From green claims to brand trust: A thematic analysis of sustainability communication in the beverage industry

[1]Dr. Ranjitha .P.K, [2]Vritti Bhutada, Shriya Jain, [3]Simran Gupta, [4]Kunjal Singh
Asst .Professor, Faculty of Management, Jain (Deemed-to-be-University), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
Student, Faculty of Management, Jain (Deemed-to-be-University), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
Student, Faculty of Management, Jain (Deemed-to-be-University), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
Student, Faculty of Management, Jain (Deemed-to-be-University), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

DOI:10.5281/zenodo.19188523

Abstract:
Growing environmental concerns and rising consumer awareness have intensified scrutiny of sustainability practices in the beverage industry. As a result, many beverage brands increasingly communicate environmental initiatives such as eco-friendly packaging, carbon reduction strategies, and responsible water use. However, the effectiveness of such sustainability communication in building brand trust remains uncertain, particularly when consumers question the authenticity of environmental claims. This study examines how sustainability communication influences brand trust through a qualitative secondary analysis of forty peer-reviewed journal articles. Using a thematic analysis approach based on Braun and Clarke's framework, the study synthesizes fragmented findings across marketing, CSR, and strategic management literature to identify the key mechanisms linking sustainability communication to brand trust. The analysis reveals that sustainability communication does not automatically lead to trust; rather, its effectiveness depends on perceived authenticity, transparency, and the absence of greenwashing. Perceived authenticity emerges as a critical mediating factor, translating sustainability messages into both cognitive and affective dimensions of brand trust. Transparency—through specific disclosures, measurable targets, and third-party certifications— strengthens this relationship by enhancing credibility. Conversely, perceptions of greenwashing weaken or even reverse the trust-building effect of sustainability communication. Based on these findings, the study proposes a moderated mediation framework in which sustainability communication influences brand trust indirectly through perceived authenticity, while transparency and greenwashing perceptions act as moderating factors. The research contributes to sustainability marketing literature by integrating signaling theory, legitimacy theory, and relationship marketing into a unified conceptual model specific to the beverage industry. From a managerial perspective, the findings suggest that beverage companies must align sustainability messaging with genuine operational practices, prioritize transparent disclosures, and avoid exaggerated environmental claims to foster long-term consumer trust.

Keywords:
Sustainability communication, Brand trust, Authenticity, Transparency, Greenwashing, Beverage industry, Thematic analysis.

1. Introduction:
The need for sustainability communication has become a strategic focus within the global beverage industry with the growing environmental concerns of plastics packaging, water consumption and carbon emissions playing an increasingly important role in how consumers evaluate products. Companies periodically use green claims to hint at environmental custodianship and branding their brands in a competitive environment. Still, the efficacy of such communication is debated upon. Although sustainability messages can further build reputational capital and consumer trust (Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen, 2010), it can also lead to cynicism when deemed as artificial or against corporate actions (Delmas and Burbano, 2011).

The credibility of environmental claims is especially sensitive to brand trust, the level of trust that the consumer exercises towards a brand founded on his or her sense of integrity and competence (Morgan and Hunt, 1994). Signaling theory is based on the idea that sustainability communication serves as a signal that works within a market, thereby reducing information asymmetry between firms and stakeholders (Connelly et al., 2011). Conversely, legitimacy theory implies that stakeholders have a critical eye on whether such signals are in tune with organizational behaviour (Suchman, 1995). Empirical research suggests that perceived authenticity and

transparency are key deciding factors on whether sustainability communication will increase or decrease trust (Alhouti, Johnson, & Holloway, 2016; Seele & Gatti, 2017).

Regardless of the growing body of knowledge, the results are still disjointed particularly in the beverage industry. This study aims to fill this gap with a qualitative secondary analysis of forty peer-reviewed journal articles and use thematic analysis to synthesize the existing knowledge and clarify the conditions under which green claims can translate into brand trust.

