to fit sustainable consumer values and preferences.

The implementation of Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing (ASM) can be done in a variety of ways, ranging from anticipating regulations to goals based on values and ethics. Overall, the literature describes the ability of companies to be reactive (respond after regulatory implementation or (negative) consumer pressure increases) (Chen, 2001; Dief & Font, 2010; Leonidou et al., 2011; Peattie & Crane, 2005); cautious (being reactive or anticipatory, before regulations are implemented, trying to avoid or influence the introduction of regulations) (Prakash, 2002); proactive (changing the company's culture, vision, or entering a new product market) (Crane, 2000; Leonidou et al., 2011; Peattie, 1999); or visionary (the core sustainability philosophy within the company since its inception) (Chamorro & Bañegil, 2006).

Some companies may act reactively, responding to pressure from regulatory changes or consumer demands, while others may seek to be cautious and anticipate possible regulation with proactive measures. There are also companies that choose to be visionaries by basing sustainability philosophy as the core of their company's vision and goals from the start. The approach chosen by companies in implementing ASM can vary depending on the situation, business strategy, and values held by the company. In each case, efforts to move towards sustainability can bring long-term benefits to the company, society, and the environment.

3. Reformative Sustainability Marketing (Reformative Sustainability Marketing)

Reformative Sustainability Marketing (RSM) expands on the aspirations of ASM and recognizes that current levels of consumption are unsustainable, usually reflecting inequities between developed and developing countries or limited resources on Earth (Achrol & Kotler, 2012). Therefore, RSM is considered responsible for promoting a sustainable lifestyle (Martin & Schouten, 2014; Scott, Martin, & Schouten, 2014) and to deprive the market of harmful or unwanted products or services (Achrol & Kotler, 2012; Bridges & Wilhelm, 2008; Kotler, 2011; Pereira Heath & Chatzidakis, 2012). Thus, RSM changed the way business and marketing exist today.

Marketing is recognized as a promoter of consumption, and at this time, it is the opposite of sustainability (Ferdous, 2010; Martin & Schouten, 2014; Prothero et al., 2010; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). In line with that, growth limits are also recognized (Kotler, 2011). Therefore, RSM involves not only promoting the sustainability of the company's products and services, but also a sustainable lifestyle (Gordon et al., 2011; Martin & Schouten, 2014). On the other hand, there are also those who believe that the job of governments and non-governmental organizations is to educate and promote sustainable behavior (Jain & Kaur, 2004). Similarly, governments should enact regulations to improve environmental and industrial standards (Chen, 2001). The RSM approach encompasses a broader role in promoting sustainability, not only focusing on the company's products and services, but also on changing people's consumption patterns and lifestyles as a whole. However, there is also the view that governments and non-governmental organizations have an important role to play in educating and mobilizing communities towards more sustainable behavior, as well as implementing regulations that support environmental and industrial sustainability.

Consumers are recognized as leaders of change, and hence, consumer demand is considered a reason to engage in sustainable activities (Belz & Schmidt-Riediger, 2010; Rakic

& Rakic, 2015; Rettie, Burchell, & Riley, 2012). RSM assumes that the problem of unsustainable consumption lies in the lack of information and knowledge by consumers (Cherian & Jacob, 2012; Kaenzig & Wüstenhagen, 2010; Rakic & Rakic, 2015). In this case, identity (Dermody et al., 2015), peer pressure, and social norms are seen as playing a role in consumption, both in symbolic consumption (Lee, 2008; Oliver & Lee, 2010) as well as peer influence (Lee, 2010), especially on young consumers and in purchases involving higher engagement (e.g. cars).

RSM sees the importance of the role of consumers in driving change towards more sustainable behavior. In RSM's view, information and education for consumers are important to change consumption patterns to be more environmentally friendly. Social identity and pressures also play an important role in shaping consumer preferences and choices in adopting sustainable behaviors, especially in purchases that have strong social and symbolic implications. Therefore, efforts to increase consumer awareness and understanding of environmental issues as well as the importance of sustainable actions are key in achieving more positive changes towards sustainability.

Displacement from individual ownership is also promoted (e.g., Charter et al., 2002; Murphy, 2005; Polonsky, 2011), and therefore focus on meeting needs through (long-term) rentals (Agrawal, Ferguson, Toktay, & Thomas, 2012), and (short-term) collaborative rentals, sharing, and consumption (Peattie, 2001; Peattie & Crane, 2005). Providing satisfaction without ownership can reduce the production of goods and their impact on the environment (Polonsky, 2011). In addition, RSM focuses on real needs, not frivolous 'wants' (Peattie, 2001). Marketers must change their mindset and ask themselves, "does this meet the real needs of humans?" (Charter et al., 2002).