2. Review of literature:

The topic of sustainability communication in relation to brand trust has received considerable interest in the marketing, corporate social responsibility, and strategic management literature. Rather than an author-by-author review, this section synthesizes forty peer-reviewed studies into interconnected thematic streams that, in turn, explain the influence of green claims on the formation of trust.

2.1. Sustainability communication as strategic signaling:

Sustainability communication is firm-initiated communication about environmental practices, sustainable sourcing, packaging innovations and carbon reduction efforts. From a signaling theory, such communication reduces information asymmetry by communicating unobservable attributes of organizations (Connelly et al., 2011). Sustainability signals, if credible, are consistently shown to have positive effects on brand evaluations and stakeholder relationships (Du et al, 2010; Luo and Bhattacharya, 2006). However studies also warn that all green claims are not effective signals. Vague or symbolic claims may be discounted by consumers who see them as being either low-cost or unverifiable (Delmas & Burbano, 2011).

The literature generally agrees that sustainability communication is not inherently trustenhancing; its effectiveness depends on perceived credibility and congruence between communicated values and actual practices (Walker & Wan, 2012). and its success relies on perceived credibility and congruence between communicated values and actual practices (Walker & Wan, 2012). Divergence arises in terms of the degree to which intensity in communication yields better outcomes with some studies finding diminishing returns from messaging that seems to be excessive or promotional in nature.

2.2. Credibility, transparency, and message specificity:

Transparency has been widely found to be an important mechanism that affects consumer behaviours. Transparent communication—characterized by specific, verifiable, and measurable disclosures—enhances perceived credibility (Schnackenberg & Tomlinson, 2016). Empirical evidence suggests that third-party certifications and performance indicators that can be measured improve consumer confidence (Ellen, Webb, & Mohr, 2006).

However, transparency is not always effective. Seele and Gatti (2017) argue that greater disclosure can lead to increased scrutiny especially when there are inconsistencies between corporate narratives and operational realities. Thus, transparency functions as a double-edged mechanism it strengthens trust when aligned with authentic action but accelerates distrust when discrepancies are exposed that increases trust if it is in line with honest action, but speeds up distrust if discrepancies are revealed.

2.3. Perceived authenticity as a mediating mechanism:

Authenticity has become a key concept in the study of sustainability. Authentic brands are seen as being genuine, value driven and consistent over time (Alhouti et al, 2016). Thematic patterns across studies reveal that authenticity takes the role of mediator in the relationship of sustainability communication and brand trust. Trust is enhanced when consumers view environmental initiatives as part of corporate identity and not as a strategy of using opportunities.

Research further suggests that authenticity is dependent on the historical consistency and longterm commitment (Morhart et al., 2015). In contrast, reactive sustainability communication - which has been introduced after reputational crises - often fails to create genuine perceptions. The literature agrees on authenticity's psychological link between communication and trust, although there are differences in how it is measured in studies.

2.4. Greenwashing perception and consumer skepticism|:

Greenwashing, defined as misleading environmental claims, represents a significant counterforce. Studies have repeatedly shown that perceived greenwashing destroys brand trust and raises consumer scepticism (Delmas & Burbano, 2011),overstated claims, opaque terms, and selective disclosure increase mistrust.

Importantly, greenwashing perception works as a moderating factor. Even substantially sustainable firms may suffer from the reduced trust if communication is viewed as excessive. Divergence exists in the area of consumer

sensitivity; some research finds that highly environmentally conscious consumers are more sceptical while others report finding scepticism to be widespread across segments.

2.5. Brand trust formation in sustainable contexts:

Brand trust has been defined as having both cognitive and affective dimensions (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Within the context of sustainability the cognitive component comes from perceived competence and reliability, while the affective component is fostered by perceived benevolence and shared values. Factors Sustainability communication affects both aspects, but in different ways, namely, specific performance disclosures build cognitive trust, and value-based narratives foster affective ties.