The move from the traditional ownership model to a collaborative rental, sharing, and consumption model is one of the approaches proposed in RSM. By prioritizing meeting real needs and offering sustainable alternatives to private ownership, marketers are expected to reduce the negative impact of overproduction and consumption on the environment. It also encourages consumers to think more critically about whether their desires really meet essential needs, or whether they are merely temporary or inessential. In RSM, marketers act as agents of change to encourage more sustainable and environmentally responsible consumer behavior.

Today, marketing is seen as something that considers the long term (Belz, 2005; Kirchgeorg & Winn, 2006; Peattie, 2001; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). The philosophy of sustainable marketing guides the behavior, strategy, and processes of the entire organization, understanding its place in society and its obligations to current and future generations (Chamorro & Bañegil, 2006; Peattie, 1999; Peattie & Crane, 2005). Thus, sustainability marketing becomes an integral part of the organization's culture and values (Biloslavo & Trnavčevič, 2009; Leonidou, Leonidou, Fotiadis, & Zeriti, 2013), and 'internal green marketing' (Chamorro & Bañegil, 2006, p. 14) can be used to initiate cultural change towards the integration of sustainability principles in decision-making and activities.

The sustainable marketing approach is not just limited to a specific marketing campaign or action, but becomes part of how an organization operates and conducts business across the board. It involves a cultural change within the organization, where sustainability principles become the core values that guide every decision and action. By adopting sustainable marketing internally, organizations create an environment where aspects of sustainability are

prioritized and integrated in all levels and operational processes. In this case, sustainable marketing is not just about influencing consumer behavior, but also about reflecting a deep commitment to sustainability across the company's structure and operations.

Finally, there is greater engagement with stakeholders, and different types of stakeholders are consulted (internally, such as employees and customers, and externally, such as local communities) (Charter et al., 2002; Prakash, 2002; Sun, Kim, & Kim, 2014). Interactions with these stakeholders are often complicated due to their vague and complex nature (Rivera-Camino, 2007).

In sustainable marketing practices, organizations seek to engage more actively with the various stakeholders who play a role in the operational environment and influence the business. This includes employees, customers, business partners, governments, local communities, and even environmental groups or civil society organizations. This engagement with various stakeholders is an effort to explore the various views, needs, and expectations of all parties towards the organization, as well as to appreciate the impact of the business activities themselves.

However, interacting with stakeholders can be challenging, as each stakeholder has different interests and can sometimes conflict with each other. The process of consultation and dialogue with stakeholders needs to be carried out carefully and transparently to reach a common understanding and find solutions that are in line with sustainability and the interests of all parties involved. This requires organizations to have strong communication and management skills in addressing the diverse and often complex interests of a variety of different stakeholders.

4. Transformative Sustainability Marketing

Transformative Sustainability Marketing (TSM) aims to transform the institutions that hinder the transition to a sustainable society. Most importantly, TSM puts continuity above profit (van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). This form of marketing understands the barriers that consumers face in sustainable consumption; such as persuasive consumption ideologies, institutional barriers, and social norms (Pereira Heath & Chatzidakis, 2012). Therefore, TSM sees the responsibility as on the company and the consumer (Pereira Heath & Chatzidakis, 2012). Indeed, sustainable marketing cannot rely solely on sustainable production practices; It also requires positive collective action from citizens, "despite much criticism of consumption and consumer society ... It remains recognized that consumption is at the center of modern society ... Therefore, any change to Human Resource Development, by default, must consider consumer culture, as the core of such change" (Prothero et al., 2010, p. 154).

There is a critical attitude towards business philosophy. Specifically, ecosystems are seen as "primary considerations, not adaptations or additions after the event" (Fuller & Ottman, 2004, p. 1231). Social entrepreneurship and the fostering of a fair subsistence market are at the heart of several proposed new business philosophies and models (Facca-Miess & Santos, 2014). For example, micro-subsistence markets emphasize social or environmental sustainability rather than economic sustainability, and collaboration with government initiatives, social enterprises, and other local business efforts is important (Facca-Miess & Santos, 2014).

This new approach in business philosophy places ecosystems and social sustainability as top priorities. This philosophy emphasizes on corporate social and environmental responsibility, and encourages cooperation with other parties such as governments and social enterprises to achieve sustainable goals. The focus on the subsistence market also emphasizes the importance of meeting people's needs in a fair and sustainable manner, not just economic gain. In this view, businesses are expected to contribute positively to society and the environment, not just seeking financial gain.