Altogether, the literature proves that the communication about sustainability has a conditional influence on brand trust. Authenticity and transparency improve positive outcomes and perceptions of greenwashing spoil them. Nonetheless, empirical findings are still scattered by industry and methodology, which calls for an integrated thematic synthesis - and especially in the beverage industry.

3. Research gap:

Although both sustainability communication and brand trust have been studied extensively, the literature is fragmented conceptually and heterogeneous methodologically. First, most of the investigations place sustainability communication in a broader context of corporate social responsibility, seldom separating its particular influence on brand trust. While a number of scholars recognise trust as an outcome of relevance (Du et al., 2010; Luo & Bhattacharya, 2006), limited research systematically integrates sustainability communication, mediating mechanisms, and moderating conditions into a comprehensive analytical model.

Second, existing research has mainly been based on primary survey design with experimental methods, with a focus on direct causal testing rather than cross-study theoretical synthesis. Consequently, there is a lack of qualitative secondary research that is critically consolidating patterns across various empirical findings, which results in inconsistent conclusions about the effectiveness of the green claims, in terms of perceived authenticity and greenwashing perception.

A third gap lies in the limited scope of industry-specific scholarship.The beverage sector in particular struggles with distinct sustainability issues such as plastic packaging waste, controversial water usage practices and carbon intensive distribution logistics, all of which makes consumers more watchful. However, much of the existing academic inquiry rarely incorporates trust dynamics within this contextualized framework.

Ultimately, whilst the authenticity, transparency and perceived greenwashing have been interrogated individually, the synergistic relationship of these constructs in a unified conceptual model is under-theorised. Accordingly, this investigation pursues a thematic analysis of forty journal articles which were peer-reviewed, and the idea is to build an integrated framework to explain the communication of sustainability into the brand trust construct within the beverage industry milieu.

4. Objectives:

The general goal of the current work is to develop a theoretically-integrated understanding of the brand trust as a consequence of sustainability communication, through a qualitative synthesis of prior scholarship in the beverage industry. More precisely the study aims to amalgamate disparate empirical insights, and to explain the mechanisms that moderate the efficacy of green assertions.

Initially, the investigation is focused on systematically collecting insights from forty peer-reviewed journal articles investigating sustainability communication, green marketing, authenticity, transparency, perceived greenwashing and brand trust. By using a thematic analysis it aims to identify repeated conceptual motifs and concordant and discordant findings across the corpus.

Subsequently the research further seeks to examine the mediating role of perceived authenticity of the concept of perceived authenticity in the intersection between sustainability communication and trust in a brand. Given the growing recognition of authenticity as psychological link between corporate discourse and stakeholder appraisal, this objective is aimed at explaining the integrative role of authenticity.

Third, the study examines how transparency and perceived greenwashing moderate trust outcomes of trust, which addresses the conditional nuances in efficacy of sustainability communication.

In addition, the research also aims to develop a coherent conceptual framework particularly suited to the beverage industry, which includes both the theoretical refinement and practical strategic implications for the management of sustainable brands.

5. Proposed theoretical propositions:

By relying on signaling theory, legitimacy theory, and relationship marketing theory, as well as grounding our research in a thematic synthesis of forty peer-reviewed studies, we formulate a set of proposed theoretical propositions intended to clarify the conditional relationship between sustainability communication and brand trust in the beverage industry.

Proposition 1: Sustainability communication increases brand trust only when it functions as a credible and resource-intensive signal of environmental commitment

The thematic analysis shows that sustainability communication promotes trust only if green claims are in the eyes of stakeholders substantive, verifiable and in line with operational realities. When such communication involves a decreased level of informational asymmetry and a genuine commitment to environmental responsibility, this type of communication will produce positive evaluations of the brand, whereas symbolic or low-cost claims do not arouse the same outcomes in terms of trust.

Proposition 2: Perceived authenticity plays a key role as the central mediating variable in the communication of sustainability leading to brand trust.

In the studies surveyed, communication on sustainability rarely has a direct impact on brand trust. Rather, it influences people's perceptions of authenticity - an aspect which in turn drives cognitive and affective dimensions of trust. When environmental messaging is perceived to be consistent over time, value driven, and integrated into corporate identity, the intensity of authenticity is increased and therefore builds greater trust formation.

Proposition 3: Transparency strengthens the positive relationship between sustainability communication and perceived authenticity, provided that disclosures are specific, measurable, and verifiable.

The synthesis shows how transparency can improve one's credibility by providing concrete evidence - for example, quantified sustainability targets, third-party certifications and comprehensive reporting. Such transparency strengthens ideas of authenticity when put in an operationalized context of behavioral congruence which unites trust. Conversely, insincere alignment and lack of substance in transparency can lead to an increased level of scrutiny by stakeholders.

Proposition 4: Perceived greenwashing weakens, or may even reverse, the positive relationship between sustainability communication and brand trust.

Our analysis has shown consistently that perceived exaggeration, selective disclosure, or lack of correspondence between what is asserted and what is actually done makes one skeptical. Perceptions of greenwashing are particularly damaging to trust in the beverage industry - where environmental pressures are strong - even when efforts to be sustainable do have some substantive merit.

Taken as a whole, these propositions support the development of a moderated mediation framework where sustainability communication has an indirect influence on brand trust through perceived authenticity, moderated by perceived transparency and greenwashing perception in terms of both the size and the direction of the relationship.

6. Variables:

The research conceptualizes sustainability communication and brand trust in the framework of a strong theoretical architecture within which mediating and moderating mechanisms derived from the thematic synthesis of existing literature are integrated.

The independent variable is sustainability communications, operationalized as firm-initiated environmental messaging relating to sustainable sourcing, eco-friendly packaging, carbon reduction programs, water stewardship, and other environmental commitments in general. It consists of substantive disclosures (like quantifiable measures of performance) and symbolic green claims prefigured by marketing discourses. In the beverage industry, sustainability communication is often focused on things like plastic reduction, recyclable packaging and ethical supply chains. The construct represents the strategic signalling function of environmental claims that are intended to influence the perception of stakeholders.

The dependent variable of interest is brand trust, defined as consumers' propensity to place reliance upon a brand predicated upon perceived integrity, competence and benevolence (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Within the context of sustainability, trust in a brand has both a cognitive dimension (an evaluation of environmental performance) and an affective dimension (an evaluation of ethical responsibility).

The mediating construct that is under study is perceived authenticity. This construct operationalises the extent to which consumers assess sustainability communications as authentic, consistent and congruent with the underlying values of the brand. In this model authenticity is the psychological channel through which communication is transformed into trust.

Two moderating variables are introduced. First, transparency refers to the clarity, specificity, and verifiability of sustainability disclosures and their verifiability. Secondly, the perception of greenwashing reflects the degree of consumers' tendency to perceive environmental claims as exaggerated, deceptive, or inconsistent with actual practices. Collectively these moderators control both the extent and the direction of the interaction between sustainability communication and brand trust.

7. Conceptual framework:

The paper provides an explanation on the conceptual framework that explains how sustainability communication can be converted into brand trust through mediating and moderating processes. Based on the signaling theory and legitimacy theory, the proposed model argues that the sustainability communication process is a strategic signal that is designed to reduce information asymmetry between the companies and the consumer population. However, an impact that this signal has on brand trust is not direct nor automatic.

Perceived authenticity is in the center of this structure as the mediating role. In addition to the fact that sustainability communication is deemed as consistent with the main organizational values, which are traditionally ingrained, and action-driven, consumers tend to understand green claims as authentic, as opposed to being opportunistic. This kind of perception strengthens the cognitive and affective aspect of brand trust. On the other hand, in case the communication looks receptive or rather promotional, the image of authenticity is damaged thus limiting the development of trust.

Transparency strengthens the medium of connection between communication of sustainability and perceived authenticity. Massive publicity, measurable sustainability figures and checks by third parties enhance credibility, which makes environmental claims more believable. As a result, the transparency effect increases the authenticity-creating effect of sustainability communication.