Marketing and its fundamentals stem from neoclassical economics and its roots in capitalism, in DSP, are considered key actors of social, economic, and environmental problems. As a result, TSM acknowledges the weaknesses of the current economic system and poses the challenge of questioning pre-existing concepts of the 'good' of capitalism and neo-liberal economics, as well as their associated assumptions and ideologies (Dermody et al., 2015; Mitchell & Saren, 2008; Polonsky, 2011; Prothero et al., 2010). In addition, planetary boundaries are recognized and the current way of looking at humans and nature (as anthropocentric) is considered a key issue in our fight with sustainability (Martin & Schouten, 2014; McDonagh & Prothero, 2014; Mitchell & Saren, 2008). Therefore, a change in the marketing paradigm is needed (Achrol & Kotler, 2012; Pereira Heath & Chatzidakis, 2012), and questioned how marketing can become sustainable because current marketing "encourages and facilitates current levels of consumption that are not environmentally sustainable" (Peattie, 1999, p. 133). Overall, TSM seeks to provide a critical perspective on current marketing practices, consumption ideologies/cultures, and institutions that hinder the path to a sustainable society (Belz, 2005; Gordon et al., 2011). Belz (2005) and Gordon et al. (2011) argue that sustainability marketing is ineffective without institutional change. In fact, the design of the current institution in a actively encourages unsustainable consumption. Gordon et al. (2011) illustrate the need to combine green, social, and critical marketing, where without the combination of these three elements, they have no power on their own, which is in line with the principles of TSM. Therefore, Gordon et al. (2011) encourage marketers to see sustainability marketing as a critical marketing dimension, where marketers can challenge the dominant positivist management epistemology in marketing, especially in research methods, and stimulate advocacy, regulation, as well as policy change for sustainable consumption. TSM also special mentioned by Belz (2006), suggests the need for companies to be involved in institutional change.

According to Belz (2006), TSM is a type of 'mega marketing' and seeks to change social and political institutions to support sustainable consumption. These institutions can be formal (legal, regulatory) (Belz, 2005; Gordon et al., 2011) and informal (social norms) (Gordon et al., 2011; Pereira Heath & Chatzidakis, 2012). Therefore, companies can transform these formal institutions through lobbying activities and a proactive attitude towards regulation (Belz & Peattie, 2010; Rakic & Rakic, 2015; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996), such as "public support from companies for ecological tax reform, voluntary agreement on socio-ecological industry standards, development of sustainability labels in cooperation with non-governmental organizations" (Belz, 2006, pp. 142–143). In addition, informal norms can be changed through social marketing campaigns that address social norms; Such campaigns can change the norms of undesirable behaviors and undesirable products, as well as normalize desired behaviors and products (Gordon et al., 2011; Rettie et al., 2012).

Discussion

Since the introduction of sustainability marketing in the 1980s, many definitions have been offered (e.g., Belz, 2005; Gordon et al., 2011; Martin & Schouten, 2012; Sheth & Parvatiyar, 1995). Marketing has direct implications on product development and consumption promotion, both of which have a major impact on social and environmental conditions, perhaps much greater than other business fields (Assadourian, 2010; Gorge, Herbert, Özçağlar-Toulouse, & Robert, 2015). Marketing is also strongly linked to DSP, which has been linked to unsustainability (Mittelstaedt, Shultz, Kilbourne, & Peterson, 2014), and in particular, unsustainable products and overconsumption (Assadourian, 2010; Gorge et al., 2015). Therefore, it is important to understand how researchers have conceptualized sustainability and the role of marketing in it.

The conceptualization of sustainability marketing in the literature shows clear differences in views on sustainability and the role of marketing in contributing to sustainable development. To develop an understanding of what sustainability marketing is, the authors offer three conceptualizations that exist in the literature that can help future researchers identify which concepts researchers embrace and guide companies on how to integrate sustainability in corporate marketing activities. Therefore, despite previous efforts by scholars, the authors suggest that there is not just one conceptualization of sustainability marketing. Instead, the paper categorizes three perspectives that have guided researchers' understanding of sustainability marketing. This has implications for the theoretical, managerial, and policy implications of sustainability marketing for academics and marketing practitioners.

CONCLUSION

This study identifies three main approaches to sustainable marketing: *Auxiliary Sustainability Marketing* (ASM), which focuses on enhancing existing marketing practices; *Reformative Sustainability Marketing* (RSM), which advocates for promoting sustainable lifestyles; and *Transformative Sustainability Marketing* (TSM), which emphasizes the need for institutional change to support sustainability. Through *discourse analysis*, the research highlights the diversity of understanding regarding sustainability in marketing and the importance of clarifying concepts for effective implementation. Additionally, the involvement of all stakeholders, including consumers and governments, is deemed crucial for achieving meaningful change. Despite the growing interest in sustainable marketing, there remains a need for further research to define and apply this concept across various contexts. Further studies should clarify terminology, explore cross-cultural applications, and assess the real-world impact of each approach. Integrating technology and measuring long-term efficacy will help bridge the gap between theory and practice in sustainable marketing.