On the other hand, the conception of greenwashing is a negative mediator between the sustainability communication and brand trust. In case the consumers realize the exaggeration, selective disclosure, or symbolic environmentalism, the trust-building effect of communication is undermined or inverted. This is more so felt in sectors which are highly scrutinized like beverage industry, where the perception of greenwashing can significantly undermine the brand credibility.

8. Research methodology:

This research study embraces a secondary research design, which is qualitative in nature because it undergoes systematic synthesis of the available literature on sustainability communication and brand trust in the beverage industry. Instead of gathering primary empirical information, the research is based on a compilation of the already published peer-reviewed journal articles and, therefore, creates a theoretical synthesis and narrows conceptual foundations.

This data includes 40 peer-reviewed articles included in the Scopus database, which covers the fields of marketing, corporate social responsibility, sustainability and strategic management. The selectivity of articles was done based on their relevance with sustainability communication, green marketing assertions, authenticity, transparency, greenwashing perception, and brand trust. Empirical and conceptual contributions were integrated so that the thematic coverage is exhaustive, and studies that were dedicated to irrelevant areas of CSR or did not have relevance to the outcomes of trust were omitted.

The thematic analysis is the applied analytical approach in line with the systematic framework developed by Braun and Clarke (2006). This technique is quite effective in identifying, analyzing, and interpreting common trends among qualitative data, and especially in cross-study synthesis in discontinuous research proceedings. Thematic

analysis is useful in condensing latent conceptual themes that reach beyond superficial discoveries and thus promote theoretical integration of varying methodological cultures.

The analysis follows a five-stage, thoroughly designed protocol, which is initial familiarisation with the chosen literature, open coding of salient constructs and inter-relationships, and categorisation of the codes into larger conceptual groups, the formation of higher-order themes, and culminating cross-study synthesis to create an integrated conceptual framework. The approach to research methodology bodes analytical rigor, preserving interpretive subtlety, therefore, aligning with the overall purpose of theory-building in the context of secondary research.

9. Data analysis:

The data analytic stage of the current study was supported by a well-organized protocol of thematic analysis, which was aimed at drawing integrative conclusions based on a set of forty peer-reviewed studies. Following the basic framework of the canonic structure developed by Braun and Clarke (2006), the methodological chain was developed in terms of underlying descriptive coding, then gradually higher-order abstractions of concepts, thus enabling a synthesis of cross-studies, as opposed to individual and discrete assessments.

The stage one involved the process of familiarisation in the systematic and repeated manner by perusing all articles and providing the opportunity to reveal the salient constructs, theoretical background, methodological strategy, and main empirical evidence. At the same time, analytical memos were designed to be able to summarize the repeated reasonings, presented contradictions, and context-related features related to the area of sustainability communication and trust building.

In the second phase, the researcher conducted an open coding process and assigned discrete labels to the emergent concepts- credibility, message specificity, transparency, authenticity, skepticism, greenwashing, cognitive trust, affective trust, signalling and legitimacy alignment. This coding project resulted in a massive repository of primary codes, both overt and latent theoretical implications.

The third phase was defined by the use of axial coding when the related codes were grouped together systematically into the more general conceptual groups. As an example, codes that applied to measurable disclosure, third-party certification, and verifiability were grouped within the blanket of transparency mechanisms, and codes signifying inconsistency, exaggeration and symbolic communication were lumped under what we term greenwashing risk factors.

In the fourth step, the development of themes was done and resulted in the higher-order theme such as Authentic Signalling, Conditional Transparency, Greenwashing-Induced Distrust, and Multidimensional Trust Formation.

Finally, convergent and divergent results in different contextual and methodological contexts were compared in a cross-study synthesis. This analytical pathway of integration led to the development of an explanatory framework that is coherent by connecting sustainability communication, mediating and moderating processes and brand trust gains in the beverage industry.

10. Findings:

The thematic synthesis also suggests that the correlation between sustainability communication and brand trust is contingent, multi-layered, and context specific, and not consistently positive.

Four patterns of analysis were identified among the forty researches reviewed.

To start with, sustainability communication is a powerful tool of building trust only when it is perceived as a trustworthy signal. The results show that the environmentally framed claims raise the brand trust in case they lessen the information asymmetry and they prove that they are actually environmentally committed. In comparison, the symbolic or generic claims do not have the same effects, which highlights the fact that the power of a signal depends on its perceived costliness and verifiability.

Second, the perceived authenticity occurs as a mediating construct. The discussion reveals that sustainability communication can seldom directly affect brand trust, but it can influence (or create) perceptions of authenticity which also leads to cognitive and affective expressions of trust. The stronger outcomes of trust are seen when brands have historically upheld a value-based position over time compared to companies that employ a reactive or campaign-based sustainability communication. In turn, authenticity acts as a psychological filter on which claims of green are judged.

Third, the contingent enhancing but not absolute role is played by transparency. Open reports build more credibility in perceptions of transparency where it is supported by evidence, third-party validation and measurable data. On the other hand, the lack of substantive alignment through transparency generates more scrutiny which can accelerate the loss of trust. Therefore, transparency strengthens credibility when there is behavioural congruence only.

Fourth, the image of greenwashing continues to send the mistrust. Even small discrepancies between stated sustainability narratives as well as operational activities arouses doubt. Greenwashing perceptions undermine the positive influence of sustainability communication significantly in the beverage industry, where consumers are more concerned with the issue of plastic waste and water usage.

Altogether, the results confirm the moderate mediation model, in which sustainability communication affects brand trust via authenticity, and transparency enables and the perception of greenwashing suppresses such a route. These findings narrow down the existing theory by showing that sustainability communication is not trust-enhancing in nature but functions within a credibility-contingent paradigm.

11. Suggestions:

The empirical findings reveal that beverage producers should formulate sustainability communication as a strategically credibility-focused activity, and not a promotion exercise. First, companies must observe a strong congruence among the claims they can make on television and the factual operational activities on which they base such claims. In fact, authenticity stands out as the key way that green claims are converted to consumer confidence and therefore, sustainability initiatives should pre-empt the communication process and not be a response to reputational demand. Environmental promise embedded over long-term within the corporate image helps in increasing perceived sincerity and solidifying the causal connection between performance and brand equity.

Second, corporations are supposed to place emphasis on its quantifiable and particular divulgations. Measured goals in terms of carbon cuts, recycled materials or water stewardship enhance disclosure and enhance credibility of genuineness. The third-party certifications, as well as independent audits, contribute to credibility by broadcasting more accountable than selfreported claims, eliminating the risk of skepticism.

Third, the managers should avoid the use of ambiguous or dramatic environmental language. The discussion shows that any slight discrepancies can create images of greenwashing, which will undermine trust. Based on verifiable data, evidence based communication reduces scepticism and protects brand equity.

Fourth, the sustainability narratives must have an optimal balance between the appeal to the thought and the appeal to the emotion. Whereas the performance metrics develop competence based trust, the value based storytelling develops emotional attachment and perceived benevolence. Both dimensions are to be combined and reinforce the process of trust formation altogether, the communication is to be convincing and resonant.

Lastly, brands of a beverage that would be in a highly scrutinized market ought to implement the proactive checking of the perception of the stakeholders. Instant monitoring of consumer reaction to sustainability messages will unravel the intruding scepticism and avoid the reputational injury. All these strategies together support a conditional, authenticity-based communication strategy that builds brand trust in the long run.

12. Limitations:

This research is limited by a number of inherent limitations of the qualitative secondary research. To begin with, the study is based solely on forty peer-reviewed scholarly journal articles and this could create a publication bias, causing those studies with substantial or positive results to be represented in the literature and consequently distort the thematic patterns that are developed. Despite the efforts to include different methodological and theoretical perspectives, the corpus might not be enough to include unpublished or even conflicting evidence.