REFERENCES

Abzari, M., Shad, F. S., Sharbiyani, A. A. A., & Morad, A. P. (2013). Studying the effect of green marketing mix on market share increase. Advances in Environmental Biology, 7(10), 2981–2991.

Achrol, R. S., & Kotler, P. (2012). Frontiers of the marketing paradigm in the third millennium. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40(1), 35–52.

Agrawal, V. V., Ferguson, M., Toktay, L. B., & Thomas, V. M. (2012). Is leasing greener than selling? Management Science, 58(3), 523–533.

Akehurst, G., Afonso, C., & Martins Gonçalves, H. (2012). Re- examining green purchase behaviour and the green consumer profile: new evidences. Management Decision, 50(5), 972– 988.

Alvesson, M. (1994). Critical theory and consumer marketing.

Scandinavian Journal of Management, 10(3), 291–313.

Alvesson, M., & Karreman, D. (2000). Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis. Human Relations, 53(9), 1125–1149.

Andreea, I. R. (2015). Green agriculture marketing: Theoretical approach. in Andrei Jean-Vasile, Ion R. Andreea & Turek R. Adrian, Green economic structures in modern business and society (pp. 239–252). Hershey, PA: Business Science Reference.

Assadourian, E. (2010). Transforming cultures: From consumerism to sustainability. Journal of Macromarketing, 30(2), 186–191.

Belz, F.-M. (2005). Sustainability marketing: blueprint of a research agenda. Discussion Paper, Freising.

Belz, F.-M. (2006). Marketing in the 21st Century. Business Strategy and the Environment, 15(3), 139–144.

Belz, F.-M., & Peattie, K. (2009). Sustainability Marketing: A Global Perspective. Chichester: Wiley.

Belz, F.-M., & Peattie, K. (2010). Sustainability marketing: An innovative conception of marketing. Marketing Review St. Gallen, 27(5), 8–15.

Belz, F.-M., & Schmidt-Riediger, B. (2010). Marketing strategies in the age of sustainable development: evidence from the food industry. Business Strategy and the Environment, 19, 401– 416.

Biloslavo, R., & Trnavčevič, A. (2009). Web sites as tools of communication of a “green” company. Management Decision, 47(7), 1158–1173.

Borin, N., Cerf, D. C., & Krishnan, R. (2011). Consumer effects of environmental impact in product labeling. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 28(1), 76–86.

Borland, H., & Lindgreen, A. (2013). Sustainability, epistemology, ecocentric business, and marketing strategy: ideology, reality, and vision. Journal of Business Ethics, 117(1), 173– 187.

Braungart, M., McDonough, W., & Bollinger, A. (2007). Cradle-to- cradle design: Creating healthy emissions - a strategy for eco-effective product and system design. Journal of Cleaner Production, 15, 1337–1348.

Bridges, C. M., & Wilhelm, W. B. (2008). Going beyond green: The “why and how” of integrating sustainability into the marketing curriculum. Journal of Marketing Education, 30(1), 33–46.

Brundtland, G. H. (1987). Our common future: The world commission on environment and development. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Calu, A., Negrei, C., Calu, D. A., & Avram, V. (2015). Reporting of non-financial performance indicators: A useful tool for a sustainable marketing strategy. Amfiteatru Economic, 17(4), 977–993.

Carins, J. E., & Rundle-Thiele, S. R. (2014). Eating for the better: A social marketing review (2000–2012). Public Health Nutrition, 17(07), 1628–1639.

Chabowski, B. R., Mena, J. A., & Gonzalez-Padron, T. L. (2011). The structure of sustainability research in marketing, 1958– 2008: A basis for future research opportunities. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 39(1), 55–70.

Chalaby, J. K. (1996). Beyond the prison-house of language: Discourse as a sociological concept. The British Journal of Sociology, 47(4), 684–698.

Chamorro, A., & Bañegil, T. M. (2006). Green marketing philosophy: A study of Spanish firms with ecolabels. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 13(1), 11–24.

Charter, M. (1992). Greener Marketing: A Responsible Approach to Business. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing.

Charter, M., Peattie, K., Ottman, J., & Polonsky, M. J. (2002). Marketing and sustainability. Published whitepaper, Centre for Business Relationships, Accountability, Sustainability and Society. Retrieved from http://www.cfsd.org.uk/smart-know-net/links/smart-knownet.pdf.

Chen, C. (2001). Design for the environment: A quality-based model for green product development. Management Science, 47(2), 250–263.

Chen, Y.-S. (2010). The drivers of green brand equity: Green brand image, green satisfaction, and green trust. Journal of Business Ethics, 93(2), 307–319.

Kemper, J. A., Hall, C. M., & Ballantine, P. W. (2019). Marketing and sustainability: Business as usual or changing worldviews? *Sustainability*, *11*(3), 780.