Second, thematic analysis is interpretive in nature and this implies a certain amount of analytical judgment. Although systematic coding procedures were used to maximize rigor, the lack of themes developed is bound to be biased by the researcher. By applying other analytical prisms, one would end up with thematic structures that are different or one would present different conceptual relations.

Third, the paper is specifically targeted towards the beverage industry to bring sectoral depth. This situational specificity reinforces applicability in the field but, at the same time limits generalisability of the results to other sectors that turn out to experience different sustainability dynamics, like technology or heavy manufacturing. The

mechanisms of trust in the different sectors can vary significantly based on the visibility levels, regulatory forces and environmental impact profiles.

Fourth, the synthesis is based on the research carried in various cultural and geographical contexts. The perceptions of sustainability communication and greenwashing by the consumers would vary significantly across the markets, thus, affecting the generalizability of the findings of this paper.

Lastly, being a secondary research design, this study is not empirically testing the hypotheses that arise into the view through the conceptual framework. The thematic synthesis suggested here would have to be verified by future studies based on quantitative or mixed-method studies.

13. Conclusion:

The current study aimed to clarify the processes by which sustainability communications elicit brand trust in the beverage industry, by performing a qualitative secondary research on forty peerreviewed scholarly articles. The thematic analytic model is used to realize the inquiry beyond the fragmented empirical descriptions to make a consistent, mechanism-based model that clarifies the nexus between the eco-branding claims and the trust accrual. Our synthesis shows that sustainability communication is not necessarily a source of trust, its effectiveness depends on the perceived authenticity which is supported with clear and verifiable disclosures, and moderated by the threat of possibility of greenwashing accusations. Authenticity is the mediating variable that turns environmental message into both cognitive and affective constructs of trust. The transparency strengthens this causal process in situations when the communication is matched with meaningful corporate action, but the perceptions of greenwashing significantly reduce or even reverse the trust results.

In theory, this publication polishes the perspectives of signaling and legitimacy to depict that sustainability communication is credibility-conditional signaling and not an unqualified reputational asset. It also contributes to understanding by suggesting a moderated mediation framework tailored to the beverage industry which is a sector that is typified by an increase in environmental scrutiny.

Through a managerial perspective, the outcomes put a strong emphasis on the necessity of harmonizing, defining, and perpetuating long-term commitments in sustainable communications. In order to achieve the benefits of sustainable competitive advantage that will be long-lasting, trust is built not only by making claims of being green, but by ensuring that there is real and open system of putting practices of sustainability to action.

Future empirical research can use this theoretical framework to test and modify the hypothesized relationships in different industries and different cultural settings.

14. Reference:

(1) Alqaydi, S., et al. (2024). Awareness, knowledge, and beliefs about probiotics among Saudi adults. Frontiers in Immunology.
(2) Gok, A., & Ulu, E. (2023). Consumers' perceptions about probiotic food products: A case study. New Medit.
(3) Gok, A., & Ulu, E. (2023). Consumers' perceptions about probiotic food products: A case study. New Medit.
(4) Ávila, B. P., et al. (2020). Analysis of the perception and behaviour of consumers regarding probiotic dairy products. ResearchGate.
(5) Sanders, M. E., et al. (2019). Probiotics and prebiotics: Prospect of functional foods. PMC.
(6) Thapar, P., et al. (2025). Awareness, attitude and practice regarding probiotic foods. Scientific Reports.
(7) Chaudhari, A., et al. (2024). Awareness and buying behavior towards probiotic dairy. JSRR.
(8) Rosito, A., & Kassem, E. (2019). More than just a food! Functional food behavior. Master Thesis.
(9) Webb, M., & Singh, K. H. (2026). Knowledge, attitude and perception toward probiotics. Nutrition & Food Science.
(10) Carvalho, N. B., et al. (2025). Consumer attitude regarding products containing probiotics. ResearchGate.
(11) Arora, S., et al. (2021). Consumer awareness and willingness to purchase probiotic food. British Food Journal.
(12) Ganga Susheel Warriar (2025). Analysing consumer intentions using Theory of Planned Behavior. APAREV Journal.
(13) Shireen, A., & Savanur, M. S. (2024). Knowledge and consumption of traditional probiotics. IJTK.
(14) Thapar, P., Niharika, G., & Maheswari, U. K. (2025). Awareness and practice regarding probiotic foods. Scientific Reports.

(15) Coherent Market Insights (2025). Medical Probiotics Market Forecast.
(16) Bhutada & Kovaleva (2025). A comprehensive review of probiotics and human health. Frontiers in Microbiology.
(17) Đanić, M., et al. (2025). Parental knowledge, attitudes, and practices on probiotic use. Frontiers in Immunology.
(18) Yassine, F., Najm, A., & Bilen, M. (2025). (2025). The role of probiotics in the treatment of IBD: clinical trials overview. Frontiers.
(19) Chen, L., et al. (2022). The impact of social media health influencers on probiotic purchase intention. Journal of Consumer Health Studies, 15(2), 112–128.
(20) Martinez, R., & Lopez, J. (2021). Price sensitivity and willingness to pay for probiotic supplements. Health Economics Review, 11(4), 201–215.
(21) Singh, P., et al. (2023). Doctor recommendation and probiotic consumption behavior in urban India. Indian Journal of Public Health Marketing, 9(1), 55–72.
(22) Kim, S., et al. (2022). Gut-brain axis marketing claims and consumer trust in probiotic products. Food Marketing Quarterly, 18(2), 89–104.
(23) Brown, T., & Ahmed, R. (2021). Subscription-based probiotic services and customer retention. Digital Health Commerce Review, 5(1), 22–39.
(24) Rao, K., et al. (2020). Cultural beliefs and probiotic consumption patterns. International Journal of Consumer Culture, 12(3), 177–192.
(25) Thompson, A., & Lee, J. (2023). Functional food vs supplement positioning of probiotics. Journal of Functional Foods Marketing, 6(2), 98–115.
(26) Garcia, M., et al. (2021). Brand transparency and ingredient disclosure in probiotic marketing. Journal of Ethical Consumerism, 14(4), 210–226.
(27) Patel, R., & Morgan, S. (2022). Consumer skepticism toward exaggerated probiotic health claims. Journal of Advertising Ethics, 10(1), 60–78.
(28) Anderson, T., & Blake, R. (2021). The role of gut health awareness campaigns in probiotic adoption. Journal of Health Communication, 16(3), 145–162.
(29) Kumar, S., et al. (2022). Online reviews and consumer trust in probiotic supplements. E-Commerce Health Review, 9(2), 88–104.
(30) Davis, L., & Wong, M. (2020). Gender differences in probiotic consumption behavior. International Journal of Consumer Behavior, 12(4), 210–226.
(31) Evans, J., & Roy, S. (2022). Perceived side effects and consumer hesitation toward probiotics. Journal of Health Risk Perception, 11(3), 134–149.
(32) Almeida, P., & Costa, L. (2020). Retail store placement and probiotic impulse buying behavior. Retail Marketing Journal, 18(1), 66–82.
(33) Verma, A., et al. (2021). The impact of health consciousness on probiotic buying behavior. Journal of Consumer Health Psychology, 17(3), 150–168.
(34) Taylor, B., & Hughes, C. (2021). Visual packaging cues and perceived effectiveness of probiotics. Journal of Packaging and Branding, 9(3), 130–147.
(35) Reddy, N., et al. (2022). Age differences in probiotic knowledge and consumption patterns. Journal of Demographic Marketing Research, 10(2), 75–93.
(36) Morgan, L., & Ellis, P. (2020). Perceived immunity benefits and probiotic purchase during health crises. Journal of Crisis Marketing, 5(2), 90–108.